

in the Moscow Academy, particularly the manuals written by the Leichoudes themselves and the Jesuit or Jesuit-influenced sources they consulted. Chrissidis is the rare scholar of Russian history with the language abilities to carry this off, adeptly analyzing unpublished and published sources in ancient and modern Greek, Latin, Church Slavonic, and Russian. His informative endnotes provide excellent additional explanation on the sources, quotes, and terminology. The result is an authoritative and original perspective on late seventeenth-century Russian education.

Two chapters delve more deeply into the instructional manuals to present the concepts taught by the Leichoudes in their rhetoric and philosophy courses, laying out the courses almost lesson by lesson, showing readers what it meant to study rhetoric and philosophy at the Academy. The rhetoric course relied on Greek manuals based on the latest Jesuit prototypes, but adding an “Orthodox guise” to adjust to the needs of Orthodox Muscovy (116). More than simply technical aspects such as elocution and disposition, the students learned to add emotion and a broader subject matter of history, custom, and myth to ensure “the captivation of the audience body, mind, and soul” (127). The natural philosophy course of study under the Leichoudes brothers was a novelty for Russia, offering “a complex understanding of the natural world” (140). In astronomy and cosmology, students considered stars, comets, celestial fluidity or solidarity, planetary spheres, and the diverse perspectives of Ptolemy, Plato, Aristotle, Copernicus, and Tycho Brahe (145). Utilizing a variety of commentaries on Aristotelian natural philosophy developed by Jesuits in the mid-seventeenth century, this course of study “paved the way for the subsequent importation of more up-to-date scientific knowledge into Russia during the Petrine period” (141).

Equally notably, Chrissidis underscores the consistent cooperation between church and state in founding and supporting the Academy, even throughout turbulent political times. The known information on its graduates demonstrates that they made vital contributions to both church and state institutions. Abruptly dismissed for personal reasons from their teaching duties at the Academy in 1694, the Leichoudes continued to serve the Russian state with translations and editing in the Typography office, as well as with creating a similar academy in Novgorod. Chrissidis never overlooks the personal weaknesses of the two brothers, even as he brings them rightfully into the limelight for consideration as instrumental precursors to the westernizing educational tendencies of the Petrine era. This important monograph comprises a valuable study on the roots of western-oriented education in Russia, and, indeed, on the intellectual development of the Orthodox East.

BARBARA SKINNER
Indiana State University

Threads of Empire: Loyalty and Tsarist Authority in Bashkiria, 1552–1917. By Charles Steinwedel. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2016. xiv, 381 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Glossary. Index. Illustrations. Photographs. Maps. \$45.00, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.235

Within today’s Russian Federation, ethnic Bashkirs total less than two million, or barely thirty percent of the Autonomous Republic of Bashkortostan (Bashkiria), their ostensible homeland. Since the tenth century or so, they have identified mostly as Muslims, as have their close neighbors, the Volga Tatars, who have typically overshadowed them in the regional historiography they share. Never in their recorded

history have the Bashkirs lived within a political organization of their own making; for that matter, since Ivan IV's conquest of the Volga region in the early 1560s, they have been subjects or citizens of one Russian state after another.

Adding to the latest scholarship on "Russia's Orient" from the fall of Kazan to the eve of the twentieth century, Charles Steinwedel has written a major study, the first in English, of the Bashkirs. By taking the long view, he seeks to unravel the ways by which this small population evolved under Russian rule, secured sometimes conflicting forms of identity (not least, acquiring estate status), engaged in often lengthy periods of dispute over land usage and ownership with Russian peers and authorities, found itself vacillating between marginality and fuller inclusion as loyal subjects, and yet, to a degree greater than any other Turco-Muslim community inhabiting the Russian Empire, increasingly formed a class of Russianized noble and/or military officer subalterns over the long nineteenth century. These are all part of the complex "local" story of the Bashkirs that Steinwedel weaves effectively through seven chapters in chronological order, but there is more to this heavily researched, deeply detailed, and theme-driven contribution to the flourishing "imperial turn" characterizing the recent historiography of Russia.

The "more" stems from Steinwedel's imaginative efforts to challenge certain enduring assumptions and methods that have often colored studies of Russia's long imperial history and imposed unwarranted analyses and conclusions on other ethnic groups and regions. On the one hand, he respects both the differences among Russia's many Turkic populations as much as he does the commonalities most if not all shared. Yet, he carefully avoids letting either override the other without cause, preferring to balance the purely local, that is, Bashkirs, against not only the neighboring Tatars, but against others more removed. For Steinwedel, although Bashkirs comprise a small population with their "own" history, understanding that history can be improved by situating it in larger contexts that are regional and national—the imperial Russian for starters, but also imperial Austrian, Ottoman, or Qing, with which comparisons can be quite informing.

