chapter deals with biblical Cain as the central "autopoetological figure" of the "interlude" (84). In this function, Cain replaced Khodasevich's former key poetic identification with Orpheus. Ananko claims likewise that Cain, with his semantics of wandering, betrayal, and rebellion, is "the main conceptual protagonist of 'European Night,'" who organizes its "(meta)poetic narrative" (163). This underplays the thematic diversity of the cycle in favor of one, albeit important, field of reference. The third chapter deals with Khodasevich's identity ambiguities that correlate with the book's key themes. Khodasevich's Russian acculturation constituted a "betrayal" of the Polish culture of his family, thus contributing to his identification with Cain both in his life and poetry. In the fourth chapter, Ananko constructs an intricate interconnection between the Berlin interlude and its animal—mainly canine—projections. Here the book is at its best, closely following Khodasevich's thematizations and deautomatizations of various idioms.

Ananko's penetrating analysis of Khodasevich's imagery and linguistic games continues in the last two chapters of the book. Pointing at the concentration of electric imagery in the Berlin poems, she shows how Khodasevich adds nuance to the common modernist thematization of electricity as the predominant feature of the modern cityscape. She then presents a meticulous thematic and syntactic examination of the poems "Under the Ground" and "An Mariechen." Basing her analysis of Khodasevich's imagery primarily on A. A. Hansen-Löve's fundamental research of the Russian early modernist system of motifs provides her with conceptual and interpretative tools for analyzing Khodasevich's profound dialogue with the Russian symbolist heritage despite the reconfigurations in his émigré poetry (A. A. Hansen-Löve, *Der russische Symbolismus: System und Entfaltung der poetischen Motive* [Vienna, 1989–2014]). Ananko's referencing of Hansen-Löve's research shows, however, its limited applicability to Khodasevich's mature poetry. Her book ends with the statement, variously anticipated throughout, that "European Night" is a "decisive auto-deconstruction of Russian modernism" (294). One may argue, however, that Khodasevich's implicit critiques of symbolism's metaphysical and "life-creative" aspirations, along with his acute reliving the challenges to and self-confirmation of poetic autonomy in post-war and post-revolutionary Europe, correspond to international high modernism's "overcoming" (Victor Zhirmunskii's term) excesses of early modernism in striving for a new, more down-to-earth modernist poetics. Such a view would suggest that the "defeat of modernism," allegedly dramatized in "An Mariechen," may be somewhat premature (292).

These reservations notwithstanding, Ananko's book provides a refreshing and stimulating analysis of a number of Khodasevich's poems and encourages further investigation of the qualities that warranted Nabokov's calling him "the greatest Russian poet of our time" (Vladimir Nabokov, "On Hodasevich," in his *Strong Opinions* [New York, 1990], 223).

Edward Waysband
Transilvania University of Brașov

Transnational Russian Studies. Ed. Andy Byford, Connor Doak, and Stephen Hutchings. Transnational Modern Languages series. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2020. xviii, 354 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. Figures. Tables. $29.95, paper.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.291

This book belongs to a new academic genre that has become quite popular over the past few years: interdisciplinary volumes written by a collective of authors exploring

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2022.291 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Russian culture in a global framework. Other recent examples of this genre include *Global Russian Cultures*, edited by Kevin M. F. Platt (U of Wisconsin Press, 2019), *Russian Culture in the Era of Globalization*, edited by Sarah Hudspith and Vlad Strukov (Routledge, 2020) and *Redefining Russian Literary Diaspora, 1920–2020*, edited by Maria Rubins (UCL Press, 2021). Given the conceptual closeness of such terms as "globalization," "transnationalism" and "diaspora," it is not particularly surprising that these books have been produced by an overlapping cast of scholars. Seven of the twenty authors contributing to *Transnational Russian Studies* also contributed to one or more of the other volumes.

In their introduction to the book the editors embrace a stance of methodological self-reflection by placing special emphasis on the word "studies." Their proclaimed goal is to interrogate "how the distinctive history of nation-making, empire-building, and diasporization that has shaped our field's object of study also shapes how Russian studies is 'done'" (3). "Russia" and "Russian culture" are treated as "epistemic frames," creating a need to navigate between "the Scylla of essentialism. . . and the Charybdis of globalism" (6–7). Furthermore, the editors stress the necessity "to view the transnational from a *Russian* vantage point" by offering and interpreting "*views 'from within'*" (19), invoking Pavel Florenskii's notion of "reverse perspective" and Mikhail Bakhtin's "outsidedness" (20–21). In spite of the stated aim of incorporating Russian perspectives, only one contributor, Vitaly Nuriev, the co-author of a chapter on translation in the multilingual USSR, is based in the Russian Federation. The other contributors teach at institutions in the UK and US, and, in one case, at the University of Amsterdam. It seems, then, that the reflection on the transnational status of Russian culture is mainly a concern of Anglophone academics (although some of them are Russian-born or of Slavic descent). This is also true for the other volumes mentioned earlier.

