

transformed in Daghestan. Unlike the Chechens, Daghestani writers did not rely on *adat*, or customary law, to oppose *zakon*, or the laws of the colonial state. Rather, they became textualists, drawing on Islamic *shari'a* law to struggle against colonial law. As Gould points out, when Daghestani scholars rebelled, as they did in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, they justified their actions in terms of Islamic legal tradition, and thus claimed fidelity to a higher legal and moral order. Gould illustrates this difference brilliantly, drawing on a deep, detailed reading of debates between Daghestani scholars and their Chechen counterparts.

Gould then looks at a third difference: the approach of the Georgians, who, rather than openly opposing Russian domination, largely accommodated it. Looking carefully at the life and texts of Tsitsian Tabidze, a sharp critic of his contemporary writers, Gould shows that rather than struggling violently, as the Chechens did, or engaging in legal debate, as the Daghestanis mostly did, the Georgians aestheticized violence and collaborated with the Russian conquest of the Caucasus. Tsitsian Tabidze's sharp critique of this collaboration led him to oppose the Soviet state—a political stance for which he was executed in 1937.

In Gould's fourth chapter, she breaks dramatically with her first three chapters to use her own ethnography rather than texts to take up the question of post-Soviet resistance. She looks at Aizan Gazueva, a Chechen woman who blew herself up along with the Daghestani general responsible for the death of her husband and brothers. Gould shows how the logic of this suicide bombing stemmed from a similar concept of transgressive sanctity to those held by the Imam Shamil and Tsitsian Tabidze. What had appeared as a senseless act of violence becomes, as Gould places it in historical and cultural context, the only meaningful act that a person subjected to arbitrary state-sponsored brutality can carry out. Gould does not lionize the *shahidka*'s radical violence. But she explains why this transgression is sanctified by the community it comes from, and in doing so, tells us much about Chechnia's contemporary anti-colonial struggle.

Gould claims that the *shahidka*'s actions are a degraded form of transgressive sanctity, and that once Chechen national independence was off the table, these radical acts of violence became mere aesthetic acts rather than serving a higher strategy. One might argue instead that once resistance was placed in the frame of Islamic jihad, acts of terrorism became even more sanctified and hence even more meaningful. The marriage of Chechen violence and Daghestani attention to *shari'a* here seems to uphold Gould's point about transgressive sanctity, rather than showing that violence had become unsanctified. But this argument merely shows the power of Gould's analysis. By giving us a unified analysis of the anti-colonial politics of the Caucasus, Gould has helped to spell out the logic of contemporary terrorism.

ELIZABETH CULLEN DUNN  
Indiana University

***The Assassination of Symon Petliura and the Trial of Scholem Schwarzbard 1926–1927: A Selection of Documents.*** Ed. David Engel. Archive of Jewish History and Culture, Vol. 2. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016. 482 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Index. €130.00, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.210

On May 25, 1926, in the heart of Paris, the Ukrainian Jew Scholem Schwarzbard murdered the Ukrainian political leader Symon Petliura in broad daylight, eliciting a frenzied domino effect throughout the Ukrainian and Jewish exile communities.

These events impinged on, and even shaped, Ukrainian-Jewish relations for decades. Less than twenty years after the murder, in the midst of World War II, in German-occupied L'viv, Ukrainian police and peasants carried out a brutal pogrom framing the violence as the "days of Petliura." More than 2,000 Jews were killed over a three-day period; many perpetrators justified the violence as an act of revenge for the death of a Ukrainian national leader at the hands of the Jews. In a unique linguistic tour-de-force, David Engel selected and translated documents from more than a dozen archives across western Europe, Israel, and the United States pertaining to the 1926 assassination and to the ensuing trial in 1927. Translated into English from Ukrainian, Russian, Yiddish, Hebrew, and Polish (the documents in French and German are reproduced in the original only), these records reveal the extraordinary complexities and intricacies of inventing national narratives.

The Jewish response to the murder was largely influenced by the unprecedented violence of the pogroms unleashed during the Russian Civil War, which, especially in Ukraine, became genocidal. The violence wiped out entire Jewish settlements, and was often carried out by troops ostensibly led but not always controlled by Petliura, who as of February 1919 had become the head of government and state in Ukraine. Many Jews throughout the world heeded Schwarzbard as a national hero, whose action was not only understandable but also a necessary act of revenge. On the other hand, Petliura became the best known Ukrainian public figure beyond the borders of Ukraine, and remained a passionate advocate of Ukrainian independence even after he fled to Paris following the Bolshevik victory in 1920. The murder turned him into a national martyr for the Ukrainian cause. Engel's introduction superbly contextualizes the systematic politicization of the events. He chronicles the reception of the murder, the trial, and the acquittal in the international arena, capturing the echoes of these events in Paris, Warsaw, Moscow, New York, Bucharest, and Prague. Both the ongoing economic crisis and the debate over immigration weighed heavily, for example, in French society, in an affair where both murderer and murdered were foreign-born.

