

Little effort is made here to bring the chapters together, aside from an introduction by the architecture historian William Craft Brumfield (who also contributed the striking cover image, a photograph of a Jewish store in Nerchinsk with carved stars of David on the façade). Brumfield notes that the essays reflect attempts by the Russian-Jewish intelligentsia to find a place for themselves in Russian society. They did this, we see here, in varied and changing ways; it is difficult to find patterns in their behavior. Even the individual chapters tend to avoid making a single pointed argument about the dominant element in an individual's ideas or strategies. Rather, Horowitz repeatedly draws attention to inconsistencies and multiple, shifting viewpoints in all his subjects. Thus, the historians he studies shift their attitudes toward the heder (traditional Jewish primary schooling) and toward the pogroms; they had multiple ideologies that did not allow them to articulate a single vision. Individuals emerge as hardly more consistent. Using Bakhtinian vocabulary, Horowitz defines both Ansky and Zhabotinskii as dialogic writers who create polyphonic worlds full of multiple voices. Although Solov'ev is often lauded as a philosemite, Horowitz points out his conviction that the Jews should convert to Christianity. Although Rozanov is understood as an anti-Semite, Horowitz observes that Jews, who functioned as projections of his fears and desires, are often portrayed positively in his work. Eikhenbaum seemed to turn his back on Jewishness (and the Formalists argued against the significance of biography) but became fascinated by his grandfather's Hebrew poem about chess. Gershenzon rejected culture in principle, opposing it to personal liberation, but simultaneously embraced it. Zhabotinskii shifted back and forth from romanticizing violence, as his followers did, to seeing its limitations.

If there was any powerful, single, positive intellectual commitment among these people, it seems, it was not to an ideology, but rather to the urge to document and to describe one's own reactions to evidence. This notion of the power of writing is evident in Horowitz's citation from a letter Rozanov wrote to Gershenzon in 1909: "I fear that the Jews will grab the history of Russian literature and Russian criticism still more firmly than the banks" (227). Writing about literature, Rozanov believed, was a way to take power. The Russian Jewish intellectuals, it appears, agreed—and Horowitz pays homage to their achievements. In his essay on historiography, he describes the fantastic number of publications that this community supported: historical journals in Russian, journals in Hebrew, newspapers in Yiddish. Most remarkably, between 1907 and 1913, they produced the sixteen-volume *Evreiskaia entsiklopediia; Svod znanii o evreistve i ego kul'ture v proshlom i nastoiashchem*. This was a cohort that grasped the value of data, sensing that it might ultimately matter more than argumentative analysis. In an era of the reevaluation of old ideologies—in Russia, Israel, and the United States—this is an increasingly appealing principle, one to which Horowitz too is heir.

GABRIELLA SAFRAN  
Stanford University

***Film and Television Genres of the Late Soviet Era.*** By Alexander Prokhorov and Elena Prokhorova. New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017. ix, 219 pp. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. \$120.00, hard bound. \$29.95, paper. \$25.99, e-book. doi: 10.1017/slr.2018.182

The Soviet Union may have long ceased to exist; however, its televisual culture—in terms of genre and system of production—remains, affecting contemporary televisual practice in the Russian Federation (and other former Soviet republics). This is one of the key messages of a monograph on film and television genres of the

late Soviet era, authored by Alexander Prokhorov and Elena Prokhorova, two of the most imminent scholars who work on the cinematic and televisual culture of the late Soviet period.

The book focuses on four principal genres: the epic, police procedural, comedy, and melodrama. The discussion includes a rigorous close reading of a number of Soviet productions and original theorization of the subject matter. The book simultaneously fills in the gaps in our knowledge about the Soviet media system and tells a story of the USSR and the late Soviet period from the perspective of their media practices. The Prokhorovs challenge a lot of assumptions about Soviet media which still persist in scholarly literature. They provide an original framework for reading the evolution of Soviet television's language medium. Current research has centered on contemporary Russian media and it often accounts for its retroactive developments by using the basic notion of the (nostalgic) return to the Soviet era. The Prokhorovs convincingly demonstrate that the dynamic of media developments is actually quite different and cannot be accounted for by nostalgia discourse. The developments also include engagement with western models of media production as well as the persistence of cultural tradition. Indeed, the authors concern themselves with the issues of authority, media control, and censorship; however they do so without fetishizing power and without rehearsing stereotypical explanations which characterize, sadly, a lot of scholarship about the period.

The book makes a significant contribution in three distinct areas of research. First, the authors expand the existing genre theory by considering film genres and television formats that had emerged in the context of the authoritarian Soviet regime. They continue the debate about media specificity, which appears to be particularly relevant in the era of "post-media," or a condition of total media convergence whereby all kinds of media are available across a range of platforms. Second, by exploring different types of media output and modes of circulation of media content during late socialism, the Prokhorovs utilize and develop the methodological tools of media archaeology. Indeed, the focus of the authors is on the filmic and televisual text itself; they ingeniously reconstruct the expectations of the Soviet viewer, making the book very enjoyable to read. Finally, the authors concern themselves with the broader context of late socialist culture, thus extending our understanding of the USSR and of Soviet culture and people. The sections on the reformulations of the private sphere, the ironic detachment of Soviet viewers, the centrality of the nuclear family, and social apathy are particularly exciting to read.

The book would have an even greater theoretical impact if it included some general background information on Soviet television and its place in the Soviet media system, for example, as well as the proliferation of technology, the availability of national and regional channels, the stars of Soviet television, and so forth. Similarly, as the focus of the book is on the 1970s–80s; it would be brilliant if the authors could have contextualized their conceptualization in the context of concurrent media theory, such as Raymond Williams's classical study of television. This is with a view toward considering whether his theory would have been different if he had had access to Soviet television. Finally, the book puts a lot of emphasis on the relationship of Soviet television to cinema; I believe it would be exciting to see some even if tangential comparisons drawn between television and other media, such as radio.

The subject matter, the mode of presentation, and the wide range of examples make this book accessible to researchers and students. The book would be of particular interest to students of courses in media studies, film studies, cultural studies, area studies, Russian studies, international relations, and history.

VLAD STRUKOV  
*University of Leeds*