the main victims of the blood libel were Ashkenazi Jews, but the literary compositions confronting this accusation were written mainly by Sephardic Jews.

As a culmination of this idea, the author treats the story of Simon of Trent and the spread of his cult throughout Germany, Poland, and Italy as a turning point in the connection between judicial and ideological aspects of the blood libel, following Hanna Węgrzynek (*"Czyrna legenda" Żydów*, 1995, 98), Joop van Banning (*Mord rytualny*, 2003, 57–78), and Anna Esposito (*Mord rytualny*, 2003, 119–56). The author challenges the widespread view that "Catholic obscurantism of the Counter-Reformation" is responsible for the change in the Holy See's attitude toward the blood libel after 1540, when the last papal bull defending the Jews from this accusation was issued by Paul III, and claims that the cult of Simon of Trent, and especially his formal beatification in 1588, caused this (379).

The author discards Benedict XIV's reputation as an "Enlightenment Pope" on various grounds, but especially citing his letter *Beatus Andreas* dedicated to the question of "children cruelly killed by Jews in hatred of the Christian faith" (313). Teter also denies that "the new spirit of the Enlightenment" brought a renewal of the explicit condemnation of blood libels profoundly expressed in the report of Cardinal Giovanni Ganganelli (future pope Clement XIV) in 1759, since this "report was explicitly prohibited from being made public" and "had little impact on the defense of Jews in late eighteenth-century Poland and even later" (11).

Generally speaking, the book is preoccupied with the Church's reaction to the blood libel, while the Church paradoxically never played a central role in this typically Christian accusation. Clerics rarely initiated the blood libel trials until the mid-eighteenth century, and the Church never officially approved blood libel accusations. Many other factors, such as tense relations between Jews and burghers and the changing economic position of Jews, which played far more important role in the spread of the blood libel, are not discussed in the book at all.

The lack of bibliography is a serious shortcoming in a book of a synthetic character. The list of archival and printed sources is somewhat misleading, since many of the manuscripts listed as "archival sources" were discussed and even printed in previous publications, which is not indicated. Bibliographical references in the notes are sometimes inadequate, since most of the Hebrew bibliography is missing. Thus, for example, dealing with blood libel in Wohyń in 1663 (249–50, 458n73) the author ignores Mordechai Nadav's article dedicated to this case (*Bein Israel LeUmot*, 1988, 53–70).

All the above, of course, does not diminish from the value of this important and useful volume, which certainly enriches the scholarly discussion on the subject, putting numerous judicial cases mainly in Italy and Poland into the general European perspective.

Judith Kalik
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Propaganda in Revolutionary Ukraine: Leaflets, Pamphlets, and Cartoons, 1917–1922. By Stephen Velychenko. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019. vii, 292 pp. Appendix. Notes. Index. Photographs. Illustrations. $63.75, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2020.215

During the revolutionary years of 1917–21, the Ukrainian provinces of the former Russian Empire experienced a kaleidoscope of regime changes, social and ethnic violence, pogroms, and civil wars. The spectrum of competing political projects included a number of Ukrainian statehoods (from socialist to conservative), the Bolsheviks (both

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2020.215 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Russian and local), the Russian Whites, a variety of local warlords, as well as the German, Austrian, and Polish troops invited by various local governments. How did all those actors strive to explain their aims and actions to the civilian population? How did an "information war" look like a hundred years ago in a post-imperial society with rather limited experience in mass politics and rather low literacy? This is a poorly-researched issue and the main topic of Stephen Velychenko's book.

Velychenko took pains to bring to the surface a survey of printed-text propaganda produced by Ukrainian states and political parties, the Bolsheviks, and anti-Bolshevik warlords (except for probably the biggest of them—Nestor Makhno and his semi-anarchist movement in southern Ukraine). The main sources are collected in two Kyiv state archives, and Velychenko is reasonably cautious, saying that his book "is necessary based on an illustrative and not representative sample and should be regarded as an initial survey of the subject" (5). He also rightly reminds his readers that the conflict in revolutionary Ukraine included more than two sides (192).

By comparing different political actors' usage of propaganda tools, Velychenko comes to interesting conclusions. For instance, that the conservative Ukrainian State headed by the former Russian general Pavlo Skoropads′kyi "produced almost no printed propaganda" (51), and "the Hetman's attempt to restore landowners discredited the Ukrainian State, which as an entity was too Russian for Ukrainians and too Ukrainian for Russians" (207). Another of his conclusions is that the Bolsheviks, if compared to their Ukrainian rivals, "demanded a much greater range of items from their civilian populations" (186) and much more often threatened them with penalties for disobedience. Ukrainian parties, on the other hand, "rarely used Russian to promulgate the national message" (189), and, unlike the Bolsheviks, "did not have a well-controlled propaganda organization" (199).

