

four seem to be an introduction for the close readings of the three closing chapters. Chapter 6 focuses on Mikhail Bulgakov's *White Guard*, home and hearth vs snow-storm in the Civil War. Chapter 7 examines three Soviet Novels with different takes on Civil War: Aleksandr Serafimovich's *The Iron Flood*, Leonid Leonov's *The Thief*, and Mikhail Sholokhov's *And Quiet Flows the Don*. Chapter 8 is on Boris Pasternak's *Doctor Zhivago*. Harrison frequently discusses Socialist Realism in these chapters, relying mostly on Katerina Clark's *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual* (1981), which makes sense given her focus on spontaneity and consciousness and the association of spontaneity with elemental entities such as floods and storms. For example, in the discussion of Dr. Zhivago, Harrison reads Zhivago's attraction to the revolution as "an unleashing of an elemental force (*stikhiost'*)" (203). It would have been good to see some reference to more recent books on Socialist Realism such as Regine Robin's *Socialist Realism: an Impossible Aesthetic* (1992), Irina Gutkin's *The Cultural Origins of the Socialist Realist Aesthetic* (1999), or Evgeny Dobrenko's *Aesthetics of Alienation* (2005) and *Political Economy of Socialist Realism* (2007).

Nevertheless, *Language and Metaphors of the Russian Revolution: Sow the Wind, Reap the Storm* is an excellent introduction to Russian culture of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It is well written, easy to read, and its historical and cultural details thoroughly explained, even to the uninitiated.

ERIC LAURSEN
University of Utah

Kanikuly Kaina: Poetika promezhutka v berlinskikh stikhakh V. F. Khodasevicha. By Iaroslava Ananko. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2020. 320 pp.

Notes. Bibliography. Index. ₴505, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.290

Iaroslava Ananko's book focuses on one of the most interesting and still understudied periods of Vladislav Khodasevich's literary career, when after having established himself as a major contemporary poetic voice with the publication of *Grain's Way* (1920) and *The Heavy Lyre* (1922), Khodasevich left Russia for Germany. There, and later in Italy and France, he wrote poems that would eventually constitute the cycle "European Night"—the last cycle in his *Collected Poems* (1927). Ananko concentrates only on a particular section of "European Night"—poems written in Germany, stating that they display a special thematic unity, though their subject matter permeates "European Night" as a whole. This focus on a particular segment of Khodasevich's poetry has its advantages and disadvantages. It allows Ananko to exhibit real skill in in-depth close reading of the chosen poems, highlighting their thematic and linguistic interconnectedness. It may, however, hinder seeing the forest for the trees, in particular in the case of the German-period poems' porousness to poetic and extra-poetic processes in Khodasevich's overall literary career in the broader context of Russian and European modernism.

Ananko's main conceptual framework that underlines the singularity of the chosen poems draws on Iurii Tynianov's 1924 article "Promezhutok" and its titular image, which can be rendered as "interlude" or "interspace." She proposes the concept "poetics of the 'interlude,'" characterized by a self-critical attitude to various poetic conventions. In the first chapter, Ananko shows how Tynianov's notion of "interlude" sheds light on Khodasevich's German period, and, by extension, on the entire period of "European Night," which she opposes to the "inertia" (another of Tynianov's terms) of Khodasevich's writing in Russia and in the 1930s. The second

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 de-automatizations 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 Khodasevich,” in his *Strong Opinions* [New York, 1990], 223).

EDWARD WAYSBAND
Transilvania University of Braşov

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