Winter 2005

Walking Streets, Talking History: The Making of Odessa

Tanya Richardson
Wilfrid Laurier University, trichardson@wlu.ca

WALKING STREETS, TALKING HISTORY: THE MAKING OF ODESSA

Tanya Richardson
Max Planck Institute for
Social Anthropology

Through walking streets and talking history, the members of the My Odessa club sense their city as place. History is encountered in buildings, ruins, monuments, and stories as both a diffuse feeling and a dialogic process. The walkers' practice of exploring nooks and crannies of the city and speaking with local residents is informed by a "large family" form of sociality, and a notion of Odessa as court-yard where space is conceived as communal. In walking the city, participants subvert and recreate aspects of Soviet and post-Soviet urban space and generate a sense of their city as distinct from a national space. (Space and place, sensing history, postsocialist transformation)

Every Sunday in the southern Ukrainian port city of Odessa, between 20 and 30 residents, mainly elderly, gather on a street in "old Odessa,"[1] the area built prior to the October Revolution of 1917. With their guide, Valerii Netrebskii, they ramble for two or three hours down a chosen street, stopping frequently to be transported to past epochs by Valerii's layered account of the history of a particular building, empty lot, or courtyard. They discover hidden parts of streets, such as an overgrown block of Champagne Lane. They enter courtyards and speak with residents, as on Cable Street where walkers, some of them Jews, debated with a Jewish resident the pros and cons of emigrating. They ponder the connection of certain places with well-known landmarks, as when Valerii explained how the fish fountains on the Pushkin Monument were made in the Jewish Labor Association's technical college on the corner of Bazaar and Cable Streets. They use motifs from Odessan authors' works in describing their environment, as Inna did in noting how a new metal balcony reminded her of Bezenchyk's coffin in the novel *Twelve Chairs*. Walkers express wonder when discovering new places, outrage at the poor upkeep of architectural landmarks, irritation when previously accessible buildings are fenced off, and amusement at participants' jokes and interjections.

The walks of the My Odessa club, which I joined from August to November 2002, are about sensing Odessa as place.[2] Sensing Odessa as place as these walkers do is intricately related to sensing history and the experience of sociability. Although the group is relatively small and not overtly political, in that it does not lobby the local administration, through these walks a sense of the urban landscape is transmitted in which Odessa is conceived as Russian, cosmopolitan, cultured, distinct from Ukraine, and more connected with Russia and the outside world. The group's practices are influenced not only by Soviet Odessan concepts of urban space and the formation of a post-Soviet public sphere in which informal groups can organize, but also by the prerevolutionary architecture and geography of the city.

Odessa was founded in 1794 by Catherine II to stabilize, settle, and develop trade in the lands north of the Black Sea that the Russian Empire had acquired

ETHNOLOGY vol. 44 no. 1, Winter 2005, pp 13-33.
ETHNOLOGY, c/o Department of Anthropology, The University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh PA 15260 USA

from the Ottoman Empire (Herlihy 1986). The city was established a few decades after the remaining vestiges of autonomous Ukrainian political formations east of the Dnipro River had been dismantled; indeed, Ukraine did not attain full political sovereignty until 1991, with the exception of brief periods in 1918-1919. Throughout the nineteenth century, Odessa was one of the most rapidly developing cities in Europe, and by the mid-1800s was the third-most prominent city in the Russian Empire in size, economy, and cultural importance. Inhabited by Greeks, Italians, French, Poles, Jews, Bulgarians, Germans, Moldovans, Russians, and Ukrainians, among others, the city was cosmopolitan from the outset. It emerged from Catherine's policy of attracting foreign merchants, administrators, and colonists from western Europe and the Ottoman Empire to develop Novorossia (New Russia). By the early twentieth century the city was linguistically and culturally more Russian than a century previously. A large Jewish community made up at least a third of its population. With the outbreak of World War I, the city was hard hit by the dislocation of industry and the decline of the Black Sea trade. By 1923, it had lost nearly half its population due to external and internal migration (Guthier 1981:175).

After its incorporation into Soviet Ukraine, Odessa was eclipsed economically, politically, and culturally by other cities, even though it remained an important port in the Soviet Union and home to a shipping fleet. During the Second World War, Odessa was occupied by the Romanians from October 1941 until April 1944. Although the Romanian administration was less brutal than the German administration in other Ukrainian territories, it was nonetheless responsible for the murder of approximately 200,000 Jews in Transnistria (Dallin 1998; Ofer 1993). Today, Odessa has about one million residents, of which approximately 60 per cent are ethnic Ukrainians, 30 per cent are Russians, and the rest comprise Jews, Poles, Bulgarians, Greeks, Vietnamese, Chinese, Koreans, and others. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, Odessans have been subject to the state's Ukrainization policies, which have been pursued in the areas of language and culture and attempts to imprint a Ukrainian understanding of history on urban landscapes (Wanner 1998). Local cultural and political actors have countered Ukrainization by drawing on the Odessan Myth to elaborate an ideology of distinctiveness that asserts that Odessa is "not Ukrainian" but rather connected with Russia and elsewhere beyond the nation. Previously hidden histories of certain ethnic groups such as Jews and Greeks are being revived and reconnected to the city.

Place is "experienced most robustly" when it becomes an object of reflection and awareness (Basso 1996:54). In phenomenological terms, places as centers of activity, human significance, and emotional attachment are considered ontologically prior to space (Casey 1996). Anthropological studies of place are often situated in small communities (Feld and Basso 1996; Stewart 1996; Mueggler 2001), perhaps because the practices and understandings of place are more easily captured when considered on this scale. It may therefore seem surprising to claim that Odessans sense their city as a whole place, given its size, complexity, differing urban milieux, and the association of "wholeness" with the vision of planners. Like London's enthusiasts (Reed 2001), when My Odessa members walk Odessa's streets, they sense and make their city as place. How the cityscape

unfolds for the walkers, enabling them to sense Odessa as place may be understood, following Hirsch (1995:4), by viewing the landscape as a cultural process created through the articulation of movements between poles of foreground and background, place and space, inside and outside, and image and representation. However, in contrast to Londoners who walk the city alone, the Odessans enjoy walking as a group, listening to Valerii's accounts, sharing stories with each other, and interacting with local residents. Thus, this article illustrates how sociability and dialogue are central to experiencing and making place similar to, but distinct from, the tourists described by Harrison (2003).

