

are inherently more fluid than [sic] western ones" (46). There is much wrong with my 1999 study *Queer in Russia: A Story of Sex, Self, and the Other*. As Stella rightly points out, I overemphasized the role of institutions and did not explore the actual lived experiences of queer Russians, but she never acknowledges that I did this on purpose, since men were still being arrested for sex with other men and women were regularly institutionalized for lesbian desires. In fact, rather than engaging in the orientalist conception of an essential Russian self, most scholars of sex in Russia were arguing that we must pay attention to the different histories of sexuality (expanding on Michel Foucault's claim that sex has a history). That is exactly the sort of insight that Stella could have built on in her own work. For instance, how did the history of Soviet science, politics, and law shape queer lives differently in Russia versus in the United Kingdom? How is this not about essential selves but historically specific ones, and how does the post-Soviet period represent its own particular history of sexuality?

In her interviews with older lesbians, Stella finds a clear difference in how they came to know and understand their own desires, since there was a near-total public erasure of same-sex desires under the Soviets. This invisibility is contrasted with the 2000s, when lesbianism was visible in a variety of media. It is exactly this specificity of sex's history that earlier scholars were attempting to document. Rather than assuming she has nothing to learn from those who came before her, Stella might have used that work to think through how the history of sex has changed radically in the past twenty years, not just because of the end of the Soviet Union, but because of the Internet, the opening up of international travel, and the relative strength of the ruble in the global economy.

Alternately, Stella might have written more about the space of sexuality. By comparing lesbian lives in Moscow and Ul'ianovsk, she is able to show how location deeply shapes the everyday experience of sexual desires and the self. In Ul'ianovsk, a variety of strategies are employed to carve out public spaces that are also invisible to the world around them. These more momentary manifestations of queer desires and identities are contrasted with the far more public lesbian gatherings in Moscow. According to Stella, in Ul'ianovsk, "invisibility is an expression of both accommodation and resistance to existing social norms. Resistance was expressed not through visibility, which is rarely considered empowering or desirable, but through collective action, which produced fluid boundaries between the *tusovka* and the outside world" (131).

It is unfortunate Stella didn't approach the rest of her insights with this sort of nuance instead of engaging in a "holier than all who came before" attitude and a need to summarize queer theory with which most of her readers will be familiar. Both of these prevent Stella from really showcasing some very interesting fieldwork and linking it to many of the theoretical concerns she summarizes.

Laurie Essig
Middlebury College

The Russian Language outside the Nation. Ed. Lara Ryazanova-Clarke. Russian Language and Society. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014. ix, 292 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Tables. \$120.00, hard bound.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Russian language, as the language of a failed ideology and a failed state, has suffered a loss in both prestige and speakers. On the other hand, as the former Union's borders, both physical and ideological, have loosened, Russian and the Russians have been moving into new geographic areas

and new fields of endeavor. Thus, this is a timely, welcome first volume on the current position of Russian outside Russia. It also launches a new series, *Russian Language and Society*, also edited by Lara Ryazanova-Clarke.

The work opens with a thought-provoking introduction subtitled "The Russian Language, Challenged by Globalization." Based on voluminous up-to-date sources recorded in a nine-and-a-half-page bibliography, it almost reads like a historiography on the subject. Ryazanova-Clarke begins with a discussion of the emerging field of the sociolinguistics of globalization, which until now Russian has been "skirting." After a pithy history of the gradual rise of Russian as *lingua franca* from the sixteenth century to that of a world language by mid-twentieth century, she focuses on the new challenges and opportunities that it faces in the post-Soviet space and beyond.

Contrary to expectations that might be raised by the book's title, the upbeat descriptions on its cover, and, to some extent, the introduction itself, the volume is not about Russian as a global language *per se*. Rather, chapters are confined to particular post-Soviet states and specialized topics. That said, the essays are important contributions, well researched and with extensive bibliographies.

The ten chapters are grouped into five different thematic parts, precluding a review that would convey its full contents. Therefore, a brief description of the individual chapters should be helpful for the reader. The first six chapters discuss Russian and its speakers in former Soviet republics, followed by three that relate to Russian communities abroad. The tenth and last chapter, by the editor, is on Moscow's use of soft power.

In chapter 1, Michael Newcity offers a valuable overview of international legislation for minority-language protection as it affects the Russian minority in those post-Soviet states to which the laws apply. He concludes that the laws do offer some protection, as in the case of Latvia. Regrettably, the valuable table provided is based on censuses from no later than 2004. Comparison with more recent data shows a further decrease in Russian speakers.

