

motivation (120–23). Some of these factors are “testable” to a degree, but mainly they require that the researcher perceive the place of protest from the protesters’ and/or the authorities’ point of view. From that standpoint the relative significance of the “intermediary factors” can be assessed through what might be called the “life cycle” of a protest, but which the author labels as “dependent variables”: “emergence,” “realization,” and “impact.”

Fine-tuning his apparatus along the way, the author explores the “Maidan” rebellion in Kyiv in 2013–14, unsuccessful protests in two central squares in Minsk in 2006 and 2010, and the disastrous defeat of Russia’s opposition in 2011 at Swamp Square (*Bolotnaya Ploshchad’*). These chapters contain much of interest. However, because they are translations of journal articles, they repeat many of the theoretical/methodological considerations contained in the first half of the book.

In sum, the author’s strengths—multilingualism and personal immersion in the research areas—are obscured by the trappings of social science. The “model” does not have predictive capability, nor does it lead to any law-like generalizations. However, Hansen has provided an “updated language to discuss such space [of protest] more efficiently” (96). That is not a bad thing, especially if it encourages more scholarly attention to the places where protests occur. A final note: the maps of the city centers are excellent.

ROBERT ARGENBRIGHT
University of Utah, Emeritus

Migration and Population Politics during War(time) and Peace(time): Central and Eastern Europe from the Dawn of Modernity to the Twentieth Century.

Ed. Andrei Cușco, Flavius Solomon, and Konrad Clewing. Cluj-Napoca, Romania: Editura Mega, 2021. 412 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. Figures. Tables. 130 Lei, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2023.56

This handsomely produced volume features mostly expanded papers from many of the presenters at the third thematic part of the international conference “Migrations and Identity in European History: Communities, Connections, Conflicts.” Of the other two thematic sections, only one has recently been published by Editura Mega, appearing in 2021. However, a person would not know that these two volumes were related, coming from the same conference, unless one has read their introductions. This meeting was held in Iași, in September 2019, hence the cover features a painting by Teodor Boian of “The Iași Fair” (1875–80) that seems a bit odd considering the title and contents of the volume. Furthermore, the subtitle is misleading as the essays overwhelmingly cover the Balkans and not all of east central Europe, while one entry contains material going into the early twenty-first century.

This book begins with a list of contributors who are academics from Germany, Hungary, Romania, Russia, and Turkey; it also includes their main areas of research. The work encompasses fourteen articles in English and German, preceded by an extensive introduction in which the contained works of the authors are described in superlative terms. Three of the entries were authored by people not listed in the official program, while several pieces have different titles than those at the conference. The articles vary in size with the average being around twenty-five pages, with most pieces being divided into subsections with headings making it easier to read. As there is no bibliography, one must consult the extensive footnotes.

The volume is divided into five major subheadings or chapters. Strangely, however, these chapters/subheadings do not appear in the text, while two of them only contain one article each. The essays are multidisciplinary and, at times, seem like case studies. The first chapter, “Towards a New History of Migrations: Reassessing Methods and Research Agendas,” contains this single piece by Alexander Rubel, “Migrationsgeschichte als Weltgeschichte. Ein Plädoyer für neue Akzente in der historischen Migrationsforschung unter Einbeziehung der Vor- und Frühgeschichte.” It very broadly covers migrations from prehistory/ancient times until today.

The next subheading, “The Birth of New Elites: Political and Intellectual Mobility in the Modern Era,” includes essays by Lidia Cotovan, “The Naturalization of Greeks in the Principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia: Disputed Meanings, Contested Interpretations”; Simon-Alexandru Garviş, “Foreign-Born Bureaucrats in the Principality of Moldavia in the Early 19th Century”; Leonidas Rados, “Forging the Modern Romanian Intellectual Elite: Andrei Vizanti as a Student in Iaşi and Madrid”; Flavius Solomon, “In Search for a New Homeland: *Narodnik* Émigrés in Romania during the 1870s”; and Andrei Cuşco, “Zamfir C. Ralli Arbore and Constantin Stere Between Anarchism, Populism, and Nationalism: Two Cases of Russian Political Émigrés to Romania in the Late 19th and Early 20th Century.” This chapter flows very well from one essay to the other by discussing Greek and Russian emigrants as well as Romanian elites who studied abroad, focusing primarily on their relationship to Moldavia.