The club's practice of sensing place is inextricable from a process of sensing history. Anthropologists have explored how narratives of memory and history relate to the formation of identities. See, for example, Ballinger (2003) on the exiled Istrian Italians, and Brown (2003) for Krusevo residents in Macedonia. Yoneyama (1999) unraveled the politics of historical knowledge about Hiroshima in urban planning debates and survivors' testimonies. Cole (2001) focused on the absence of talk about colonialism among the Betsimisaraka of Madagascar, and Heatherington (1999) addressed the way elderly women and young men laid claims to spaces and history through cultural tactics appealing to the senses in Orgosolo, Sardinia. Other anthropologists have turned their attention to the way people sense history, pasts they have not themselves experienced, through dreams (Stewart 2003), and spirit possession (Lambek 2002). In a similar vein, walking is a means of sensing history. During walks, history is encountered in buildings, objects, ruins, monuments, stories, or other traces of the past in the urban landscape. At these moments, history is a diffuse feeling that may evoke or mingle with memories rather than the fixed form of a narrative. It is also a dialogic process in which, during discussions, the past is experienced as concrete and intangible, known and unknown.

Some anthropologists have related movement and the creation of spaces, places, and landscapes (Meyers 1991; Munn 1990; Pandya 1990), but a discussion of the meanings and forms of movements that make place is often only implicit (e.g., Reed 2002). However, Mueggler (2001) has analyzed walking in the context of ritual practice among the Zhizou, while Stewart (1996) has described Appalachians' encounter with history through roaming the hills. The experience of the city as place can occur through movement, for to walk is to "lack a place" (de Certeau 1988:103), meaning a point in a grid, rather than the existential, meaningful experience Casey (1996) describes, while space is "practical place" (de Certeau 1988:117). Although de Certeau and Casey appear to have contradictory understandings of place and space, they actually point to different aspects of the experience of place: it can be located and created through movement; it can be existential and social.

Walking as a place-making practice in Odessa raises the issue of emergent social forms in the postsocialist context. Analytical insights for this context are suggested by Mbembe's (2001) reflections on the African postcolony. He writes that positing a "before" and "after" colonialism fails to take into account that "every age is a combination of several temporalities," that "every age has contradictory significations to different actors," and that the present "is not a series but an interlocking of presents, pasts and futures that retain their depths of

other presents, pasts and futures, each age bearing, altering and maintaining the previous ones" (Mbembe 2001:15-16). Mbembe's observations can be used to illuminate how different temporalities and historicities are present in and constitute walking as a place-making practice in Odessa. This article examines the spatial concepts underlying walking, and the ways history is implicitly and explicitly entangled with the making of Odessa as place.

THE MY ODESSA CLUB

The My Odessa club was formed in 1995 by residents who participated in a local television program called "Where's That Street, Where's That Building?" This program was sponsored by a successful local real estate firm and aired at the time of the celebrations of Odessa's 200th anniversary in 1994. After seeing the shows, the head of the Association of Youth Clubs invited Valerii Netrebskii, the winner of the final game, to form a club under this umbrella organization. At first the club met on the premises offered by the association in a basement on Pushkin Street. Then, after a conflict between the head of the association and Valerii, and because individuals expressed interest in walking the streets, the group began to meet outside on Sundays. During the walks, Valerii does most of the talking and presents research published in newspapers or in the form of handwritten notes copied from documents.

The participants come from a variety of backgrounds. Most, though not all, were born and have roots in Odessa. They include engineers, lawyers, artists, architects, the head of the Memorial Society,[3] tour guides, and occasionally a student, professions that are considered to make up the intelligentsia. Some have been interested in Odessa's history all their lives, whereas others developed an interest in it later in life. Although individuals in their twenties or thirties occasionally joined the group, most participants were between the ages of 50 and 80. They have walked the entire prerevolutionary part of Odessa several times. Some individuals have participated since the group was formed. Others stopped attending regularly while new people joined. Dubbed the *gorodskie sumashedshie* (the city's crazy people), they appropriated this name for themselves. Valerii explained:

> Some of my friends say, "We've known that you're not normal for a long time. But what's with this group of idiots that crawls around the streets with you? O.K., we understand if you sit in the basement at that club and tell them something interesting about a street, but to walk around in the winter, in the rain?" So it indicates one more time that there are always different kinds of people.

Valerii is a professional tour guide. Born in 1946 in Odessa of a Jewish mother and Russian father, he studied history, graduated from Odessa State University, and has worked in the state tour bureau in Odessa since 1968. He has had an interest in *"Odessika"* (history, literature, art, and lore about Odessa) since he was a child, an interest that allegedly began with stories about World War II, although his family did not talk much about the city's history. Valerii explained:

In those years [the early 1950s] there was no local history (*kraievidcheskaia*) literature. I still have an old map my aunt gave me. The maps in the Soviet Union were awful right up until it broke up. They were maps in name only. They were afraid of revealing information to foreign spies. So there were these rudimentary outlines which didn't match the reality, like whether there was a turn or a parallel street. It was absurd. But at first we didn't have even those kinds of maps. . . . So my friend Slava and I would pretend we were going to school so our parents wouldn't suspect and instead we went somewhere like Zhivakhov's Hill. . . . We didn't rest until we had walked through [all the streets on the old map].

Besides the old map, the family's prerevolutionary guidebook provided inspiration. Later, Valerii obtained a copy of Aleksander De Ribas's well-known book *Old Odessa* (1913), and read works about Khadzhibei and those of Soviet Odessan writers when they were republished in the late 1950s. Since the early 1990s, Valerii has written articles for local newspapers about Odessa's history. A small local publisher began reproducing his articles in 2001 in a series of tiny books about Odessa's streets called *Walks in Old Odessa*. Valerii's story also illustrates the effects unique objects and texts can have in transmitting the past. Objects seem to have a kind of agency in that they pique interest and act as clues to pursue knowledge of the past by different means (Gell 1998).

The club's name, My Odessa (also the name of a song), reifies the city as an entity to be walked. The possessive "my" implies ownership and at the same time suggests the existence of multiple Odessas, as if each participant has his or her own city. Yet the existence of a dominant narrator also suggests an effort to persuade or create a common sense of Odessa.

WALKING THE STREETS OF OLD ODESSA

The introduction to *Walks in Old Odessa* describes the club's excursions:

Every Sunday for six years regardless of the weather, a tall, heavyset man arrives at 9 a.m. at a previously agreed place. Between twenty and thirty people await him. He greets them and invites them to follow behind him.

They walk along the street (agreed upon in advance), enter the courtyards, the entrances to the buildings, cross from one side of the street to the other, the person leading them in front all the while speaking continuously in a booming voice so that everyone can hear. They stop, people ask questions and then they go further, this lasting more than two hours.

