

of the horrific trauma that befell her in her childhood, but the narrative gives insight into her rich inner life.

Like Kotsiubyns'kyi's novella, Matios's text offers the reader an insider's perspective on the world where the events unfold, with the help of a *skaz*-type narrative interspersed with a Greek chorus of locals commenting on the events. However, there are significant differences between the narrative voice and reported speech of the principal characters; the latter is quoted sparingly but with great effect, as when we first hear Darusya's lover Ivan speak in Part II. Here the original presents unadulterated Hutsul dialect and vocabulary unfamiliar to many Ukrainian readers. Representing this in English is a formidable challenge, and the translators generally privilege content over style and register, but the results are occasionally puzzling, as when they render *nenzo liesta* as "wicked wench" (39). At times, the translation experiments with using American dialectisms, but with questionable success, as in having a character who speaks fairly standard Ukrainian say "they was goin' to a weddin'" (125). Such problematic choices, however, are few; overall, the translation is fluent and engaging.

With *Sweet Darusya* and Oksana Zabuzhko's earlier translated *Museum of Abandoned Secrets* (2009), two key texts by Ukrainian women focused on the traumas of World War II and Stalinist repression and their enduring effects published in this century's first decade are now available in English. As the world pays increasing attention to Ukraine's current challenges and dramatic history, *Sweet Darusya* is essential for understanding the lasting impact of past traumas on the complex socio-political landscape of Ukraine, and of post-totalitarian eastern Europe more broadly.

VITALY CHERNETSKY
University of Kansas

Vera i lichnost' v meniaiushchemsia obshchestve: Avtobiografika i pravoslavie v Rossii kontsa XVII-nachala XX veka. Ed. Laurie Manchester and Denis Sdvizhkov. Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie, 2019. 408 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. ₴288, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2021.46

For a long time, historians have been thinking over the question of why the "silence of Muscovy" persisted after modernity—an age of self-expression—began in the eighteenth century. The authors of this collection decided to find an answer to this question. Their goal was to research the role of faith in the establishment of personal selfhood under imperial Russia.

The collection was named after the issue at hand, which, in turn, marked it as an innovative work in this field of research. Relying on the studies of Protestant autobiographies of the Modern Age, research in history has long ago refuted the traditional opposition between modernity and religiousness. Due to meager source base, searching for religious autobiographical individualism in texts written during the Russian Synodal Era has been difficult for a long time, though this did not prevent the emergence of several detailed, comprehensive works by such authors as Laurie Manchester or Nadieszda Kizenko. The authors of articles in this collection undertook two tasks based on the suggestion that "the autobiographical vacuum as such does not allow a conclusion that the clergy did not write texts on themselves" (61). The first was to outline the complex of genres which focused on self-presentation; and the second was to show how to read them as ego-texts (62).

The articles in this collection are chronologically divided into three large sections: "From the beginning of the Modern Age to the 19th Century," "From the Great Reforms to Revolution," and "An excursion: after 1917."

Archpriest Avvakum (1620–1682), author of his own *Life*, is considered to be the founder of the Russian autobiography genre. This is why the editors saw fit to open the collection with a piece analyzing another book by him, *The Work of Interpretations and Moralizing*. Tatiana Sochiva demonstrated that the text stood out in “being replete... with autobiographical details—concerning both the interpretations themselves and Avvakum’s commentaries on them” (21–22), which was beyond the scope of the genre etiquette of Old Russian literature.

The first section focuses on the problem of searching for texts from the seventeenth to eighteenth centuries, which can help answer the question of whether this period marked the rise of selfhood, given that “autobiography in Russia became widespread from the second half of the 19th century onwards under the influence of social change, increasing literacy rates, the ongoing development of the press, and the emergence of autobiographical projects” (30). The authors managed to demonstrate, quite persuasively, that texts which were not originally intended for self-expression did contain some elements of self-reflection. Denis Sdvizhkov, Gary Marker, and Olga Tsapina provided an extensive range of indirect sources from the eighteenth-nineteenth centuries (forewords and afterwords, correspondence, visual signs in texts, clergy-related lawsuits) that help establish a connection between the new religiousness and the formation of self-awareness of a new identity. Aleksandr Feofanov analyzed the autobiographic texts by Prince Ivan Mikhailovich Dolgorukov (1764–1823), Galina Ulyanova focused on those written by merchants from 1770s to 1860s, while Nadieszda Kizenko studied the genre of a written confession among early nineteenth century nobility.

