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According to Zaliznjak, the birch bark documents are critical to the analysis and Gunnarsson could not have reached the proper conclusions, since his study predates their discovery. The sixth and final chapter is devoted to the final category of enclitic which underwent drastic changes in the history of Russian – the present tense forms of the verb byti, which served as the auxiliary verb with past tenses as well as the copula. All of these were reduced to zero, while other meanings of the verb have survived in the present tense (p. 262).

I found the author's style very straightforward and easy to follow. Since the author devotes most of the book to a presentation and analysis of textual data, one does not need a high degree of theoretical sophistication to read this work. Anyone who can understand a linguistic history of Russian should be able to understand this book. I found it to be almost completely devoid of misprints, with one small exception (on p. 51, line 18, the singular ènklitik appears instead of the plural ènklitiki).

In conclusion, I would say that Zaliznjak’s work is a great and groundbreaking study of the enclitics of East Slavic. It fills a major gap with a very comprehensive and clearly argued study. Using Jakobson’s short, but brilliant article on enclitics as its point of departure, Zaliznjak contributes the data and statistics which have long been needed in this field. I would imagine that large numbers of scholars, who have been interested in Slavic enclitics, but have paid little attention to East Slavic, will now be motivated to re-think the entire Slavic situation, as a result of Zaliznjak’s work. It certainly can be considered to be the most important book on its subject – the enclitics of Old Russian.
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In recent years, many scholars of Soviet history have begun to turn their attention away from traditional research programs focusing on European Russia in the 1920s and 1930s. Elena Shulman has recently written on the Khetagurovites, scholars such as Adeeb Khalid, Adrienne Edgar, and Marianne Kemp, to name only a few, on Central Asian history in the twentieth century, and both Cynthia Ann Ruder as well as Matthew Payne on the early great Soviet construction projects of Belomor and Turkisb, respectively. Christopher Ward’s well-researched book on the construction of BAM (Baikal-amurskaia magistral’) continues admirably in this tradition, examining how familiar themes of environmentalism, gender, internationalism, and nationalism played out in the frontiers of Northeast Asia during the Brezhnev era.

BAM, of course, was a massive railway mainline that, unlike the southerly Trans-Siberian Railroad, cut north across Baikal, then east to Sovetskaia Gavan’, a port on the Straits of Tartary between Northeast Eurasia and Sakhalin. Russian leaders in both the late nineteenth as well as
the twentieth century had hoped to improve East-West connections across Eurasia. By the 1970s, Japan’s economic rise and the spectre of an unfriendly China increased the pressure to expand transport lines to the East for both commercial and strategic reasons. While sections of what would become BAM had already been built with slave labor under Stalin, by the mid-1970s, Party elites sought to turn the completion of BAM into their generation’s prestige project. Heralded in similar language to that of Dnieprostroi or Magnitogorsk, BAM would, according to the propaganda, be built “with clean hands only!” within a decade (1974–1984), and represent, both economically and spiritually, a “path to the future.” It didn’t work.

Still, as Ward shows in this book, BAM was more than a mere economic failure. The project became a miniature of the dinosaur that was late socialism, plagued by alcoholism, criminality, segregation, racism, and irresponsibility towards the environment. Ward’s slender volume, based on research in Moscow and Irkutsk as well as interviews with former rail workers, may feel at times more like a collection of articles than a unified monograph, but it nonetheless represents an important case study because of the range of areas concerning “developed socialism” that it touches on. More than the last word on the social history of BAM, it lays out several potentially fruitful future lines of research that will complicate and enrich historians’ understanding of an era more complicated than the label “stagnation” suggests.

Ward divides his analysis of this world into five chapters: environmentalism, crime, women, international interactions between Soviet citizens of different nationalities, and international cooperation on BAM. Of these, I found the two chapters on nationalities policy and international cooperation the most compelling. With regards to the former, Ward begins the chapter with a macroargument about Soviet nationalities policy that will require further work to fully substantiate. He views the 1970s as a watershed, when fears of Slavic demographic decline, the Iranian Islamic Revolution, and rebellion against the Communist regime in Afghanistan, spurred Soviet leaders to pursue policies of Russianization, both on the level of cadres as well as on the micro-level. Ward’s examination of Kazakhs, Uzbeks, Georgians, Armenians, etc., at work on BAM largely confirms this picture: the Komsomol, which ran BAM, struggled to recruit non-Slavic minorities to the Far East, even when they (as were as all BAM workers) were promised lavish incentives. Those who did come spoke poor Russian, were typically segregated into national units, and were given menial service jobs rather than tasked with rail-laying. While Party press organs glorified the token, for example, Yakut groups at work on BAM, Ward convincingly shows how a system of segregation for all but the Party elite had crystallized by the early 1980s. The chapter points to future research on the tensions and missed opportunities regarding Muslims and non-Slavs in the postwar USSR.

