

tively free print market" and an "expanding, diversifying and culturally active middle class" in his Western European examples (10), yet he ultimately deems Soviet print culture "stunted" in its lack of product differentiation and Soviet society deprived of "the luxury of the gradual, 'organic' broadening of the reading public." His 19-page second chapter sketches the creation of the Soviet reader over roughly the first four decades of Soviet history; his 26-page third chapter identifies illustrative changes in "the practices and representations of reading" (45) and consequently revised strategies of book promotion in the post-Stalin era until the advent of glasnost. Lovell devotes the remainder of his book (83 pages exclusive of conclusion) to the "perestroika project and its aftermath," tracing more closely the somewhat frantic attempts to "massovize" Soviet intelligentsia publishing preferences and the emergence of a much more differentiated and sometimes polarized reading public in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Especially in the first chapters, Lovell's investigation suffers from a tendency toward far too condensed summarization rather than detailed source description and analysis; in its entirety, his book perhaps too ambitiously "touch[es] on" a wide array of topics he itemizes in the historical sociology of print culture: "(i) the route print culture takes from author/editor to public; (ii) the reception and consumption of the printed word; (iii) the differentiation of reading according to socio-cultural strata; (iv) the representation of reading; (v) the social anthropology of reading; (vi) the social meanings inscribed in print culture; and (vii) books (magazines, journals, pamphlets, newspapers) as artifacts" (2).

Even as selective summary, Lovell's history of pre-glasnost Soviet reading yields useful general concepts and intriguing insights. Seconding the work of Evgeny Dobrenko and Richard Stites, Lovell asserts the at once "top-down," "group-up" definition of norms for Soviet reading (42-43) and the cultivation of Soviet mass culture (its combination of "bourgeois homogeneity and stability with mass print-runs" (34)). He points out certain abiding patterns in Soviet book production/consumption that had come to be shared by publishers and readers—the preference for and prestige accorded the unadorned book, the primary role of genre (rather than individual author) in attracting readers. Lovell's discussion of post-Stalin era attitudes towards the book makes a pithy contribution to our still very spotty English-language coverage of Thaw culture. He remarks on the various phenomena generated by a less regimented, more affluent and stabilized Soviet reading public—the revitalization of the thick journals, officially encouraged research on reader habits and interest, the book hunger artificially created by a non-differentiated book production and resulting in more intensive private collection and a burgeoning black market book trade.

Lovell reserves close analysis of specific sources for his book's primary and culminating focus—the "reading revolution" which he firmly locates in the glasnost and post-Soviet periods, implicitly equating "revolution" with Western European-style differentiation of print culture. Here Lovell provides a synopsis of the ploys and fortunes of old and new publishing houses from 1986-91; parallel surveys of book consumption according to somewhat vaguely defined genres in the glasnost and post-Soviet eras; and, in a rather abrupt shift, a "historical overview of Soviet periodicals" preparatory to his in-depth coverage of the evolving thin journal *Ogonek* (98). Lovell explores how this journal's format, contents, editorial policy, featured critics, and cultivated reader relations adapted to and presumably reflected the newly differentiated tastes and interests of Soviet readers. His examination of *Ogonek* "as a case study of cultural change in the glasnost period and afterwards" functions as a kind of centerpiece in this section and in the book as a whole, at last affording the reader careful engagement with an intriguing and telling primary source.

One wishes for more of the same, for Lovell's embedded study of *Ogonek* tantalizes us with the possibility of a book more sharply focused in its argument and more nuanced in its treatment of its rich source material. The tension between his book's eventual intensive focus (declared in its title) and its dutiful, yet of course unrealizable, commitment to comprehensive coverage (intimated in its subtitle) yields a promising, interesting, information-filled study

that articulates but very unevenly develops its too-ambitious agenda. One hopes that Lovell will revisit and elaborate on the topics of his early chapters in future publications (particularly publishing/reading in the Thaw era); the seeds of several substantial books are packed into this 215-page volume.

Beth Holmgren, *University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill*

Armory Burchard. *Klubs der russischen Dichtern in Berlin 1920–1941: Institutionen des literarischen Lebens im Exil. Arbeiten und Texte zur Slavistik*, 69. München: Sagner, 2001. 349 pp., DM 58.00 (paper).

Burchard promises a monograph to inform us on the “literary organizations and poetic circles of the Russian exile in Berlin between 1920–1941” (11). In fact, her study does far more. For the first time there is a serious effort to examine in detail not only the organizations, but also the individuals who gave life support to Russian literature long after the decline of the literary zenith of Russian Berlin in the years 1921–1923. Burchard acknowledges those who have gone before her from Struve, Fleishman and Mierau to Raeff, Dodenhoeft and Schloegel, but her own contribution goes far beyond their important works in the span of chronological time and encyclopedic annotation.

