Russischer Alltag: Eine Geschichte in neun Zeitbildern vom Frühmittelalter bis zur Gegewart, 3 vols. Vol. 1: Die Vormoderne, Vol. 2: Auf dem Weg in die Moderne, Vol. 3: Sowjetische Moderne und Umbruch (review)

Gregory L. Freeze

Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History, Volume 8, Number 4, Fall 2007, pp. 877-886 (Review)

Published by Slavica Publishers
DOI: *https://doi.org/10.1353/kri.2007.0050*

Carsten Goehrke, *Russischer Alltag: Eine Geschichte in neun Zeitbildern vom Frühmittelalter bis zur Gegewart* [Russian Everyday Life: A History in Nine Time-Pictures from the Early Middle Ages to the Present], 3 vols. Vol. 1: *Die Vormoderne* [Before Modernity]. 471 pp. Zurich: Chronos, 2003. ISBN 3304005830. €39.80. Vol. 2: *Auf dem Weg in die Moderne* [On the Road to Modernity]. 547 pp. Zurich: Chronos, 2003. ISBN 3034005849. €39.80. Vol. 3: *Sowjetische Moderne und Umbruch* [Soviet Modernity and Transformation]. 554 pp. Zurich: Chronos, 2005. ISBN 3034005857. €39.80.

Gregory L. Freeze

"Everyday history," long a significant sphere of European historiography, has belatedly come to Russian historical scholarship.[1] Western historians, to be sure, are cautious about invoking this descriptor,[2] but Russian researchers have been far more wont to do so, with the term *povsednevnaia zhizn'* having become firmly entrenched in Russian national historiography.[3] In large measure, of course, the interest in "everyday history" reflects a shift long underway, with the emphasis moving from elitist political history to the lesser social strata, with particular attention to their living conditions and culture.

[1] For a significant collection of essays outlining *Alltagsgeschichte,* see Alf Lüdtke, ed., *The History of Everyday Life: Reconstructing Historical Experiences and Ways of Life*, trans. William Templer (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995), originally published in German in 1989. See also B. S. Gregory, "Review: Is Small Beautiful? Microhistory and the History of Everyday Life," *History and Theory* 38, 1 (1999): 100–10; and Andreas Eckert and Adam Jones, "Introduction: Historical Writing about Everyday Life," *Journal of African Cultural Studies* 15, 1 (2002): 5–16.

[2] Angela Rustemeyer and Diana Siebert, *Alltagsgeschichte der unteren Schichten im russischen Reich 1861–1914* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1997); Sheila Fitzpatrick, *Everyday Stalinism: Ordinary Life in Extraordinary Times. Soviet Russia in the 1930s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

[3] To cite only some striking examples: G. V. Andreevskii, *Povsednevnaia zhizn' v stalinskuiu epokhu, 1920–1930-e gody* (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 2003); N. S. Borisov, *Povsednevnaia zhizn' srednevekovoi Rusi nakanune kontsa sveta: Rossiia v 1492 godu ot Rozhdestva Khristova, ili v 7000 godu ot Sotvoreniia mira* (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 2004); N. B. Lebina and A. N. Chistikov, *Obyvatel' i reformy: Kartiny povsednevnoi zhizni gorozhan v gody NEPa i khrushchevskogo desiatiletiia* (St. Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2003); and E. V. Romanov, *Povsednevnaia zhizn' russkogo srednevekovogo monastyria* (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 2002).

Quantity, however, does not necessarily mean quality; a focus on the quotidian can mean anything from "pots and pans" to a sophisticated theoretical conception with a clear definition of goals, methods, and parameters. Far too often, it is tempting to invoke the mantra of "everyday history" but without an explicit formulation of what this means.

