

new spiritual era but as the prelude to far greater violence, and so, Landa argues, he was prepared to respond immediately to the October Revolution not as a catastrophe that ruined his previous messianic dreams, but as part of the journey towards salvation. Yet, as Landa points out, Voloshin's poems on the Red Terror in Crimea show that he could not always find ways of endowing sustained acts of brutality and degradation with redemptive significance, preferring to give a voice to the victims rather than seek a purpose in their killers' actions.

The first part of the book illustrates clearly the characteristics which might make Voloshin an appealing figure for those hoping to construct a twenty-first-century identity for Russia which would emphasize continuity while enabling a cathartic acknowledgement of the "painful complexity" (163) of the Soviet past. Voloshin avoided taking sides; his poems, as Landa shows, were read, published, and admired by those on both sides of the Civil War, offering a vision of at least some hope for a Russian nation in the future. A particularly interesting aspect explored in Chapter 2 of Part One is Voloshin's role as a "poet of Russia." It examines his engagement with readers in the Civil War years, from whom he solicited comments, to whom he both recited his poetry and provided commentary on it at public lectures, and who circulated his work in ways that, Landa argues, anticipated *samizdat*. The public comes to the fore once more in Part Two of the book, which includes material taken from online discussions of the religious significance of Voloshin's poetry from a forum for Orthodox believers, showing that the poet's nonconformism appealed not just to the educated urban population, but also to more conservative-minded people in small towns and villages.

The second part of the book, dealing as it does with very recent developments in contemporary culture, suggests a possible travel direction rather than a destination description. Its conclusion points to a sharp distinction between the Russian President's view of Crimea as Russia's own Holy Land, and Voloshin's view of it as a place that represents a dream of the "spiritually enlightened, multinational, and cosmopolitan Russia" (190). Landa's study is to be welcomed for its careful engagement with a poet who modelled such inclusiveness in his own life and writing.

KATHARINE HODGSON
University of Exeter

Pisateli—"derevshchiki": literatura i konservativnaia ideologiya 1970-kh godov.

By Anna Razuvalova. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2015. 616 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. RUB 494, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.218

The works by the Russian "village prose" authors, the so-called *derevshchiki*, apparently belong to the most-studied texts in late-Soviet literature (1950s–80s). They were discussed in papers published not only in Russian but also in English, German, and French. The wonderful monograph by St. Petersburg-based scholar Anna Razuvalova, however, is not just another book on this issue. It seems to be closer to a synthesis of different approaches to the "villagers'" prose and worldviews than anything else, and, at the same time, it revisits many beliefs hardened among the critics from the 1970s–90s.

In the papers of western academics and journalists, "the villagers" were usually interpreted through their political position, as manifestations of political nationalism or political conservatism hidden from the Soviet public sphere by censorship. In her books of 1992 and 2004, Kathleen Parthe drew attention on this unilateralism of

interpretation and returned to the study of the artistic means used in the derevenshchiki's prose. While referring to Parthe's research, Razuvalova takes the next step. She presents the "villagers" progress as the artistic creation of cultural conservatism that acquired political meanings in the circumstances of late-Soviet ideological erosion. In all instances, Razuvalova strives to present the "villagers" viewpoint "from within," explaining their own cultural and social logic as they understood it themselves.

The main topic of this book is the correlations between the core motifs of the "villagers" novels and short stories; the writers' social and cultural attitudes; and the reception of their texts among cultural elites. In fact, Razuvalova supposes that the "villagers" opuses were aimed at the construction of a new conservative cultural identity in late-Soviet society; in other words, at the "invention of tradition." From the very beginning, this conservative movement was influenced by Stalinist-style nationalism, but it was primarily cultural and social, not political. This approach allows Razuvalova to disengage the nationalist and conservative attitudes on an imaginary map of the Soviet intellectual movements, and to focus on the literary production of identity and social emotions.