There are two outstanding chapters on Ukraine. Chapter 2, by Bill Bowring, is a critical examination of Ukrainian language laws from 1989 through the controversial legislation passed in August 2012 by President Viktor Yanukovich (set aside after his dismissal in February 2014). Volodymyr Kulyk's contribution, in chapter 4, reports on ten focus groups from western and southeastern Ukraine. Though written before the February 2014 events, the two chapters are an excellent source for understanding the highly complex and emotionally charged linguistic situation in Ukraine. At the time of writing, both authors were cautiously optimistic in concluding that other than "language entrepreneurs" and politicians, the majority favored Ukrainian and Russian coexistence, while giving Ukrainian the edge as the state language.

Chapter 3 is a solid study by Curt Woolhiser of the peculiar language situation in Belarus, where Belarusian is the state language while Russian is the chief language of communication. In fact, according to a 2011 survey, which he cites, standard Belarusian is used as the main language by only 1.9 percent of the population. Woolhiser blames this situation on the "ambiguous enduring legacies" (82) of Soviet nationality and language policies, which delegitimized national language varieties of Russian.

In chapter 6, Martin Ehala and Anastassia Zabrodskaja examine levels of ethno-linguistic vitality among Russian speakers in Estonia using Ehala's original vitality-measurement model, which combines both quantitative and qualitative data. Overall, they find that only 14 percent in their sample of 460 are strongly concerned with Russian language preservation. In chapter 9, Aleksandrs Berdicevskis studies lexical divergences between Latvian and mainland Russian by thoroughly analyzing twenty-two high-register Latvian Russian terms, presenting them in a helpful

three-page table. His conclusion is that the split from mainland Russian “has already occurred” (241).

Monica Perotto reports in chapter 5 on her survey of recent Russian-speaking immigrants in Italy. Her findings show there is little concern for Russian language maintenance and that language attrition correlates with time lived in Italy. Chapter 7, by Claudia Zbenovich, is a discourse analysis of everyday conversations between Russian-Israeli parents and their children. It is a lively read that contrasts the authoritarian Soviet style of parenting with the more democratic culture of their children, as the parents try hard to pass on their linguistic capital and Russianness.

In chapter 8, David R. Andrews, using numerous fascinating examples, compares émigré Russian in America from the 1970s and 1980s with that of post-Soviet Russian in the motherland. While differences remain, he finds the languages growing closer as knowledge of English and the west becomes more widespread in Russia. In spite of the deluge of English borrowings and neologisms, the author remains sanguine about the survival of the language in Russia but is now much less optimistic than he was in 1999 about survival of émigré Russian in America beyond the children of the present generation.

The last chapter, “Russian with an Accent: Globalisation and the Post-Soviet Imaginary,” is not a conclusion (absent here) but another case study. Ryazanova-Clarke returns to issues raised in the introduction and offers a more detailed discussion of soft power and Russia’s growing interest in pursuing it. She then illustrates the use of such power in the rest of the chapter by presenting a critical discourse analysis of programs beamed from Moscow between 2009 and 2012 to all post-Soviet states (except Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan, which declined them).

As can be seen from this overview, the volume should be of interest to those concerned with language, sociolinguistics, and post-Soviet studies. Of course, there is so much more that waits to be explored in this exciting field of Russian and globalization. Hopefully, many new volumes will be forthcoming.

ISABELLE KREINDLER
University of Haifa

The Strong State in Russia: Development and Crisis. By Andrei P. Tsygankov. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. x, 259 pp. Notes. Index. \$99.00, hard bound. \$29.95, paper.

With contemporary Russia locked in the toils of an extended developmental and political stalemate, scholars are tempted to raise their eyes and look at the long-term patterns into which the current stage could be fitted. This is what Andrei Tsygankov has done in this synoptic overview of Russian history as seen through the prism of what he has identified as the strong-state syndrome. The work adopts an unabashedly revisionist stance, in that the author identifies two perspectives for the study of Russia, the westernist and the nativist, and associates himself with the latter.

The westernist approach tends to denigrate Russia’s historical experience and distinctive challenges, with Russia considered not only an inferior nation but also as institutionally alien to the west, the stance typical of liberals who throughout the modern age have criticized its governance arrangements, while conservative westerners add to that a critique of Russian culture as well. All this naturally converges on the sustained condemnation of “Putin’s Russia,” which in the end has returned to the Cold War stance of hostility and containment. The nativists, on the other hand, understand the necessity of elements of autocracy as a way of overcoming divisive