Carsten Goehrke makes here a major contribution to the theory and praxis of *Alltagsgeschichte,* with a three-volume application to the entire course of Russian history. Trained as a specialist in early and medieval Russian history, Goehrke had earlier produced solid scholarship on the "material" dimension of the Russian historical experience—the way of life (*byt*), social and economic development, settlement patterns, and historical geography.[4] Even while conducting this pioneering research, Goehrke began to develop a complex conception of *Alltagsgeschichte* that embraces not only material existence but also the corresponding culture—the conception of the world, the pattern of social relations, and the values and norms that constitute the cultural counterpart to the material. It is this goal—to illuminate the interplay of matter and meaning, the real and the represented—that has shaped Goehrke's work, which he has aptly called *Alltagskulturgeschichte.* In a cursory introduction to this three-volume study, but in greater detail in a separate essay,[5] Goehrke identifies the intellectual roots of *Alltagsgeschichte* (Edmund Husserl and others), prominent practitioners,[6] and seminal theoreticians, chiefly from anthropology (especially Martin Dinges).[7] Goehrke seeks to examine the development and interaction of two dimensions: *Lebenswelt,* or the lived experience of everyday material reality that encompasses everything from food and housing to work and wealth; and *Vorstellungswelt,* or perceived experiences—how actors decode and understand their lived experiences. The emphasis here is on the concrete, the individual, and the local, not for its own sake but as a way to understand the larger world; the narrative thus focuses on the micro as an effective literary device and as a means to cast light on the macro. That enables the author to avoid the pitfalls both of a simplistic "basis–superstructure" model such as prevailed in crude Marxist historiography, and of the immaterialist claims of a radical postmodernism that treats extant documents as "texts" and not data to reconstruct material

[4] See, for example, Carsten Goehrke, *Die Wüstungen in der Moskauer Rus': Studien zur Siedlungs-, Bevölkerungs- und Sozialgeschichte* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1968).

[5] Apart from the brief statement in the three volumes (1: 11–16), see Carsten Goehrke, "Russland in der historischen Alltagsforschung," in *Digitales Handbuch zur Geschichte und Kultur Russlands und Osteuropas. Virtuelle Fachbibliotek Osteuropa* (2005), found at epub.ub.uni-muenchen.de/archive/00000716/01/goehrke_Alltagsgeschichte.pdf.

[6] Richard van Dülmen, *Kultur und Alltag in der Frühen Neuzeit*, 3 vols. (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1990–94).

[7] Martin Dinges, "'Historische Anthropologie' und 'Gesellschaftsgeschichte': Mit dem Lebensstilkonzept zu einer 'Alltagskulturgeschichte' der frühen Neuzeit?" *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung* 24 (1997): 179–214.

reality.[8] In Goehrke's view, the task is to link these two worlds—matter and meaning—in what he and Martin Dinges call "everyday/cultural history" (*Alltagskulturgeschichte*).

To bridge those worlds, Goehrke transcends the boundaries of traditional historical scholarship. That means, in the first instance, an interdisciplinary work that draws heavily on allied disciplines like archaeology, anthropology, and historical geography. For the pre-Petrine periods, he goes still further and, to compensate for the dearth of sources, blurs the boundaries between traditional scholarship and imaginative literature. Thus, in his first four "time-pictures," the author offers fictional scenes that are duly labeled and seek to invent the probable thoughts of contemporaries. The author thus replaces the Rankean imperative (*Geschichte wie es eigentlich gewesen*) with a reality-based, fictional account (*so könnte es gewesen sein*). These four episodes are addenda, hardly on the scale of Simon Schama's *Dead Certainties* but quite risqué for Russian historiography.[9] Goehrke uses these imaginary vignettes to embellish the scanty, taciturn evidence, such as that excavated by archaeological research, in hopes of providing a plausible, if invented, picture of political and social life.[10] These vignettes make for excellent reading, have a clear ring of reality, and imply how much of the historian's work is necessarily imaginative reconstruction if it is to be more than a mere "archival report," and the historian, more than a "naïve storyteller."[11]

Thus *Alltagskulturgeschichte* and interdisciplinarity constitute the twin foundations for Goehrke's *Russischer Alltag*. The author launched this ambitious project as part of his teaching at Zurich University in the 1970s and has brought that to the magnum opus presented here.[12] It is monumental in sheer size (three volumes with a total of 1,572 pages), comprehensive in scope (running from the ninth century to the year 2000), and erudite in scholarship (4,476 footnotes). Despite that size and erudition, Goehrke seeks to engage the general reader, not just a tiny circle of specialists. The work's lively style, the profusion of illustrations (445) on glossy pages, the abundance of brief documentary text annexes (127), and the relatively low price—120 euros for all three volumes—reflect a desire to go beyond "dry scientific" exposition but avoid the perils of "popularization" (1: 14–15). The text, illustrations, and documentary annexes seek not only to inform but to allow

[8] While all of the trilogy makes this abundantly clear, Goehrke is explicit in rejecting those extreme postmodernists who seek to reduce the entire world to a "text" (Goehrke, "Russland in der historischen Alltagsforschung," 4).

