shtetlach surrounding Warsaw, in search of statistical research to refute antisemitic accusations of parasitism and draft-dodging. The work's critique derives from the delicate and often precarious position of the author-cum-narrator, who is both enlightened observer and sympathetic landsman. Which brings us to the question: in what sense is Zalmen Brokhes's work "Palestinian"? The study describes a relatively brief body of work produced in Palestine: according to Chaver, Brokhes "spent ten formative years in a Zionist environment" and "eventually returned to the Diaspora, in which he lived for most of his long life" (p. 91). Is Brokhes's critique enabled by the fact that he was "passing through"? Surely I am not suggesting a "love it or leave it" scenario. Peretz did not. But there was something about Peretz's fictional status as traveler and outsider that enabled the textual critique. That this was historically true for modern Yiddish literature is axiomatic. Perhaps Brokhes simply continued this tradition.

Chaver convincingly shows how Hebrew translations of the Yiddish fiction effectively dulled the original's critique of Zionism and Yishuv society, thereby demonstrating Brokhes's "selective induction into the canon of Zionist literature" (p. 85). By which she means "Hebrew"? Are Hebrew and Zionist interchangeable terms in this study? Is it possible that they are not? This quibble regarding nomenclature, like all arguments concerning names, is of course about more than that. It is a serious debate, and one which will undoubtedly draw the attention of readers who don't like the phrase "Zionist Palestine" (as opposed to Mandatory Palestine, Eretz Yisrael, the Yishuv, the Zionist Yishuv, etc.). Its title should not, however, prevent them from appreciating this absorbing book's enormous achievement, and its groundbreaking introduction to Yiddish modernism in Palestine.

Barbara Mann
Department of Jewish Literature
Jewish Theological Seminary


The study of Russian-Jewish culture in the twentieth century is undergoing a major revision. Scholars are increasingly moving away from the tragic view of Jewish victimization that long dominated the field, and are instead developing alternative approaches that give greater emphasis to what Russian Jews created and built as members of Soviet society. Among recent studies that take this revisionist stance may be included, for example, Yuri Slezkine's The Jewish
Century, Gennady Estraikh's *In Harness*, and Jeffrey Veidlinger's *The Moscow State Yiddish Theater*. David Shnee's *Yiddish and the Creation of Soviet Jewish Culture* makes a significant contribution to this new trend by offering in the place of the standard tragic narrative of Soviet Jews a fresh picture of the creation of a culture that was both Soviet and Jewish, but Jewish in a new way, with crucial changes to Jewish models of time, space, and identity. The Yiddish language itself was key to the Jewish intelligentsia's view of the possibilities for Jewish peoplehood in the new classless society. In focusing on Yiddish print culture in particular, including, graphic and visual material, the book tells the story of Soviet Jewish culture differently from the way it has been told before, and offers a detailed explanation as to why it should be told differently. One of the most crucial points Shnee makes has to do with the self-creation and self-regulation of secular Soviet Jewish culture in Yiddish. The standard picture of the tragic opposition between the Soviet state and the Yiddish writer is false, according to Shnee, because Jews were part of the Soviet state and controlled their own cultural activity, at least in the period in question. Unlike other studies that focus on nationality policy from the perspective of the center, Shnee offers a detailed and cogent picture of the people, institutions, publication venues, literary groups, ideology, major battles, and literary works that were central to Soviet Yiddish print culture in the early years of the Soviet Union. The work provides an in-depth history of Yiddish, which, while focusing on the modernization of Yiddish in the Soviet period, also contextualizes the Soviet-era controversies in light of the nineteenth-century trajectory of Yiddish and the language wars of the earlier period. By providing a detailed explanation of the Yiddish publishing industry, its internal censorship apparatus, and the numerous Yiddish writers' groups, framed by a discussion of the parallel Russian literary circles, Shnee offers a densely textured narrative of the history of Yiddish literature as an institution, providing, in addition, some discussion of comparable developments of other so-called national literatures. Finally, the book gives portraits of the great writers and critics of the era, focusing particularly on the poet Izi Kharik. It is in his discussion of Kharik that Shnee is particularly successful in demonstrating that Soviet Yiddish literature was not merely "national in form, socialist in content" but was instead deeply engaged with Jewish literary forms and tropes, Jewish tradition, and with current trends in Russian literary modernism. Not political zealotry, but ambivalence, specifically between yearning for the new society and mourning the loss of the old, dominated Kharik's work. Kharik, according to Shnee, offers a window into the "simultaneous psychological process of self-creation and self-destruction" that was so characteristic of Yiddish writers of the era (p. 184).
All students of Soviet Yiddish interested in revising the lachrymose view face the problem of telling the end of the story of Soviet Yiddish culture. Instead of the conventional conclusion, Shneer offers a reflection on this central question in the afterward of his study. He points out that the centralization of control over culture in the early 1930s did not mean the end of Soviet Yiddish. Shneer also emphasizes the ambivalence with which the Jewish intelligentsia regarded their own project. The question may be raised, however, as to whether Shneer in some way ends up embracing the tragic view that he steadfastly repudiates throughout his narrative. The Jewish intelligentsia used state power to create Soviet Jewish culture, and according to Shneer, “state power was turned against them” (p. 219). This ironic outcome seems classically tragic—the tragic hero’s advantage (the Yiddish writer’s ability to use state power) always leads to his downfall. The question of how to frame the history of Soviet Yiddish remains open, and Shneer’s work advances the problem significantly by making the story more complex. What makes his study stand out, aside from the superior quality of his writing, is his deft combination of archival research, theoretical sophistication, broad historical sweep, and solid literary analysis. Scholars of both Russian and Jewish studies will stand to gain by reading this work.

Harriet Murav
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign


Ranjit Chatterjee proffers the radical thesis that “Wittgenstein wished to lead his reader on slowly from the gentle to the Jewish world of thought as part of the deep solution to philosophical (or religious and ethical) problems” (p. 189). In one sense, this is a new thesis: no one has yet argued that Wittgenstein was a Jewish proselytizer. In another sense, it is not a new thesis: several authors have argued that Wittgenstein was a religious man, perhaps a religious mystic. The first difficulty with a thesis of this sort is that Wittgenstein famously told his friend M.O.C. Drury that he was not a religious man. Wittgenstein deeply respected religious ways of living. He once said, “All genuine expressions of religion are wonderful” (Rush Rhees, ed., Ludwig Wittgenstein: Personal Recollections, [Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield, 1981], p. 108). But he would have been the first to remind us that respect and appreciation are not the same as appropriation. Arguments for a religious Wittgenstein sound tortuous in the face of words like these, penned in 1946: “I cannot kneel to pray because it’s as