

community of wartime Aleppo, which emphasizes the resistance of the collective at the bottom-level rather than individuals at the top. Arguing that scholarly and public attention to the Armenian genocide has been biased in favor of perpetrator-centered narratives, armed resistance and western humanitarianism, Mouradian attempts to restore agency to Armenians allegedly described as passive victims and recipients of foreign aid. Informed by similar debates in Holocaust literature, he argues that the various survival strategies employed by the victims themselves constitute active resistance.

In an afterword to the volume, Hamit Bozarslan discusses continuities across time, from the attempted reforms in the nineteenth century and what Kieser refers to as the betrayal of the “O toman Spring” of 1908 meaning the brief promise of Ottoman liberalism, to the current regime of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, a reformist-turned-rogue much like the Young Turks of the 1910s. Although the discussion of these analogies remains a bit sketchy, the afterword as well as the volume’s chapters as a whole offer plenty of insights about the mass-violence and its legacies in the post-Ottoman world. *The End of the Ottomans* is a major contribution to Armenian genocide scholarship and a promising sign of its vitality.

ERIK SJÖBERG  
Södertörn University

***Blick ins Ungewisse: Visionen und Utopien im Donau-Karpaten-Raum 1917 und danach.*** Ed. Angela Ilić, Florian Kühner-Wielach, Irena Samide, and Tanja Žigon. Verlag Friedrich Pustet: Regensburg, 2019. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für deutsche Kultur und Geschichte Südosteuropas an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München (IKGS). 304 pp. Notes. Illustrations. Photographs. Maps. \$40.00, paper.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2021.38

Revision is a permanent and often fruitful feature of the evolution of historiography, shifting an existing perspective is one of its frequently used methods. This volume attempts a revision of this genre, and even if the effort is palpably driven by the logic of commemorative cycles, it is not unjustified. Turning the telescope of the historian to look out from the perspective of 1917 towards a hitherto unknown future is warranted, as that year was the moment of an acceleration of events and processes that finally changed Europe fundamentally.

The editors of this volume attempted to use this moment and narrow the focus of contributions to look at phenomena and processes whose outcome seemed undetermined in 1917 and pointed towards the not yet settled, relatively open future. Thus, the chapters are divided into three parts, the first one dedicated to political ideas on the coming reorganization of Europe at local or regional levels; the second to churches around the time of WWI; the third to visions of the future in literary works. With this structure the volume—while narrow in terms of its chronological limits—spans a wide range of disciplines, a feature that does not help its coherence.

Coherence is the most significant challenge the editors faced, especially as the individual chapters never address broad issues. Their focus is deliberately narrow, often relating small stories that are easily forgotten or neglected by that part of historiography which tries to paint an all-encompassing picture of the changes after the WWI. Four of the five studies in the first part deal with political projects that either failed to be realized or turned out to be ephemeral. These were, however, not completely unrealistic and demonstrate agency from the margins of historical consciousness.

Ljubinka Tošević Karpowic presents how the Italian National Council prepared for the realization of the annexation of Fiume to Italy, a topic she unfortunately discusses mainly on the basis of a single source, the minutes of the INC. Nataliya Nechayeva-Yuriychuk argues that the Hutsul Republic in the northeastern Carpathians was a conscious attempt at Ukrainian state-building, unfortunately neglecting the literature on national indifference. Tullio Vorano presents a fascinating attempt of miners in the Italian Istria to establish their own communal mines with an attempted strike, ultimately failing in this endeavor but for the time being strengthening their social position. Nándor Bárdi and Csaba Zahorán outline how pro-Hungarian intellectuals in what was to become the geographic center of Greater Romania, the Székelyföld tried to use the historic peculiarity of the region to obtain autonomy for all or most of the Hungarians in the country, thereby planting the seeds of a political movement and the corresponding suspicion from the Romanian side that exists even today. Finally Éamonn O'Ciardha presents with rich material and flair how much the example of dualist Hungary motivated the late nineteenth century Irish independence movement and was used as a viable example of home rule and independence.

The second part consist of four case studies on churches. France Martin Dolinar describes how the Catholic archdiocese of Görz/Gorica and its bishops experienced the wartime suspicion of the authorities and the transition to nation-states in a multi-ethnic region. Neither Italy, with the accession of Fascism, nor Yugoslavia, dominated by the Serbian Orthodox Church, turned out to be friendly to Catholic dignitaries, irrespective of their nationality. Neither was wartime Austria-Hungary to its slavophone clergy, and state intervention proved to be detrimental to the relationship of the church and its believers. Heiner Grunert argues that not even the Serbian Orthodox Church, whose representatives envisioned national redemption through wartime suffering, was entirely satisfied with the new Yugoslavia that dismissed its traditional autonomy and subjected it to extended state control. As a result, a divide between church and society opened. In Lajos Szász' chapter on Hungarian protestant churches, the coincidence of the political changes in the wake of the 1917 reformation jubilee offers the starting point to argue that Hungarian Protestant thinking on the future was nationalistic, envisioned the Magyarization of the country, but the year 1917 was also a moment of establishing the basis for the Christian-Conservative political unity that defined counterrevolutionary Hungary. In contrast to Szász, Tanja Žigon demonstrates how the wartime circumstances and a small number of constituents subdued the reformation jubilee in Ljubljana.