At first glance it may seem that there is nothing special here–an ordinary excursion in the city. But when they stop at a building, his speech unfolds in such an interesting manner that it seems the shadows of those who once lived, walked and suffered here are also present and listen to the story about themselves. Names, surnames, forgotten place names are cited–and the listeners are involuntarily immersed in a world long gone. Like the stalker in Tarkovskii's film, the storyteller leads those who have gathered into the "room of happiness" where he is forbidden to go alone. A spell of beauty is attendant throughout the walk, yes, a walk, and not excursion. . . . Once everything has been said about a particular building, everyone walks further so that at the next stop once again they become immersed in the world of the past. When the excursion has finished people leave carrying this beautiful, possibly rainy, snowy or unbearably hot and humid Sunday morning in their consciousness. The storyteller receives no honorarium–this happens thanks to his enthusiasm. He leaves, but the buzz of conversation continues as people retell the stories and add pieces that have been missed.

Some prosaic details can be added to this lyrical description of a walk. At the beginning, Valerii usually provides a thumbnail sketch of the kind of district in

which the street was located–an elite dacha district, a merchant's district, an aristocratic district, a red-light district–and how it transformed. He reads out the different names the street possessed. Sometimes he shows copies of maps from different periods as well as his own hand-drawn maps of particular streets listing the names of building owners. Often, he reads from a prerevolutionary guidebook or a newly written history and refers to literary texts, films, or conversations with residents concerning a particular place. He almost always reads excerpts from his own articles. Valerii frequently intersperses his accounts of the past with stories about how, through his ingenuity, good fortune, or personal networks, he acquired documents, maps, or clues leading to the resolution of a particular puzzle before other historians were able to do so.

Valerii's accounts feature stories about famous writers, actors, artists, musicians, political activists, and prominent individuals in the city's history. These included Eduard Bagritskii's flat at 3 Bogdanov Street, where Odessan writers such as Isaak Babel and Iurii Olesha would have cavorted until late, often disturbing the neighbors. However, besides highlighting remarkable places and people with illustrious pasts, he also points out ordinary places, such as the location of perfume and cable factories or where bakeries and wine cellars operated. Sometimes, in front of a particular building, Valerii merely recites the names of the various owners, knowing little about their fate. Since many of these names are Jewish or Russified Jewish names, participants (many of whom are Jewish or have Jewish relatives by blood or marriage, such as Aleksandra and Inna) noted with some pride how Jewish the city once was.

Between stories, Valerii or a participant often underscores how a particular feature in the city illustrated the uniqueness of Odessa and its superiority over Kyiv, St. Petersburg, and Moscow. Exalting the high culture of the city in the past, Valerii often lamented the current state of affairs, the loss of the intelligentsia, and the incursion of "uncultured" villagers into the city. In this way, conversations about the present and evocation of the past perpetuate features of a local ideology about the distinctiveness of Odessa. For participants, the Odessa of the past, which was more cultured, cosmopolitan, and pre-eminent, is more authentic than the Odessa of the present, a place eroded by villagers and unfavorable state policies.

When Valerii stopped to talk about a particular place, many participants listened attentively, scribbled notes, and took pictures. Some preferred their own conversations, although often they were asked to be quiet by those who wanted to listen. Several people told me to take Valerii's sometimes sweeping generalizations with a grain of salt. Once when I was scribbling down an inflammatory remark about villagers, a few people looked at me and said, "Don't take him too seriously." Individuals thus accepted Valerii's version of the past and present to differing degrees.

Odessans are reputed to appreciate eccentricity and flamboyance, qualities Valerii exhibits. Indeed, many participants said they enjoyed listening to and conversing with Valerii because of his characteristically Odessan behavior and speech, and not just to learn about history. The walkers often would erupt into laughter at a story, joke, or comment Valerii or some other participant shared. Once as we walked along Ravine Street, Valerii paused to tell us a story about

writing two articles. "I have this article [about Dalnitskaia Street] where I describe how I spoke with this old Odessan woman. This old woman told me about her neighbor: `In the morning she read your article with her own surname in it, and then in the evening she died!'" The group burst into laughter. "And there's a sequel to it. I was writing an article about Middle Street. I was on the corner there. This *very* old man was walking by. I started talking with him and it turned out he was a well-known lathe operator, a former member of the Oblast Committee of the Communist Party. His surname was Jewish, by the way. An interesting one, too. Pasternakevich." Again, peals of laughter rose from the group. "So I strolled for a while with this Pasternakevich. Finally, some months later my article came out. It turns out that our Natasha is the niece of this Pasternakevich. She told us that he read my article about Middle Street in the morning with his name in it, and then died in the evening!" The walkers gasped with a mixture of horror and amusement. "And so we shouldn't read your articles in the morning!" This vignette illustrates Valerii's proclivity for telling stories and his central role in animating the group. It also illuminates the intricate ways in which he interacts with the urban landscape and its residents. He approaches local residents and gathers stories from them, which he then uses in his articles.

In the walking practice of the club there is continuity with, and elaboration on, practices that existed under socialism. Despite the fact that during the Soviet period Odessa, according to Literature Museum researcher Anna Misiuk, was a kind of "repressed city"[4] with respect to the production of historical knowledge, information about the past percolated through various texts, objects, and stories. In the postwar period, an old map or guidebook, casually passed on, piqued interest and inspired young people to walk the streets and gain a familiarity with place that official representations attempted to conceal. This created a practice that made the city into an object known differently from the pre-World War II and prerevolutionary periods. However, although individuals could wander and explore streets prior to the collapse of the Soviet Union, or join an official tour, an informal group like the My Odessa club could not have existed. The formation of such a group became possible only after 1991.

The walks resemble neither the everyday, embedded, unreflexive practices that de Certeau (1988) theorized nor the self-conscious but aimless rambling of Baudelaire's *flaneur* that Walter Benjamin examined (see Gilloch 1996:151-57). In contrast to the *flaneur* who wanders the city alone, aloof, without any particular objective, to enjoy the shocks and stimulation of the crowds, noises, and sites, these Odessans not only walk as a group and actively communicate with residents, but also deliberately choose a street which they walk systematically. The My Odessa club's walks also differ from the Russian variant of *gulianie*, in which friends walk the city for pleasure or leisure without a particular aim or destination. Although somewhat akin to Lemon's (2000) discussion of commentaries about social change on the Moscow Metro, the Odessan walkers may be distinguished by the regular, planned, ritualistic quality of their walks, and their deliberate focus on history. Moreover, as the publisher of Valerii's book asserted, walks were not formal tours. A tour weaves together stories of disparate, usually visible, "extraordinary" sites (Rojek 1997:52) into a formalized, repeatable, coherent narrative. A tour compresses time and space to convey a sense of place aimed

mainly at neophytes and outsiders whom a guide encounters often for the first time. In contrast, the Odessan walks are directed at insiders who possess knowledge of Odessa and who meet regularly, and involve a relatively systematic movement through the streets to encounter different epochs present at particular places. In other words, to tour, *se flaner* or *guliat*, and to walk as this group does, form different chronotopes where time and space are compressed differently (Bakhtin 1981).