The authors’ attempts to “find a key” to unlock the “encrypted” sources of the extrabiographical genre can be seen as a successful methodological experiment. The search for sporadic displays of selfhood and autobiographical meanings in “indirect” sources is a novel strategy for researching this period. Unfortunately, it will not lead to global conclusions, as it only operates on the level of hypotheses. Furthermore, the notion that during the reign of Peter the Great monks “demonstrated a considerably better grasp and wider variety of the language of emotions than secular authors” (87) is questionable, informed as it is by the frequency of their use of the terms “love” and “passion.”

The second section covers several interpretations of unique sources from the nineteenth century: obituaries of parish priests (Laurie Manchester), church chronicles (Elena Ageeva), priests’ diaries (Marta Łukaszewicz and Heather Coleman), religious autobiographies by peasants of late imperial Russia (Julia Herzberg), and ego-texts by noblemen who turned monks (Gleb Zapalsky). The diaries of the clergy, which in the nineteenth century became a caste of its own, not only provide a glimpse into the inner world of their authors, but outline the many intricacies of the interrelations inside this structure, such as social inequality in monasteries, or hierarchization of the relationships between parish priests and archbishops. One might agree with Heather Coleman’s opinion that the rareness of priests’ diaries make it hard to fully outline the specific features of this genre (266).

The collection begins with an analysis of the works of Avvakum, a disgraced seventeenth century archpriest. It ends with two articles on self-reflection of those living in the conditions of the forced secularization of the twentieth century. The first of them is Archbishop Varfolomey, a persecuted leader of underground monastic communities in the 1920s and 1930s (Aleksy Beglov); the second one is Emelyan Yaroslavsky, the “soul” of the USSR’s anti-religious campaign (Sandra Dahlke). These antagonistic characters are unified by a burning faith: in the transcendental, for the bishop, and in the possibility of building a heaven on earth, for the revolutionary. It is quite obvious that the latter case expands the meaning of “faith” as a category,

which is postulated at the beginning of the collection (“cultivating an ‘inner human’ instead of an amorphous faith in something” [5]). However, it is the display of modernity in the secular mind of the revolutionary (“religious allegories brought up by Yaroslavsky, comparing himself to Christ,—all of these are typical for a Modern Age secular rethinking of religious values” [18]) that allows us to evaluate the legacy of the Synodal Era.

To summarize, it can be said that the authors in this collection managed to do more than show the inner evolution of the creators of autobiographical texts. They also traced the changes that faith underwent as a “focus of the formation of the modern identity,” as well as how varied religious autobiography can be.

The review was prepared within the framework of the HSE University Basic Research Program.

GALINA EGOROVA

National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow

The Imperial Russian Army in Peace, War, and Revolution, 1856–1917. By Roger R. Reese. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2019. xviii, 494 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. Figures. \$45.00, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2021.47

Elitism—especially when based on nothing but caste—can be fatal. This a central lesson of Roger Reese’s new book, which traces attempts to reform the Russian Imperial Army from its defeat in the Crimean War to its collapse during the Great War. Reese tells an overwhelmingly pessimistic story of missed opportunities and those who were supposed to lead retreating into their own sense of self-satisfaction. The nobility’s self-serving narrative of innate ability and privilege based on noble birth is the fatal flaw that undid an army and an empire. The book tenaciously follows its argument and engages with a number of major debates in the military history of the Russian Empire.

Reese’s book is reminiscent of István Deák’s classic *Beyond Nationalism*—drawing a portrait of the Imperial Army, its place in society and how this changed over a period of key transitions. The work represents the exploitation of the explosion of memoirs by ultra-conservatives that had been hidden in Soviet archives and have been published in the last decades due to interest in the Whites as alternative, nationalist path through Russia’s twentieth century. The author uses these texts as evidence in what amounts to a four hundred-page indictment of their authors and the system that they fought to defend. (Interestingly, the work relies almost entirely on published sources and the author does not cite any Russian archival work of his own.)

The central tenets of Reese’s argument are that the army failed to shift from one based on honor (fealty to the tsar and noble status) to one based on virtue (meritocracy); the nobility was more focused on maintaining its privilege than modernizing the army, officers were never apolitical, and there were essentially two separate armies—the experiences of officers and soldiers were so different as to create almost discrete institutions in what should have been a unified organization. Even as the officer corps expanded to include a majority of non-nobles, the old nobility held the highest positions and mobilized to protect their powerbase. Reese also traces how soldiers’ experience and expectations changed during this period of reform, ultimately concluding that the army failed to adapt to the social realities of the end of serfdom. Officers continued to treat their soldiers as men with no rights or autonomy, even as a growing discourse of citizenship (especially after the 1905 Revolution) and recruitment outside the peasantry increasingly led to draftees who expected the army to recognize their human dignity. Reese’s officers emerge as boorish men who are