a good starting point as it takes a first step from analysis to the discussion of possible steps forward.

Such an ambitious book inevitably leaves room for questions and doubts. I would be particularly interested to learn who would act on behalf of the victims in the suggested national bargaining about the past. Epplee demonstrated the existence of such societal groups in Argentina and South Africa, but it is unclear who in Russia could play a role similar to mothers and grandmothers demanding truth in Argentinian case. Moreover, the author correctly points out that in many cases in Russia descendants of victims and perpetrators are the same people. The distance of two generations made the Russian case different from most of the countries the author analyzes in the book. Indeed, it deals with the victims of the Soviet (mostly Stalin) regime, and Epplee seems to understand the difference between the task of immediately publishing the truth and the subsequent reconciliation after the fall of the criminal regime following the loss of past decades and generations. Incidentally, this is why the German experience seems relevant, since generations there have changed since the Nuremberg trials, and the contemporary dealing with the past is no more a result of foreign pressure.

This last comment also suggests another possibility: the more we know about the contemporary Russian state, the more we think that the models analyzed in the book could be used in Russia after the end of the current regime. The link between democratization and overcoming the difficult past was a key feature of all the cases in the monograph, with each process facilitating the other. Russia will face a double challenge of dealing with its past, and we will see whether this fact will weaken or empower its future democratizing surge.

Ivan Kurilla
European University at St. Petersburg

Unity in Faith? Edinoverie, Russian Orthodoxy, and Old Belief, 1800–1918. By James M. White. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020. ix, 271 pp. Appendixes. Bibliography. Index. $75.00, hard bound; $35.00, paper.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.194

Drawing on a wide range of rare printed and archival sources, James White has written an important book about the Russian Orthodox institution of *edinoverie* (unity in faith), an effort to heal the seventeenth-century schism provoked by the liturgical reforms of Patriarch Nikon (Nikita Minin, r. 1652–58) of Moscow. The Old Believers (*staroobriadtsy*, *starovery*), who had refused to accept the reforms, were anathematized at the Moscow Council of 1666–67. Separated from the state church, which they regarded as heretical, the Old Believers formed their own ecclesiastical communities that continued to follow the pre-Nikonian rituals and books. Initially, state and church severely persecuted all religious dissent, but by the mid-eighteenth century, Russian authorities tried more tolerant policies to govern their large numbers of Old Believer subjects. *Edinoverie* represented one of the most long-lasting of these policies. Formally created in 1800 by Emperor Paul (r. 1796–1801) and Metropolitan Platon (Pëtr Georgievich Lëvshin, r. 1775–1812) of Moscow,

edinoverie provided a way for Old Believers to legally practice their faith and the old rituals—as long as they accepted the authority of the state church. Under the aegis of official Orthodoxy, the *edinovertsy* observed the pre-Nikonian rites celebrated by their own elected priests in their own consecrated churches.

This welcome of the Old Believers into the state church was limited, White argues. Platon's rules (included in an appendix) contained an essential contradiction. On the one hand, the new institution legitimated the pre-Nikonian ritual and allowed for Orthodox priests in good standing with the official church to conduct the old rites. On the other hand, the rules clearly indicated that the old rituals were inferior to their Nikonian counterparts and that they contained errors. The rules did not lift the anathemas on the old rites, and they did not treat the two forms of the Orthodox rituals (Nikonian and pre-Nikonian) as equal in value. On the contrary, Platon, who drew up the rules only reluctantly, clearly considered *edinoverie* as only a temporary expedient to convert all Old Believers to the Nikonian rituals. At some point in the future, Platon believed, both Old Belief and *edinoverie* would disappear. Over time, however, the Orthodox Church developed a more accommodating and tolerant view of the rituals of *edinoverie*. The Local Council of 1917–18 adopted new rules that promised greater acceptance of and autonomy for *edinoverie* (which gained its own bishops), but soon afterward Soviet antireligious persecution almost completely destroyed this ecclesiastical movement.