[9] Simon Schama, *Dead Certainties* (New York: Knopf, 1991).

[10] See, for example, the use of the reconstruction of an ancient settlement by the Soviet archeologist Liagushinskii in 1958 (1: 41).

[11] Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), ix, 8.

[12] See Carsten Goehrke, *25 Jahre Osteuropa-Abteilung des Historischen Seminars der Universität Zürich, 1971–1996* (Zurich: Historisches Seminar, 1996).

the reader—specialist or layman—to feel the complex textures of the Russian historical experience. These volumes have been received with acclaim, not only in the academic world but also among a more general readership, being proclaimed the "historical book of the year" by an online German "journal for history and culture."[13]

To show in great detail and specificity how Russia has evolved over the course of its entire history while keeping the length within manageable proportions, Goehrke elected to forgo the traditional chronological coverage in favor of multiple "time-pictures" (*Zeitbilder*) that portray Russia at discrete junctures. Altogether, the author presents nine cross-sections: four in volume 1 (the 9th, 12th, second half of the 15th, and second half of the 17th centuries), two in volume 2 (1762–96 and 1880–1914), and three in the final volume (1929–41, 1965–85, and 1992–2000). For each time-picture, Goehrke presents a synthesis of secondary accounts, but he predominantly relies on a "thick description" of specific communities or individuals while mining a broad range of sources that include archaeological artifacts, architecture, diaries, letters, portraits, photographs, and the like. His goal is to portray the "real," thereby allowing readers to imagine the material and spiritual lives of his subjects.

These nine cross-sections provide a graphic portrait of the evolution of Russia, with the growing contrasts between town and country and between various social strata in terms of material existence and culture. Above all, the structure of nine time-pictures allows the author to provide a sweeping chronological breadth while indulging in "thick descriptions" of individual cases. Implicitly, at least, these cross-sections show growing differentiation, especially in the modern era. Whereas the ninth-century portrait shows remarkable homogeneity, subsequent time-pictures show a growing gap between elites and lower social orders, not only in material culture, such as housing and dress, but also in culture and religion. Indeed, that diversity becomes kaleidoscopic in the modern era; in the time-picture of late imperial Russia, the author must sketch portraits of myriad social-cultural groups, not only traditional estates such as nobles and peasants but a plethora of new social categories—workers, professions, and marginals like prostitutes. The author does impose some order on this complexity; for example, he offers a typology of cities for the prerevolutionary period (2: 292–413) and for the Stalin era (3: 153–74), drawing sharp distinctions between the two capitals and provincial towns. Literarily, the cross-sections enable both depth and breadth, giving the reader a sense of the concrete yet also of the general changes that were reshaping Russian society.

[13] "Die historischen Bücher des Jahres 2005," *Damals (Geschichte Online):* www.damals.de/sixcms/detail.php?id=168213. See also the assessment by the doyen of Russian historians in Germany, Dietrich Geyer: "Leben im Schatten autokratischer Allmacht," *Die Zeit,* 25 September 2003 (no. 40).

Nevertheless, the use of these "time-pictures" is not unproblematic. First, the choice of *which* time-pictures to present does not have a clear rationale; their very selection appears arbitrary, with insufficient justification for specifically these nine periods.[14] While some, like late imperial Russia, are logical, others are far less so. The criteria appear to shift; the choices for the Soviet period (1929–41 and 1965–85) are essentially political, even impelling the author to abandon his usual approach—to work from the individual and household outward (3: 29)—and instead to foreground politics in the analysis of events and processes of change. Second, the author marginalizes wars and warfare, obviously so powerful a dynamic in Russian historical development. The Mongol Yoke, the wars with various neighbors in the 16th to early 18th centuries (such as the Great Northern War), the Napoleonic invasion and the Crimean War, the Russo-Japanese War, the first and second world wars—all had a profound, if not defining, impact on politics, society, economy, and culture. Prerevolutionary historiography (literally counting how many years Russians spent at war) may have exaggerated the role of warfare, but this study goes to the other extreme, all but ignoring this critical dimension by selecting periods when large-scale combat was far less central. One suspects an anthropological urge to seek the timeless, the unchanging that transcends the extraordinary and short-term. In the Russian historical process, however, the military played an extremely important role, not only during the great wars but in peacetime, too, as it shaped priorities and profoundly affected social development. Finally, the nine time-pictures vary kaleidoscopically in length: some are exceedingly brief (the ninth century elicits 39 pages, the post-Soviet era 21 pages), whereas others are book-length monographs (the chapter on 1880–1914 runs to 279 pages, while that on 1929–41 fills 287 pages). That exponential growth in length, except for the post-Stalin eras, partly reflects the sheer increase in sources, from mute archaeological artifacts and scanty written sources in pre-Petrine Russia to the explosive profusion of documentation in the modern era, but it also mirrors the growing complexity of Russian society itself.

