

the same as “привіт од гоголівського Вакули” and “Те, серце моє, так у цьому ж вся й штука.” Additionally, the novel is full of historical, cultural, and literary allusions. Readers would be thankful if there were some comments about what Gogol’s *Vakula* is, or *Forest Song* (36) (a poem by Lesya Ukrainka), or the line “I was learning the lessons of parting” (13) (“я вчилася науки розставань”) that refers to Mandelstam’s “я изучил науку расставанья,” and others.

Hryn gives English-speaking readers the opportunity to peek at a part of the world which until just recently was unknown to many Americans, who can now look at some events of the Soviet Ukraine from within. Thanks to the translator, readers of *Fieldwork in Ukrainian Sex* have a chance to better understand a Ukrainian woman and her problems. While Hryn does not fully preserve the unique linguistic landscape of Zabuzhko or her heroine, she makes the translation appropriate in the context of the receiving culture.

Marina Rojavin, Bryn Mawr College

Serhyi Bilenky. *Romantic Nationalism in Eastern Europe: Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian Political Imaginations*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 2012. Maps. Bibliography. Index. xvi + 389 pp. Cloth.

As the title indicates and the content confirms, Bilenky’s book discusses the political imagination of Russians, Poles, and Ukrainians in the period of Romanticism. The author first outlines the “imaginary borders” of the three nations as they present themselves in the writings of Russian, Polish, and Ukrainian men of letters (no women!), drawing the predictable conclusion that these mental geographies infringed upon one another and invited future conflicts. He then discusses the vastly dissimilar concepts of nationality in Russia and Poland, concluding that while they were being articulated in various political and cultural texts, the appearance of a third nationality partially invalidated them by creating facts on the ground. Thus the Russian and Polish theory and practice of nationality had/have to be readjusted to accommodate the Ukrainians. Several dozen thinkers are discussed, their views summarized and generously footnoted. The presence among those footnotes of primary sources (often in nineteenth-century editions) indicates that the author availed himself of rarely-accessed materials. In addition to showing familiarity with the major and minor political thinkers of the three nations, Bilenky makes a persuasive case for the much earlier appearance of Ukrainian national consciousness than has generally been assumed by American Slavists. Individual writers are discussed one after another and the views of each writer are presented with clarity, accuracy, and fairness.

The book was a pleasure to read, and the polemical remarks below in no way detract from its value. But they have to be stated because they concern fundamentals. Bilenky is indebted to the value-free postmodern methodology that treats with equal attention texts and events of great importance, and those that were marginal at the time of their appearance and afterwards. He is a talented researcher who avoids the obvious pitfalls, but occasionally his enumeration of names and views is too mechanical. For instance, Pavel Pestel’ in Russia, or Bronislaw Trentowski and Michał Czajkowski in Poland, exerted no substantial influence on the political imagination of their respective societies, yet they are presented on par with those who captured either the attention of their countrymen (Adam Mickiewicz) or wielded enormous political power (Sergei Uvarov). Another example: the author quotes as evidence of the prevalence of a certain attitude among Poles the “Manifesto of Poles in Belgium” (24). One wonders how many Poles in Belgium signed their name under that Manifesto; and even if all of them did, can such a piece be accepted as evidence that Poles thought thus and so? With regard to Ukraine, the author states that Stefan Buracheks’s vision of Ukraine was “bizarre” and “eccentric” (74), kind words re-

placing “absurd” and “one of a kind.” He also remarks that the new Romantic generation of writers invested the term *Ukraine* with more and more meaning (73). Well and good, but his presentation sometimes blurs the distinction between the mental geographies accepted by a huge majority of European and local populations, and those that arose in the minds of lone individuals. Unless one adheres to some principles that allow one to assess the relative weight of the various pieces of evidence and discriminate among them, a huge number of texts can be accurately quoted while important pieces are sidelined and marginal ones highlighted. This is a major weakness of the postmodern method that the author applies somewhat routinely.

Similarly, recent hypotheses about the primacy of “imagined communities” over other concepts of nationhood cover only some aspects of nationality. It should be remembered that the Muscovite elites had a strong sense of nationhood already by the time Nikolai Karamzin wrote his *History* (Anthony D. Smith would probably explain this as being a byproduct of Muscovy’s numerous wars). On the other hand, the Polish republican tradition goes back to the fifteenth century and has produced such thinkers as Paweł Włodkowic, Andrzej Frycz-Modrzewski, Stanisław Orzechowski, Augustyn Rotundus, and Krzysztof Warszawicki. Their thoughts on citizenship-based nationality, followed by the countless debates on liberty in seventeenth-century Poland, account in large measure for the emergence of the Polish concept of state and nation in Romanticism and beyond. Bilenky rightly points out differences between the Russian and Polish conceptions of nation and state, but he does not explain how these differences arose; indeed, his methodology does not allow him to do so. He takes for granted the admittedly well-rooted *idée reçue* that Slavic political imagination is crucially indebted to German philosophers of the eighteenth century, particularly Herder, and that the notion of “imagined communities” and other felicitous phrases of neo-Marxist Terry Eagleton explicate the existence of nations. Yet these “orientalizing” propositions cover only part of the territory and are woefully inadequate as yardsticks measuring national awareness in the East.

The book contains a number of small factual slips, such as the attribution of a strange name (“John III Kazimir,” 162) to a Polish king (did the author have in mind Jan III Sobieski or Jan Casimir?); the designation of Maurycy Mochnacki as a “conservative” (115); or the author’s objection to Zygmunt Krasiński’s statement about “Byzantine stagnation” (125). Krasiński referred to the fact that at the time of Christianization of Rus’, the Byzantine world was still in the grasp of iconoclasm that stifled creativity in more ways than one—for several centuries, Byzantium did not produce a single original poem.

Altogether, the book is a welcome addition to scholarship on Eastern Europe. It is both significant and praiseworthy that a study of the “geographical imagination” of the three largest nations of the region has been written by a scholar of Ukrainian background. It signals an interpretive change and calls for readjustment of many works on Russia and Poland that have not taken the rise of the Ukrainian nationality into account.

Ewa Thompson, Rice University

Matthew Rampley, ed. *Heritage, Ideology, and Identity in Central and Eastern Europe: Contested Pasts, Contested Presents*. Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 2012. Illustrations. Index. x + 206 pp. \$95.00 (cloth).

This volume focuses on the symbolic narrative of architectural and iconic representation of national and ideological heritage in Central and Eastern Europe. The articles deal with Hungary (“Caught in the Ferris-wheel of History: Trianon Memorials in Hungary” by Juliet Kinchin), Romania (“Public Sculpture in Cluj/Kolozsvár: Identity, Space, and Politics” by Paul Stirton), Germany and East Germany (“Interrupted Histories: Collective Memories and Architectural