

2011

Strangers in a Strange Land: Occidentalists Publics and Orientalist Geographies in Nineteenth-Century Georgian Imaginaries by Paul Manning (3/2013): 17-21.

Rebecca Gould

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 ссылки, отъезда, пересечения всяческих границ). На всех уровнях повествование Герцена пронизывает историческая концепция, связывающая процессы письма, самопознания и истории (С. 146). Исследуя “путешествующее сознание” нарратора, Клиспис, по сути перефразируя лучшие работы о Герцене, утверждает, что “Былое и думы” – это повествование о процессе воспоминания и механизмах памяти. Более продуктивны размышления исследователя о хронотопе пересечения границы (С. 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 (С. 157-161).

Таким образом, номадизм выполнял в русской литературной мифологии первой половины XIX века роль метафоры культурной

недостаточности, неполноценности, которую славянофилы и Достоевский обратили в идею “особого пути” и достоинства (протеизм Пушкина). В то же время, подводя итоги, Клиспис справедливо отмечает, что вопрос о том, в чем же заключается русскость, не имел в первой половине XIX в. однозначного ответа и провоцировал разногласия мнений (С. 176). Представляется, что если бы связь между определением русскости и культурным мифом “русского номадизма” была проблематизирована во введении, то исследование от этого лишь выиграло бы.

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

Важное исследование Клисписа, прорисовывающее контуры еще одного культурного мифа эпохи романтического национализма в России, нуждается в дальнейшем развитии – в более многомерной реконструкции синхронных контекстов и изолированном инструментарии, который бы улавливал более тонкие различия и границы между разными литературными и дискурсивными феноменами.

Rebecca GOULD

Paul Manning, *Strangers in a Strange Land: Occidentalists and Orientalist Geographies in Nineteenth-Century Georgian Imaginaries* (Cultural Revolutions: Russia in the Twentieth Century) (Brighton, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2012). 315 pp., ill. Bibliography. Index. ISBN 978-1-936235-76-6.

Strangers in a Strange Land joins a growing number of recent studies of the historical formation of the Georgian intelligentsia over the course of the long nineteenth century. Viewed within the context of related works on the Georgian intelligentsia, especially Austin Jersild's *Orientalism and Empire*, Stephan Jones's *Socialism in Georgian Colors*, and multiple articles by Oliver Reisner, *Strangers in a Strange Land* stands out through its close attention to texts, its deft literary and linguistic analyses, its theoretical ambitions,

and its wide-ranging implications for comparative analysis.¹ Over the course of its eight chapters, *Strangers in a Strange Land* charts the cognitive and semiotic terrains of the nineteenth-century Georgian intelligentsia through serial publications, feuilletons, ethnographies, fiction, and poetry.

Across the many genres and texts he engages, Paul Manning concentrates on what he calls, following Benjamin Lee and Edward LiPuma, the “cultures of circulation” that shaped the emergence of Georgian print culture. Manning launches his account with Ilya Chavchavadze's *Letters of a Traveller* (1861–71), a text that has been the subject of his earlier work,² but which he considerably expands on here. *Strangers in a Strange Land* then shifts into a series of close readings of the texts and genres that emerged from the newspapers Chavchavadze founded: *Droeba* (Times), a publication that functioned from “the mid-1860s to the mid-1880s [as] more or less

¹ Cf. Austin Jersild. *Orientalism and Empire: North Caucasus Mountain Peoples and the Georgian Frontier, 1845–1917*. Montreal & Kingston, 2002; Stephen F. Jones. *Socialism in Georgian Colors: The European Road to Social Democracy, 1883–1917*. Cambridge, MA, 2005; Oliver Reisner. *The Tergdaleulebi: Founders of Georgian National Identity // Ladislaus Löb, István Petrovics, and György E. Szonyi (Eds.). Forms of Identity: Definitions and Changes*. Szeged, 1994. Pp. 125-137; Idem. *Die Schule der Georgischen Nation: Eine sozialhistorische Untersuchung der nationalen Bewegung in Georgien am Beispiel der “Gesellschaft zur Verbreitung der Lese- und Schreibkunde unter den Georgiern”*: (1850–1917). Wiesbaden, 2004.