On the other hand, Steinwedel insists that we not project upon all ethnic Turkic groups that which occurred in the history of one or another, as if a template produced all of their communal pasts. All too often, many aspects of Tatar history, for example, continue to be treated in just such a way, serving too frequently as the unquestioned handbook for that which happened elsewhere, in Crimea or Azerbaijan, as examples. "Elsewhere" may as well have been another part of the world, where the local turns out to be little related to anything remotely imperial in a general sense.

Moreover, Steinwedel reminds us that the imperial metropole never imposed consistent and enduring policies for any ethnic group. Rather, it engaged in repeated policy reassessments based upon changing times, the self-conscious reshaping of the empire's very identity, the perceived needs of the empire—at home and abroad—as viewed from the center, and even what other imperial systems practiced. More complicating is the remarkable extent to which the edicts from Moscow or St. Petersburg were modified or completely ignored by local officials, whether bureaucratic, military, or religious, ironically in the furtherance of stability.

If one imperial goal for the Bashkirs endured, it was the state's hunger, never fully satiated, for their loyalty and respect. Steinwedel locates loyalty at the core of policymakers' concerns, making the implicit case that it defined the meanderings through which generations of administrative organizers wandered in hopes of finally reaching their objective, even if they seemed to be in pursuit of other goals and felt no compunction at sacrificing everything else. Beyond loyalty, however, Steinwedel dismisses notions of empires as monolithic and unified; rather, as he presents it, the Bashkir case serves as a reminder that by their nature they are as manifold as the

number of different communities they harbor and divided by unequal spaces of dialogue, each of which has its own unique voice.

EDWARD J. LAZZERINI
Indiana University

Druzhba, sem'ia, revoliutsiia: Nikolai Charushin i pokolenie narodnikov 1870-kh godov. Tat'iana Saburova and Ben Eklof. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2016. 448pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. Photographs. RUB 598, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.236

In this excellent study, Tat'iana Saburova and Ben Eklof examine the life of the radical Nikolai Charushin as a window onto the social and cultural history of the Populist movement. Born in 1851, Charushin became a member of the Chaikovtsy circle, stood trial for revolutionary agitation and was sentenced in 1878 to 17 years exile in Siberia. Both in Siberia and after his return to Viatka in 1895, Charushin made a career as a photographer, zemstvo insurance broker, and newspaper editor. The existing literature on Populism usually focuses on revolutionary activity in the 1870s and (sometimes) the experience of exile in the 1880s and 1890s but has little to say about the later fortunes of a generation many of whom lived into the 1920s and 1930s. By contrast, the authors engage with a range of studies, from those examining the radical movement of the 1860s and 1870s, the exile to Siberia of the regime's opponents, the zemstvo movement, the new age of pseudo-constitutional politics after 1905, to the ideological struggles of the 1920s and the fate of the Populists and their legacy under the Soviet regime.

Saburova and Eklof follow a conventional biographical narrative that maps out the key stages in Charushin's life and draws heavily on his memoirs, but they are careful to maintain a wider analytical lens throughout, citing writings and letters of Charushin's fellow radicals including Vera Figner and Sergei Sinegub to examine the history of the generation of the 1870s. This generational identity lay at the heart of the social movement and "expressed the interests of a young generation that revolted against the power of its "fathers" and strove for their own place in a new hierarchy." Yet the rhetoric of generations also served "to consolidate social solidarity" within that emerging group during a prolonged period of social upheaval (413). The "ethical rationalism" (11) of this cohort bound it together but so did its treatment by the authorities. The arrest and imprisonment of Charushin and his comrades in the wake of the failed going-to-the-people movement in 1873–74 was a defining experience that cemented their collective identity.

Charushin emerges as a self-critical individual, responsive to the changing political situation in the empire. Four years of solitary confinement awaiting trial did not break him (he was one of those who put his signature to a document calling on Russia's youth to join the revolution), but it did force him to ponder "his revolutionary experience, the means of struggling with the authorities and to understand his own limited resources" (157). This critical self-awareness helps explain Charushin's readiness both in Siberia and later, after his return to Viatka in 1895, as a zemstvo official and then as an editor to pursue the "small deeds" of civic activism and state service.

Indeed, the post-exile activities of Charushin and some of his comrades within the zemstvo movement offer a welcome corrective to views of educated society as irreconcilably divided between the proponents of reform and proponents of revolution. Moreover, many individuals moved between the zemstvo and state service, suggesting that the boundaries between state and civil society were decidedly porous in