

dermine democracy. Several of the other chapters show the same. Likewise, unified memory regimes do not always correlate with democratic consolidation. If they did, then Bulgaria and the Yugoslav successor states would have the most consolidated democracies in the region (which they clearly do not) since they have the most unified memory regimes with respect to 1989.

Aida Hozić's chapter on the memory of 1989 in the former Yugoslavia (appropriately titled "It Happened Elsewhere") points most directly to a limitation of Bernhard and Kubik's theory: there is no mechanism for determining which of the multitude of memory regimes in a given society relates to democratic consolidation and which does not. Looking at the memory of 1989 in the former Yugoslavia does not reveal much about the quality of democracy there. Furthermore, the association of mnemonic warriors and their attendant fracturing of memory with a threat to democracy seems overstated. Sometimes this is the case, but equally as often it is not. More important, every society will always have a mixture of mnemonic actors and memory regimes; even the most consolidated democracies have fractured memory regimes with respect to certain past events. Look no further than France's "Vichy Syndrome" for a prime example. In their chapter on Slovakia, Carol Skalnik Leff, Kevin Deegan-Krause, and Sharon Wolchik point out that individual political figures commonly play the role of more than one type of mnemonic actor: "Everybody is sometimes a warrior and sometimes an abnegator" (121). What matters most for democracy, then, may not be the presence or absence of warriors per se but rather how a society relates to its warriors and manages the fractures they bring.

Still, Bernhard and Kubik have developed a constructive new vocabulary for negotiating the thorny terrain of memory politics. It is likely to prove useful for some time to come.

THOMAS ORT

Queens College, City University of New York

Realizam i stvarnost: Nova tumačenja proze srpskog realizma iz rodne perspektive. By Svetlana Tomić. Biblioteka Novi Vidici, no. 1. Belgrade: Alfa Univerzitet, 2014. 353 pp. Bibliography. Paper.

This ambitious monograph, *Realism and Reality: New Interpretations of Serbian Realism from the Perspective of Gender*, adapted from the author's doctoral dissertation, aims to offer a radically new interpretation of realist fiction based on feminist literary theory. Starting, appropriately, from the claim that realism is the foundational ground for the literary canon, Svetlana Tomić emphasizes that the predominant interpretations view Serbian realist texts as glorifications of patriarchy, its dominant moral norms, and a traditionalist way of life.

In response, Tomić proposes a feminist reading of realist fiction that enables her to offer a very different interpretation; instead of idealizing patriarchy, she finds in the canonical texts a subversion of the patriarchal family, a diversity of characters, and complex narrative situations that call for a critical reevaluation of the given social norms. The other important aim of Tomić's study is an affirmation of the work of some forgotten women writers, like Draga Gavrilović, who is recognized here as the author of the first feminist Serbian novel.

In undertaking this double task, Tomić addresses several interrelated sets of problems. Fittingly, she starts from criticism of the rigid academic structures wherein traditionalist interpretive approaches to the literary canon are perpetuated over generations. Tomić also points out that it is impossible to read literary texts without understanding their context, which in this case also means understanding the gendered

reality of the second half of the nineteenth century in Serbia, a history of everyday life that is still very much missing.

The core of the study is a typology of Serbian realist fiction's heroes and heroines in the public sphere, labeled here "public patriarchy," and in private life, labeled "private patriarchy." The typology of characters in the private sphere is based on the central family relations of fathers, mothers, husbands, wives, sons, and daughters. When it comes to the public sphere, Tomić focuses more (although not exclusively) on the particular types that are strictly gendered, like the emancipated-women characters.

Tomić has a sharp critical eye and strong interpretative skills. Her readings are convincing and often inspired. Covering a number of realist texts, she argues her main points quite persuasively, and her study offers a rich and highly diversified picture of realist fiction in which well-known works reveal new meanings and prove to be intriguing and relevant for contemporary readers. That said, the study has some theoretical and methodological problems that cannot be overlooked. The biggest one is an unresolved gap between the theory and its application. Although Tomić refers mainly to feminist literary criticism from the 1980s and the 1990s—with good reason, since the questions she is asking were most forcefully discussed at that time—her theoretical resources are presented in a scattered and eclectic way, without coherent reflection on their relevance for her research. Moreover, some important scholarship in Serbian literature, like Biljana Dojčinović's monograph on gynocriticism, *Ginokritika: Rod i proučavanje književnosti koju su pisale žene* (1993), are missing.

The theoretical part would also strongly benefit from a more thorough discussion of the central interpretative categories and a clearer explanation of the principles on which the typology is set. Tomić refers to the works of Kenneth D. Bailey and William Kroft as the grounds for her methodology, which she claims to be rather original when it comes to literary studies. The problem here is that the application of social science methodology to literary texts requires some reflection on the interdisciplinary travel of theories and methods, which is lacking here. It would also be useful to see a reflection on the theoretical implications of using such a typology in feminist criticism. Calling on Diana Fuss and Judith Butler, Tomić declares that her position assumes "convergence of essentialism and constructivism" (30), but this claim and its implications are not further pursued. The author's aim is to show that feminist critical and theoretical strategies "can offer a double resistance, against the patriarchal marking of male and female literary characters but also against patriarchal interpretation of literary characters" (30). But in doing so, Tomić takes a number of concepts as self-explanatory, starting with the concept of patriarchy itself.

In short, *Realizam i stvarnost* is a valuable contribution to Serbian literary history that sets far-reaching goals and achieves a lot. At the same time, however, it shows how complex the tasks the author has set for herself are and how much more work is still to be done.

JASMINA LUKIĆ
Central European University

"Miłosz Like the World": Poet in the Eyes of Polish Literary Critics. Ed. Zdzisław Łapiński. Trans. Grzegorz Czemieli. Cross-Roads: Polish Studies in Culture, Literary Theory, and History, vol. 6. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2015. 404 pp. Notes. €76.95, hard bound.

The last two decades of the previous century were marked by international recognition for contemporary Polish poetry, including a Nobel Prize in Literature for Czesław Miłosz, in 1980, and Wisława Szymborska, in 1996. In the case of Miłosz, worldwide