essay on “Am I Writing or Am I Being Written? A Diary of a Young Soviet Woman (1968–1970),” Savkina contemplates the possible role of implicit audience even in a genre—the diary—that has traditionally been conceptualized as among the most private of genres. Incorporating into her analysis the ground-breaking scholarship of Katerina Clark and Oleg Kharkhordin on the ways that Soviet citizens attempted to shape their identities according to models such as “one big Soviet family” and the need to “work on [or shape] oneself,” Savkina explores the conflicting tensions and attitudes in this young woman’s work (and reveals at the end that this was her own diary that she subjected to scrutiny!). Rytkönen quotes Bonner in the title of her article, “Reminiscence Is Not Knowing What Lies Ahead: Constructing Memory in Memoirs,” and contributes the strongest piece in this section as she too deals with the topics of memory and subjectivity in Bonner’s 1992 memoir *Mothers and Daughters*. Rytkönen reiterates an often recurring theme in recent studies of memoirs about the Soviet Union, i.e., that memoirists such as Bonner find a greater truth in their own subjective memories of that period than do “objective” historical or documentary texts. In her brief piece, Holmgren takes on Susan Sontag’s dismissal of the Polish actress Helena Modjeska’s memoir as a source for her own recent novel, *In America*, and seeks to establish Modjeska’s value as a memoirist on her own terms. The last and least satisfactory essay in this section is Ekonen’s linguistically and conceptually garbled essay on Gippius. While her point that Gippius consciously constructed her life like a work of fiction is well taken (although not original), Ekonen would have benefited from an editor who could have helped her clarify her arguments and correct her English.

The middle section of *Real Stories, Imagined Realities* focuses on “Fiction, Non-Fiction and Social Realities” and is dominated by essays on Finnish history and journalism. Probably the piece that is the most interesting to Slavists is an analysis by the historian Simo Leisti of “Fiction, Non-Fiction or Something Else? The Possible World of Soviet Ideology.” An excellent example of the strengths of an interdisciplinary approach, the essay incorporates the insights of studies of the intersections of historiography and fiction to convincingly argue that “in some societies the clear-cut division between fiction and non-fiction has to be transgressed.” Using as his starting point a (119-page!) letter of denunciation written in 1971, Leisti articulates the interconnection between institutional structures and ideology, which he defines as a collection of texts reflecting power relations rather than as a system of beliefs. A second piece of literary history—in this case writing by Finnish novelists in Soviet Karelia in the 1960s—by Yuulikki Kurki can also be recommended as an interesting case study in the transmission of dominant values through a minority literature, although its topic is tangential to the fiction/non-fiction theme of the collection.

The topics addressed in *Real Stories, Imagined Realities* sometimes digress from the main theme of art and life or fiction/non-fiction, and the collection could have benefited from an editor for whom English is a native language. Nonetheless, the book adds to our ongoing consideration of these hybrid genres and narrative techniques that were first discussed by the Formalists in the 1920s, a discussion that continued in the 1970s, which leads me to ask why there isn’t more engagement in the volume with some of that earlier scholarship.

*Natasha Kolchevskaya, University of New Mexico*


*The Odd Man Karakozov* investigates the unprecedented attempt on the life of Tsar Alexander II by former law student Dmitry Karakozov on April 4, 1866. Verhoeven’s careful inspection of
the failed assassination reads like an extremely well researched detective story. Her multi-layered narrative teases out the facts of the ill-begotten crime as reported by the special Investigative Commission, represented in the Russian press, and replicated by images of the revolutionary in Russian literature and society which pre- and postdate the Karakovoz case.

The crux of the mystery for the Investigative Commission was whether Karakovoz acted alone, or as part of a wider conspiracy. Was he a denizen of "Hell," an alleged secret cell of the Muscovite socialist student group The Organization, which had ties to The European Revolutionary Committee? Or was he a crazed lunatic acting alone? The Commission never properly solved the mystery. Verhoeven takes a wholly different tack. Alexander II's would-be assassin is an analogue to the "odd man" [chudak] of Dostoevsky's preface to The Brothers Karamazov, who "bears within himself the heart of the whole" (vii). Or, by analogy to Porfiry Petrovich's famous assessment in the same author's Crime and Punishment, the Karakovoz incident shows that the average case does not exist; it is "the exception that proves both more and less than one rule at once" (13).

Verhoeven's convincing arguments prove that the first act of modern revolutionary terrorism politicized the self in unprecedented ways. Karakovoz differed from historical assassins in motive and method. In his own words, he, chronically ill and suicidal, wanted his death to be "useful" [polезн] to the people (146). His motive was to transform his death into "factual propaganda" [fakticheskai propaganda], a neologism used to imply that his crime served the logic of systematic, rather than singular, violence (147). In Verhoeven's analysis, his method can be understood only in the material contexts of modernity. Two full chapters are devoted to his appearance, clothing, hypochondria and medical history—leading to the remarkable insight that "Terrorism [...] is regicide reproduced in the age of science" (149). The link here is that Karakovoz, who underwent repetitive shock treatments to cure a nervous disorder and stomach pains, applied his clinical experience to political aims: the difference between the singular fact of tsaricide and the systematic violence of terrorism is that the former treats symptoms, while the latter is a form of "repetitious shock treatment designed to eliminate the cause of the disease that is ailing the body politic" (149). The discovery that "all the diseases of the urban nineteenth century cling to the body of Russia's first modern tsaricide" lead the author to conclude that "terrorism was born of an affected body, not an irrational mind" (147).

