

and making unexpected connections. *Alternative Kinships* is the latter sort of book, which is to say it functions best (and seems to be intended) as a beginning rather than an ending. Exhaustiveness would hardly seem to be a form of excellence in such a work. Allusive brevity would, and (not counting the endnotes, bibliography, and index) these are one hundred and forty-three highly suggestive, stimulating pages.

**Timothy Langen, University of Missouri**

Zuk, Patrick, and Marina Frolova-Walker, eds. *Russian Music since 1917: Reappraisal and Rediscovery*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017. xiv + 434 pp. \$115.00. ISBN 978-0-19-726615-1.

The study of Russian music has undergone tremendous change in recent years. The advent of perestroika in the mid-1980s and collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 generated an unprecedented flow of archival documents, intellectual debates, and musical performances between East and West. This upheaval has been productive but uneven, transforming some areas completely while leaving others mired in the past. As the dust begins to settle, Russian music studies is in need of a stock-taking. Patrick Zuk and Marina Frolova-Walker provide a timely and useful one in *Russian Music since 1917: Reappraisal and Rediscovery*, a compilation of essays from a conference held at Durham University in 2011 that surveys the current state of the field.

The volume is divided into five sections. In their introduction, Zuk and Frolova-Walker state their intention that it should “not only constitute a useful resource for the specialist, but also serve as an accessible introduction ... for the general reader” (p. 17). To this end, they provide an overview of the development of Russian music and its study from 1917 to the present, then delineate the problematic received narratives developed on both sides during the Cold War. It is these narratives they seek to correct by working toward a unified, evidence-based account that sets ideology aside and places twentieth-century Russian music in historical context. Part I digs into the past twenty-five years of Russian music studies in Russia and the West, while Part II focuses on music under Stalin. Parts III, IV, and V, respectively, explore problems in contemporary Russian musicology, new finds from Dmitrii Shostakovich’s archive, and the construct of the musical “Russia Abroad.” Finally, Part VI sheds light on Russian composers’ journeys since the Soviet Union’s collapse.

Several contributors discuss the still-incomplete reunion of Russian music studies. On the Western side, Zuk faults the persistence of two Cold War pieties: the Adornian worship of musical complexity, which works to the detriment of Soviet compositional accessibility, and the top-down model of Soviet censorship, which denies Soviet composers agency and isolates them from their international context. On the Russian side, Olga Manulkina blames institutional changes enacted during late Stalinism, when Soviet musicologists, already isolated from other humanities disciplines in conservatories, were similarly proscribed from considering comparative and historical perspectives. To bring these sides closer, Zuk and Frolova-Walker have gathered an equal number of essays from both loci, which required substantial translation work by Zuk. The resultant juxtaposition is refreshing and salutary, but it also reveals that there is more to be done. The essays show marked differences in academic style, and at times Russian and Western scholars seem to talk past each other. For example, Levon Hakobian insists on the importance of one composer’s Armenian identity, while Daniil Zavlunov critiques national identity as a construct in his piece on Glinka scholarship.

Thanks in part to such disjunctures, this volume provides a vibrant picture of a field alive with healthy debate. If Manulkina, Zuk, and Frolova-Walker advocate for greater attention to contextual factors, Marina Rakhmanova and Hakobian caution against moving too far in this direction. As Rakhmanova notes, “having got caught up in such discussions, we have tended to stop listening to the actual music” (p. 41). And while several contributors criticize Western musicologists’ emphasis on “dissident” composers and call for more study of the Soviet mainstream, Yekaterina Vlasova asserts that Stalinism strangled all creative expression. In so doing, she appears to fall into a post-Soviet pitfall Zavlunov cautions against: inverting Soviet narratives rather than reconceptualizing

them. As a fascinating counterpoint, Bill Quillen demonstrates that while Brezhnev-era avant-garde composers drew inspiration from their pre-Stalinist forebears, their reverence was based on a mistaken understanding of this earlier generation as “apolitical.”

Perhaps because the archives have opened so recently and their continued openness is uncertain, some contributors relate to their documentary sources rather uncritically. Liudmila Kovnatskaya describes a newly discovered cache of Shostakovich’s letters with little analysis, while Vlasova reads the Bolshoi Theater’s formulaic birthday greeting to Stalin as evidence that its repertoire and staffing decisions were “effected at the behest of the Kremlin’s overlord” (p. 165). Pauline Fairclough makes a similarly overdetermined reading of a document about orchestral repertoires in her otherwise illuminating piece on the merging of the European canon with Russian Romanticism in the Soviet “Imperial Sublime.” By contrast, in undoubtedly the finest essay in the collection, Inna Klause frankly admits the limits of her sources, which, paired with her careful analysis, enhances the reliability of her revelation of composers’ suffering during the Purges.

Given this volume’s mission to bring together Russian and Western scholars, it is interesting to note the positioning of its two “crossover” contributors: Frolova-Walker and Elena Dubinets, both of whom were educated in the Soviet Union but made their careers in the West. The persistent difference in academic styles requires them to make a choice. In this instance, Frolova-Walker adopts a more personal, “Russian” manner in her insightful analysis of why “the scholarly overhaul of Soviet music history, once looked forward to with relish, has turned out to be a slow and painful process” (p. 114), while Dubinets employs a more formal, “Western” approach in her study of post-Soviet émigré composers. In his piece on Russian musical expatriates, Richard Taruskin declares that Frolova-Walker, Dubinets, and their contemporaries share neither community nor comradeship, because emigration no longer entails a shared sense of exile. But his claim is belied by their role in this collection. Unlike Taruskin, Frolova-Walker and Dubinets do not have the privilege of separating their scholarly identity from their nationality. As their essays demonstrate, until the bridging of the Cold War divide is fully achieved, they will remain united in the community of those who must constantly negotiate their position between two worlds.

With *Russian Music since 1917*, Zuk and Frolova-Walker have provided a valuable resource for scholars and educators. Their diverse selection of essays has something for everyone, specialist and non-specialist alike. While tone, approach, and quality vary, this volume will surely have staying power as a wide-ranging collection of contemporary work in Russian music studies and a portrait of this important transitional moment in the field.

**Leah Goldman, Reed College**

Lane, Tora. *Andrey Platonov: The Forgotten Dream of the Revolution*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2018. xii + 147 pp. \$90.00. ISBN 978-1-4985-4775-8.

Tora Lane’s book on Platonov is less a monograph outlining a comprehensive view of the writer than a series of essays on selected works by him. If the themes Lane pursues are largely familiar (Platonov’s early enthusiasm for the Revolution, followed by something like disillusion or ambivalence, his preoccupation with existence and the physical body), her strategy is to read the works on a certain level of abstraction from the Soviet context in which Platonov wrote. Lane’s interest instead lies in what she sees as “Platonov’s quest for a forgotten revolutionary consciousness of existence in common” (p. 5) as that relates to the philosophical writings of Martin Heidegger, Maurice Blanchot, Georg Lukacs, Georges Bataille, and Jean-Luc Nancy. This is the territory of Fredric Jameson, whose essay on Platonov’s *The Foundation Pit* in light of ideas about utopia and death in his 1994 *The Seeds of Time* Lane cites often.

Lane’s idea that what makes Platonov distinctive is his search for revolutionary consciousness in *literature* as such—as a mode of ironic distance, alienation, or a frustrated alternative to life itself—is interesting and generally consonant with the view prevalent in other scholarship on Platonov.