In four chronological chapters, White traces the history of *edinoverie* from its creation in 1800 to its transformation in 1918. A fifth chapter, devoted to an analysis of "lived *edinoverie*" during this entire period, explores the movement's statistics, institutions, rituals, and relationship with those Old Believers who had refused to join the state church. In a bracing conclusion, White quickly summarizes the Soviet period of *edinoverie* and describes its surprising revival under Patriarch Kirill (Vladimir Mikhailovich Gundiaev) of Moscow, who sees its modern "purpose as creating a bridge of understanding between Old Belief and the Russian Orthodox Church… a joint front on social, cultural and moral issues" (204). Likewise, for the Eurasian nationalist Aleksandr Dugin, "the pre-Petrine rituals and piety maintained by edinoverie offer an antidote to secular, materialistic, and Western phenomena allegedly plaguing modern Russian society" (205). Despite such positive appraisals, contemporary *edinoverie* remains controversial, with some disparaging it as obsolete and hostile to normative Orthodoxy.

White analyzes *edinoverie* in the context of other imperial efforts to coopt and control the many different religious confessions in the empire. The impetus for this institutional experiment, White argues, always came from the state rather than the church, which was brought along reluctantly. Just as the state created special spiritual boards for Muslims, Jews, and Buddhists, it established *edinoverie* as a strategy for ruling over the Old Believers. The emperor's introduction of this reform, which directly addressed ecclesiastical issues, demonstrates the church's relative weakness vis-à-vis the state. Moreover, few Old Believers converted; those who did often acted under duress, especially during the reign of Nicholas I. White contends that the presence of two Orthodox rites, pre-Nikonian and Nikonian, eventually moved the state

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2022.194 Published online by Cambridge University Press

church to become less rigid and more tolerant of ritual diversity. Remarkably, despite all of its limitations and apparent artificiality, *edinoverie* continues to be a living movement to this very day. White's careful and engaging scholarship, which has mined an impressive number of provincial archives, provides an excellent foundation for further historical and comparative work.

J. Eugene Clay
Arizona State University

***A Spy for an Unknown Country: Essays and Lectures by Merab Mamardashvili*.** Ed. Julia Sushytska and Alisa Slaughter. Stuttgart: ibidem-Verlag, 2020. xiv, 248 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. $32.95, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.195

Merab Mamardashvili's figure and thought is arousing increasing interest in the international scholarly community. Alyssa DeBlasio's monograph, *The Filmmaker's Philosopher: Merab Mamardashvili and Russian Cinema*, appeared in 2019, as did a special issue of the journal *Studies in East European Thought* on his "philosophical legacy." But only a few translations of the philosopher's original works are currently available in English, as well as other languages. This collection edited by Julia Sushytska and Alisa Slaughter is meant partly to fill this gap by providing the English translation of some of Mamardashvili's works dating back to the last years of his life, which happened to be the last years of the existence of the Soviet Union. Here one finds interviews and papers delivered at conferences and seminars, published between 1988 and 1989, and three lectures on Marcel Proust (number 1, 6, and 11), from a course offered first in 1982 and a second time in 1984. The translation of an unpublished text, under the evocative title of "What Belongs to the Author," is provided together with the fascinating facsimile of the first pages of the original typed draft with handwritten notes. Two essays complete the volume: a brief survey of Mamardashvili's biography and thought by Annie Epelboin, and a very interesting contribution by Miglena Nikolchina on the concept of *Verwandlung* (transformation) from Mamardashvili's early work on Karl Marx's "transformed forms" (*verwandelte Formen*) up to his interpretation of Franz Kafka's *Metamorphosis* (*Verwandlung*).

The particular character of Mamardashvili's work explains the editors' preference for interviews, papers, and lectures. In opposition to the dead and deformed language of official Soviet ideology, Mamardashvili practiced philosophy as a "personal experiment." He never conveyed to his audience already established "truths," but offered the concrete experience of thinking, where the living language of thought creates a space for authentic encounters and discussions. Language as a "form of life" can only take place in public conversations, in the *agora*, which Mamardashvili created every time he engaged his audience in his own thinking, during a lecture, a seminar, or an interview (158–62). His philosophy takes shape with an always unconventional and fully deliberate language, in the concrete practice of oral discourse.

Such a combination makes translation particularly difficult. Mamardashvili constantly deviates from the trivialized meaning of current language,