The volume places thus Petliura and Schwarzbard at the center of world events, revealing how and why their names became intermittently famous and infamous, were ensnared by the left and the right, and generated both admiration and hatred. Despite some genuine attempts by Ukrainian and Jewish leaders to diminish the rift caused by the assassination and achieve political cooperation, diplomacy failed miserably. If Schwarzbard became a Soviet agent (he had indeed served in the Red Guard and fought on behalf of the revolution in Ukraine) and a national avenger of the Jewish people killed by Petliura's troops; Petliura became "the pogromchik par excellence," whose "bones should be ground to dust" (170–71); while for the other side a symbol of the desperate struggle for Ukrainian independence against Bolshevik rule. The two national myths that emerged, and the literary responses they engendered, could never harmoniously converge. What is missing in the introduction is a discussion of the impact that the Schwarzbard affair had on the dangerous myth of Jewish Bolshevism, which often defined the relationship between Jews and non-Jews from the late 1920s well into the post-World-War-II years, and still reverberates across eastern Europe today. The extensive press coverage of the murder and the trial inevitably promoted the lie of Judeo-Bolshevism, which in many contexts served as the chief trigger for collaborating with the Germans in murdering the Jews. In Soviet Ukraine, for example, as recorded by existing reports by the OGPU, the Soviet secret police, the discussion of the trial, and its outcome exacerbated ethnic tensions between Ukrainians and Jews: they enhanced anti-Jewish feelings among those Ukrainians who resented the Bolshevik experiment and identified it with Jewish "power and secrecy." Engel's comparison between the reception of Alfred Dreyfus

and Schwarzbard also seems somewhat unpersuasive. The unreserved acclamation of the Ukrainian Jewish avenger as a national Jewish martyr versus the reluctance to adopt Dreyfus as a Jewish hero some thirty years earlier stems from the extraordinary violence of the pogroms of the Civil War, compared by many contemporaries to the Armenian genocide. This exceptional volume brings together some unique sources that remind us of the ambivalent and fragmented nature of the politics of memory in twentieth century Europe, where narratives of victimhood and victimization coexisted, clashed, but rarely intersected.

ELISSA BEMPORAD

*Queen's College, the City University of New York*

***Poiavlenie geroia: Iz istorii russkoi emotsional'noi kul'tury kontsa XVIII-nachala***

***XIX veka.*** By Andrei Zorin. Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie, 2016, 563 pp.

Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. RUB 624, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.211

Andrei Zorin has given us yet another page-turner. His latest book is a study of Andrei Ivanovich Turgenev (1781–1803), who lived at a time when the “tradition-oriented” individual, whose values and behavior were based on the rituals and practices of prior generations, was giving way to the “inner-oriented” individual, who endeavored to live his life by principles worked out in his youth (David Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd*, 2001). How a shift in sociocultural norms brought about in Turgenev an emotional conflict that had a profound effect on his worldview is the subject of this book.

The introduction provides a survey of the psychological, anthropological, and sociocultural theories of the history of emotions, both in European and Russian contexts, and outlines the theoretical underpinnings of the author's approach. A rich bibliography accompanies this survey. Zorin bases his approach on a sociocultural theory of emotion developed by two Dutch psychologists, Nico Frijda and Batja Mesquita, according to whom emotions are social and relational phenomena, which accounts for significant differences in emotional experiences in different cultures. Emotions, generated not so much by an event as by the meaning assigned to it by a specific culture, are inseparable from the sociocultural context that produces emotional matrixes. Emotional experience—emotional process—consists in “event coding,” “appraisal,” and “action readiness.” The study of emotional process becomes a matter of cultural history, because its ingredients depend on a particular sociocultural context.

Setting the stage for the analysis of Turgenev's emotional experience, Zorin offers several examples of emotional culture at the end of the eighteenth century—the time of Turgenev's coming of age. Chapter 1 juxtaposes emotional matrixes developed at Catherine's court and orchestrated by the empress herself to alternative symbolic models of the senses worked out by the Moscow circle of Rosicrucians, one of whose leaders was Turgenev's father, Ivan Turgenev.

The matrixes of the sentimental education for her courtiers and others close to the court emanated from the empress: the court theater, whose most authoritative dramatist she was, instilled patterns of feelings that, although coming from the outside, were supposed to be interiorized by the viewers and produce desirable behavior.

For Rosicrucians, the idea of emotional education led in the opposite direction. Rejecting theater as an example for imitation, they turned to reading, interpreting, and translating esoteric and moral-didactic literature for self-edification and, in the long run, for the benefit of the public. They developed a ritual of writing confessional