

mandments of the Party in 1961 go as follows: love for the socialist motherland, labor for the good of society, preservation of the public domain, consciousness of public duty, collectivism, mutual respect, honesty, high esteem for the family, intolerance of injustice, brotherhood of all peoples, intolerance toward the enemies of communism, and solidarity with workers of all countries (30). Chapter 1 discusses the system of internal discipline; Chapter 2 the expulsion of POWs and communists who lived on occupied territory; Chapter 3 purging and politics in postwar expulsion cases; Chapter 4 corruption and administrative misconduct; Chapter 5 family troubles and marital infidelity; and Chapter 6 the struggle with alcoholism. As a mirror of official campaigns against different forms of public misconduct, the cases presented in these chapters indicate a continuity of measures from Late Stalinism to de-Stalinization in favor of “moral education” (4). Consequently, the price delinquents had to pay for not fulfilling their obligations was no more than a career setback (3).

As Cohn points out, after the war the party was frightened by the growing passivity of its members (5, 56), while on the other hand, it was more interested in their personal lives (6, 142). In contrast to Stalinism, under the reign of Khrushchev, mobilization was based on the construct of a hero society, in which every communist could find relief in the role of a “fighter for a socialist everyday life.” Consequently, the focus of official discourse shifted from political loyalty to personal behavior (5–6): “The party was less likely, then, to discipline a Communist who had flirted with Trotskyism or whose father had been a kulak, but more likely to drag alcoholics and philanderers before their peers to discuss the most intimate details of their private lives (6).” Does it really mean that the “collective leadership” after Stalin distanced itself from “punishment” and instead preferred “persuasion” (10, 94, 138)? Or had physical terror upon Soviet society in general been replaced by the force of the collective?

In the conclusion of the book, the reader would have expected a few provocative theses. The author speaks of a “crucial transitional period in Soviet history, from the revolutionary prewar era to the conservatism and corruption of the Brezhnev years and late socialism,” but he only emphasizes that the communists had failed to establish behavioral standards for all (195). Although this well-written and convincing book provides deeper insights into the mechanisms of de-Stalinization, it does not offer new definitions or further perspectives on the topic

THOMAS M. BOHN

Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen

Vasily Zhukovsky's Romanticism and the Emotional History of Russia. By Ilya Vinitsky. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015. xiv, 386 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. \$39.95, paper, \$120.00, hard bound.

In *Vasily Zhukovsky's Romanticism*, Ilya Vinitsky has taken as his central subject the conventional material of literary biography—the “life and times of a famous writer”—and more the self-conscious record of Zhukovskii’s emotional world as manifested in the poet’s work. Vinitsky defines his project as a “psychological biography” in which he examines the literary prism through which Zhukovskii represented his life; here we have a fine-grained portrait of a life scripted in accordance with prevailing Sentimental constructions of feeling and narrative. Zhukovskii is hardly the only example of an individual whose life was significantly shaped by the interplay of literary modes and texts; however, Vinitsky’s masterful study reveals the extreme extent to which Zhukovskii and many of his intimates engaged in the practice of *zhiznetvorchestvo* (life work). In so doing, Vinitsky provides a thought-provoking and insightful investi-

gation into the psychological and other mechanisms by which lived experience was mediated through literary abstraction in the early nineteenth century.

As Vinitsky argues, it was Zhukovskii's three extended and largely unrealized romantic attachments that lie at the core of the poet's projected identity and centrally organize his poetic work. Fittingly, Vinitsky structures his study around these three "epochs" in Zhukovskii's life: his love for his half-niece Maria Protasova-Moier, his more secret love for his tutee, Princess Charlotte of Prussia (the future Grand Duchess Alexandra Feodorovna), and, finally, at the age of 57, his marriage to the eighteen-year-old Elisabeth von Reutern, daughter of his friend, the German artist Gerhardt von Reutern. When taken together with an earlier attachment to another niece, Maria Veliaminova, as well as strong feelings for Maria Protasova-Moier's sister Alexandra, this list bespeaks a core paradox of Zhukovskii's personality: a man who professed tremendous longing for domestic bliss in his work, yet repeatedly directed his romantic interests at women who were not attainable or suitable, for various reasons. In so doing, he placed himself at the edge of an imagined domestic circle into which he could not enter. Vinitsky reads these three affairs of the heart on multiple levels: for what they reveal about Zhukovskii's personality, for how they illuminate Zhukovskii's manipulation of dominant early nineteenth-century cultural forms expressed in works such as *Lalla Rookh*, *Oroonoko*, and Rousseau's novels, and for how these histories shape Zhukovskii's work in both explicit and less noted ways.

Drawing on impressive primary and archival research, Vinitsky reconstructs the key elements of Zhukovskii's childhood and early adulthood that set the stage for the pattern of his later romances and idiosyncratic persona. The illegitimate child of Tula landowner Afanasii Bunin and a Turkish concubine, Zhukovskii grew up at the edge of a core family unit that did not fully embrace him. A longing to effect a "legitimate (re)unification" with this family circle would prove to be the driving force of his adult life, at times to what might be termed a pathological degree. As Vinitsky shows, sentimental plots and family romances provided Zhukovskii with a means both of ameliorating and elevating his experience of exclusion. In his work and personal relations, he fostered a trope of "brotherly love" in which he figured as an avuncular "husband-brother" to his feminine protégées (152). Thus, on the page at least, he was a central member of an idealized family circle. In Vinitsky's words, these protégées formed a "secret order of the 'sisters' of the poet" (282) that came to function as the subject and addressee of his work. Of particular interest is the chapter devoted to Maria Protasova-Moier; Vinitsky's argument that she was an engaged, active participant in this scenario is compelling.

Vinitsky's study is so complete as to leave little room for questions, yet on occasion the reader wonders if the author could take a more directly psychological approach to Zhukovskii and his intense identification with literary models. Could this be a form of repression or denial in a man who presumably had no intimate relations until late middle age? What might be the psycho-social motivations for experiencing one's life in the guise of the "chivalric ideal of a chaste youth," or—in other words—in terms that ultimately condemned Zhukovskii to the position of onlooker or voyeur? Vinitsky argues that Zhukovskii is the first example of the practice of *zhiznetvorchestvo*, a critical paradigm in Russian artistic culture, and so might offer more discussion of the practice itself and of the specific legacy that he would trace to Zhukovskii. On a more minor note, it was not clear why translations are not provided for all foreign language quotes, particularly several German passages. A family tree would have been a helpful addition for the reader less familiar with the extended Bunin family.

In all, however, *Vasily Zhukovsky's Romanticism* is a fascinating account of a seminal early Russian writer and of the origins of a key Russian cultural practice.

INGRID KLEESPIES
University of Florida