In summary, Moss's thoughtful and well-researched study will be of interest to Russian scholars from different fields. It makes an important contribution to the existing scholarship pertaining to Russian history of ideas and modernist studies. It maps a new direction in the exploration of Russian treatment of the woman question across different periods and genres.

University of Edinburgh Alexandra Smith

Oppo, Andrea. *Lev Shestov: The Philosophy and Works of a Tragic Thinker*. Academic Studies Press, Boston, MA, 2020. xvi + 346 pp. Notes. Appendices. Bibliography and works cited. Index. $129.00.

This remarkably thorough study aims to provide a comprehensive view of Lev Shestov's philosophical legacy by analysing all its individual parts (including the most obscure and often overlooked works of this prolific philosophical writer) — something that has so far largely been lacking in research on Shestov. Indeed, as the author rightly notes, the majority of previous studies of Shestov's heritage tend to focus on segmental, specific aspects rather than achieve a holistic understanding of Shestov's 'philosophy of tragedy' in its entirety. Such an approach, which fails to see the wood for the trees, suffers more often than not from the predictable dichotomies, such as 'Faith versus Reason', 'Athens versus Jerusalem', and so on. Consequently, these studies, with a few exceptions, either dismiss Shestov's legacy as impractical or admire his daring, but rarely venture outside this framework.

Andrea Oppo avoids falling into the trap of taking things at face value, for he understands precisely the need for 'reading between the lines' — that is, adopting essentially the same method that Shestov did in his study of major thinkers — for Shestov 'often concealed his real thoughts and intentions under an opposite attitude' (p. 240). This immediately brings to mind Shestov's own analysis of Dostoevskii, whom Shestov deemed his principle teacher: 'fighting with evil, [Dostoevskii] put forward such arguments in its defence which it had never dared to dream of' ('Dostoevskii i Nitzshe — filosofiia tragedii' [1902], in Lev Shestov, *Sochineniia v dvukh tomakh*, Tomsk, 1996, p. 92, translation is mine — OT). This is just one example that illustrates the relevance of the type of methodology (of careful and insightful decoding, the kind of hermeneutics for which Shestov is famous) that Oppo adopts — which proves to be very fruitful. In fact, this is most probably the only methodology capable of producing new meaningful analysis of a thinker like Shestov, whose ideas have tended to be presented in polemics with others rather than developed into a philosophical system in its own right.

In a confident manner, lucid style and with substantial philosophical erudition, Oppo looks beyond the self-evident to unravel Shestovian hidden meanings, analysing Shestov's legacy as a coded philosophical narrative, whilst also leaving no thematic stone unturned. At the start of the book Oppo sets out 'to reveal Shestov from a number of less-considered aspects, including: an initial personal crisis; a defense of morality he sought to pursue at the beginning of his career; his first activity as a literary critic and his "aesthetic" thought; his relationship with the Russian philosophers; his political views; his studies on Greek philosophy; the experience of exile within the Russian émigré community; the crucial role of Plotinus within his thought; his relationship with psychoanalysis; the shift towards a more religiously committed philosophy and a sort of "return" to Judaism; the heritage of his "only disciple" Fondane; the relevance of his meetings with Husserl; and finally the legacy of his thought in Europe' (pp. xiii–xiv). He delivers on each one of these, largely following Shestov's thought in its chronological development.

The book impresses not only in its methodology and thematic scope, but also in the exhaustive range of primary and secondary sources, in a range of languages, that Oppo draws upon. Oppo clearly feels at home in both the Western and Russian philosophical traditions, and is thus able to map Shestov organically and in a meaningful way within both worlds. Not deceived by Shestov's taking issue with virtually every thinker of the Western speculative philosophical tradition, Oppo places Shestov within that very tradition, fighting at its fringes, questioning its very sources. He acknowledges that Shestov's path was 'the attempt of rationality itself to investigate its own foundations, and Shestov always put this issue in these terms: as a criticism of the philosophy of knowledge and an opening towards a new level (or source) of metaphysics' (p. 231). Thus, while tracing Shestov's investigations of a wide variety of thinkers and their respective philosophies, Oppo never loses sight of Shestov's greatest concern and preoccupation: the theory of knowledge, which, Oppo argues, became the basis of Shestov's 'tragedy' — 'Shestov's tragedy is essentially a "gnoseological tragedy," in that it challenges the theory of knowledge' (p. 236). At the same time, Oppo views Shestov's philosophy of tragedy as firmly rooted in the Russian philosophical tradition in which personalities prevail over systems or abstract ideas (or, rather, are inseparable from them), and where the existential and metaphysical element is primary.

This leads to a masterly consideration of Shestov's legacy in its hidden meanings and insights which circumvents the standard accusations of the thinker in monological discourse, *idée fixe* and 'hogging the covers' (i.e. assigning his own ideas to others). Oppo treats Shestov's legacy, intrinsically steeped in paradox, simultaneously with personal passion and respect, as well as philosophical ease and fluency.

In summary, this is a fresh, well written and thoroughly researched study, full of original insights, that offers a comprehensive and holistic picture of Shestov's philosophical heritage. It both does justice to Shestov's thought in historical perspective, and convincingly highlights its contemporary relevance.

School of Humanities, Language and Global Studies O. Tabachnikova
University of Central Lancashire

McAteer, Cathy. *Translating Great Russian Literature: The Penguin Russian Classics*. BASEES/ Routledge Series on Russian and East European Studies, 140. Routledge, London and New York, 2021. xxx + 166 pp. Illustrations. Notes. References. Appendices. Index. £120.00; open access e-book.

The early history of the British reception of Russian literature is well known. Following the sporadic appearance of translations in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the Crimean War generated more sustained interest, and by the end of the century, publishers had recognized there was a definite market for Russian literature. Some developed close partnerships with particular translators. Heinemann's collaboration with Constance Garnett from 1892 to 1920 is justly renowned for bringing the work of Turgenev, Dostoevskii and Chekhov into the British canon of foreign literature, though Vizetelly's earlier publication of Frederick Whishaw's translations and Constable's and Oxford University Press's associations with Stephen Graham and Aylmer and Louise Maude respectively, were also important. Graham edited 'Constable's Russian Library', for example, one of several series of Russian writing in English that appeared during the First World War, as publishers capitalized on the wartime alliance with Russia.

In *Translating Great Russian Literature*, Cathy McAteer examines Russian literature's place in a later, more familiar series, probably in fact the best-known book series in British publishing: Penguin Classics. As Constable, Hodder and Stoughton, and Maunsel had responded to a market for Russian literature created by the First World War, so during the Second World War, Penguin began to investigate a market that had become more sympathetic to the Soviet Union. In their main list, they published books on recent Soviet history, politics and society, and in 1945 the company founded the *Penguin Russian Review* 'to contribute to the initiation of the stranger to Russia into the spirit of the Russian people as it is embodied in their history and literature, their arts and sciences, their philosophy, their aspiration, and their economic life'. 'No other post-war nation qualified for similar *Penguin Review* treatment', McAteer notes (p. 3). But the *Review* cost more to produce than it earned and