The last part presents chapters on literature, and therefore an imaginary reality, rather than a historical one, dominates. The exception is Johann Georg Lughofer's study on Joseph Roth's experiences in western Hungary right after the fall of the Republic of Councils in August 1919. Roth found here a population favorable to Hungary and often nationally indifferent, but it did not deter him from representing the area with clear-cut national categories. While Lughofer's focus is similarly narrow as the other historical chapters, Clemens Rutner's (apocalyptic scenarios in German-language fantastic literature), Anja Urekar Oswald's (utopia and dystopia in the German language press of Lower Styria), and Milka Car's (Miroslav Krleža's ideas in 1917) contributions span a longer period. In all three the emphasis is on the dystopian potential of the early twentieth century and the war, as well as the idea of the decline and dissolution of the bourgeois world as the dominant theme in journalistic and literary products. However, while for Krleža Leninism and its utopian potential offered the glimmer of hope, Germans in Lower Styria hoped to find salvation from pan-German nationalism.

The micro focus of the texts is a strength of the volume; these seemingly not significant stories reveal important dynamics and forgotten agency (like the miners

of Istria) or highlight issues that were much more significant for contemporaries (like religion) than posterity presumes, based on today's radically changed society. Nevertheless, with all the enriching detail and unexpected connections made (Ireland-Hungary) the volume remains a half-success, mostly because of the lack of coherence and the sometimes overly factual approach of the authors. It shows that diverse futures were imagined in 1917 and the attempted reversal of perspectives merits consideration, but with a mosaic with too many missing pieces it offers little more than the diversity itself.

GÁBOR EGRY  
*Institute of Political History, Budapest*

**“Pomeshchich’ia Pravda”: Dvorianstvo Levoberezhnoi Ukrainy i krest’ianskii vopros v kontse XVIII—pervoi polovine XIX veka.** By Tat’iana Litvinova. *Historia Rossica*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2019. ii, 644 pp. Notes. Index. 576 rubles, hard bound.  
 doi: 10.1017/slr.2021.39

*“Landlord’s Truth”: Nobility of Left-Bank Ukraine and the Peasant Question During the Late Eighteenth Through the First Half of the Nineteenth Centuries* is a revised and abridged Russian version of the book which was originally published in Ukrainian in 2011. The monograph seeks to reconsider two influential narratives of Ukrainian history of the period in question. The first one, devised by the nineteenth century populist historians and later modified by the Soviet scholars, focuses on enserfment and the increasing economic and social exploitation of Ukrainian peasants by the nobility. This narrative is critical of the former Cossack *starshyna*, who during Catherine II’s reign acquired the status of the imperial nobility because of their betrayal of the broader responsibility for the fate of the fatherland and its society in favor of narrow economic and social interests of one’s own estate. The second narrative, which is dominant in contemporary Ukrainian history writing and which was originally produced by historians from the statist school, concentrates on the gradual abolition of the Ukrainian Cossack autonomies in the late eighteenth through early nineteenth centuries. It positively highlights the activities of those members of the former *starshyna* who opposed the imperial unification, who collected and preserved sources from the past, and who penned historical works devoted to the glorious Cossack history.

Tat’iana Litvinova argues that Ukrainian history of the late eighteenth through the first half of the nineteenth century cannot be reduced to the imperial unification and the opposition to it. She also believes that the nobility is misrepresented in both abovementioned narratives. In her view, it is the peasant question that defined the logic of historical changes during the period in question. Ukrainian noblemen were deeply immersed in the economic and social life of their estates. Their activities were guided not so much by the desire to increase exploitation of the newly enserfed peasants but by their desire to organize the economy of their estates on rational grounds. After the abolition of autonomy, the nobility did not also abandon their responsibility to the entire society. The noblemen attempted not only to take care of their own serfs; they also came up with various economic, educational, and charitable projects that had to benefit the whole local society.

To prove this argument, Litvinova examines ego-documents, speeches, projects, and publicistic works produced by noblemen from the former Hetmanate—the largest Ukrainian Cossack autonomous zone in the Russian Empire. Her analysis