T. L. Gladkova, *Russkoe zarubezh'e: Khronika nauchnoi, kul'turnoi i obshchestvennoi zhizni, 1920–1940*, 4 vols. (1995–97)—the authors provide a vivid picture of émigré cultural life, including art exhibits, literary groups, book and journal publications, readings, lectures, and the comings and goings of individual writers. In addition to providing documentary evidence for the arguments advanced in the introduction, the chronology also suggests numerous lines of future scholarly inquiry, the most intriguing of which, at least to this reviewer, is the relationship between avant-garde writers and artists. Without a doubt, future researchers on any topic having to do with the culture of the first emigration will want to consult this chronology.

Perhaps the most challenging part of the book to review are the more than six hundred pages of poems and documents by, and about, the Russian avant-gardists of Paris. The poems are either reprinted from bibliographic rarities or are printed for the first time, while several of the prose documents have been translated ably from French by Livak. Alongside works by relatively well-known émigré writers like Sharshun, Poplavskii, Knut, Ginger, and Zdanevich, the editors include several hundred poems by obscure writers like Valentin Parnakh, Mark Talov, Georgii Evangulov, Boris Bozhnev, and Vladimir Sveshnikov (Kemetskii). While the Zdanevich poems are the most uncompromisingly radical and closest to Russian futurism, most of the other poets sampled are appreciably more traditional in form, versification, and theme (e.g., love, poverty, depression, friendship), although the psychological states they describe and the surprising metaphorical leaps suggest the influence of automatic writing and surrealism.

The critical materials (e.g., letters, excerpts from journals, manifestos, introductions) provide additional fascinating insights into the close relationship between French and Russian avant-gardists in the 1920s. Sharshun's article "Dadaizm," for example, introduces Dada to Russian readers as the rightful heir of futurism and cubism, while Zdanevich provides a similar service for French readers, ascribing the roots of "The New Schools in Russian Poetry" to the traditions of symbolism and futurism. These poems and critical documents call for a general reassessment of Russian poetry of the first emigration. My only regret is that the annotations are inconsistent and that both sections lack an introduction.

ANTHONY ANEMONE
The New School

Political Animals: Representing Dogs in Modern Russian Culture. By Henrietta Mondry. Studies in Slavic Literature and Poetics, vol. 59. Leiden: Brill, 2015. xviii, 433 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Photographs. Figures. €95.00, paper.

At the outset of this 400-page study, Henrietta Mondry states, "The dog is modern Russian culture's most representative and most political animal" (1). The volume that follows attempts to support this contention by exploring a wide range of mostly literary works from the nineteenth century through the post-Soviet era in order to trace the significance of dogs as a recurring cultural preoccupation. From Fedor Dostoevskii's use of borzoi hounds as an emblem of a tsarist nobleman's sadism to cinematic representations of the dogs who guarded the Soviet Union's borders and prison camps, from Nikolai Gogol'’s epistle-writing canines in "Diary of a Madman" to Viktor Pelevin's parodic representation of Soviet space dogs in *Omon Ra*, Mondry explores Russian culture's appropriation (and misappropriation) of dogs to investigate their centrality in a diverse set of texts and contexts.

https://doi.org/10.5612/slavicreview.75.1.218 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Political Animals is divided into four sections of two to three chapters each along with a substantial introduction and brief conclusion. Rather than pursuing a chronological progression through the entire volume, each section examines the theme of dogs through a particular interpretive prism and does so both synchronically and diachronically. Part 1 focuses on dog-human hierarchies, the theme of cruelty, and the parallelism between dogs and humans as they endure changing circumstances. Part 2 explores emotional bonds and projection as well as narratives of partnership between dogs and disempowered humans, in particular. Part 3 examines the cult of police, prison camp, and border guard dogs as paradigms of Soviet patriotism as well as dissident critique of their use in Soviet propaganda. Part 4 studies "narratives of transition, transformation, and transgression" (27), emphasizing the interrelationship between metaphysical and scientific discourse.

Mondry understands and conveys successfully a central lesson of animal studies, which is that humans represent animals "as sites of subjectivity" (21). This makes the representation of dogs in literature, cinema, and memoirs a productive source of insight into changing attitudes within Russian culture toward a number of fundamental issues. For example, she argues that the dog's "outsider" status in traditional Russian folk culture allowed the artistic representations of dogs to serve as a vehicle for exploring marginal human identities ranging from Russia's Jewish community to diverse groups among the politically, economically, and sexually marginalized. At the same time, the dog was appropriated as part of the Soviet project—from Sergei Briukhonenko's 1920s experiments in reanimating severed dogs' heads to Laika's one-way journey into space as symbol (and victim) of Soviet military-industrial prowess.

The author cites an impressive range of scholarship in support of her interpretations, resulting in a thirty-page bibliography. In addition to such classics in animal studies as John Berger's "Why Look at Animals?" (1980) and Peter Singer's *Animal Liberation: A New Ethics for Our Treatment of Animals* (1975), she engages with works focused on canines, such as David Gordon White's *Myths of the Dog-Man* (1991), and significant recent publications, including Jane Costlow and Amy Nelson's *Other Animals: Beyond the Human in Russian Culture and History* (2010). She also draws on Russian semiotician Boris Uspenskii's thinking about the "correlation of dog and human" (12), as well as Jacques Derrida's definition of the dog as "the fraternal allegory of social poverty, of the excluded, the marginal, the 'homeless'" (4). Her exploration of Russian folk beliefs as a context for other cultural appropriations and expressions of canine themes is particularly productive.

This study is provocative, as it should be given the transgressive nature of animal studies and the range of material addressed. It will especially reward readers who are interested in cultural studies, Russian literature and history, and animal studies. Some readers will regret that Mondry does not engage more extensively and consistently with the historical background of many of the literary works that she investigates. For example, she explores literary representations of dogs killed for food after the revolution and during the siege of Leningrad, but she provides relatively scant historical context. In addition, many of the illustrations in the book appear without adequate explication in the text, which would have added to their value. The writing can also seem redundant at times, which may reflect Mondry's attempts to cover so much ground while reminding the reader of earlier points. Taken as a whole, however, the book makes a significant contribution to the growing field of animal studies and demonstrates the importance of such scholarship for Russianists in particular.

IAN HELFANT
Colgate University

https://doi.org/10.5612/slavicreview.75.1.218 Published online by Cambridge University Press