MAPPING HISTORY, MAKING PLACE

During the walks, the club participants encounter places in the city they would not normally visit because they are out of the way, invisible, appear uninteresting, or are dilapidated areas that otherwise remain hidden from them. In listening to and telling stories about buildings, their occupants, events, and the transformation of the site, participants sense places in the city. Even if one does not remember all the details of the account, the memory of places on a street remains. In walking more and more streets, participants' knowledge of places expands, which contributes to the sense of Odessa as a distinct and special place in a new national space, albeit meaningless for many.

The group's practices are like some aspects of Benjamin's (1979) engagement with the city. Like Benjamin, the Odessa walkers interpret the cityscape through traces, objects, and ruins that remain from previous epochs. In walking and talking about the past, they evoke, imagine, and reassemble it, which enables them to sense history. The experience of sensing history is shared (as participants hear the same stories and see the same places) and personal (as memories of individuals' own experiences mingle with what they hear and see). The difference with Benjamin is that the members' stories and practices lack the critique of modernity and historicism that Benjamin (1968) elaborates. Furthermore, in contrast to Benjamin's search for a future-oriented, redemptive history, the group's critique of the present is largely based in nostalgia for past epochs.

While on the one hand the group is engaged in sensing the city through interpreting various traces of the past, on the other it is mapping history (Boyarin 1994). Boyarin (1994) employs the idiom of mapping history to imply a Cartesian notion of abstract space when discussing how states map history onto territory. Mapping history can be nuanced with Gell's (1985) understanding that people everywhere have both abstract and embodied ways of understanding space (Gell 1985). Thus, mapping history through traversing a street and locating all known places and their histories bears similarities to the creation of a map of abstract space. However, since Valerii's maps do not always match the terrain, participants move through the city partly by feel as well, as the following account illustrates.

One late summer day, the group explored Pioneer Street. It received this name after the revolution when an orphanage was set up where the Pioneers, the state-run children's organization, ran camps. Part of the street was formally called Charlatan Lane, a name it allegedly acquired because it was originally a poor district where prostitutes and stevedores lived. The other part was called Lazar Lane, after the person who owned the land, although some maps designate the whole lane Charlatan. The street is close to the edge of the prerevolutionary

boundary of the city, and most of the buildings in the area were constructed after World War II. The group discussed a new church under construction on the corner in honor of the daughter of the Head of the Law Academy. Valerii led the group behind a building on the opposite side and pointed to a car park where once was the residence of Boris Lesanevich, a mountain climber whose ancestor helped storm Khadzhibei with Russian troops, and who spent many years in Nepal, where he died. Walking back to Pioneer Street, Inna, an artist, stopped to point out the location of artists' studios where, in the 1970s, posters were painted for the October Revolution and Victory Day holidays. She explained, "I always chose to paint Lenin so I could avoid painting all the medals on our other leaders." Responding to Inna's description of her paintings of Lenin, Valerii said, "It sounds as if you painted Lenin during his Switzerland period, not during the October Revolution!"

Back on Pioneer Street, Valerii spoke about the First Comintern Children's Village on the other side of the street, which functioned from 1922 until the outbreak of World War II. It was the largest orphanage in the Soviet Union, with some 40 buildings that housed children of different nationalities. He noted, "In those days, though, it was easier to set up such a place and work with children because many of them were cultured, educated, and from good families. Today's homeless children are degenerates!" Only a few buildings of the orphanage remained intact, some of which had been occupied by a school. Some of the orphanage's buildings were knocked down when the building occupied by the Law Academy was constructed. Behind the Law Academy, down the cracked and overgrown remains of Maple Street, Valerii pointed out one remaining residence from the Children's Village. After lingering, the walkers crossed the street to sit in a shaded area next to a single-family home built in 1913. Valerii transported the participants to the end of World War II, as he read a letter written by the owner of the house describing the retreat of the Romanians and Germans.

As this cursory description shows, Valerii escorts his audience from epoch to epoch, from the present, to the early twentieth century, to the 1920s, to the Romanian occupation, as he leads from place to place. Although the walk, as a type of chronotope, fuses time and space, during these walks space rather than time is the organizing principle. At the same time, the walk along Pioneer Street illustrates a complex spatio-temporal process of making the cityscape: the juxtaposition of encounters with new places (such as the church), ruins (Maple Street, no longer in use), traces of the past (a remaining building of the Children's Village), and memories of the more recent use of buildings (such as Inna's account of painting posters for Soviet holidays).

Valerii also created places out of absences, as with the Ravine Street area. Along this "ditch," as locals called it, Ukrainians and Moldovans had settled and cultivated vineyards prior to the founding of Odessa. Prerevolutionary maps recorded ponds and a river. In Odessa's early days, this ravine was called Cossack's Ravine after the Cossack settlements nearby. Valerii shifted to the more recent past in recalling that there had been a Roma settlement on the other side of the street that had been cleared away in the 1960s. Walking further, and in anticipation of Duke Park ahead, Igor recalled the long queues for an exhibition in 1970 about tourism in the United States. The year 1970 provoked Aleksandra's

and others' reminiscences of about the cholera epidemic and quarantine that year: "I remember not being able to take my vacation. The trains weren't running at all."

Then Valerii took a path between a 1970s-style multistoried administrative building and a studio for making molds for plaques and sculptures to show the one remaining building from the "sailor's village," settled a few years after the founding of Odessa. Painted pink, it was being maintained. Although walkers were elated to see this remnant from Odessa's early history, they were disappointed when the resident knew nothing about the building. Although some members had heard of this place, for others it was a revelation. Later in the walk, Valerii pointed out the alleged birthplace of Soviet Jewish writer Isaak Babel (the original building is no longer there), mentioned the controversies about whether he was born in Odessa or Mykolaiv, and headed for the site of the oldest synagogue in Odessa. In this way, buildings that seemed insignificant or remained hidden from view were incorporated into an understanding of Odessa.

Ordinary buildings emerged as noteworthy through Valerii's revelations and recollections. Upon entering a small courtyard with a gallery on Cable Street, Valerii asked if anyone recognized it. The walkers looked around, puzzled, searching unsuccessfully for some clue. He explained that this was the courtyard where the Soviet film, *The Heroic Deed of Odessa,* was shot, a film about the defense of Odessa in 1941 that all of them had seen. "How surprising! I never would have recognized it!" one woman exclaimed. Others shared her surprise. Another woman noted, "I've walked by this place so many times, but I never would have thought this had some special significance." The face of an eminent local Pushkin scholar lit up with recognition. The walkers around her listened as she recollected: "During the Romanian occupation, my parents brought me here occasionally. We came to see some friends here who helped us out with food and medicine."