The chapter on international cooperation is likewise rewarding: Ward describes both how Soviet BAM workmen were occasionally invited on trips to East Germany, Cuba, and the Southeast Asian Communist world to present a positive image of the project. Likewise, Latin Americans, Kenyans, Bangladeshis, Indians, and other internationals were able to work on the project. The theme of segregation emerges here, too: Spanish-speakers were often confined to their own Latin American units, black Africans were particularly mistreated, and almost none of the internationals was actually able to work laying rail (primarily, Ward shows, because construction standards were so shoddy and so little of the track was actually operational). What emerges, both in the chapters on nationalities and internationalism as well as the chapters on women, crime, and the environment, is that of an abortive international imperial project, if not in a state of zas-tot (stagnation), then sluggishly plodding along, the dreams of emancipation, cosmopolitanism, and dynamism halted by Slavic chauvinism, sexism, favoritism, and a corrosive culture of crime and corruption. One hopes to see Ward return to these themes in a more expansive work on the Brezhnev era that might engage with the recent work of Jeff Sahadeo and Adrienne Edgar.

_Brezhnev’s Folly_ represents a major step forward in scholarship on the era of “developed socialism,” but there are some areas where I would have liked to see more analysis. In his discussion of environmentalism in the Russian Far East, rather than Ward’s juxtaposition of the “Promethean” values of the regime versus the “conservationalist” values of BAM bureaucrats, I would have found it more enlightening for Ward to explore how both sides rhetorically positioned themselves as acting in the spirit of Lenin. Many of the quotations by the “conservational-
ists” are striking for how they claim to be representing the values of October, and it would have been interesting to investigate, as Amir Weiner has done in his work on postwar Vinnytsia, how the meaning of October was so often reinterpreted and contested after World War II. Ward, I felt, falls at times into taking quotations from Party newspapers or confidential letters either at face value, or as distorted by the editorial narrative formation process. Examining such material as examples of what had become a changed dialect of what Stephen Kotkin called “speaking Bolshevik” in public contexts might have proven more revealing than the approach taken here. These quibbles, though not serious, prevent a commendable case study from becoming what might have been a more probing investigation into the intellectual culture of the Brezhnev era.

Still, Brezhnev’s Folly – for its investigation into Northeast Asian history as well as for its author’s courage in venturing into what will prove a rich field for some years to come – will have to be read by all scholars interested in Soviet history or the history of Russian technology. As a welcome step forward in scholarship, it will make for a necessary addition to university libraries and specialized Slavic collections, as well as a more general readership interested in a fresh look at the Soviet 1970s and 1980s.

Timothy Nunan, Corpus Christi College, University of Oxford


The interest of Polish Slavists in contrastive linguistics dates back to the 1970s. The Polish-Bulgarian academic conference held in Warsaw on 23–25 November, 1977 by the Polish and Bulgarian Academies of Sciences was one of its first manifestations. In the years 1988–2009, thirteen parts of the Bulgarian-Polish Contrastive Grammar were issued, comprising nine volumes:

I: I. Sawicka, T. Bojadżiev, Phonetics and phonology (Sofija 1988)
II: V. Koseska-Toszewa, G. Gargov, The Semantic Category of Definiteness/Indefiniteness in Bulgarian and Polish (Sofija 1990)
V: M. Korytkowska, Types of Predicate-Argument Positions, (Warszawa 1992)
VI 2: M. Korytkowska, R. Roszko, Imperceptive modality (Warszawa 1996)
VI 4: M. Korytkowska, Interrogative Modality: Polar Questions (Warszawa 2006)
VII: V. Koseska-Toszewa, The semantic category of time (Warszawa 2006)
IX: V. Maldzieva, J. Baltova, Word Formation (Warszawa 2009)

Volumes I–IV were issued in Bulgaria in Bulgarian, and the remaining volumes were written in Polish but were also issued in Bulgaria. As Violetta Koseska-Toszewa puts it in the introduction to the series, “The Polish-Bulgarian Contrastive Grammar is the world’s first extensive attempt at semantic juxtaposition with an interlanguage.” It is a result of many years of research at the Institute of Slavic Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences and at the Institute for Bulgarian Language of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. According to other reviewers, it is the world’s