And the subject is indeed *Russian* society: the author explicitly excludes non-Russians, even East Slavs like Ukrainians and Belorussians, and concentrates on the Russian heartland, with little reference to the "periphery" (borderlands) that were so important to the power and problems of the Russian empire. As in the case of war, it is artificial and misleading to detach the empire from public consciousness, especially in the post-Petrine era, when power was so integral to the regime's legitimacy and to Russians'

[14] It must also be said that the author does not strictly adhere to the periodization, drawing (perhaps of necessity) on materials from later, usually subsequent periods. For example, the 12th-century segment draws on material from 1100 to 1400 (1: 158–59), no doubt because of the paucity of sources. But this porosity of boundaries also appears in later periods—as in the use of a house built in 1828 to describe the Catherinian period (2: 76).

self-consciousness and ethnic identity. Nor is it possible, in cultural terms, to segregate the Russian from the non-Russian, even within a geographical Russian core; many areas from the northeast to the Volga, not to mention the Urals and beyond, included significant enclaves of non-Russians. The internal Other was critical for defining Russian identity and national culture and, contrariwise, served as a major source of cultural borrowing. Thematically, similar to the chronological marginalization of war, Goehrke's work seems to show a strong predisposition to identify cultural foundations, even though that means inattention to the conjunctural (war) or peripheral (national minorities).

The author—who seeks to engage both academic and lay readerships—is very much concerned about description. In addition to the structure of discrete time-pictures, Goehrke uses the particular to illustrate the general; his strategy is to move outward from the individual or household to larger units—the village, city, region, estate/class, and (in the aggregate) an abstract Russia. The principal goal is to reconstruct the past with concrete details (about the layout and size of dwellings, the configuration of fields and factories, the rhythm of the village and city). This detailed description is most ambitious—and most difficult—for the ancient and medieval periods, where written sources are notoriously scanty and more normative than normal. Nevertheless, the author demonstrates an extraordinary ability to combine diverse sources to reconstruct the way of life and thinking, and to connect this culture with the existing material reality.[15] The historian's task is much easier, of course, for the modern era, when the individual (through diaries, letters, and the like) can credibly and concretely represent an imaginary "average" group.[16]

The extraordinary number of illustrations reproduced here do not merely adorn but footnote the text, providing graphic evidence for customs, fashions, behaviors, and differences. In contrast to most illustrated histories, Goehrke's volumes integrate the visual evidence into the text with highly insightful and revealing captions. Unfortunately, as the author notes (3: 25–26), the photographic evidence became exceedingly weak in the Stalin era, when the state hijacked images for propagandistic purposes and, predictably, embargoed the negative—the scenes of the poor and downtrodden that were so plentiful in earlier times. Although Goehrke attempts to make up for

[15] The slash-burn method, for example, is shown (1: 180–81) to be highly volatile (amazingly productive in the first years, but with a precipitous decline in yield thereafter), providing an impetus to the famous mobility (V. O. Kliuchevskii's "colonization") and low population density (given the 25 to 30 years required for such land to recover and re-enter the production cycle).

[16] This personalization is subtle and revealing, especially in the account of collectivization—from the perspective of a dekulakized peasant, a middle peasant, and a peasant who is adapting to the new system (3: 40–53, 122–33).

this, for example by using some German wartime photographs, that hardly compensates; only intensive research, especially in archival collections, could have helped overcome the dearth of good visual images.

At a more general level, it is regrettable that the author did not tap Russian archives and, in particular, take advantage of the revolution in access after 1991. To explore new spheres, as the author does here, it would have been highly desirable to engage new sources—those that earlier historians neglected or that regimes concealed. The author does draw on unpublished materials found in Western repositories—for example, the records bequeathed by Swiss visitors and the documents of Russians (such as prerevolutionary female students) that made their way into Western, especially Swiss archives. More substantively, the author makes prodigious use of published sources, especially the huge volume that has appeared since 1991 and that includes many relatively obscure provincial publications. Still, that is no substitute for the raw, undigested information buried in Russian archives. While a general work must necessarily limit its research, judicious sampling could, in cases where the published sources and scholarship are deficient, significantly enhance the exposition and explanations offered here.

The specialist, moreover, must be cautious and critical in the use of published sources, however great their literary appeal might be. It is tempting but dangerous to assume that any one source is "representative" and "typical"; extended summaries and quotations from a diary may be captivating, but that in itself does not demonstrate representativity.[17] Contrariwise, the historian must be wary of using the general to describe the particular: normative documents, such as the Church's confessional publications, do not necessarily correspond to real behaviors.[18] To be sure, it is tempting to use such documents, not only to fill the yawning gaps in the scanty written record in the pre-Petrine period but also in the modern period to describe what was so self-evident that indigenous sources remain stubbornly mute.

Moreover, skeptical circumspection is especially apropos in the case of foreign accounts, which are as likely to be prejudicial as perceptive; this bias hardly abates for the modern period, when cultural production for Russophobic audiences featured aspersions about Russian fondness for the bottle and brutality. While historians of pre-Petrine Russia perforce rely heavily on foreign accounts, given the paucity of Russian written sources, that is hardly true for imperial Russia and the Soviet eras with their stupendous abundance of published, not just archival, sources. The reliance on foreign sources—even unpublished materials in a Swiss archive—seems

[17] The nexus between the particular and general is always problematic, but at least it should be explicitly addressed. See Matti Peltonen, "Clues, Margins,and Monads: The Micro–Macro Link in Historical Research," *History and Theory* 40, 3 (2001): 347–59.

[18] See, for example, the use of *Trebniki* to shed light on the "intimate sphere and ideas of the population" (1: 250).

superfluous when the indigenous sources are so bountiful.[19] Were the author seeking to illuminate Western perceptions of Russia, that choice of sources might be appropriate; in a study aspiring to reconstruct the life and thoughts of Russians, however, the use of foreign accounts (especially in the modern era) seems disproportionate and unwarranted.

The text also draws heavily on current scholarship for analysis and detail and displays an extraordinary erudition with regard to the secondary literature, both prerevolutionary and more recent. That is true not only of the author's specialization (pre-Petrine Russia) but for the periods covered in the last two volumes. In addition to providing a concise summary of existing scholarship (e.g., on the Stolypin land reforms), the author addresses the major historical controversies and presents a balanced treatment and an independent judgment on key issues (e.g., the genesis and spread of the three-field system, peasant attitudes toward education, or the dynamics of the purges and Great Terror).[20] As economic historians nowadays are wont to do, Goehrke also challenges the traditional stereotype of the "backward peasants," discerns the economic rationality of their behavior in light of objective circumstances, and concludes that they adapted as economic opportunity dictated (for example, 1: 181–82). To be sure, modernists will note the absence of seminal monographs, perhaps because the author restricted research to titles that directly corresponded to the given "time-picture"—even when their data and conclusions were much broader. Such lacunae, however, are inevitable in so broad a study and do not substantially negate the force of the analysis and broader understanding.

Of greater concern is the reluctance to offer generalizations. This text enables the reader to imagine and even understand the particular but stops short of offering a deeper understanding of the underlying processes, dynamics, structures, and context. Apart from a few elliptical comments and comparisons with Europe, the text focuses on description and eschews transnational or diachronic comparisons.[21] The diachronic comparisons, which would seem so appropriate in a book that foregrounds nine cross-sectional "time-pictures," are rare and disappointing.[22] That is all the more surprising since the author explicitly warns against a "nostalgic idyllization" of the past

[19] See, for example, the use of a Swiss account by Ernst Deredinger (2: 174–75).

[20] Goehrke stakes out an independent view in the debates about the emergence of the three-field agrarian system: he presents the standard Soviet view emphasizing the 16th century, a modified view (R. E. F. Smith's restriction to major landowners), and the much later dating of the 18th century (Michael Confino).

[21] Those comparisons, indeed, are quite illuminating; the data on sanitation, water, and electricity in Russian and German cities in the early 20th century provide a graphic portrait of the difference between Russia and its emerging new adversary in the West (2: 302–3).