These descriptions of walks illustrate various facets of the urban landscape as process and its creation as place for the participants. During these walks, histories and places were encountered, sensed, and mapped. Participants sometimes took interested friends or relatives to a "hidden" place. Spaces became places, past epochs came to life, absences became presences as streets frequently or infrequently walked were incorporated into a sense of the city as place. Significantly, it is the prerevolutionary part of Odessa that is mapped and made meaningful. Like the London enthusiasts, these Odessans did not visit the suburbs, as they did not consider them part of the "real Odessa," a view that resonates with perceptions of Milton Keynes as a bland city with no history and little sense of place (Finnegan 1998). According to these Odessans, there is "no history" connected with the new districts except for the construction of the suburb on top of a pre-existing village.

These walks illustrate Mbembe's (2001) point about how different temporalities coexist in a place-making practice. The city of the prerevolutionary period is made present through a focus on what remains from this period. At the same time, the group moves back and forth across time imaginatively from the late eighteenth century to the present. De Certeau's (1988:108) observation that "places are fragmentary and inward turning histories . . . accumulated times that can be unfolded but like stories held in reserve, remaining in an enigmatic state" captures

the essence of walkers' practices and gives flesh to Mbembe's observations about the present as a composite of different temporalities and historicities.

Disputing History

Although it may appear that people commune with unproblematic pasts, presented mainly by one person, history was not infrequently disputed. Sometimes this concerned factual issues, such as who may have lived in a building, when, and what it was used for. Other times a dispute was more acute and concerned the interpretation of major historical events. At such times, history became a dialogic process where meanings were open and gaps in knowledge tangible. Yet the idea of Odessa was capable of encompassing the fragments, disputes, and gaps.

Valerii and Iurii had ongoing, sometimes sharp exchanges about evaluating the Romanian administration of Odessa during World War II. Iurii had lived through the occupation as a teenager, and with his brother and mother had escaped arrest by the Romanian police and the German SS several times. Despite hardship, Iurii insisted that life under the Romanian administration had been much better than in the Soviet Union and was unrelenting in his criticism of the Soviet system and leaders, particularly Stalin. Valerii, who was born after the war and whose father fought in the Soviet Army, refused to acknowledge Iurii's position.

Iurii talked about his experiences during a walk on Koblevskaia Street near the New Market. At the end of the Defense of Odessa in October 1941, when Soviet troops were withdrawing, he heard explosions and came to see what happened. People staggered out of the market wounded, while others lay dead on the street. A woman yelled, "It was our planes that bombed us!" He used this story to illustrate the insidious nature of the Soviet administration and to inject ambiguity into the heroic Soviet narratives of war that still have widespread currency in Odessa.

Another episode illustrates contested views about the interpretation of the events of World War II. One Sunday, the group was near the New Market where the bombing Iurii described had occurred. In a spacious courtyard, Valerii explained that before it was bombed, it had a garden, four buildings, and a theater. He had found this out from the daughter of one of the servants who had lived in a small shed in the back of the courtyard. Iurii came in and said, "We've just met a woman who witnessed how the Soviets bombed this street when they retreated." Valerii turned away, clearly not interested. Cutting Iurii off, he derided live witnesses, saying that they could not be relied on to give accurate accounts. Iurii muttered to himself, "This is really crazy. Somehow, he just can't understand." Later in the walk, Iurii said that he was not surprised by Valerii's reaction, since he was aware of his general position. Yet he was taken aback at Valerii's categorical refusal to pay attention to this particular incident and to an eyewitness. He planned to go and record this woman's testimony together with a member of the Memorial Society.

Iurii is Jewish, but many people who are not and who themselves or whose relatives lived through the occupation. They declare that life was better under the Romanians. Others hold to the Soviet interpretation of events which vilifies all occupiers. Valerii, born after the war, categorically rejected Iurii's experiences and

oral testimony on the basis that it contradicted his own understanding. Yet, curiously, a connection to place, to Odessa, holds people together despite possessing widely different views of critical events.

Whereas sometimes disputes emerged over the interpretation of large-scale events, at other times the walking group served as a forum to discuss and debate the merits of other recently published articles or books about the history of Odessa. Valerii often challenged the accounts of other local historians. For example, on Ravine Street, he contested the date for the founding of the oldest synagogue in Odessa which a local historian cited in a new book about the district of Moldovanka. At the original Ravine Street, which few people knew, the group entered a courtyard with crumbling buildings in search of the site of the synagogue and was greeted with hostile barks from a pack of stray dogs. Valerii described his encounter in the early 1990s with an old woman who lived in the courtyard, and then read the entry from the Odessa Cicerone, a prerevolutionary guidebook, which cited the founding date as 1792, while the new book gave the date as 1797. He then argued that this author had likely cited the late 1790s as the date because an earlier one did not fit the book's argument that Moldovanka was founded after Odessa, a position he also challenged. After some participants expressed disbelief, Valerii read from his own article:

> I wanted to tell you how I described this: "The Odessa Cicerone says that the Ravine Synagogue is located at 133 Ravine Street and is the oldest in Odessa, built in 1792. I spoke with some old residents of Ravine Street and searched for the place where this oldest place of worship in Odessa was located. I found that it was located in the block between Razumovskaia and Sredniaia Streets. It probably stood deep in the courtyard. It was dissembled stone by stone during the Romanian occupation. Evidently, it was on Ravine Street that some of the first Jews of Odessa lived before the founding of the city. . . ." Now I'll read you what [the author] wrote: "The place of worship known as the Moldovanka community synagogue located on 133 Ravine Street was built at the end of the 1790s." For the sake of those who don't believe me let's look at her reference for this: footnote #17. "See Odessa Cicerone 1914, p. 17." Here the date 1797 is cited. What do you call this?

The discussion continued with some people from the group playing devil's advocate. Most people had seen or read the book about Moldovanka and many had enjoyed it. Valerii continued to criticize the book and claimed that the author, like most Odessans, was unable to find the site, not knowing that the original Ravine Street was a small side road rather than the main road currently in use.

Valerii explained the difficulties in locating buildings and properly identifying institutions that had been housed there. Sometimes the numbering on streets had been reversed. Sometimes the buildings had been destroyed and the street renumbered, which misleads researchers. Other times, institutions or organizations had relocated several times. He mentioned a recent case in which some historians wanted to mount a plaque on a building to commemorate the college where Leonid Utesov, the Odessan jazz musician, and Sergei Utochkin, an early Russian aviator, allegedly studied. Valerii said that the college had changed location several times, so it was not clear whether these men had studied in that very building.

Engagements of this sort with other historians' work confront participants with the slippery nature of the past and the difficulties in fixing dates and

connecting institutions with certain buildings. Like the disputes over interpretation of the Romanian administration, discussions about the merits of historians' work create another layer of meaning in these Odessans' understanding of place.

