Known for his “radical political shimmering” (191), artist Beliaev–Gintovt, Novikov’s erstwhile disciple and a current member of the Eurasian Movement, continues to produce stunningly effective visual celebrations of the Soviet totalitarian past and Russian national unity, which can also be read as ironic commentaries on the prevailing institutional discourses of Putinism. Whether his projects, such as the commissioned portraits of the Kadyrov clan that rules Chechnya, should be viewed as conceptualist and ironic or servile and mercenary is a question of lively debate in Russian art circles. Having read Fenghi’s study, the reader will be better equipped to fully appreciate this “shimmering.”

This being said, by putting the word “protest” in the book’s title and generally stressing the underground and countercultural roots of the phenomena he examines, Fenghi tones down the transformation of many of his subjects from rightwing dissident figures into well-compensated members of the Putinist cultural establishment and purveyors of patriotic propaganda for the Russian state. The reader should be reminded that Limonov worked as a columnist for Russia Today and *Izvestia*, Dugin frequented state TV as a political commentator and lectured at the Academy of the General Staff, and Beliaev–Gintovt painted the Kadyrovs.

A technical flaw should also be noted: the book’s analytical language occasionally turns nonspecific to the point of being imprecise; a more careful editing would have eliminated this problem. Overall, Fenghi’s fascinating study will be of great value for both scholars and the general reading public—for anyone interested in post-Soviet Russian culture and politics.

Evgenii Bershtein
Reed College

Russian Philosophy in the Twenty-First Century: An Anthology. Ed. Mikhail Sergeev, Alexander N. Chumakov, and Mary Theis. Value Inquiry Book Series, vol. 349/Contemporary Russian Philosophy. Leiden, Netherlands/Boston: Brill/Rodopi, 2021. xviii, 426 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Figures. $162.00, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.68

In her Foreword to this book, Alyssa DeBlasio suggests that Russian philosophy has more often been a problem than a tradition. It arose late, was censored early, borrowed belligerently from western Europe to define its Russianness, and was practiced most inventively by non-professionals—at least until twentieth-century Marxism-Leninism straightjacketed whatever “official” philosophy was left. The present volume, appearing almost simultaneously with Mikhail Epstein’s magisterial two-volume survey of post-Stalinist Soviet thought (1953–1991) for Bloomsbury Academic, aims to demonstrate the richness and diversity of this field in our present.

To some extent this goal is achieved. Twenty-one philosophers are represented, both in Russia and émigré, writing on topics ranging from ontology and the metaphysics of method to xenophobia, globalism, and terrorism. Some names are familiar to an English readership, including the seasoned Russian-American scholars Epstein and Boris Groys. Others created well-publicized subdisciplines in the late Soviet era: Valery Podoroga’s analytic anthropology (academic postmodernism) and Sergey Horujy’s synergic variant of hesychasm, or Christian energetism. But many names are new. Very welcome, therefore, is the editorial decision to preface each essay not with a mere byline but a two-page autobiography. These trajectories, wonderfully idiosyncratic in self-presentation, make it clear that only in a highly qualified sense does this

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2022.68 Published online by Cambridge University Press

constitute "twenty-first century philosophy." Three-quarters of the contributors were born between 1930 and 1950. A given essay might have been published after the year 2000, but the past weighs heavily on both content and style of argumentation.

The essays fall into four groups. First is historiosophy, mostly grim: why Russian history repeats itself in increasingly impoverished cycles, and are there any ways out? The liberal theoretician Igor Kliamkin (b. 1941) documents Russia's half-millennium of militarization (defined as a command economy with universal service) alternating with periods of relaxation that, when discontinued in 1989, resulted in the prompt collapse of the state (231). Nikolai Rozov (b. 1958) asks whether cyclical dynamics is an "incidental disease" or Russia's "inner essence"—and opts for illness, although severe: "At the height of its power, the Russian political regime does not even try to liberalize" (343). Discussing Russia's "civilizational identity," Vadim Mezhuev (b. 1933) urges us to outgrow the old competitive binary "Europe versus Russia," where each side nurses its own fantasy of universalism, and be content with the genius of Russian culture. Related to these historical ruminations but less focused on Russia's exceptional fate are the sociopolitical essays. Boris Markov (b. 1946) provides an even-handed discussion of xenophobia and xenophilia, arguing that a distinction between friend and foe is utterly natural and pleading for "a realistic plausible image of the Other that is neither a phantom nor a romantic conceit" (271). Markov concludes by recommending tourism as a benevolent, albeit trivializing, solution to the curiosities and anxieties of otherness. Two essays tie Russia into contemporary world processes: Valentina Fedotova (b. 1941) on terrorism, old and new, and Alexander Chumakov (b. 1950) on globalism.