The book's chapters are arranged in four overarching categories. Part One, "Nation, Empire, and Beyond," deals with the multi-ethnic space of the Russian empire and the Soviet Union as a geopolitical frame for national, imperial, and postcolonial entanglements. Part Two, "Beyond and Between Languages," addresses such topics as translation, world literature, and Russian-language drama beyond the confines of Russia. Part Three, "Cultures Crossing Borders," explores the transnational resonance of Russian opera, film, and fiction as well as representations of queerness and the "aesthetics of imperfection" in Russian online dating sites. The fourth and final section, "Russia Going Global," concerns itself with the Russian internet and state media in the age of Putin. It also contains an ethnographic chapter by Lara Ryazanova-Clarke featuring a sociolinguistic analysis of three quite different members of the Russian diaspora in London.

As becomes clear from this list, the individual contributions are quite varied and cover a wide range of topics and approaches. Some chapters, such as Vera Tolz's opening survey of Russian colonial discourses vis-à-vis the west, offer useful reading especially to non-specialists. Other contributions provide more specific case studies. For example, Stephen M. Norris discusses the curious fact that Fedor Bondarchuk's *Stalingrad* (2013), the highest-grossing film in Russian cinematic history, became an unexpected blockbuster in China, and Jeanne-Marie Jackson analyzes the reception of Fedor Dostoevskii and Lev Tolstoi among South African novelists. Strangely enough, she does not mention J. M. Coetzee, who, on the other hand, does make an appearance in Marijeta Bozovic's chapter on Vladimir Nabokov and World Literature. Two of the editors contribute chapters of their own. Connor Doak's informative essay about queer transnational encounters shows how gender and sexuality map unto questions of nation and civilization. Stephen Hutchings provides an illuminating analysis of the international broadcaster RT. He argues that, far from being a linear

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2022.291 Published online by Cambridge University Press

instrument of state propaganda, RT's "double-voicedness" can be connected with the (self)-satirical discourse known as *stiob*. To their credit, and unlike most other contributors, both Doak and Hutchings explicitly link their discussion to issues raised in other chapters of the volume.

In the meantime, Russia's brutal invasion of Ukraine, which is still ongoing at the time of this writing, has fundamentally transformed Russia's transnational entanglements with its neighbors and the rest of the world. It also forces one to read some of these essays with new eyes. The Russian-Ukrainian relations addressed in Amelia Glaser's essay about Nikolai Gogol′ as a writer from a transnational "contact zone" will never be the same again, and it is doubtful whether the cultural bonds between Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus through their common use of the Russian language, as argued in Julie Curtis' essay on "The Politics of Theatre," will remain intact. Other observations in the book show that the Russian imperialist rhetoric justifying military aggression as a settling of old grievances has not changed since the nineteenth century. Olga Maiorova, in a chapter dealing with the Russian colonization of Central Asia, mentions that the forceful annexation of non-Russian territories was presented "as a 'return' of 'our own' native lands, which had been taken from helpless Russia in the remote past when it was suffering from multiple invasions" (70). Tatiana Filimonova's discussion of Vladimir Sorokin's dystopian novels provides glimpses of a future dominated by the paranoid Eurasianist fantasies of Aleksandr Dugin. Already back in 2007, Sorokin "expressed his concern about the darkest pages of Russian history entering contemporary reality" (97). Whether Sorokin's prophecy in the novel *Telluria* (2013) that the forceful revival of the empire will lead to "tumultuous changes, political instability, and its eventual disintegration" (103) remains to be seen. In any event, with the Russian Federation having become an international pariah and the worldwide Russian diaspora turning into an exilic community, there will be a continued need to reassess Russia's position in the contemporary world.

Adrian Wanner
The Pennsylvania State University

Haunted Empire: Gothic and the Russian Imperial Uncanny. By Valeria Sobol. Ithaca: Northern Illinois University Press, Imprint of Cornell University Press, 2020. xvi, 216 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Maps. $49.95, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.292

Six months before he was murdered in the shadow of the Kremlin, Boris Nemtsov warned that the beginning of Russia's war against Ukraine in 2014 was a descent into "lies, violence, obscurantism, and imperial hysteria" (137). In her timely, concise, and brilliant *Haunted Empire*, Valeria Sobol explores how such "imperial hysteria" manifested itself in the literature of the Russian empire at times of conquest and expansion—as a Gothic nightmare.

Sobol sees the Gothic as much more than a literary fashion in the Russian empire in the first half of the nineteenth century. In her reading, the Gothic is a mode that channeled and expressed the strange, erratic energies of a vast contiguous land empire, where the boundaries between colonizer and colonized, between home and not-home, were profoundly unstable. Her major contribution in the book is not only interpreting the Russian Gothic through a colonial frame, but revealing how disorientating and even fearful anxieties accompanied the march of empire in Russia, sparing neither center nor periphery.

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2022.291 Published online by Cambridge University Press