

during the two periods of Austrian rule, 1688–1690 and 1717–1739; and Vladimir Simić, also of Belgrade University, concludes the volume with a description of the commemorative medals struck by the Austrians to mark the peace.

This is a very useful compendium because it makes the findings of much southeast European scholarship on this period available in English for the first time and covers ground generally treated only superficially in Anglo-American scholarship. The volume clearly transcends the limitations suggested by the title and is thus a significant contribution to our understanding of the Habsburg-Ottoman conflict in early modern times. The collection has been excellently copyedited and proofread by English native speakers, so that with a few notable exceptions, the reader is spared the usual lexical malapropisms one frequently encounters in such linguistic migrations.

FRANZ A. J. SZABO
University of Alberta, Canada

Prague Panoramas: National Memory and Sacred Space in the Twentieth Century. By Cynthia Paces. Pitt Series in Russian and East European Studies. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009. xvii, 309 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Photographs. Maps. \$60.00, hard bound. \$27.95, paper.

Toward the end of the twentieth century, a group of central European historians began to mine the concept of sites of memory for new insights into the cultural, political, and national histories of the region. Ranging from studies of statues to public squares, war memorials, cemeteries, and museums, these various works produced numerous new insights into the complex history of the region. Most, but not all, of the scholarship produced by the central European sites of memory industry has been relatively narrow in focus, dealing with either a particular historical moment, a specific location, or a single type of monument, space, or practice. Cynthia Paces's *Prague Panoramas* exemplifies the finest qualities of this genre of historical work even as it occasionally succumbs to the problems inherent taking a specific place—in this case Prague—as the main focus of analysis.

Yet Prague makes an excellent choice for a study of the interactions between public spaces and larger cultural, political, and national agendas for the very reason that the city itself was as much a contested space as any of the locations within the city that Paces examines. As she points out in the introduction, the making of Prague into both a Czech city and the national capital of a state if not fully Czech, then at least one dominated by Czechs, was a project more than a century in the making. As a changing constellation of prominent Czechs sought to, quite literally, carve their vision of Czech Prague into the public landscape, divisions between the Czechs and other Prague citizens as well as those between and among the Czechs themselves were laid bare for all to see. The greatest strength of Paces's work is the deftness with which she teases out the internal divisions among the Czechs themselves, rather than focusing too much of her time and effort on the better-known story of the Czech-German divisions in the capital.

In particular, Paces emphasizes the ways in which interactions between Czech visions of Prague as the capital of the nation and of Prague as a canvas upon which to express the religious ideals—both Catholic and Protestant—of the Czech people helped to define the public landscape we find there today. As a result, she rescues from at least partial obscurity the importance of religion, especially Catholicism, to contemporary debates about the Czech nation and its place in the wider world. While the role of Catholicism in recent Czech history is well documented in Czech-language scholarship, authors working in English have too often ignored this vital element of Czech culture and political life. For this reason alone, Paces's book is well worth reading.

Another strength of the work is the way that Paces traces these issues over time, beginning in the late nineteenth century and ending after the fall of the communist regime, thereby giving readers a clear sense of both the continuities and the changes over time in the spaces she studies. That said, one could have hoped for a more extensive treatment of two issues. The first would be how the remaking of Prague involved the erasure of the

history of others who lived there—Germans and Jews before the 1980s and, since the early 1990s, Slovaks and Roma. This is not to say that Paces does not deal with the question of erasure, because she does. But her analysis would have been enriched by investigating in greater depth the issues she does raise in her final chapter.

The second, and admittedly more challenging area of research that could have improved the later chapters of the book—those dealing with more recent manifestations of the issues central to her study—is the ways in which non-elite citizens of Prague have constantly redefined these spaces in their own ways and for their own purposes. Paces does mention, for instance, graffiti on certain monuments at certain moments, but anyone who has visited the more out-of-the-way national monuments of Prague in the past decade or so is confronted by the constant refashioning of walls, sidewalks, and even the monuments themselves by graffiti artists and taggers, but also by young people who have turned what once were “sacred” spaces into places to drink or use drugs, ride skateboards, or have sex late at night. Similarly, a consideration of such ad hoc sites of memory as the “Lennon Wall” might have shed additional light on how Prague youth culture fashioned its own sacred spaces.

Extensively documented and felicitously argued, *Prague Panoramas* is a useful addition to any library or syllabus devoted to modern central European history, the history of modern cities, or the study of the interactions between religion, politics, and culture.

T. MILLS KELLY
George Mason University

Stalinist Terror in Eastern Europe: Elite Purges and Mass Repression. Ed. Kevin McDermott and Matthew Stibbe. Manchester, Eng.: Manchester University Press, 2010. xv, 235 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. \$90.00, hard bound.

The historiography of the Stalinist terror in eastern Europe has grown by leaps and bounds over the past two decades. Access to police, party, and state archives in the region has made it possible for historians to discover genuinely new material on repressions, surveillance, labor camps, numbers of victims, forms of torture, and Soviet involvement in purge trials, among other subjects. New institutes in the region devoted to the history of the secret police and state repression—some more or less political in their orientation—have organized conferences and published new studies and document collections that illuminate this particularly dark and brutal dimension of communist rule.

Despite the flourishing of studies on the terror in the individual countries of eastern Europe, there is very little synthetic work about the region as a whole, or even systematic comparative studies, that could provide insights into the determinants of terror across state and cultural boundaries. Although Kevin McDermott and Matthew Stibbe’s edited book does not fill these striking lacunae in the literature, it takes an important first step by providing substantive and veracious contributions on each of the countries of the region by reputable and well-informed specialists. Moreover, the editors’ introduction contains a series of cogent and concise observations about the sources, functions, and effects of communist terror as a whole that bring the reader up-to-date on the state of the field. They consider the numbers of victims in each of the countries, which are generally much larger than usually understood. Along with this, they talk about the widespread nature of the terror, rather than focus exclusively on the political elite, which constituted less than 1 percent of the number of victims. They suggest a new, more diversified periodization of the terror, beginning in some cases in 1940, in others during the war and ending in 1955–56, or even later, rather than the standard 1948–1953 understanding. And they review the arguments about Moscow’s role in the repressions, concluding that there remains no scholarly consensus about the extent of the domestic versus external (Soviet) sources of the purges and show trials. Until historians can work in the archives of the secret police in Moscow, it is unlikely that such a consensus can be reached.

This is not the place to argue the relative merits of including chapters, albeit interesting ones, on Soviet Moldavia, 1940–1953 (Igor Cașu) and the Baltic states, 1940–1953