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В последней главе книги исследователь показывает, как в “Былом и думах” эмигрант Герцен конструирует автобиографический дискурс скитальчества, который реализуется в тексте как на структурном (многочисленные отступления, блуждания памяти, ретроспекции и т. п.), так и на мотивном уровне (мотив ссылок, отъезда, пересечения всяческих границ). На всех уровнях повествовательная героевца проявляется история-софия концепция, связывающая процессы письма, самопознания и истории (C. 146). Исследуя “путешествующее со- знание” нарратора, Клиспис, по сути перефразируя лучшие работы о Герцене, утверждает, что “Былое и думы” – это повествование о процессе воспо- минания и механизмах памяти. Более продуктивны размышления исследователя о хронотопе пере- сечения границ (C. 161-167), который неоднократно возникает на страницах герценовского романа, о сцеплениях между разными мотивами, реализующими метафору скитальчества, об образе Чадаева в “Былом и думах”, который служит важной автобиографической проекцией для автора (C. 157-161).

Таким образом, номадизм вы- полнял в русской литературной мифологии первой половины XIX века роль метафоры культурной недостаточности, неполноценности, которую славянофилы и Достоевский обрали в идей “особого пути” и достоинства (протеизм Пушкина). В то же время, подводя итоги, Клиспис справедливо отмечает, что вопрос о том, в чем же заключается рус- ская, не имел в первой половине XIX в. однозначного ответа и про- воировал разноголосицу мнений (C. 176). Представляется, что если бы связь между определением русскости и культурным мифом “русского номадизма” была пробле- матизирована во введении, то исследование от этого лишь выиграло бы.

При чтении напрашивается и другой вопрос: бывает ли в жанре-трavelога так, что писатель-путешественник риторически опровергает свой кочевой статус? Как риторически оформляют свою идентичность писатели-до- моседы?

Важное исследование Клиспис, прорисовывающее контуры еще одного культурного мифа эпохи романтического нацио- нализма в России, нуждается в дальнейшем развитии – в более многомерной реконструкции син- хронных контекстов и изощренном инструментарии, который бы улавливал более тонкие различия и границы между разными ли- тературными и дискурсивными феноменами.
the only Georgian newspaper” (P. 81), as well as its successor, Iveria, which ran from 1886 to 1891. Along the way, readers are introduced to multiple sectors of the Georgian intelligentsia, including ethnographers (Urbneli, Bavreli), poets (Akaki Tsereteli, Vazha Pshavela), and prose writers (Aleksandre Qazbegi). Manning’s framework reveals how a modern Georgian literary sensibility emerged first in ethnographic prose. The evidence Manning assembles to demonstrate his thesis that “virtually all the ‘mountain writers’ of the 1880s (Qazbegi, Vazha Pshavela, Urbneli) turned their hand first to ethnography” and only later embarked on literary careers (P. 306n17), significantly adds to our understanding of the temporal sequencing of genres in Georgian literary history.

In each of his eight chapters, Manning carefully and provocatively distinguishes the world of the Georgian intellectuals from their counterparts in Russia and Europe. He demonstrates how Georgians “positioned ... on the borderline of European modernity and civiliza- tion” were only able to conceive of themselves as a public through “constant reference to the lack, the absence of civilizational progress which was due to the stubborn obduracy of the space of Asia” (P. 96). Situated in, but not of, Asia, the liberal Georgian intelligentsia inhabited the multiple contradictions of colonial modernity with varying degrees of accommodation and self-consciousness. Georgian intellectuals who cognized the contradictions that shaped their imagination more acutely than others, namely writers such as Qazbegi and other eulogizers of the vanishing life ways of mountainous Xevsuretia and Xevi, and the Christian ruins of Muslim Ajaria, stand out most memorably in Manning’s chronicle of the emergent Georgian public sphere.

The Georgian intellectuals who prove most central to Manning’s exposition inverted the sublime posturing of Russian Romantics who (as influentially documented by Harsha Ram) viewed the Caucasus landscape from the “neutral, almost invisible position of the road” (P. 67). Parting ways with while also building on the Russian Romantic tradition, Chavchavadze, Qazbegi, and the pseudonymous Bavreli (Droeba’s special correspondent to the newly conquered regions of Ottoman Georgia, whose real name was Soloman Aslanishvili) viewed the “road” from the landscape’s point of view (P. 67). Manning’s documentation of Georgian intellectuals’ inversions of the Romantic sublime will help scholars throughout the Eurasian cultural sphere inflect, deflect, and otherwise deploy the literary-theoretical legacy of reflection on the sublime in ways locally relevant to indigenous cultural spaces, and particularly to indigenous cultures encountering the infrastructures of technological modernity. Of equal significance, Manning’s retooling of the sublime concept for the study of technolog- ical modernity on a colonial borderland reconfigures the circulation of culture and the grounding for political agency in colonial modernity in ways that are sure to generate future scholarship along similar lines. Some of the most important aspects of Manning’s intervention in these domains come through in the book’s reflections on the Georgian intellectuals’ engagement with the technological sublime (Pp. 74-76), and the contrasts he draws between variations on the sublime and the picturesque in this aesthetic milieu.

Manning draws liberally on current anthropological theory (including inter alia Brian Larkin on the colonial sublime, Leo Marx on the technology and the pastoral, Erving Goffman on technologies of representation, and Michael Herzfeld on self-display and self-recognition) to extend the boundaries of Caucasus Studies outside the Soviet/Rus- sian framework that unfortunately continues to dominate the field.3 At the same time, he places Georgia in a more interdisciplinary and geo- graphically capacious framework than prior work on this region has managed to do, including the only other English monograph on the topic prior to this work, Austin Jersild’s Orientalism and Empire.

Adding to the book’s value, Manning’s investigations are grounded in profound archival knowledge of many reams of Georgian print culture, which no scholars working in English have studied or discussed in print. Prior to the publication of Strangers in a Strange Land, Iveria and Droeba were peripheral to Caucasus scholarship, and known only to a few Georgian specialists. (Jersild’s monograph remains the only other work of scholarship in English to make serious use of this material, but, whereas Jersild writes as a historian of empire, Manning writes as a theorist of technological modernity, and pays closer attention to the textual and literary aspects of Georgian print culture than do his counterparts in history and political science.)

On a more trivial note, there are places (e.g., “in his way every step”

---

Russian rule. But such comparisons, important as they are for scholarship of the future, would still leave unaccomplished the task of clearly defining the geography traversed by the genres, texts, and cultures of circulation studied in Manning’s work. The future of Caucasus Studies is at stake in the determinations that are made with respect to Manning’s geography, and, once that determination is made, there is no doubting that Manning’s achievement will be a foundation stone in the eventual field that his work is helping to constitute.

4 That contemporary areal logics privilege the association between Georgian culture and Russian studies more than any of the other possibilities suggested here is indicated by the fact that the only review of Strangers in a Strange Land that has appeared thus far has been in the Slavic Review (2013. Vol. 72. No. 3. Pp. 638-640) by G. M. Hamburg.

5 A productive line of inquiry in this regard would be with the emergence of Hindi print culture, which coincided in many respects with the emergence of Georgian print culture, and under similarly fraught, and colonially inflected, conditions. On this topic, see Ulrike Starke. An Empire of Books: The Naval Kishore Press and the Diffusion of the Printed Word in Colonial India, 1858–1895. New Delhi, 2007, and, for a slightly later period, Francesca Orsini. The Hindi Public Sphere 1920–1940: Language and Literature in the Age of Nationalism. Oxford, 2002.