The visual art theorist Boris Groys (b. 1947) discusses another -ism, Cosmism, from an earlier era, one in which sociopolitics intersected with religious metaphysics—our third group. Intriguingly, Groys rethinks Nikolai Fyodorov's Common Task as might a curator, in terms of sustainability (the dead must rise as artworks). Darkly echoing this theme, Vladimir Kantor (b. 1945) construes "Bobok"—Dostoevsky's parable of a temporary afterlife ending in absolute death—as a fate worse than Dante's Inferno, and "a symbol of human existence in Russia" (225). Other religiously-inflected essays include Natalya Shelkovaia (b. 1953) on Friedrich Nietzsche, Christ, and the Buddha as parallel bearers of joy, and Karen Swassjan (b. 1948) in a polemic against the folly of theological argument. More ecumenical is the comparativist Mikhail Sergeev (b. 1960), whose probing essay on the American Idea as a New-World Enlightenment project draws on his work on cyclical models in the evolution of world religions.

The final group deals with methodology and the contours of the profession. Alexander Nikiforov (b. 1940), assessing the value of science, observes that it has always been techno-science, inattentive to humanity's spiritual needs. David Dubrovskii (b. 1929) updates Thomas Nagel on the mind-body problem; more impatiently, Fedor Girenok (b. 1948) advocates a postmodernist "clip consciousness" in place of old-fashioned communication via words and concepts. Aleksei Griakalov (b. 1948) provides a dense phenomenology of the event, asking whether that key psychological state, *un*certainty, "can ever be defined in epistemological terms" (147). Several essays cast a characteristically broad Russian net, with such titles as "The Theme of Man" (Pavel Gurevich, b. 1933), "Philosophy for and by Humans" (Vladimir Kutyrev, b. 1943), and "Homo Europaeus" (Anatolii Akhutin, b. 1940), on the trauma and demise of Cartesian individualism. But Gurevich, as if anticipating the irritated shrug of his more orderly western colleagues, suggests that Russians should stop apologizing for being too broad: Nikolai Berdiaev, after all, was lionized in his time by European philosophers while being ignored at home, disgracefully so. As usual the best balanced and most visionary discussion is by Epstein (b. 1950), who plots out how a responsible philosophy, both Russian and non-Russian, might move from

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2022.68 Published online by Cambridge University Press

analysis to synthesis in non-mechanical, non-aggregative, and thus transformational ways.

Finally, on the technical aspect of this huge volume. Rebuilding an idea-system so that it succeeds in translation is hard work. Still, Brill-Rodopi did no copyediting at all. Often we are not told when or where the essays were first published. Excepting the elegant Epstein, Groys, Sergeev, and a handful of others (Kliamkin, Markov, Mezhuev, Rozov), the English is only barely serviceable, often inscrutable, and exhausting to read. Simple grammatical errors account for most of the opacity, although a spot-check of the Russian originals confirms that several contributors philosophize in an ecstatic associative fashion that Russian accommodates comfortably but the logic of English resists. These accomplished senior scholars probably deserved a better debut. But the persevering reader will glimpse an energetic Russian philosophy ever more out of the box, and with many faces.

Caryl Emerson
Princeton University

Alfred Schnittke's Concerto Grosso No. 1. By Peter J. Schmelz. Oxford Keynotes Series. New York: Oxford University Press, 2019. xiii, 162 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Photographs. Figures. Musical Notations. $17.95, paper; $78.00, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.69

Throughout the course of his life Alfred Schnittke (1934–1998) was wont to observe that, because he was born in Russia in the Volga German city of Engels to a Jewish father and a German mother, he possessed not one drop of Russian blood. Instead, his personal, cultural, and national heritages formed at the confluence of many streams forming a counterpoint with parts that variously fitted together or conflicted, that might reflect the historical diversity of the Soviet Union or the sonic diversity of his compositions. Schnittke's sonic diversity, the sheer profusion of consonance and dissonance at work with each other, came to be known as polystylism, and as the hallmark of his voice as a composer during the late USSR, it is the subject of this book and the single musical work at its core, Schnittke's Concerto Grosso No. 1 (1976/77). Polystylism was recognizable in many rather than fewer forms, and both Schnittke and music critics in the 1970s and 1980s more frequently identified it not by what it was, but rather by what it was not. The distinguished musicologist Peter J. Schmelz traces the many strands of polystylism that coalesced with stunning brilliance in Concerto Grosso No. 1, proving it the turning point in Schnittke's career and establishing it as one of the most important and influential of all musical works composed in the late USSR.

The book under review takes its context from the series, "Oxford Keynotes," in which each volume presents the study of a single musical composition broadly recognized for singular importance in music history. Doubleness in various guises shapes the metaphors of polystylism in the prose, for example, when Schmelz introduces the image of Peter Schlemihl's shadow and Fedor Dostoevskii's *The Nose* (1836) as literary precursors for the concerto grosso: the two voices of the solo violins and the dedicatee violinists who premiered and performed the work for decades, Gidon Kremer (b. 1947) and Tatiana Grindenko (b. 1940). Formally, Schmelz employs a chapter structure that bears witness to the polystylism of the concerto grosso. He dedicates each of the six chapters to a movement of the composition—Preludio, Toccata, Recitativo, Cadenza, Rondo, Postludio—and each of these encompasses four narrative registers:

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2022.68 Published online by Cambridge University Press