

Taken as a whole, however, Razuvalova's monograph is one of the most innovative books on late Soviet literature published over the past few years. This is a deep, thoroughly-written work embracing a very wide range of issues. Its bibliographical list is vast. This book could be recommended for everybody who is interested in Soviet culture and the evolution of Soviet society.

ILYA KUKULIN

The National Research University—Higher School of Economics Moscow

Stalin's Music Prize: Soviet Culture and Politics. Marina Frolova-Walker. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016. xi, 369 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. \$65.00, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.219

The rather dry subtitle belies an engaging and pleasurable tour through the middle decades of twentieth-century Soviet musical life. These events have received extensive, if less captivating, attention in recent years. Frolova-Walker takes a fresh angle on the topic by using the prism of the Stalin Prizes to analyze the musical world of the 1940s and 1950s. She accords the prizes a central role, and convincingly demonstrates how they interacted with and indeed shaped important aesthetic and political debates. Readers with some background in Soviet music and politics at mid-century will have a much easier time with this narrative, which can often feel like the insider's story that in a sense it is, written by a scholar educated in the late Soviet Union and heir to the mid-century tradition, using as her main primary source the protocols of various meetings. A dizzying array of figures, major and minor, are splashed across the pages, some of them for just a moment.

The expected figures of Dmitrii Shostakovich, Sergei Prokofiev, Nikolai Miaskovskii, and a darkly-painted Tikhon Khrennikov take center stage. Despite some recent attempts to relativize or even rehabilitate the longtime head of the Composers' Union, Khrennikov here comes across as a culpable and craven individual (256–57). Miaskovskii assumes a key role and, indeed, even the “institutional epicentre” (158) in this analysis. He proved essential to the workings of the musical world, and his music was an important touchstone. Although Prokofiev won more prizes—six—than any other composer, his persona and work rather recede into the background in this narrative.

A somewhat unexpected Shostakovich emerges in this re-telling, rather different from the close-lipped, dour figure in so many other works. He gets full treatment in two chapters, and appears regularly throughout the book. In the prize discussions, he offered biting criticism and actively supported those he deemed worthy. We see him more active, taking positions and engaging in the political-aesthetic debates of the era. In an interesting side note with larger implications, Frolova-Walker undermines an important plank in Solomon Volkov's *Shostakovich and Stalin*, in which Volkov posits that Stalin himself selected Shostakovich's Piano Quintet for a prize in 1941. She devotes her second chapter to a detailed examination of the discussions during this first year that prizes were awarded. Here she convincingly shows that the Quintet received a prize due to its appreciation by a large number of Stalin Prize Committee members; Stalin's potential advocacy of the piece is largely incidental. Such a role for Stalin is largely typical in her story, and is one of her key arguments: the dictator had a voice and took interest, but “Stalin's whims had a direct effect in only a handful of cases” (9).

It is no surprise coming from this expert on Russian music and nationalism, but she attempts to rehabilitate some of the massive output of “national music”—based

in folk material, while embracing Russian classical traditions and the techniques of 19th-century western music. Such music was absolutely central to Soviet culture and, while much of it was “blandly generic work and downright incompetent,” there was also fine music and even “hidden gems” (180–81).

In lieu of a conclusion, Frolova-Walker engages in a discussion of socialist realism in light of her study. She claims, convincingly, that the Prizes and discussion around them offer a working definition of this aesthetic ideology. And contrary to the views of many scholars, she argues that there is a there there; the socialist-realist canon was made up of pieces that realized Stalin’s prescription “national in form, socialist in content.” These were works in a national style based on folk music, and were often cantatas, concertos, or middlebrow works like symphonic suites that had patriotic or historical themes. (290) This examination of the Stalin Prizes “allows us to see socialist realism within a coherent narrative framework, evolving slowly, never changing beyond recognition, with demarcations between core works, acceptable but marginal works and the unacceptable” (292). She concludes that both the Stalin Prizes and socialist realism lost momentum in the early 1950s, prompting a push to artistic quality and independence after Stalin’s death.

DAVID G. TOMPKINS
Carleton College

Terror and Pity: Aleksandr Sumarokov and the Theater of Power in Elizabethan

Russia. By Kirill Ospovat. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2016. xviii, 316 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. \$72.00, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.220

Terror and Pity: Aleksandr Sumarokov and the Theater of Power in Elizabethan Russia arrives just in time for Sumarokov’s 300th birthday. Ospovat’s monograph contributes to renewed interest in the “father of Russian theater” by Marcus Levitt, Joachim Klein, and myself, among others. More broadly, it richly complicates arguments about ideals, public, and power initiated by Elise Kimerling Wirtschafter’s *The Play of Ideas in Russian Enlightenment Theater* (2003) and integrates key concepts from Richard Wortman’s *Scenarios of Power* (1995) and other scholarship on court symbolism as a means to display and affirm autocratic power.

Terror and Pity weaves a compelling story about Sumarokov’s first tragedies as recasting events from Elizabeth’s reign—royal travels, weddings, and political show trials—to reveal to her courtly public the subtle mechanisms of power that rely, among other things, on acts of erratic and unlawful cruelty, occasionally tempered by unexpected clemency; in other words, acts that elicit Aristotle’s tragic “terror and pity.” As Ospovat succinctly explains in the introduction, “cultural patterns of domination and submission . . . were not only the historical context for Sumarokov’s tragedies, but also made up the very fabric of their drama” (xiv). The plays served to elicit and maintain courtiers’ loyalty during an era where lawful succession to the throne was repeatedly upended by palace coups and intrigue.

The book includes an introduction, three major subsections, an epilogue, and a conclusion. The introduction contextualizes the study historically and outlines the theoretical approach, which, in addition to Walter Benjamin’s work on tragedy, incorporates “Max Weber’s theory of charisma, Carl Schmitt’s revival of Machiavelli and Hobbes, and Michel Foucault’s discussion of public punishment” (xiii). The introduction concludes with a brief summary of each major section of the book. The five brief chapters of Part I, “Political Theater and the Origins of Russian Drama,” trace the