Chapter 3, “Searching for the Lost Homeland: Population Movements in Interwar Europe,” is comprised of articles by Konrad Clewing, “Zwischen allen Stühlen? US-albanische Erfahrungen vom Auswandern und Rückwandern in frühen 20. Jahrhundert”; Tatiana Ilarionova, “Migration as Salvation: Contributions to the History of Germans and Jews in Russia and Southeast Europe between the World Wars”; Gábor Egry, “Magyar Returnees and Political Radicalization in Post-World War I Hungary”; and Mehmet Hacisalihoğlu, “Blurring Borders between Religion and Ethnicity: Turkey’s Migration Policies towards the Balkans in the Interwar Period (with Special Reference to Bulgaria).” As compared to the previous grouping, these presentations are case studies that only have in common returning co-nationals with completely different experiences.

The fourth part, “Identity Projects and Population Politics during World War II and its Aftermath,” contains papers by Ottmar Traşcă, “The Impact of the Second Vienna Award on the Demographic Situation in Transylvania. Forced Population Displacements in a Contested Space, 1940–1944”; Philippe Henri Blasen, “‘Vor allem eine Kirche deutscher Menschen’: Die evangelische Landeskirche A.B. in Rumänien und die Taufe der Juden (1940–1944)”; and Dorin Dobrinu, “‘A Famine Like No Other’: The Swedish Rädde Barnen Society and Its Assistance to the Children of Eastern Romania, 1946–1948.” Out of the five major chapters, these pieces connect very well with one another, although the chapter title is a bit strange for the three essays.

Péter Varga, “Jüdisch-deutsche Literatur der dritten Nachkriegsgeneration—eine Migrantenliteratur?” is the sole work in the last chapter, “Migration and Reshaping of Identities in Post-Cold War Europe.” The author only describes Russian Jews who migrated to Germany after the fall of the Berlin Wall and have a strong influence on German-Jewish literature. For them, the Holocaust plays little or no role. Rather than victims of the Nazis, they see themselves as victors over them. Here, Varga’s piece extends into the twenty-first century when the subtitle of the book notes, “... to the Twentieth Century.”

Although the articles are interesting to read and well researched, the volume has some issues. There appears to be little that connects them all together other than the

fact that most were presented at the same meeting. As a result, it suffers the major pitfall of conference proceedings despite the editors' attempt to cover them all with a broad and lofty title that over steps its purpose; the editors admitted this fact by stating, "This volume with the somewhat ambitious title..." (9). Subsequently, it will remain a seldom consulted volume as it will be difficult for a reader or researcher who has an interest in one or two of the topics to find access to these essays. Finally, no conclusion ties the pieces together with only the introduction and a brief book description on the back cover serving as poor substitutions. Overall, the book, sadly, is a great disappointment.

GREGORY C. FERENCE
Salisbury University

Historical Writing of Early Rus (c. 1000–c. 1400) in a Comparative Perspective.

By Timofey V. Guimon. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2021. xv, 477 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. Figures. Tables. Maps. \$170.00, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2023.57

Written works in early Rus' are a complex web of interrelationships, as authors borrowed readily from each other. It is even more so for chronicles, annals, and similar historical writing of the time. To explore those interrelationships takes decades of study. Most of the information that chronicles provide would not be admitted into a court of law. That is because at best that information is hearsay; at worst, fictionalized. It is not that what the chronicles report is necessarily wrong; rather, we do not know when they are necessarily right. Instead of focusing specifically on what the chronicles and other narrative sources report (as source for something), a turn has been occurring in chronicle studies to study what the sources are (source as text) and how and why their authors report what they report.

Timofey V. Guimon (Gimon) is one of the premier experts on pre-1400 history writing in Rus', having published extensively, including monographs on weather reports in medieval annals and a comparison of Anglo-Saxon chronicle writing with that of Rus'. His latest monograph, *Historical Writing of Early Rus (c. 1000–c. 1400) in a Comparative Perspective*, is the culmination of over twenty years of his study of early Rus' texts.

Guimon adopts the conventional chronological demarcation of around the year 1400 between the age of parchment and the age of paper in Rus'. In addition to treating *letopisi* as primary sources, he is among those scholars who agree that we need to think of them also as early historiographical works. Guimon tackles the problem in translating the word *letopis'* as "chronicle," since *letopis'* means "year writing," whereas "chronicle" derives from the Greek *χρονικόν*, indicating a chronological narrative of historical events, not necessarily in a yearly format. Yet Guimon maintains the traditional translation "chronicle" when referring to a specific text, such as the Laurentian Chronicle or Kiev Chronicle, but prefers "annals" when referring to *letopisi* in the plural as a genre (§1.2).

The book is based on twenty-one of Guimon's published works (all but one in Russian), the contents of which have been incorporated in whole or in part, with modifications to fit the monograph and updates to take into consideration more recent scholarship. After an introduction in which he discusses terminology and provides a brief overview of the historiography of Rus' annals, Guimon divides his book into four main chapters, which discuss: extant texts and a genre typology; the