Velychenko pays special attention to the usage of "Ukrainian" as both an adjective and a noun in Ukrainian parties' publications, and the Bolsheviks' choice in favor of such phrases as "workers of Ukraine," and "revolution in Ukraine" (106, 147, 151). In this response, a missing comparison to the Russian Whites' propaganda could be of special interest. No less relevant could be a discussion of the Bolsheviks' selection of words to define "Ukraine," as well as Lenin's conscious choice in favor of the term "Ukraine" instead of "Little Russia" already during the First World War when it was rather rare in Russian political thought.

The book depicts a war of ideas and definitions in the propaganda texts. The Ukrainian socialist governments presented the Bolsheviks as an "imperial foreign power" and a purely Russian party, while the Bolsheviks spoke of the Central Rada and the UNR as "bourgeois" institutions, and the Red Army forces as an actor of class and not national war (157). Such topics as the Jewish question, the Polish question (particularly in the context of the Petliura-Piłsudski agreement and their joint offensive to Kyiv in spring 1920), and the anti-Makhno Bolshevik propaganda are also analyzed. In the latest case, it is a pity that Makhno propaganda itself is not presented in the book. In the first case—the Jewish topic—Velychenko thoroughly analyzes the dynamics of its propaganda usage by the Ukrainian parties and the Bolsheviks, and concludes that for understanding of the anti-Jewish violence "situational issues" are more significant that printed propaganda (190).

Concluding his research, Velychenko points out that "no one should either exaggerate Ukrainian failures or overestimate Bolshevik successes in the war of words. In the longer term, circumstances were crucial in determining how influential messages would be among audiences" (208).

Velychenko's book is a valuable contribution to the multi-faceted research on the Ukrainian revolutions. It could be productively used for comparisons of the Ukrainian situation with the other "national peripheries" of the former Russian Empire, for

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2020.215 Published online by Cambridge University Press

transnational study of propaganda in inter-war Europe, or for in-depth local studies of particular Ukrainian cities, towns, and villages during the revolutionary turmoil.

Andrii Portnov
European University Viadrina (Frankfurt/Oder)

A Satellite Empire: Romanian Rule in Southwestern Ukraine, 1941–1944. By Vladimir Solonari. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2019. 308 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. Maps. $55.00, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2020.216

In 1993, Olivian Verenca published a glowing report/memoir on Romania's administration of Transnistria, the territory between the Dniester and Bug rivers that Romania occupied from mid-1941 to early-1944 (*Administraţia Civilă Română în Transnistria*, Chişinău, 1993). Verenca, former cabinet director of the governor of Transnistria, noted that no one before him had published such a study, which risked that the episode might be forgotten or falsified. A quarter century after Verenca's gross misrepresentation of Transnistrian realities, Vladimir Solonari's *A Satellite Empire* finally provides a serious exploration of the subject.

Solonari investigates Transnistria from three distinct perspectives: that of the Romanian national government; that of the civilian and military personnel on-site; and that of the local population. He frames essential questions associated with each perspective: Was occupation policy based on idealism or pragmatism? Were local policies designed to transform or to exploit? Did the local population accommodate or resist? The author brings to bear, in a manner unmatched in any prior treatment, primary source materials in *all* of the languages in which records were created at the time—Romanian, German, Russian, and Ukrainian (though not Hebrew, Yiddish, or Romani). Given this vast source material, it is not surprising that Solonari's study yields many new insights, while also confirming certain understandings and demolishing some long-cherished myths.

Solonari documents the myriad ways in which the Germans restricted Romanian freedom of action. He details German control of the rail system and other militarily significant assets. The Romanians were unable to prevent the expulsion of non-Germans, including ethnic Romanians, from localities with Volksdeutsch majorities; similarly, they could not prevent the unauthorized German seizure of foodstuffs to supply their armies further east. The two allies collided over treatment of the province's Ukrainian population. The picture that Solonari thus presents alters prior understanding of Romanian "rule."

The speed with which Romania abandoned the aspiration to develop the province, in favor of exploiting it, and the systematic stripping of the territory of foodstuffs and virtually all movable economic assets leave no room to doubt a policy of systematic spoliation. Malnutrition, disease, and impoverishment were the result. Bribery, nepotism, greed, brutal treatment of the local population, and the regime's effort to conceal its violation of international norms definitively puncture all image of the Romanians as benevolent occupiers.

Two aspects of *A Satellite Empire* invite the reader onto terrain where mythologies about the past and its heroes come into play. The first relates to the ethnic nationalism of *Conducător* Ion Antonescu, to which Romanian nationalists make positive reference even today. Despite the regime's oft-asserted commitment to the 200,000 ethnic Romanians in Transnistria and the 120,000 beyond the Bug, Solonari reveals Antonescu's personal disdain and distrust of these populations. Solonari's nuanced

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2020.215 Published online by Cambridge University Press