killed about two million acres of taiga-tundra forests. He is less descriptive than prescriptive in his analysis, clearly explaining how SO\textsubscript{x} and NO\textsubscript{x} emissions can be reduced if treated appropriately before combustion. Post combustion systems such as flue gas desulphurization (or, wet lime or limestone “scrubbers”) also reduce emissions. Scrubbers are common in the West, but Russian authorities have yet to install them in many power plants; importing such technologies from the West remains prohibitively expensive for FSU nations.

Towards the conclusion Hill suggest several future research priorities, which include studies of carbon dioxide (CO\textsubscript{2}) emissions and “clean coal” combustion technologies. One of the most alarming conclusions of this study indicates that environmental conditions in the FSU have not improved since the fall of communism in 1991. In part, as Hill notes, this is due to the Soviet-style organization legacy in the government and energy sectors.

This study is a valuable resource on industrial pollution and its causes in the FSU. It contains numerous charts on topics ranging from fossil fuel power station capacities to gas turbine efficiencies of FSU plants. It appears well researched; the author’s use of both Russian language and Western sources is wise because the latter are often more accurate and up-to-date.

This book will appeal to environmental and science policy makers, business and commercial proprietors with an interest in the FSU, federal energy officials, and FSU academic specialists. Despite its scientific terminology, Environment and Technology in the Former USSR is not technically overwhelming for non-scientifically trained readers.

Anne Fitzpatrick


When Liudmila Petrushevskaya’s collected works were published in 1996 and began to appear in bookstores and on library shelves, readers of Russian literature knew that this author had “made it.” Both scorned and celebrated in the 1980s for what came to be known as her chernukha, her black, cruel prose and dark, often absurdist plays, Petrushevskaya is now a part of the canon of late twentieth-century literature, and should be taught and studied as such.

It was only a matter of time before a major book attempting to analyze all of Petrushevskaya’s work to date came out in the West. Now, to complement insightful reviews and articles in Russia and the West, several dissertations on Petrushevskaya’s prose, and a separate book on her plays, Sally Dalton-Brown provides English-language readers the first study devoted in its entirety to the varied oeuvre of this complex and fascinating author.

Dalton-Brown’s title aptly describes her focus on Petrushevskaya. She argues that Petrushevskaya’s work “operates on the principle of negation of voices and her texts . . . are based on the principles of negation, nullity, and negativity.” In Dalton-Brown’s estimation, Petrushevskaya’s narration “strangles itself . . . into silence,” and the voices of her
texts “come to [the reader] faintly across a dark silence, yet with all the power of a cry from the void” (p. 17). Petrushevskaya’s world is peopled with fascinating characters, all of whom suffer tremendously in one way or another and most of whom are achingly lonely. The scholar employs the binary term “human animal” to describe the characters and offers us their voices from the void, “the silence of isolation” and of madness. Dalton-Brown concludes her study by telling us that “Petrushevskaya’s texts speak and yet are silent, because the void of which they speak is too vast. The void is our own fear. How can we listen to it for too long without going mad?” (p. 197).

The subtitle presents the main problem which Dalton-Brown struggles to work out: Petrushevskaya loves to place her stories and plays in categories, and Dalton-Brown wants to figure out how these “genres” are interrelated and why Petrushevskaya occasionally reclassifies a story from one genre into another. Petrushevskaya’s “main” genres, of course, are prose and drama. Dalton-Brown distinguishes seven others: “contemporary histories, monologues, requiems, songs, sluchai, tales of the fantastic, and prose poetry” (p. 17). The central four chapters of the book are devoted to these genres, with an additional chapter on drama and one on “style.”

The introduction, “Petrushevskaya and Contemporary Literary Trends,” is arguably the most interesting part of the book, with good references to works on Petrushevskaya and on other contemporary authors, and with perceptive ideas about the place of Petrushevskaya in both the perestroika and the post-Soviet Russian literary scene. But the body of the book is less illuminating than one might have hoped (and infinitely more sloppy). In her attempts to survey all of Petrushevskaya’s publications, Dalton-Brown often finds herself “confused” – by the different headings given to stories in journals and in various collections, by the genre classifications which Petrushevskaya “confusingly” changes, and so on. Although the question of genre is certainly one that stumps Petrushevskaya’s reader, Dalton-Brown merely rehearses the problem rather than revealing the solution.

Frankly, Dalton-Brown also seems confused about who her own reader is. While using transliterated titles throughout her book, thus identifying a reader familiar with Russian, she recounts virtually every story and play Petrushevskaya has written, thus assuming that her reader is unfamiliar with the majority of the texts. Dalton-Brown’s desire to categorize all the works results in perplexing assertions that all genres are linked (see p. 85), and her summaries of every text take up valuable space which might better have been used to sharpen her arguments on the basis of carefully selected texts.

Regrettably, Dalton-Brown’s more perceptive insights into individual stories and into Petrushevskaya’s aggregate voices are undercut by the commonplace she throws in, such as her summing up that “One can reduce the Petrushevskaya [sic] ‘message’ to a practical bit of advice . . . one must perhaps be cruel to be kind. After all, life is not only about love, but about survival” (p. 56). Too often her judgments are reductive, such as when she calls the heroine of Vremia noch’ a “harridan” (p. 162). The author identifies a number of potentially interesting topics: techniques such as parody and narrative density, the chronotope of Soviet domestic space and the theme of domestic vulnerability, the dichotomy of “victim/victor” characterization, and the gap between perceived reality and a romantic view of life. Most tantalizing of all are her occasional mentions of the authors whose world views helped shape Petrushevskaya’s own as well as those of her characters: