

Solzhenitsyn: Cold War Icon, Gulag Author, Russian Nationalist? 2014, 222–29). But Tempest abandons ship: he does not expose Solzhenitsyn's false causal links, or the fictitious and indeed antisemitic aspects of these representations.

Pointing to Solzhenitsyn's "particularly good" representation of "male desire" (34), Tempest glosses over Solzhenitsyn's ignominious representation of women. He decides not to criticize Solzhenitsyn's portrayal of a character's development from "rape victim to nymphomaniac" (488–489), among other controversial passages (425–27). In his analysis Tempest draws from Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago* (1973) even in such instances, but he skips over Solzhenitsyn's relevant (and recurring) arguments that link rape to female depravity and that some women prefer rape over celibacy (Kriza, 179–86). In these cases, "male desire" sounds more like a euphemism for troglodyte desire.

Historical allusions in this book are sometimes bizarre, for instance, when Tempest discusses the character of a literature student who becomes a nurse at the camp infirmary in the novel *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* (1962). Tempest writes: "The professionally unqualified figure in a 'crisp white gown' jabbing inmates with a hypodermic needle calls to mind Hitler's *Konzentrationslager*" (100). He then describes the doctor, who adheres to outdated penological notions that work is always beneficial to convicts, and adds: "*Arbeit macht gesund*. He is a complete medical fraud. On the other hand, one recalls Varlam Shalamov: he was saved from death by starvation by a camp doctor who got him an appointment as a hospital attendant" (100). Tempest's gratuitous references to Nazi concentration camps—human experiments carried out by doctors and the phrase *Arbeit macht frei* from the Auschwitz death camp—are not buttressed by arguments, on the contrary, he describes how there is no evidence that the student-nurse is a sinister figure (101). Since pre-revolutionary times prison nurses were often convicts who were not professional nurses—and he knows that writer Shalamov was one in the Soviet era, so why the dubious Nazi comparison? Similarly absurd is the claim that the Soviets copied from the Nazis the regulation that prison inmates had to remove their caps to greet camp guards (79). Again, this practice stems from tsarist prison camps. What, then, does he wish to convey?

Indeed, Tempest reveals more than he bargains for when he candidly writes that "Solzhenitsyn is yet to be fully understood" (xviii). His pusillanimous analysis including his constant references to Solzhenitsyn's family's help in interpreting one passage or another strengthens the impression that he fears scrutinizing Solzhenitsyn's texts for himself (xvi, 24, 44, 47, 203, 591, 599 and others). This does not only belittle his analysis, but also Solzhenitsyn's work.

ELISA KRIZA
University of Bamberg

Journeys Through the Russian Empire: The Photographic Legacy of Sergey Prokudin-Gorsky. By William Craft Brumfield. Durham: Duke University Press,

2020. xii, 518 pp. Notes. Index. Photographs. Maps. \$49.95, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2021.208

This book is spectacularly beautiful and provides a look at the lands of the Russian Empire, as photographed by Sergey Prokudin-Gorsky in late Imperial Russia and then by William Craft Brumfield from the 1970s to the 2010s. Prokudin-Gorsky, Brumfield argues, sought to unify the empire visually, making it legible and in full color due to his innovative use of three-separation negatives. Securing the future of the empire required more than photography, however, and one of the main aims of the book is

to come to terms with what its end meant in terms of the preservation of architecture and cultural heritage more broadly.

Prokudin-Gorsky worked with the Ministry of Transportation, which helps to explain the structure of the collection, as the railroads, like the photographs, sought to tie the empire together more securely. The photographer's own fate, exile to Paris after the Revolution, however, meant that after his death the Library of Congress bought the collection from his heirs there. (In 1910, the Russian government had ignored Prokudin-Gorsky's proposal to buy his collection.) Brumfield worked with the Library of Congress in preparing an exhibit of the collection in 1985 and was commissioned by former Librarian of Congress James Billington to document architecture from the Russian North to Siberia in the 1990s and early 2000s. These parallel projects and biographies form the subject of the first part of the book, while the second presents the photographs from the various regions of the empire.

Prokudin-Gorsky's photography, once published and then digitized by the Library of Congress, attracted a devoted following in Russia. They were often used for purposes of nostalgia, as an example of the "Russia we have lost." Brumfield pushes back against this framing, arguing that much has survived. His own photography documents the survival of a great many churches, cathedrals, monasteries, and urban ensembles. His photos also show the shift from a decrepit 1990s to a new era where money for preservation has been found. His text notes that some of these large projects are tied to Vladimir Putin's celebration of the Russian, and especially the Romanov, past.

There are times, however, when the focus on what has been saved seems to be out of step with his own photography, as some panoramas show a complete lack of the churches that had been there before 1917. In his 2015 book, *Architecture at the End of the Earth: Photographing the Russian North*, he had discussed the culpability of local authorities in the destruction of some great examples of architecture. Only a brief discussion of these issues arises in the conclusion to this work.

Still, the book provides a fine introduction to the architectural heritage of the Russian Empire, with sections on the ancient heartland, then in a large circling motion from Smolensk to the Russian North, the Volga, the Urals, Siberia and Central Asia, with a final chapter on the Solovetskii Islands. The photographs of Bukhara and Samarkand, now in Uzbekistan, are particularly spectacular from both photographers, and Brumfield's photos from 1972 capture the monuments before the extensive renovations of later years.

The question of the visual representation of empire has recently attracted a considerable amount of attention from scholars. These photographs focus on the architectural heritage of the different parts of the former Russian Empire, but both the Prokudin-Gorsky and Brumfield collections, the latter of which is in the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., include ethnographic materials that would be of interest.

The design of the book is especially beautiful. It is a pleasure to read a well typeset book. Each geographically focused chapter includes a map, but unfortunately some of them have not labeled bodies of water, which can make following the text difficult in places. A useful index will assist those who are interested in specific places.

Scholars of Russian architecture, photography, and culture more broadly will read this book with profit. Hopefully a Russian translation will make this important work accessible to Russian speakers, whose interest in these topics is immense. The care that the Library of Congress has taken in the Prokudin-Gorsky collection shows that cultural heritage need not remain inside the borders of its place of production to be preserved and even cherished.

SUSAN SMITH-PETER

College of Staten Island / City University of New York