

earlier in the book, I saw the self connected with a collective unconscious and primordial types but not with the religious notion of “divine presence”—leading me to think that this is a book about a set of cultural themes that are associated with Dostoevskii’s concept of the self.

STEVEN CASSEDY

University of California, San Diego

Simvolisty i drugie: Stat’i, Razyskaniia. Publikatsii. By Aleksandr Vasil’evich Lavrov. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2015. 761 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. RUB 624, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.134

Aleksandr Lavrov is an original whose opinions are firmly grounded on consideration of his predecessors and on impeccably sourced and cogently assimilated archival material. This book assembles republished articles and publications, many from sources now difficult to access, and a new series central to the history of the crisis of Russian Symbolism, featuring a first publication of Valerii Briusov’s correspondence with the editors of “Apollon.”

This reviewer recalls Dmitrii Likhachev, back in the so-called period of stagnation, signaling out Lavrov and Sergei Averintsev as the most promising Academic candidate of their time, a recognition that, each in his own quiet and dedicated fashion, they amply justified. A name to conjure with among the cognoscenti, Lavrov has kept a low profile, working—above all from small print and manuscript—as a patient explorer of worlds temporarily buried under the lava of Revolution, repression, and state censorship. It would have been welcome, therefore, had this treasure chest of a book been provided with an introduction, or at least an authorial statement of intent and achievement.

This does not detract, however, from the value of the book as it stands: essential reading for all students of Russian Modernism, providing, as it does, fresh insights into the lives and works of Osip Mandel’stam, Vladimir Nabokov, Boris Pasternak, Mikhail Bulgakov, and the Proletarian poets, as well as the major Symbolist figures such as Viacheslav Ivanov, Andrei Belyi and Valerii Briusov, and of a number of lesser poets, litterateurs, and peripheral friends and colleagues who contributed to the atmosphere of the times and made possible the creative life-style of the Russian Symbolists, their *zhiznetvorchestvo*.

The book opens with three articles on Ivan Oreus, the poet Konevskoi, including an extensive study of his personality and poetry, which served as an introduction to a long overdue republication of the poetry itself. From the beginning, the reader is impressed by Lavrov’s extensive knowledge of non-Russian and émigré predecessors in the field, as well as his use of the archival sources for Ivan Konevskoi, particularly of the account he kept of his own reading and the variants suggested by his editing of his own printed works. The correspondence amongst his contemporaries reflects the “bon humor” that Aleksandr Benois singled out as a characteristic of the *World of Art* pioneers of early modernism, which made it possible for Piotr Pertsov and the Merezhkovskiiis to be enthralled by the “power and sure aim” of the young poet’s temperamental but “quite mad” polemic against Zinaida Gippius’s critique “of love” in *Novyi put’* and *Mir iskusstva* (91n12).

Maurice Maeterlinck, one of the writers who “demolished materialism” for Konevskoi, is central to the last of these studies and also plays an important part in the following three articles devoted to Briusov’s inamorata, “the fatal trio”: Liudmila

Vilkina, Nina Petrovskaia, and Maria Vul'fart, a nice study in *zhiznetvorchestvo*, the very factuality of which is at times intensely moving.

AVRIL PYMAN-SOKOLOV
University of Durham

"Our Native Antiquity": Archaeology and Aesthetics in the Culture of Russian

Modernism. By Michael Kunichika. Studies in Russian and Slavic Literatures, Cultures, and History. Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2015. 344 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. Figures. \$75.00, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.135

In Osip Mandel'shtam's *Egyptian Stamp* (1928), a muttering, terrifying "stone lady" stomps around St. Petersburg. Michael Kunichika's study "*Our Native Antiquity*" provides a compelling set of concepts that illuminate such puzzling imagery; more broadly, his book addresses the human desire to derive meaning and value from the deep past. Kunichika examines modernist texts from the first three decades of the twentieth century that feature ancient steppe artifacts, focusing on the stone women (*kamennye baby*) and the kurgans, or burial mounds, that served as their pedestals. Modernists such as Mandel'shtam were fascinated by the stone women of the Eurasian steppe that they saw exhibited in museums and abandoned in courtyards. These statues were "goods to think with" (to borrow from Sherry Turkle's *Evocative Objects: Things We Think With*); for artists they served as "archaic mirrors" (16) and provided a concrete way to conceive of Russia's unique identity between east and west, primordial and futuristic.

Kunichika deftly merges analysis of cultural texts with discussion of archeological discoveries and debates. He draws upon thinkers from Piotr Chaadaev to Nikolai Berdiaev, Mikhail Bakhtin to Gilles Deleuze. The space of the steppe and the artifacts found there spurred artists to turn "inward into the vast space of Eurasia," broadening what it meant to be Russian (14–15). While researchers debated the archeological and aesthetic value of the stone *babas* (here I use Kunichika's term), modernists later embraced this statuary's deviation from classical norms as a cherished precedent (48–49). For Ivan Bunin and other writers, the "primitive crudeness" of the *babas* evoked a terror whose mystery Kunichika seeks to solve via painting and philosophy. In 1911, poet Sergei Bobrov articulated the notion of "our native antiquity" and promoted stone *babas* "as models for a new art" (141). Bobrov and painter Natal'ia Goncharova incorporated the *babas* "into a Cubist genealogy whose roots they transplant from the Seine to the Russian steppe" (164). Boris Pil'niak's novels reveal how, concurrently with the upheavals of revolution and industrialization, archaeology itself "destabilize[d] the ground," exposing the presence of "archaic strata" within the land (210). Kunichika reads Pil'niak's work as an argument for an alliance between archaeology and industrialization in the face of a militantly future-oriented ideology (306).

This book offers brilliant close readings, whether of a poem by Bobrov that links the stone *baba* with the Bronze Horseman; a Dziga Vertov film whose superimposition of images evokes temporal layering; or Pil'niak's depiction of a train station adjacent to an archaeological site, a symbol of the Russian people's perpetual nomadism. Kunichika elegantly applies archaeological terms such as stratigraphy and topography to the workings of artistic texts. "*Our Native Antiquity*" itself excavates a wealth of valuable information and images. We learn that the *babas* (some sporting phalluses) were so named as a result of the Russification of the Turkic word *balbal*