evidence is usually presented with most useful comparisons to succession practices in other contemporary European states.

The author has chosen to use a narrative format to discuss the evolution of these arrangements over changing and complex political and international environments, a difficult rhetorical task accomplished with verve and grace. In chapters separated by the dominant choice of basic succession tools, the reader is treated to extensive discussions of each succession from one ruler to the next. Of course, most of these "succession crises" have been discussed at length by other historians. To the task of retelling these stories, Bushkovitch brings an impressive array of new sources, often diplomatic, and the linguist skills to use and interpret them. His extensive footnotes testify to his labors not only in the French, German, Russian, Latin, and English, but also in Polish, Greek, Danish, and Swedish, and not only in printed sources but in archives. The result is a fresh and engaging view of these crises, always told with a perceptive eye towards the succession principles or devices involved.

I emphatically agree with Bushkovitch that the basic categories used by early modern Russians to understood what we call politics (and succession) remained firmly religious and moral, down to the second half of the seventeenth century, when new western currents in political thought infiltrated the court. This reader benefitted particularly from the subtle and rich discussions of these new court thinkers, particularly the Ukrainians Simeon Polotskii and Feofan Prokopovich. At the same time, I have a more pessimistic view of the literacy of secular members of the elite before about 1600, and the influence that written sources like chronicles could have had upon them. The book might have benefitted from more discussion of visual evidence like the imagined successions of Rus′ and Old Testament rulers in the pendentives of the Golden Hall (other parts of these now-destroyed images are examined, (200–201), or in the ancestor portraits in the Archangel Michael Cathedral. If the idea of sovereignty was new to Russia under Peter (323), does it make sense to translate the all-important term *gosudar′* as "sovereign" throughout the book?

These are minor points. Paul Bushkovitch has given us an enormously erudite and gracefully written book on a crucial subject, a gift for which we should all be grateful.

Daniel B. Rowland
University of Kentucky

Russia's Early Modern Orthodox Patriarchate: Foundations and Mitred Royalty, 1589–1647; Apogee and Finale, 1648–1721. Ed. David M. Goldfrank and Kevin Kain. Washington DC: Academia Press, 2020. Vol. 1: viii, 284 pp. Vol. 2: viii, 291 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. $139.95 each, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.268

This two-volume collection from a 2013 international symposium presents important research into the art, architecture, culture, history, politics, and religion, as well as biographies of several key figures of the early modern Moscow Patriarchate (1589–1721).

The first volume's seven essays look at the patriarchate from its 1589 establishment to 1647. The first essay, by Ludwig Steindorff, provides a useful history of the Eastern Orthodox patriarchates from the formation of the ancient Pentarchy (Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem) through the creation of the various medieval patriarchates (Bulgaria, Serbia, Romania, and Russia). The second and third essays, by Elena V. Belyakova and Nikolas Pissis, look at the divergent Russian and Greek views of the establishment of the Moscow patriarchate, documents used by

the Muscovite state and church to legitimize it, particularly under patriarchs Filaret (r. 1619–1633) and Nikon (r. 1652–1666), contrasted by the refusal by the Greek patriarchates to recognize Moscow as equal to them, and explaining the elevation of Moscow as either a mistake by Patriarch Jeremiah II (r. 1572–1579, 1580–1584, 1587–1595) or a decision forced upon him by tsarist officials.

In the fourth essay, Isaiah Gruber does not address the Moscow patriarchate, but rather focuses on the Jewish community in Russia before the Petrine reforms and the Partitions of Poland, offering a thought-provoking glimpse at overall Russian policy versus the realities of Jewish life in a period that is poorly understood, while pointing the way—like many essays in this collection—to further, fruitful research.

The fifth essay by Dmitrii P. Isaev reconsiders the co-rulership of Tsar Mikhail Romanov (r. 1613–1645) and his father, Patriarch Filaret, arguing the tsar was always preeminent and the patriarch could issue *ukazes* on his own only on ecclesiastical matters. The sixth essay, by Georg B. Michels, is an engaging look at Filaret's attempt (which ultimately failed) to insulate Russian society, and especially the Russian clergy, from Catholic and Polish influences by interrogating Ukrainians and Belarusians crossing over from Poland-Lithuania.

The first volume's seventh and final essay, by Alfons Brüning, reviews the career of Peter Mohyla and his family and their contribution to Orthodoxy in L'viv and Kyiv, despite being accused of Catholic tendencies. Kyiv was ecclesiastically under Constantinople at this time, but Mohyla's academy and printing press greatly influenced the Moscow Patriarchate.

The second volume's nine essays discuss the patriarchate from 1648 to Peter the Great's abolition of it in 1721. Several essays focus on the significant figure of Patriarch Nikon.