The incident also sparked a string of firsts in the empire—the side effects of the forces of modernity. In one of its truly fascinating outcomes, the crime initiated a barrage of political propaganda that centered on the public image of Karakovoz and the hat maker O. I. Komisarov. The latter had allegedly struck the assassin's firing hand, thus saving the tsar's life. The Komisarov intervention spawned interpretations of the event in the press, especially the conservative government organ Severniaia pochta [Northern Post]. The Tsar-Liberator who had delivered the people was himself saved by one of them—this at a time when April 4 was rumored to be an act of aristocratic vengeance for the Emancipation Proclamation of 1861 (69). Komisarov's image became a veritable industry of modern capitalist production, distribution and consumption of official ideology, the man himself Russia's first modern mass media star. He was exhibited primarily to preserve the myth between the tsar and people, and "to suppress the history Karakovoz was trying to make" (69).

The greatest merit of Verhoeven's approach is the sociopolitical analysis she brings to the story via works of the nineteenth-century Russian literary canon. These include Crime and Punishment and N. Chernyshevsky's What Is To Be Done?, among others. When the Russian Supreme Criminal Court read the "end justifies the means" gospel into the case, it colored and distorted the "real Rakhmetov" of Chernyshevsky's revolutionary handbook forever afterward. Likewise, Dostoevsky's Notes from Underground misreads Rakhmetov's rigorism—to Verhoeven, "the sin of a novice," which Rakhmetov transcends through laughter where Karakovoz cannot (64-65).

Verhoeven also sagaciously inspects the coincidence that Crime and Punishment was in the
middle of serial publication when Karakozov committed his crime. The mystery of the simultaneous occurrence of the two crimes in fact and fiction is slotted out more conclusively here than anywhere prior to this study. Both exemplify "the individual use of violence to force the birth of an idea," or, in Dostoevsky's language, a "new word" (86; emphasis C.V.). The extraordinary coincidence "injects the political into Dostoevsky's writing" (101), which had been conceived by the author as "a philosophico-literary dialogue on the moral sanction of the maxim that the end justifies the means" (92; emphasis C.V.). Most importantly, Karakozov made the link for Dostoevsky from crime and illness to political conspiracy, which before April 4 had been unimaginable (101). The novel on the rotten fruits of nihilism had not been political before the Karakozov incident occurred.

In this thorough and captivating study, the only stone unturned seems to be a more extensive comparison to the successful assassins of Alexander II in 1881—or for that matter, to the failed attempt by Anton Berezovsky in 1867, all the more relevant because in that case the perpetrator was a Polish nationalist, whom Karakozov was initially suspected of being. The motives and circumstances of these crimes, as well as their representations in the press and other media, would seem to be natural points of comparison to support the claim that Karakozov's act, and no other, constitutes the first example of modern revolutionary terrorism.

Lonny Harrison, University of Texas at Arlington


This monograph, published by Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie in the series Historia Rossica, provides a meticulously researched new perspective on what is otherwise a well-studied early nineteenth-century literary group. The Historia Rossica series was launched in the late 1990s in order to publish serious multi-disciplinary analyses of under-represented aspects of Russian history. To that end, the series includes monographs by Russian and Western historians of Russian history (the latter translated), many dealing with topics traditionally little published in Russia, such as the place of magic in Russian culture, the confluence of jurisprudence and property rights for noble women, or the study of sacred parody and charismatic authority in the time of Peter the Great.

In this volume the author departs from the standard, well-trodden reading of the literary group Arzamas as an important branch in the study of Pushkiniana. Instead, she traces the relationship of the participants, some of them previously seen as tangential to this loose confederation, to the power structures of their times. Using a large number of historic documents she frames the overall structure of the monograph around what she calls the modernizing project in the formation of Russian national, political, and cultural identity after the War of 1812. Maiofis grounds her theoretical analysis within the writings of twentieth-century Western theorists of political identities, such as Habermas, Althusser, and Giddens. In the introductory chapter, she examines the historiographic construction of the Arzamas mythologies, some perpetrated by the members themselves. She also posits the group’s influence on the formation of Pushkin’s political and aesthetic ideals. In the rest of the monograph, she engages the reader in the debates shaping Russia’s imperial identity after the victory over Napoleon as seen through the prism of the important and the lesser known members, their internecine feuds, and their literary and political roles. The book has eleven chapters, each containing extensive endnotes, and is profusely illustrated with small black and white portraits and engravings from the period covered.

Chapter 1 looks at the forces that shaped contemporary intellectual discussions about Rus-