mid-forties. Smith wisely refrains in his introductory comments from attempting to analyze the author's emotional makeup. Catherine's abandonment to the intensity of her infatuation is obvious, as is her growing uneasiness with Potemkin's moodiness and seeming inability to be satisfied with her commitment to him. The most telling of these letters is the one numbered 4, written at the beginning of the relationship, in which Catherine recounts and accounts for her previous loves. Armchair psychologists have much material to sift through in these letters.

Potemkin's share is much greater in the later correspondence dealing with the annexation of the Crimea, the integration of new southern territories into the empire, and the second war with Turkey that opened in 1788. Of the 209 letters dated after May 1782, 103 were written by Potemkin. The correspondence on both sides during these years is substantive. Both authors lay out policy recommendations for the other's response. Potemkin reports on and justifies his military decisions. Most important, the reader gains an appreciation of the breadth of his responsibilities, of the energy with which he attacked problems, of the range of issues occupying his attention. Still the picture of Potemkin is partial. The correspondence does not mention Samuel Bentham, who worked for Potemkin in the south of Russia. Nor does it mention Joshua Zeitlin, the Jewish merchant and sometime Talmudic scholar who provided Potemkin with entrée into Jewish communities. Potemkin's financial profligacies are only hinted at, and there is nothing of his influence over the Russian court's management of finances. (His personal bankers became the first two bankers for the Russian court.)

Both Catherine and Potemkin wrote portions of their letters in French; those lines are left in the original language. Keeping in mind the abilities of the American reader in particular, however, Smith rendered all the French passages in English in footnotes. Further aids to the reader, besides brief introductions to each chapter, include three maps, a brief chronology, and Russia's Table of Ranks as appendices. Catherine's nicknames for Potemkin were many and varied. Smith provides contemporary English equivalents, for the most part successfully.

Who is the intended audience for this volume? The serious scholar will still want to read the letters in the original Russian. It is too specialized and, as a hardback, expensive for undergraduates. Might the general reader be titillated into purchasing it? Is the answer to be found in a dustcover somewhere between rose pink and magenta?

George E. Munro
Virginia Commonwealth University


More than a decade in the making, Dan Healey's new book provides one of the historical discipline's first in-depth studies of homosexuality in Russia — from the origins of an urban homosexual subculture in post-Emancipation Moscow and St. Petersburg, through the medicalization of the discourse on same-sex love at the turn of the century, and finally to the Stalin-era criminalization of sodomy and persecution of those accused of it. Building on the pioneering work of Eve Levin, Laura Engelstein, and Simon Karlin, Healey fills in significant gaps in Russian history on homosexuality, while simultaneously enriching a queer studies discipline that rarely consid-
ers Russia. He demonstrates an impressive command of the literature, methodology, and theory of both fields, and his interdisciplinary approach to the subject should ensure a broad audience for this book. Strongly influenced by Foucauldian theories of power, regulation, and discipline, Healey seeks to deconstruct what he calls "the myth of a universal, natural, and timeless Russian or Soviet heterosexuality" (p. 9). He argues that examining the history of Russia between 1870 and 1940 through the lens of sexual and gender "dissidents" – both male and female – reconceptualizes our understandings of authoritarian power in the tsarist and Soviet eras.

Healey begins by investigating the development of a male homosexual subculture in Russian cities in the wake of the Great Reforms. His detailed discussion of the increasingly "sexualized territories" of urban space and the commercialization of male same-sex encounters rewrites the history of civil society and the public sphere in late imperial Russia. Public spaces such as Nevskii Prospekt's famous Passazh gallery, or the outskirts of the Peter and Paul Fortress, counted among St Petersburg's most notorious locations for male sexual encounters – for those willing to look.

The book's middle section provides the crux of the argument as Healey demonstrates that the Russian treatment of homosexuality in medical, psychiatric, and eventually legal discourse differed remarkably from that of Western Europe, largely owing to the nature of autocratic government in Russia. Although Russian doctors and psychiatrists were aware of emerging medical practices in Paris and Berlin that could challenge criminal codes by purporting to identify and diagnose homosexuality (particularly among men), Healey argues that medical professionals in Russia left policing in the hands of a tsarist regime that ruled over doctors and patients, homosexuals and heterosexuals alike. Following the 1905 Revolution, however, liberal calls for the decriminalization of sodomy, as well as an increase in homosexual characters in boulevard literature, led to the medical overtaking the judicial as the dominant discourse controlling homosexuality. The Bolsheviks, for Healey, completed the modernist project by not only repealing the penalty for sodomy in their new criminal code, but also secularizing and medicalizing the language used to discuss sexuality.

In the book's third section, Healey considers Stalin's recriminalization of sodomy in 1933-34 and, using court records, discusses the law's impact on Russian men accused of the crime. A Foucault-inspired epilogue then outlines the spaces of the Gulag and the clinic as potential sites for future research into homosexual subcultures in Russia and their interaction with authority. Detailed discussions of sources, especially in this final third of the book, provide a fascinating and useful glimpse into the state of Russian archives since 1991, as most of Healey's material (tsarist and Soviet court cases, medical and legal documents, personal papers and memoirs) has been available only since that date. Many documents on the 1933-34 anti-sodomy law remained inaccessible to him, however, offering future researchers a chance to investigate this particular topic in more detail once the sources become available.

While overall an important project, Healey's book may face criticism from certain audiences. His forays into the nuances of same-sex love during this period in the Caucasus and Central Asia might strike historians of empire and nationality as too brief. The urban and imperial centers of Moscow and St Petersburg dominate the study, and while his occasional examples from non-Russian regions are welcome and illuminating, the power dynamics between centers and peripheries certainly complicate his arguments about sexual regulation and dissent. Meanwhile, feminist audiences may take