any of the military values" (185) in Durkheim's classification—to lend his life meaning: an outcome of the nihilism, atheism, immorality, and ennui at the heart of Dostoevskii's inquiry. Anomic suicide haunts *Brothers Karamazov* as well, where three of the four brothers either plan, contemplate or commit suicide. Anomy in Dostoevskii's final novel, however, is countered by the ideal of active love, passed on by Zosima to Alyosha, who "attracts love and fosters robust collectivity" (251)—potent antidotes to suicide in Durkheim's etiology and the answer to the "ruptured families, atheism, and disbelief in immortality" that breed "polymorphic, anomic and egoistic pathologies" (253).

Irina Paperno's *Suicide as Cultural Institution in Dostoevskii's Russia* (1997) looks at suicide as a changing cultural metaphor. Ronner's focus is less broad but equally useful. In showing how Dostoevskii anticipates Durkheim's etiology, she underscores the importance of the sociological questions raised by the author about the importance of family, religion and communality (*sobornost'*) to the individual's well-being. Egoism and nihilism were evil not only because they aligned themselves with the new materialism, but also because they frayed the ties that bind the individual to kith, kin, and country, leading to social atomization, isolation and, increasingly, to suicide. Though more descriptive than analytical, Ronner's detailed Durkheimian typology of suicides in Dostoevskii will serve as a valuable resource for future studies of the writer's treatment of this phenomenon.

John Givens
University of Rochester

Stsenarii peremen: Uvarovskaia nagrada i evolutsiia russkoi dramaturgii v epokhu Alesksandra II. By Kirill Zubkov. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2021. 608 pp. Appendixes. Notes. Bibliography. Index. ₽660, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.286

In *Stsenarii peremen* (Scripts of Change), Kirill Zubkov has produced a fascinating study on the evolution of drama during the second half of the nineteenth century through the lens of the Uvarovsky prize, which included an award for plays from 1856 to 1876. Given the context of Aleksandr II's sweeping reforms during that period (the abolition of serfdom, the establishment of self-government at the regional level, the institution of a jury system in the courts and more), together with the growth of Russia's intelligentsia and revolutionary movements, Zubkov's study logically concentrates on drama as a reflection of societal and political tensions within the country. The archeologist and historian, Aleksei Uvarov, established the prize to honor his father as the former president of the Academy of Sciences. Initially, awards were available in two categories, drama and historical research, with the inclusion of plays making the Uvarovsky the first literary award in Russia.

The judges represented a governmental and civil coalition, comprised of Academy members and experts from among the editors and critics at the leading so-called "thick" journals. Their overall goals included the promotion of high art within the theatrical arena and drama as an educative force in society. However, they were "frankly perplexed" (137) by the multiplicity of dramatic forms and the wide range of content submitted annually by dramatists for their consideration, leading them to exclude works that they considered to be low forms of art, such as farces with no purpose other than entertainment, and politically provocative plays, such as those about nihilism. The judges also dismissed women playwrights and works from the diverse cultures of the far-flung empire, preferring plays by and for Russians. Thus, despite the high number and rich artistry of submissions (as detailed in Appendix 1), only four plays were

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2022.286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

chosen for awards in twenty years of competitions. Two went to Aleksandr Ostrovsky for his tragic *Groza* (The Storm) in 1860 and his comic *Grekh da beda na kogo ne zhivet* (Sin and Grief are Common to All) in 1863. Aleksei Pisemsky won for his realistic portrayal of peasant life in *Gor′ kaia sud′ bina* (A Bitter Fate) in 1863 and Dmitrii Minaev (Molière's Russian translator) in 1874 for *Razorennoe gnezdo* (The Devastated Nest), a satire reflecting moderate political views that was later retitled *Spetaia pesnia* (The Sung Song). In these four winners, the judges found support for Russian culture and educative value. As Zubkov observes, the small number of prizes awarded to plays, in contrast to the many in history, testifies to the fact that the Uvarovsky was "a complete failure" (529) in its attempt to bring about a productive relationship between the Academy and the public sphere in artistic matters concerning drama. In 1876, when Aleksei Uvarov withdrew his financial support, the Academy dropped the dramatic category, but continued to make awards in history until the Bolshevik Revolution.

Zubkov brings a creative point of view to his thesis and scrupulous analysis of the copious archives, including published and unpublished plays by known and unknown writers, discussion notes, critical reviews and correspondence from the judges. Rather than focusing solely on the winning plays, he identifies the trends and values that led the judges to exclude so many submissions that are now part of the dramatic canon. For example, Zubkov's analysis of the rejection of *Smert′ Ionna Groznogo* (The Death of Ivan the Terrible), the first play in Aleksei Tolstoi's now famous historical trilogy, uncovers the divisive argument between the Academy members, who valued accurate depictions of the past, and the civil experts, who sought for analogies to contemporary issues within artistic treatments of Russian history (535).

Without a doubt, Zubkov's prodigious archival study of the Uvarovsky prize for drama and his analysis of its underlying values and tensions will contribute significantly to future literary, political, and cultural studies that treat one of the most important and complex periods in nineteenth century Russia.

Sharon Marie Carnicke
University of Southern California

Hunting Nature: Ivan Turgenev and the Organic World. By Thomas P. Hodge. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2020. xvi, 303 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Plates. Photographs. $39.95, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.287

Everyone who studies or teaches Ivan Turgenev will want to read this book. The subject, as the title indicates, is the link between Turgenev's lifelong passion for hunting and his writing. It was hunting that connected him to nature, and also to Russian peasant culture through the huntsmen who accompanied him on his shoots. One of the strengths of Thomas Hodge's book is his weaving of the insights of others into his text; nonetheless, it turns out there is more to say. For one thing, no one has as thoroughly embedded Turgenev's writing in the history of hunting, or the genre of writings about hunting in vogue in the mid-nineteenth century. Hodge thoroughly illustrates the crucial importance of details of nature and the hunt in Turgenev's fiction. Over and over again he demonstrates how a reference to a specific plant or animal—in the latter case mostly hunting dogs and game birds—provides both scientific and cultural knowledge that illuminates the text from below its surface. For instance, through 1868, in his writing Turgenev mentions hunting twenty-two different species (46). His favorite is the black grouse (*teterev*), which can play a metaphorical as well as a cultural and factual role in texts (150–51), but there are many other examples of this.

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2022.286 Published online by Cambridge University Press