Odessa as Courtyard

On practically every walk the participants had discussions with residents about certain buildings and the people who once lived there. Sometimes they knocked on doors. Other times they struck up a conversation with someone in a courtyard. Thirty people could walk boldly, uninvited, into a tiny courtyard, the entrance to a building, chattering away, while Valerii boomed out his story. They were usually warmly received, but sometimes residents viewed them with suspicion and, on the rare occasion, hostility. The only hindrances were locked gates, vicious dogs, and hostile residents. These practices reveal additional dimensions of history's dialogic and dispersed qualities and its social life beyond narratives embodied in written texts. They also reveal an implicit understanding of the relationship between public and private spaces underlying the group's movements through the city, as the following anecdotes illustrate.

One hot, sunny day in July, on the lower end of Belinskaia Street, the group walked toward the sea in search of Wagner Lane through the shaded grounds of the old evangelical hospital, now a tuberculosis clinic. Wagner Lane was located at the end of French Boulevard close to Shevchenko Park, where in prerevolutionary times the wealthy built their dachas. Using Valerii's copies of old maps and hand-drawn street outlines, the group located the lane only to hear Valerii explain that in fact there appeared to have been two such lanes. The group set off in search of the second lane, now called Pleasant Street. After entering the courtyard where the NKVD chief of Odessa had lived, Valerii read from his article about flat number two, where Aleksandra Kollontai, a prominent Bolshevik feminist, and her second husband had lived.

Then he turned and addressed a man in his forties who was cleaning a car in the yard. After being told that they were a group of local historians interested in the first residents of the building, the man explained that his wife's mother was the great granddaughter of Kollontai. A few members of the group crowded around, telephone numbers were exchanged, and some members agreed to talk to the woman at a later date. Just as the group was preparing to leave, another woman emerged from the building at the back of the courtyard. On learning who the interlopers were, the woman said that her husband was the grandson of Kiriak Kostandi (1852-1921), a well-known impressionist painter from Odessa who had painted the city and its environs and taught at the Odessa Art College. She informed them that a book of recollections about him would soon be published, and once again numbers were exchanged. Further down this street, the group entered an open gate and approached the side entrance of a house that was once the dacha of a wealthy family. The walkers had come to see the open staircase with murals on the walls. In small groups the participants ascended the narrow staircase to have a closer look. Some residents gave the strange interlopers inquisitive looks, but no objections were raised.

Sometimes the members or Valerii would knock on doors of people they had spoken to previously. Once, at the bottom of French Boulevard, Valerii yelled through the open window of an elegant, two-story, single-family dwelling and asked for Irina. The group was afraid to enter the yard because a vicious dog growled at them from the other side of the fence. Irina came out and was happy to see the group, some members of which she evidently knew. The participants began to talk about the house and the family that had lived there when it was first built. Valerii told the woman a few things he had uncovered and included in an article: there had been four children in the Sotianov family; the Soviet Odessan writer Evgenii Petrov had been friends with one of the sons, Ivan, who later became a victim of the repressions for serving as a naval officer in Tsarist Russia; and one of the daughters had been the first love of Valentin Kataev, another Soviet Odessan writer. In this exchange, group participants expanded the local resident's knowledge of the history of the building.

Residents also viewed members of My Odessa with amusement and suspicion. Sometimes passersby were surprised that people would take such an avid interest in buildings and places that seemed ordinary and insignificant. Sometimes residents would anxiously try to discern if the group were inspectors from the Gas Bureau intending to shut off their supply, or from the Architecture Bureau to inform them that their building would be knocked down. Most residents were welcoming, but not all. One woman angrily shouted at the group to leave her courtyard and threatened to call the militia. A member retorted, "You must be from Slobodka![5] Have you paid for your gas? Bugger off!"

The processes of exchanging knowledge while walking into private spaces are likely related to a conception of the Odessan landscape as a communal space accessible to all Odessans to be viewed and enjoyed. This understanding of space has prerevolutionary and Soviet roots. Courtyards are a ubiquitous feature of the prerevolutionary architecture of Odessa. Prior to the revolution, there was likely a much greater contrast between courtyard life in the central elite districts and in poor areas such as Moldovanka. After the revolution, the Soviet authorities nationalized property and attempted to cultivate the ethos of collectivism (Bater 1984:139). The luxury flats of Odessa's central districts were turned into communal flats, settled by people of different social backgrounds. The notion of *bolshaia semia* (large family) is used to describe the ideals of courtyard life, and indeed Odessa as a whole (Boldetskaia and Leonhardt 1995). Among other things, this concept conveys the sense in which everyone in the city knows everyone and talks to anyone as if he or she were a relative. The courtyard may serve as a metaphor for an Odessan form of sociality and an understanding of urban space as communal, neither fully public nor private. These features of the courtyard also tie in with the notion that in the Soviet Union, where the state tried to abolish the "private," "public" was better understood as social, neither public nor private but resembling an overgrown family (Kharkhordin 1997:343). If Odessans are considered one big family and the city as a whole is conceived as a courtyard, what might be considered public and private spaces are presumed to be accessible to all. The hostile reactions of some residents indicate that not everyone shares the group's spatial understanding of the city. Indeed, those who

are hostile are characterized by the group as being uncultured, probably from a village, and therefore not "really Odessan."

TRANSFORMING CITYSCAPE, TRANSFORMING SOCIETY

The introduction to Valerii's book suggests that these walks are mainly about voyaging to the past. While talking history was certainly a major part of a walk, the present always intruded, and indeed, encounters with the past were also encounters with aspects of present social transformations. Walkers' comments were often framed by a narrative of decay, loss, and degradation. A few members, like Valerii, were nostalgic for the Soviet Union in which there was a "higher level of culture," order, and a better standard of living for the average person. Many others, while recognizing some of the merits of the previous system, were not as nostalgic. However, everyone was critical of the current state of affairs and many of the changes that had occurred since 1991.

Some remarks addressed changes in practices of the population at large and the demographic changes in Odessa; namely, the increased presence of rural people. In one incident, on discovering that the grass had been paved in a courtyard on Cable Street, Valerii launched into one of his tirades against the *Zhek* (Housing and Utilities Committee) and the yard-keepers. A member chimed in, "The yard-keepers are barely literate. This one certainly couldn't be an Odessan. An Odessan would never have allowed the paving to occur!"

Some members expressed anger at the current "regime" of Leonid Kuchma, whose hand-picked successor was defeated in the fall of 2004 after a powerful opposition movement successfully challenged attempts to falsify the elections. Others articulated a more generalized frustration at the "Ukrainian authorities" at all levels, whose officials were incapable of governing.

Some luxurious old buildings on Black Sea Street had been newly renovated and closed off by high fences. One had housed the American consulate in prerevolutionary days and now allegedly belonged to the mayor's daughter. Much to the disgust of the group, she had tastelessly, and in disregard for the original style, added a mansard roof. In response to the high fences and the takeover of these buildings by the new elite, one person sighed, "That's democracy for you." The walkers' reactions registered frustration with the privatization of property and changing uses of buildings and spaces in the city. Increasingly, certain buildings and grounds which were once publicly accessible are being enclosed for the enjoyment of a privileged few. These transformations undermine the concept of urban space held by the My Odessa club.