The book consists of five chapters and a conclusion. In the first chapter, the "villagers" conservatism is presented as a cultural innovation. Chapter 2 is focused on the "villagers" psychological complex of cultural inferiority; this complex was connected—in the "villagers" private letters and public speeches—with a feeling of moral superiority over these writers of the Soviet intelligentsia. Razuvalova supposes here that the main source for such attitudes was the experience of obstacle negotiation, while joining the intelligentsia elites who were only condescending to the poorly-educated young writers of *kolkhoz* origin. Chapter 3 considers how the *pochvennyye* critics—that is, conservative, irrational, and nationalist-oriented—interpreted the "villagers" writing as the key successors of 19th century classical Russian prose, and inscribed them into the national literary canon. At the same time, however, the *pochvennyye* critics made the very notion of the Russian canon more anti-intellectual and intuitivist. Razuvalova demonstrates how these critics used the "villagers" opuses as an argument in their promotion of a "holistic," anti-avant garde, anti-structuralist, and covertly anti-Semitic approach to art. The fourth chapter turns to the correlation of ecological and anti-modernization motifs in the "villagers" prose. The fifth chapter discusses how the anti-Semitic and anti-Caucasian ideas appeared in the works of the "villagers" starting in the late 1970s. At last, in the conclusion, Razuvalova focuses on contemporary, post-Soviet authors who are considered in criticism as the aesthetic and social successors of the "villagers." Notwithstanding the "villagers" silent resistance to Bolshevik violent modernization, these "heirs," like Zakhar Prilepin or Mikhail Tarkovsky, present the Soviet period as "the good old days," like pre-*kolkhoz* village life in "villagers" works.

The less persuasive section of this wonderful monograph is its second chapter. The "villagers" enemies, intellectuals of Russia's "two capitals," are depicted predominantly according to resentful memoirs of "villagers" and "fundamentalist" critics as the snobbish holders of heritable symbolic capital. The broader contextualization allows us to see that a significant share of the "intelligentsia writers" of the 1960s and 1970s who later became opponents of the "villagers" had been the children of Soviet elites who perished in or survived the GULAG. The fiercest critic of the "villagers," Friedrich Gorenstein, was the son of an arrested provincial professor of economics. In his youth, Gorenstein had to serve as an unskilled laborer. Later he was educated as a mining engineer. It would perhaps have been more useful to describe the struggle for symbolic and cultural capital between the "villagers" and "intelligentsia writers" of the 1960s as a fight between two groups of disadvantaged people.

Taken as a whole, however, Razuvalova's monograph is one of the most innovative books on late Soviet literature published over the past few years. This is a deep, thoroughly-written work embracing a very wide range of issues. Its bibliographical list is vast. This book could be recommended for everybody who is interested in Soviet culture and the evolution of Soviet society.

ILYA KUKULIN

The National Research University—Higher School of Economics Moscow

Stalin's Music Prize: Soviet Culture and Politics. Marina Frolova-Walker. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016. xi, 369 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. \$65.00, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.219

The rather dry subtitle belies an engaging and pleasurable tour through the middle decades of twentieth-century Soviet musical life. These events have received extensive, if less captivating, attention in recent years. Frolova-Walker takes a fresh angle on the topic by using the prism of the Stalin Prizes to analyze the musical world of the 1940s and 1950s. She accords the prizes a central role, and convincingly demonstrates how they interacted with and indeed shaped important aesthetic and political debates. Readers with some background in Soviet music and politics at mid-century will have a much easier time with this narrative, which can often feel like the insider's story that in a sense it is, written by a scholar educated in the late Soviet Union and heir to the mid-century tradition, using as her main primary source the protocols of various meetings. A dizzying array of figures, major and minor, are splashed across the pages, some of them for just a moment.

The expected figures of Dmitrii Shostakovich, Sergei Prokofiev, Nikolai Miaskovskii, and a darkly-painted Tikhon Khrennikov take center stage. Despite some recent attempts to relativize or even rehabilitate the longtime head of the Composers' Union, Khrennikov here comes across as a culpable and craven individual (256–57). Miaskovskii assumes a key role and, indeed, even the “institutional epicentre” (158) in this analysis. He proved essential to the workings of the musical world, and his music was an important touchstone. Although Prokofiev won more prizes—six—than any other composer, his persona and work rather recede into the background in this narrative.

A somewhat unexpected Shostakovich emerges in this re-telling, rather different from the close-lipped, dour figure in so many other works. He gets full treatment in two chapters, and appears regularly throughout the book. In the prize discussions, he offered biting criticism and actively supported those he deemed worthy. We see him more active, taking positions and engaging in the political-aesthetic debates of the era. In an interesting side note with larger implications, Frolova-Walker undermines an important plank in Solomon Volkov's *Shostakovich and Stalin*, in which Volkov posits that Stalin himself selected Shostakovich's Piano Quintet for a prize in 1941. She devotes her second chapter to a detailed examination of the discussions during this first year that prizes were awarded. Here she convincingly shows that the Quintet received a prize due to its appreciation by a large number of Stalin Prize Committee members; Stalin's potential advocacy of the piece is largely incidental. Such a role for Stalin is largely typical in her story, and is one of her key arguments: the dictator had a voice and took interest, but “Stalin's whims had a direct effect in only a handful of cases” (9).

It is no surprise coming from this expert on Russian music and nationalism, but she attempts to rehabilitate some of the massive output of “national music”—based