Malaurie's classical *The last kings of Thule* (1985), as well as that of Birgitte Jacobsen's thorough analysis of phonetic changes in PE (1991) are surprising – but he does not seem to know much about other Inuit groups. This leads him to make a number of uninformed statements, for instance when he postulates that the use of the ethnonym Inugguit ('big or great people') might be due to an 'exceptional level of pride to be found among this group' (page 1). Perhaps, but most Inuit groups outside Greenland define themselves in a similar way: the Alaskan Inupiat ('super people'), the Mackenzie Inuvialuit ('big super people'), the western Nunavut Inuinnait ('genuine people'), etc. Incidentally, over the last two or three decades, the term 'Inuinnait' (their language is Inuinnaqtun) has been the official name of those who were formerly called 'Copper Eskimo'. Using the latter appellation, as Leonard does on pages 3 and 8, should be avoided.

In my eyes, the only real quality of the linguistic chapters is to give some examples of the way contemporary Inugguit speak their language. The latest published accounts of PE phonology, grammar and/or lexicon (Fortescue 1991; Jacobsen 1991) date from some 25 years ago, at a time when the language reflected a stronger influence of variety B speakers. Data found in *Some notes* … thus enable readers to witness the recent evolution of the language and its partial drift towards Standard West Greenlandic, a drift already described by Jacobsen (1991, page 70–71) when it was incipient. Other than that, however, there is not much to learn from these chapters. Chapter 2, for instance, presents a very sketchy description of the phonology of PE, based on a short story written by the author. A basic tenet of linguistics stipulates that research materials must be elicited from native speakers rather than produced by the linguist himself. Resorting to self-generated data is, at the least, strange.

Deficiencies in Leonard's linguistic analysis are numerous. They include an absence of discrimination between phonetical and morphological apocope (pages 17–18); an unclear distinction between the three vocalic phonemes of the spoken language and the five vocalic graphemes of the Greenlandic writing system (page 24); the author's presentation (page 30) of the canonical PE 'sentence' (actually, morphological word) as formed by a root + derivational affix + enclitic + inflectional affix (although enclitics usually appear in word-final position); his mistaken distinction (page 37) between the PE words that are 'Proto-Inuit', and those that come from Standard West Greenlandic (actually, both PE and West Greenlandic stem from the same ancestral Proto-Inuit language); etc. One can also question the writing conventions devised by the author – which differ from those of Fortescue and Jacobsen – as well as a few apparently idiosyncratic inflectional morphemes (e.g. *-huhut/-tuhut*, 3rd plural indicative, instead of *-hut/-tut*, as in Fortescue 1991, page 174). This means that a large part of the linguistic sketch that constitutes the matter of chapters 2 to 7 is untrustworthy.

By contrast, the Glossary (pages 93–270) can be useful to those interested in communicating with the Inugguit. It comprises ca. 3,500 current PE words (or, more rarely, phrases) in alphabetical order, along with their English translation. Some entries include a short ethnographic or contextual description of the meaning of the word. This glossary thus provides interesting examples of what can be found in the conversations of contemporary Inugguit (e.g. *alioqtoqtoq*, 'sees a ghost'; *oonaqtuqtoq*, 'drinks tea or coffee'). Its only shortcomings are the apparently haphazard way that has presided to the choice of entries, and the absence of an English to PE word-finder. Those wanting to learn PE more systematically should, thus, use Leonard's glossary in combination with the better structured lexicon (and lists of derivational and inflectional affixes) found in Fortescue's *Inuktun* (1991), even if the latter reflects an older stage of the language. (Louis-Jacques Dorais, Quebec, Canada (louis-jacques.dorais@ant.ulaval.ca)).

References

Fortescue, M. 1991. *Inuktun. An introduction to the language of Qaanaaq, Thule. En introduktion til Thulesproget*. Copenhagen: Københavns Universitet (Institut for Eskimologi 15).