The first essay, by Aleksandr Lavrov, looks at the reform program of the Zealots of Piety, aimed at ending the practice of *mnogoglasie* during the Divine Liturgy, increasing clerical discipline, and strengthening lay piety. He cites several letters Nikon issued while Metropolitan of Novgorod (1649–1652), indicating his early reforming zeal there.

In the second essay, Vera Tchentsova looks at the strange, multiconfessional career of Arsenios the Greek (ca. 1610-ca.1666), a translator of important texts and key associate of Nikon, who was, at one time, Orthodox, perhaps Catholic, then Muslim, then Orthodox again.

The third and fourth essays look at art and architecture. Lilia M. Evseeva discusses the artistic and theological transformation of Russian iconostases beginning in the late 1390s, from traditional altar screens or templons to a full, multi-tiered wall reaching to the ceiling. Alexei Lidov's contribution then looks at Nikon's creation of sacred space in his construction outside Moscow of the New Jerusalem monastery and the Hermitage or Otkhodnaia Pustyn attached to it.

In the fifth essay, David Goldfrank reconsiders what we know about why Nikon's patriarchate collapsed, and though he does not reach a firm conclusion, he asks a number of intriguing questions pointing the way to future research.

In the sixth essay, Ovidiu Olar looks at manuscripts from Leiden and Bucharest and what they tell us about Nikon's reforms, in particular an exchange of letters between Nikon and Patriarch Paisios of Constantinople (r. 1653–1654): Nikon asks about differences between Russian and Greek liturgical texts and practices and requests guidance in bringing Russian practices in line with those of the Greek church. Paisios and his synod reply by praising Nikon's efforts to strengthen and preserve Orthodoxy but warn him not to press minor matters too much to avoid unnecessary division: "the proper hour to begin the liturgy or the number of the fingers used for the sign of the Cross, should not cause separation" (142). Nikon failed to heed this warning, eventually bringing about the Old Believer schism.

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2022.268 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the seventh essay, Nikolaos Chrissidis reviews the Moscow patriarchate's charitable giving in the year 1661–62, during the patriarchate of Joasaf II (r. 1667–1672), revealing a very narrow geographic focus in and around the Moscow Kremlin and the nearby bridges (where beggars congregated).

Donald Ostrowski argues in the eighth essay that the Russian church did not become an arm of the state, nor did it fall into decline, with end of the patriarchate in 1721, but in fact, the Holy Governing Synod enacted the church's Enlightenment program to better train the clergy, fight superstition, and increase lay piety. The Russian church, in fact, flourished up until the end of the empire in 1917.

Finally, Kevin Kain looks again at art, in particular the Parsuna "Patriarch Nikon with Clergy," a seventeenth-century secular portrait in an iconographic style, and how this particular portrait influenced historic views of Nikon, especially in the nineteenth century.

These essays offer fascinating glimpses at Russian Orthodoxy, the patriarchate, and broader religious and cultural history in the time of the earlier Moscow Patriarchate, adding to our overall understanding of early modern eastern Europe.

Michael C. Paul
Christendom College

The Tsar, the Empire, and the Nation: Dilemmas of Nationalization in Russia's Western Borderlands, 1905–1915. Ed. Darius Staliunas and Yoko Aoshima. Historical Studies in Eastern Europe and Eurasia, vol. V. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2021. 400 pp. Notes. Tables. Index. $95.00, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.269

Was the late Romanov empire a truly "nationalizing" polity during the early twentieth century? If so, to what extent and in what way exactly? How did it respond to the challenges posed by peripheral national projects while aiming at the consolidation of a hard-to-pin-down "Russian" national core? The emerging historiographical consensus, epitomized, among other works, by the recent broadly comparative volume on *Nationalizing Empires* (2016), edited by Stefan Berger and Alexei Miller, posits that the European continental empires (and the Russian empire, in particular) were quite successful at "taming" nationalism, while appropriating it for their own purposes of political legitimization or state-building.

The collection edited by Darius Staliunas and Yoko Aoshima—a product of an excellent international team of scholars specializing in Russia's western borderlands—engages with and partially amends this view by changing the lens of analysis and focusing on "the response of the empire's ruling elite to the challenges of nationalism in the tsarist regime's last decades" (4). It does so, first, by revisiting the older dichotomy between "bureaucratic nationalism" and the "imperial strategy," formulated by Polish historian Witold Rodkiewicz over two decades ago, and by fruitfully contributing to the current debates on the nature of the relationship between empire and nation in an era of mass politics. One of the core arguments of this volume is that there was a constant tension—which was never actually resolved—between two antagonistic visions of the empire: one that "perceived the empire as primarily an ethnic Russian (*russkii*) state" privileging "the interests of Russians. . . at the expense of non-Russians," and another, which "embraced the idea of imperial heterogeneity" and aimed primarily at "ensur[ing] the loyalty of non-Russians" (2). In his contribution, Staliunas expresses this opposition through making the "distinction between the *imperial* or *pragmatic* nationality policy and