[22] What, for example, is the specialist to surmise from the observation that the peasant's status under Soviet rule differed little from tsarist times, with only a change in superiors, not the principle of subordination (3: 117)? That sounds more like value-judgment than

(1: 16), implying the need to discern and analyze change. But the author, in principle and in praxis, warns against the attempt to measure progress, even while admitting the possibility of seeing change and continuities in the cross-sections (1: 16). Ultimately, Goehrke has set as his primary goal the task of reconstructing and describing, not comparing or generalizing. After so many pages, so many illustrations, the reader craves broader conclusions, but the author demurs, ending this massive study with a perfunctory overview. Reading these massive tomes, to be sure, is worthwhile; still, it is a pity that the author declined to offer his conclusions on the patterns of continuity and change.

Predictably, specialists (especially modernists) will find cause to quibble and cavil. Some statements seem distinctly outdated; to characterize the reign of Alexander III as "pure repression" (2: 170) reflects old liberal historiography and fails to appreciate the dynamic state-building and development that occurred during his reign. Some statements are not a question of interpretation but plain factual accuracy. Thus the discussion of a crucial sphere of everyday life—marriage, family, and divorce—is disappointing, especially for the late imperial Russian period, for which sources are abundant and accessible. Some statements are downright inaccurate. For example, the author writes that in contrast to earlier times, the adultery of a wife no longer served as grounds for divorce (2: 215). In fact, however, the Church continued to acknowledge the traditional grounds for divorce, adultery included, not only in theory but in practice—indeed with an exponential increase in the divorce rate. The Church even abetted this change by abandoning its early ban on remarriage for adulterers and adulteresses. Namely, from 1904 on, such sinners, male and female, could remarry after performing a brief, private penance, which helped make adultery responsible for about 90 percent of all divorces on the eve of World War I.[23] Some passages, especially for the Soviet period, seem more judgmental than enlightening. Although some historians of late have shown a penchant for rehabilitating the totalitarian trope, phrases like "total indoctrination" (3: 189) and the "information monopoly" (3: 191) bear no resemblance to the empirically driven *Alltagskulturgeschichte* that pervades so much of the text in these volumes.

The treatment of religion, given its manifest importance in popular culture, is especially disappointing. While the scholarship itself is relatively backward and the author perforce must rely heavily on secondary literature, the account here is still very old-fashioned. The text does include some rich

analysis: both state and peasant had changed profoundly, and this comment seems little more than a critique of Soviet communism.

[23] Gregory L. Freeze, "Profane Narratives about a Holy Sacrament: Marriage and Divorce in Late Imperial Russia," in *Sacred Stories: Religion and Spirituality in Modern Russia,* ed. Mark D. Steinberg and Heather J. Coleman (Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press, 2007), 146–78.

material that has been recently published, such as a priest's diary that appeared in a provincial serial in 1995 (2: 136–37), but the failure to consult recent scholarship and tap primary sources has led the author to recycle old stereotypes about popular religion as "emotionally driven, ritualistic, undogmatic" (2: 264). Part of the problem no doubt resides in the undue reliance on foreign travelers' accounts; given the abundance of printed, not to mention archival sources since the Petrine era, there is no need to rely so heavily on foreign accounts such as the 1889 German account by Hermann Roskoschny.[24] That negative assessment essentially reiterates the traditional denigration of popular Orthodoxy as a phenomenon of "dual faith," which "was still alive" in late imperial Russia (2: 265). In addition to eschewing comparative approaches and the perspectives afforded by the sociology of religion, this "dual faith" trope ignores the enormous change in popular religious practice, the impact of education (including the obligatory study of religion), the Church's increasing emphasis on catechization and preaching, and the people's own strivings (which indeed spawned the rapid growth of sectarian movements). The casual neglect of Orthodoxy is also apparent in the annotations to the illustrations: photographs from the canonization of Serafim Sarovskii in 1903—a liminal, epoch-defining event in religious history—are used with no apparent cognizance of this very special context (2: 276, 418).

Such reservations notwithstanding, Carsten Goehrke has indeed produced a *magnum opus*—a spectacular piece of research and writing. Specialists will find much that is new, not only graphic information taken from monographs and published sources but also the kind of detail about material reality so rarely found in traditional histories. To rescue that scholarship from virtual oblivion and foreground it in an engaging way is a major achievement; these three volumes provide rich material and guidelines on how to incorporate the quotidian into mainline historical scholarship.

Dept. of History
Brandeis University
Waltham, MA 02454-9110 USA
freeze@brandeis.edu

[24] Hermann Rokoschny, *Das arme Russland: Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der wirtschaftlichen Lage des russischen Reiches* (Leipzig: n.p., 1889), which is quoted approvingly in Goehrke (2: 264–66).