Jacobsen, B. 1991. Recent phonetic changes in the Polar Eskimo dialect, *Études/Inuit/Studies* 15:1, 51–73.

Malaurie, J. 1985. *The last kings of Thule: with the Polar Eskimos as they face their destiny*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Russia and the Arctic. Environment, identity and foreign policy. Geir Hønneland. 2015. London and New York: I.B. Tauris. xii + 191 p, illustrated, hardcover. ISBN 978-1-78453-223-9. £58.00.
doi:10.1017/S0032247415000960

The year 2015 is now coming to an end and it seems as if every year since 2010 this reviewer has been responsible for the review of a book of the Director of the Fridtjof Nansen Institute in Oslo, Geir Hønneland. And by the end of this year it is the book *Russia and the Arctic. Environment, identity and foreign policy*, which, as the author states in the *Preface*, builds on material of two of his previous books, namely *Borderland Russians* (Hønneland 2010) and *Arctic politics, the law of the sea and Russian identity* (Hønneland 2014) to which this reviewer would still add *Making fishery agreements work* (Hønneland 2013). And indeed, one can find several parts from these books in the present volume, however significantly expanded through a much more theory-based underpinning. Moreover, while overlapping in content, Hønneland's goal is not to reproduce the findings, but to locate it within the impressive swing of linking identity, narrative and foreign policy, thus establishing a theoretical framework in which his empirical data is located. And the focus is, as the title implies, Russia, which in this reviewer's opinion is a dramatically underrepresented actor in the foci of English research on Arctic (geo)politics. This fact alone and Hønneland's analysis which 'maps the narrative fabric within which Russian Arctic politics evolve' (page 19) make this book incredibly valuable.

It is thus that after the theory-based *Introduction*, the second chapter delves right into the subject matter and analyses *Russian identity between north and west*. Feeding on previous literature on the issue, the author locates current Russian political actions within contexts of westernism and Eurasianism, thus making also the current events in Crimea from a political perspective explainable. At the same time Hønneland shows how the 'north' became part of Russian identity and how it has thus influenced Russian policy-making. But he goes further and presents different forms of identity-making and -shaping to the reader.

Different narratives form the self-understanding of Russians within a diverse country and diverse world.

In *The rush for the north pole* the Russian understanding of Arctic geopolitics are deciphered. Drawing from extensive newspaper analyses, the author shows, as in his other books, the high degree of suspicion towards the other Arctic states as to their motives in the Arctic. In order to further make this feature understandable, Hønneland does not shy away from citing a critical article in *Kommersant* in its entirety directly after the infamous 2007 flag planting (see page 52–55). But all in all it is the narrative of NATO which is 'surreptitiously preparing for the rush for the Arctic, while Russia insists on international cooperation and open dialogue' (page 55) which steers Russia's discourse and foreign policy in the Arctic.

Delimitation of the Barents Sea, as the title implies, covers the Russian reactions prior and after the signing of the Norwegian-Russian Barents Sea delimitation treaty in 2010. As such, the chapter draws heavily from *Arctic politics* (Hønneland 2014) by using the same interview excerpts and following the same structure of the respective chapter in *Arctic politics*. But while earlier Hønneland's account was more based on description and his own views on the matter, the present chapter has been significantly expanded with more information and data as well as substantiated with IR theory. In a sense, the data provided in *Arctic politics* could therefore be considered a prelude to or a teaser of what this volume has to offer. Naturally, if one has read both books there will be some overlap in content, but given the different foci of the books and the further expansion of the data, one is not left disappointed.

Similarly, the chapter *Management of marine resources* is partly taken over verbatim from *Making fishery agreements work* (Hønneland 2013) and constitutes a compressed version of the book. And as the previous chapter, the data presented is not necessarily new, but significantly expanded through more details and the theoretical underpinning. The difficult and shaky relationship between Russian and Norwegian negotiators, commentators and diplomats becomes ever more apparent in this chapter. And once again, it seems that suspicion is a driving force behind Russian narratives that constitute a discourse of opposition regarding fisheries management in the Barents Sea.