² H. Paul Manning. *Describing Dialect and Defining Civilization in an Early Georgian Nationalist Manifesto: Iliia Ch'avch'avadze's “Letters of a Traveler” // Russian Review*. 2004. Vol. 63. No. 1. Pp. 26-47.

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 civilization” 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 Solomon 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 technological modernity on a colonial borderland reconceives 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/Russian framework that unfortunately

continues to dominate the field.³ At the same time, he places Georgia in a more interdisciplinary and geographically 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”

³ Cf. Brian Larkin. *Signal and Noise*. Durham, 2008; Leo Marx. *Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America*. London and Oxford, 1964; Erving Goffman. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Cambridge, MA, 1974; Michael Herzfeld. *Anthropology through the Looking Glass: Critical Ethnography in the Margins of Europe*. Cambridge, UK, 1987; Idem. *Cultural Intimacy: Social Poetics in the Nation-State*. New York, 1997.

[P. 65]; the repetition of the phrase “culture of circulation” [P. 77]) where *Strangers in a Strange Land* would have benefited from more careful proofreading. Such matters, however, appear insignificant when one considers the scope of Manning’s achievement in comparison with the few prior works that have touched on this subject, and takes account of just how little serious work has been done on the subjects he assays, in many cases for the first time, in English. Manning’s historical anthropology of Georgian intellectual life is the most creative and theoretically ambitious study of Georgian print culture ever to have been published in the English language. As such, it signals the auspicious future awaiting this as-yet quite small subfield of Caucasus Studies. It may indeed make possible the teaching of Georgian literature in translation in the North American academy.

Manning’s important contribution to the historical anthropology of the Caucasus asks us to rethink relations between peripheries and imperial centers, and to reimagine the role of Georgian culture in the constitution of the imperial knowledge. Beyond its intrinsic significance, the existence of this

work invites another concern, specific to the present state of Caucasus Studies. Given the many areal cracks beneath which so much scholarship on the Caucasus is inevitably buried, there is a danger that, at least in the immediate future, *Strangers in a Strange Land* will fail to find the interdisciplinary and pan-geographical audience it deserves. As with Georgian culture, so with Manning’s book. Does it belong to Russian and post-Soviet studies?⁴ Do Manning’s accounts of the intellectual coming of age of figures such as Chavchavadze and Qazbegi constitute a chapter in the history of European modernity? Or does Manning’s account of the emergence of a vernacular Georgian intelligentsia through serial publications, travel narratives, anonymous correspondents, letters to editors (see, e.g., Pp. 156-157, 163), and most important of all, readerly publics of different demographic backgrounds, traverse a more complicated cultural geography, indefinable in terms of contemporary existing areal rubrics?

One might suggest the histories of vernacular print culture in Egypt, Algeria, and South Asia as possible comparanda with Manning’s study of Georgian intellectual life under

Russian rule.⁵ 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.



Alexander MORRISON

Alexander Etkind, *Internal Colonization. Russia's Imperial Experience* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2011) ix + 289 pp., ill. Index. ISBN: 978-0-7456-5130-9.

This is an important and stimulating, but flawed book. It consists of a series of essays in cultural history and literary criticism, which Etkind describes as “a kind of Eisensteinian *montage* interwoven with an overarching principle, which in this book is internal colonization” (P. 2). He argues that the internal colonization of Russia by its own state, and the relationship between Russia’s literate elites and its masses in the post-Petrine period, are comparable to the external colonization of Asia, Africa, and America by European states and by Russia itself, and can thus be interpreted through a post-colonial lens. He also states at the outset that “this book is a project in Cultural Studies” (P. 3). Both these statements rendered this reviewer apprehensive – the first because the language of postcolonialism frequently mistakes opacity for pro-

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.