First and foremost, Burchard’s work is an invaluable summary in German of information found in Russian and in English on the topic. Her lengthy introduction reviews the rise of Berlin to prominence as the “literary capital of Russia” for a few short years in the early 1920s. She examines as literary historian the groupings, the philosophies and the outlets for publication available to the mix of Russian writers who descended upon Berlin. She uses her own extensive knowledge of the Russian press and periodicals for over twenty years along with unprecedented access and familiarity with the library and archival resources in Berlin, New Haven, Moscow, Prague, St. Petersburg, and Paris to fill out the picture previously presented by others. Her analyses are clear, precise and make complicated issues, such as the Smenovekhovtsy movement, comprehensible. Burchard’s command of the details of the period continually surprised and delighted this reviewer with new information and insights into the lives and works of the Russian émigrés and exiles.

Burchard’s principal focus is on four key institutions: The Committee to Aid Russian Writers and Scholars, The Union of Russian Journalists and Writers, The Spinning Wheel, and The Poets’ Club. What emerges is an overall assessment of the people, events and literary works that shaped a generation of writers left behind in Berlin after 1923, a restoration of the missing pages of the history of Russian Berlin. The chapter on the Committee is informed in large part by Burchard’s work with the archival materials of the organization passed on by the founder and first president, I. V. Gessen, to the Russian Historical Foreign Archive in Prague, then transferred to Moscow where its existence became officially acknowledged and access first granted for foreign scholars only in the 1990s. These archival materials shed new light on its range of activities and on those who benefited financially from the Committee. The Committee, which received its financial support from the New York mother organization, was rarely mentioned in the press and its financial assistance to Aleksei Remizov, Nikolai Berdiaev, Aleksandr Iaschenko, and Nina Petrovskaja were of course not publicized. The concrete references to people and places, plus the inclusion of addresses in Berlin will be welcomed by future scholars as they piece together the geography of the city and the Russian presence in it.

Far more politically active and well represented in the press was the organization of the Union of Russian Journalists and Writers in Germany (115–66). Here too Burchard’s access to

archival materials in Russia substantially adds to the portrait of the organization, its members and activities behind the scenes. In the beginning (1920), the Union organized Russian literary evenings in honor of Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and Blok. The regular Press Balls would become a major fund-raising initiative attended not only by the Russian high society but German national and local political representatives as well. The Union would also attempt to replace the literary evenings of the Berlin Russian House of the Arts and the Writers' Club, both of which dissolved in the late 1923. Burchard translates into German extensive passages from the Russian Berlin daily press, periodicals and archival materials—all enrich her text and enhance its value for German historians of their city.

One of the most fascinating and largely neglected groups of Berlin was The Spindle [*Vereteno*] and its creator Aleksandr Drozdov. Almost single-handedly Drozdov brought to life a literary group of younger writers supported by its own newspaper, *Veretenysh*, and its own literary journal *Vereteno*. The chapter devoted to a history of the group and its publications contains a thoughtful reading enhanced by analysis and extensive quotation from these overlooked publications. The rise and fall of the group, along with its politicization under Drozdov who would return to Moscow in 1923, constitute a fascinating and largely ignored page in the history of Russian Berlin.

A final chapter covers important events of literary Berlin from 1925 until World War II. Burchard again singles out one group, the Poets' Club, for careful scrutiny and analysis. Close readings of the Russian press in the years beyond 1923 enhance her study. The tragic close to these otherwise bright chapters in Russian literary history is followed by an extensive up-to-date bibliography which will prove invaluable to those who wish to understand the Russian Berlin of the first half of the twentieth century. Russian Berlin lives today, a very different Russian Berlin, but one alive with its own Russian language newspapers, clubs, restaurants, organizations, writers and writers' clubs. It too will deserve a history as well informed as Burchard's scholarly, yet very readable study.

Thomas R. Beyer, Jr., Middlebury College

*Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*. Band 47 (2001). Vienna & Munich: Gesellschaft zur Förderung Slawistischer Studien (Wien), 2001. 334 pp. Paper.

This issue of the *Almanach* contains mostly articles on Russian theater and film taken from an international conference on "Actor and Power: On the Connection between Culture, Politics and Science in Soviet Film and Theater from the 1930s to the 1950s," held in Munich in January 2000. Only the more significant contributions will be discussed here.

The lead article, "Von der Dominanz zur Hierarchie im System der Kunstformen zwischen Avantgarde und Sozialismus" by Aage A. Hansen-Löve deals with the question of the mutual relations of different art forms in the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The author begins by taking for granted that Modernism meant a trend in the direction of an autonomous development of various art forms, while Socialist Realism meant a return to a unified verbal approach to all art forms. But Hansen-Löve then proceeds to register some significant discriminations concerning this scheme: Modernism also features Neoprimativism, Archaism, the art of savages and children, as well as various other traits that are taken from outside of the Modernist canon and often contradict its key principle of centrifugal, dynamic, and utopian creativity. Socialist Realism, centripetal, static, and presumably anti-utopian, also has traits that are in contrast with its dominant verbalism, for instance, the illustrative quality of Socialist Realist poetry and prose, or the tendency of Socialist Realist novels and films to be structured like myths with themes and motifs as their building material, as in