One excursion took in the oldest health resort in Odessa, dating from the 1820s. Many of the buildings from the mid-nineteenth century were in disrepair, which deeply dismayed the participants. Iurii expressed his exasperation vociferously: "Look at how they've let those buildings run down. Now they are beyond repair. It is absurd that they have not been kept up and used to attract tourists! Any other country in the world would pay attention to this, but not this regime."

These comments illustrate readings of post-Soviet social and political changes among certain age groups and members of the intelligentsia. Key themes included

the "loss of culture" (in the sense of declining reading practices); the influx of villagers, the outflow of intelligentsia; the privatization and enclosure of property; the emergence of new inequalities; and the negligence of the Ukrainian authorities. On the one hand, some aspects of the walkers' critique reproduced distinctions between people of different social backgrounds that emerged in prerevolutionary Odessa as part of the articulation of a bourgeois identity (Sylvester 2000, 2001). On the other hand, their criticism of the enclosure of what is perceived as public property seems to stem more from an understanding of urban space that was created during Soviet times. These walks can be read in part as a response to disenchantment with the present and a momentary escape to the times and places of a past idealized as more meaningful and authentic, a chance to experience Odessan sociality, and a forum to register discontent about current transformations.

WALKING THE CITY, MAKING THE SELF

Participants take distinct pleasure in these Sunday walks. That they are an important part of the participants' weekly routine suggests that they are a significant self-practice. One elderly man was concerned that the younger generations no longer know much about Odessa's past: "Who will remember when we're gone?" He seemed to fear that this knowledge will be lost or play a less significant role in the lives of the young than it does for the members of this group. Tatiana, who works as a guide, expressed enthusiasm, saying, "Odessa is such an interesting and unique city. I enjoy finding out more and more about its history. Valerii Petrovich knows so much. We appreciate that he shares his knowledge with us."

Aleksandra, a lawyer in her late forties, has a degree in history. A native Odessan, she has always been interested in the city, read as much as she could about it, and worked as a tour guide during the summer while studying at the university. She and her husband have been members of My Odessa for a couple of years. Her husband said he and others need to join the walks, just as Valerii needs to tell his stories, although when asked why, he struggled to articulate reasons and mentioned his and others' interest in and love for the city. When she misses a walk, Aleksandra feels "something is not quite right . . . that a natural rhythm has been disrupted." Both often commented on the transformation of the city and explained that many of their friends had emigrated.

Aleksandra also enjoys walking in certain parts of the city on her own, such as the Third Jewish Cemetery or French Boulevard. The cemetery makes her feel peaceful, and the large dachas along French Boulevard, including the legends and stories associated with them, capture her imagination. She does not enjoy walking where she grew up, another old part of the city inhabited mainly by the poor prior to the revolution. "I find it gloomy. The living conditions here are very bad: poor plumbing and heating. Many people are crammed in a small space. There were some pleasant aspects, like when we all watched TV in the courtyard, but there were also squabbles." She prefers "a more beautiful, enlightened part of town . . . French Boulevard." Different places of the city evoke different feelings for Aleksandra because of personal experience. At the same time, feelings transmit

understandings about the social geography of the city from prerevolutionary times.

Inna, an artist, was born in 1937 in Odessa and is a generation older than Aleksandra. She is a ghetto survivor and emigrated to Israel with her son in the early 1990s. In 2000 she returned, partly because of the financial difficulties she faced in Israel, but mainly because she missed her homeland, particularly Odessa. Before emigrating, she hadn't known much about Odessa's history. After she returned she became interested in the city's past and wanted to forget about her wartime experiences. She joined the group and has attended regularly. The club participants teased her that she had to leave in order to understand the value of what she left. Like Aleksandra, she feels she has missed something important if she does not join a walk on Sunday.

The experience of walking could be both pleasant and painful for Inna. She knew that her relatives had owned buildings in Odessa prior to the revolution, but had specific knowledge only about the one in which she had lived as a child. During one walk, Valerii listed the owners of a particular building and she heard the name of her relative. It was a startling but pleasant revelation. Like Aleksandra, Inna did not enjoy looking at the run-down, dilapidated courtyards in Moldovanka: "I find this part of town depressing, dark, lacking in culture." When Valerii took the group on a tour of Jewish Odessa and stopped at the Holocaust monument marking the Road to Death, Inna left the group and walked away by herself.

In his discussion of the interrelations of people, stories, and landscape in Apache practices of acquiring wisdom, Basso (1996) illustrates how places are often part of the process of "working on the self." This dovetails with aspects of the concept of "technologies of the self," "which permit individuals to effect by their own means or with the help of others a certain number of operations on their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection or immortality" (Foucault 1988:18).

Aleksandra and Inna's comments illustrate that walking is a practice, even ritual, that renews or restores a sense of self through an intimate engagement with history and places in Odessa. Personal memories and more diffuse ideas about the city's social geography influence the meanings attached to different places. Sociability is also part of this experience of place. Although neither woman lamented the passing of the Soviet Union, both women seem to find something in the walks that displaces or overcomes the feeling of loss that pervades their sense of themselves and their city. Aleksandra's friendships and social networks have been disrupted. Inna's sense of loss is informed by a regret about the transformation of the city and an acute sense of loss connected with the experience of genocide during the Holocaust. The walks and group may be part of an attempt to cultivate a connection to and establish continuity with a place that she rejected and that at one time brutally rejected her, yet a place to which she nonetheless returned and calls home.

Walking is not the only or even the most important practice of self for these people. But for them, walking the city and sensing history generate a sense of self that is "Odessan" through the cultivation of a detailed knowledge of history and

place. It differs from those who, often knowing little about Odessa's history, claim to be Odessan by referring to tropes of local ideology. It is also significant that mainly people aged 50 to 80 participate in these walks and find them meaningful. In their youth, the details of Odessa's bourgeois, trade-oriented, cosmopolitan, and aristocratic past were a kind of illicit knowledge. Given the Soviet attempt to impose social and architectural homogeneity to undermine connections to locality (not only ideologically, but also through providing incentives for people to move away from their birthplace), it is possible that learning local history in a place such as Odessa was a way of finding meaningful activities beyond, but not necessarily in opposition to, the hegemonic forms that prevailed under socialism (Yurchak 1997, 2003). The interest in Odessa's history that re-emerged in the late 1950s and '60s paralleled the emergence of other practices that subverted and coexisted with Soviet hegemony. Thus on the one hand, the significance of walking and learning local history illustrates the persistence of practices formed in the late Soviet period. On the other, efforts to cultivate a connection to Odessa through walking may be a response to the disintegration of old, if problematic, Soviet certainties, and discontent with the policies and ideologies of the Ukrainian state.