Region building, identity formation draws from *Borderland Russians* (Hønneland 2010). This chapter depicts and analyses self-understanding of Russians in the Barents region *vis-à-vis* the proximity to Norway. It becomes clear that while active region-building has created the Barents Euro-Arctic Region (BEAR), this does not mean that it is to be equated with the historical identity the region shares, first and foremost in the form of the Pomors. To the contrary, in spite of regional political cooperation, cultural exchange and environmental problem-solving (Sellheim 2013), Hønneland shows how the fostering of Barents-identity can lead to significant problems with the Russian authorities, once again sparked by a fear of the West aiming to undermine Russian integrity.

In the last chapter of this engaging book, *Arctic talk, Russian policy*, the author links the findings of the foregoing, recalling that the 'sense of self, or identity, is part of the fabric that constitutes action, foreign policy included' (page 145). To this end, actions taken by Russia in the Arctic become explainable and in order to clearly do so, Hønneland has included short tables of key events after the end of the Cold War for the Arctic Ocean, the Barents Sea and the Barents Region after which he lets the 'story-tellers', meaning key articles in the Russian press, speak themselves, once again linking the narratives of identity and Russianness with actions within foreign policy.

The author ends the book with the words: 'The Arctic is the ultimate commonplace for the cultivation of Russianness. [. . .] It is is the venue for the big epic dramas in life, a ballroom floor for the wild Russian dance – through the ages, across the plains' (page 170). *Russia and the Arctic* certainly makes exactly this 'Russian dance' understandable for those that have been wondering about Russia's actions not only in the Arctic, but also elsewhere in the world. And in combination with Hønneland's unmistakable personal style, which this reviewer is very fond of, *Russia and the Arctic* should be read and be an inherent part of the book shelves of those interested in Arctic politics, geopolitics and International Relations in general. (Nikolas Sellheim, Faculty of Law, University of Lapland, PO Box 122, 96101 Rovaniemi, Finland (nikolas.sellheim@ulapland.fi)).

References

Hønneland, G. 2010. *Borderland Russians. Identity, narrative and international relations.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hønneland, G. 2013. *Making fishery agreements work: post-agreement bargaining in the Barents Sea*. Cheltenham and Northamton: Edward Elgar.

Hønneland, G. 2014. *Arctic politics, the law of the sea and Russian identity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sellheim, N. 2013. Problem-solving capabilities, goal-attainment and effectiveness of the Barents environmental cooperation. *The Yearbook of Polar Law* IV: 519–539.

The socialist way of life in Siberia: transformation in Buryatia. Melissa Chakars. 2014. Budapest, New York: Central European University Press. 320 p, illustrated, hardcover. ISBN 978-963-386-013-7. $55.00 / €42.00 / £35.00

doi:10.1017/S0032247415000972

The formation of ethnic identities is influenced at the same time by state discourses and local experiences. It is, however, hard to draw a line between 'ideology' and 'daily life', as Mark Bassin and Catriona Kelly (2012: 9) point out, because everyday practices are often shaped by relationships with political institutions. Melissa Chakars, the author of *The socialist way of life in Siberia*, focuses on this complex interplay of ideology and everyday life in Buryatia (south-central part of Siberia) pondering the following questions: Who are the Buryat people? How were their identities shaped by Soviet-time reforms? Answers to these questions are sought from a rich compilation of sources ranging from statistical and archival data and publications in Buryat newspapers to transcripts of Soviet TV-shows.

The theme of ideology and daily life in Buryatia was primarily developed by Caroline Humphrey in her famous anthropological study of the *Karl Marx* collective farm (1983) and its updated edition *Marx went away – but Karl stayed behind* (1998). In her 1983 work Humphrey argues that the categories existing in Buryat society long before the Soviet time