CONCLUSIONS

The walking of the My Odessa club is a particular local practice of making a city as place. In walking the city, sensing place and sensing history are practically inseparable. The participants sense history through traces of the past with buildings, signs, old streets, ruins, and monuments in the prerevolutionary part of the city. The walks, which are distinct from tours or the practices of a *flaneur*, enable participants to see, touch, smell, and discuss features of the urban landscape and thereby sense Odessa as place. Sensing history and sensing place occur also through conversing and interacting with their guide, Valerii, other walkers, and local residents. Indeed, the centrality of sociability to the walkers' experience of place is also underscored by the conception of urban space informing the group's movements through the city. This can be captured by the notion of Odessa as a courtyard with its communal space and "large family" form of sociality. The walkers thus illustrate that while sensing place is linked with perception, feeling, and consciousness, dialogue and interaction with other people play an equally important part in making and mediating the experience of place.

Considering the walks as a place-making practice disrupts the before/after frame of the narrative underlying analyses of postsocialism as they bend time and space and bring different pasts to bear on the present. Although the group could only form in the post-Soviet period as a result of the transformation of the public sphere, the practices can be traced to the late Soviet era, when walking the city with old maps created the city as an object to be known and remembered in a particular way, partly through nostalgia. Yet it is the prerevolutionary part of the city that is walked and made as place, and the histories that are conjured in Valerii's stories are primarily related to the prerevolutionary period. The My Odessa club's walking practices, and indeed the very formation of such a group, subvert Soviet spatiality by uncovering repressed history and spaces hidden by Soviet maps. Soviet Odessan understandings of urban spaces as communal are

recreated in the present through the group's insistence on entering all nooks and crannies of Odessa, and transgressing where possible the growing demarcation and enclosure of public spaces since 1991.

Finally, the urban landscape and sense of place created is not entirely innocent and inclusive. The group maps a subtle (and sometimes not so subtle), exclusive conception of what and who is really Odessan, a conception in which Odessa is imagined as a Russian/cosmopolitan island of urbanity and culture that is distinct from the surrounding countryside and a Ukrainian national space. Although the combination of walking and talking history is in part a continuation of a Soviet-era practice, it now also serves to articulate a sense of being Odessan which responds to, and registers a critique of, economic and social decline in the city resulting from the collapse of the Soviet Union and the policies of the Ukrainian state. There is a trend in the anthropology of cities to address transnational spaces and flows of people and the metropolis as site of economic rupture and political contest with "global forces." While the focus on the transnational is undoubtedly important, the My Odessa club reminds us of local efforts to establish continuity and generate a sense of place in the city, and of the need to refrain from letting the "transnational" overdetermine what we examine in urban spaces.

NOTES

1. Odessa's historical center has remained largely intact from the prerevolutionary era. Although some construction took place in the interwar period, it was primarily after World War II that the city significantly expanded when large residential districts were built where about 70 per cent of the population lives (Topchiev 1994:48). I use the Russian transliteration of "Odessa," street signs, and place names in the city to reflect the language and cultural identification of most participants. I use the Ukrainian transliteration of other place names in the country, such as Kyiv.

2. Field research conducted in Odessa from July 2001-November 2002 was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the Cambridge Commonwealth Trust, the Royal Anthropological Institute, and the William Wyse Fund. I am grateful to Frances Pine, Paola Filippucci, Catherine Alexander, Alaina Lemon, and the reviewers at *Ethnology* for helpful comments.

3. This organization was set up in the latter years of *Perestroika,* first in Moscow and then in other cities, with the purpose of researching and publicizing the names of victims of the repressions.

4. Anna claimed that much of Odessa's history could not be researched or recounted openly because of its cosmopolitan character, the bourgeois ways of its inhabitants, and the centrality of trade and commerce, features that did not accord with Soviet historiography.

5. Slobodka is part of Old Odessa that was settled by people from rural areas. It is also the location of a hospital for the mentally ill.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bakhtin, M. 1981. The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays. Austin.

Ballinger, P. 2003. History in Exile: Memory and Identity at the Borders of the Balkans. Princeton.

Basso, K. 1996. Wisdom Sits in Places: Notes on a Western Apache Landscape. Senses of Place, eds. S. Feld and K. Basso, pp. 53-90. Santa Fe.

Bater, J. H. 1984. The Soviet City: Continuity and Change in Privilege and Place. The City in Cultural Context, eds. J. Agnew, J. Mercer and D. Sopher, pp. 134-62. Boston.

Benjamin, W. 1968. Illuminations. New York.

——— 1979. One Way Street and Other Writings. London.

Boldetskaia, O., and M. Leonhardt. 1995. Bolshaia Semia? Sosedskie otnosheniia v staroi chasti goroda Odessy. Unpublished ms.
Boyarin, J. 1994. Space, Time and the Politics of Memory. Remapping Memory: The Politics of TimeSpace, ed. J. Boyarin, pp. 1-37. London.
Brown, K. 2003. The Past in Question: Modern Macedonia and the Uncertainties of Nation. Princeton.
Casey, E. S. 1996. How to Get from Space to Place in a Fairly Short Stretch of Time. Senses of Place, eds. S. Feld and K. Basso, pp. 13-52. Santa Fe.
de Certeau, M. 1988. The Practice of Everyday Life. Berkeley.
Cole, J. 2001. Forget Colonialism? Sacrifice and the Art of Memory in Madagascar. Berkeley.
Dallin, A. 1998. Odessa, 1941-1944: A Case Study of Soviet Territory Under Foreign Rule. Iasi.
Feld, S., and K. Basso. 1996. Senses of Place. Santa Fe.
Finnegan, R. 1998. Tales of the City: A Study of Narrative and Urban Life. Cambridge.
Foucault, M. 1988. Technologies of the Self. Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault, eds. L. H. Martin, H. Gurtman, and P. H. Hutton, pp. 16-49. Amherst.
Gell A. 1985. How to Read a Map: Remarks on the Practical Logic of Navigation. Man 20(2):271-86.
_____ 1998. Art and Agency. Oxford.
Gilloch, G. 1996. Myth and Metropolis: Walter Benjamin and the City. Cambridge.
Guthier, S. L. 1981. Ukrainian Cities during the Revolution and the Interwar Era. Rethinking Ukrainian History, eds. I. L. Rudnitsky and J. P. Himka, pp. 158-79. Edmonton.
Harrison, J. 2003. Being a Tourist: Finding Meaning in the Pleasure of Travel. Vancouver.
Heatherington, T. 1999. Street Tactics: Catholic Ritual and the Senses of the Past in Central Sardinia. Ethnology 38(4):315-34.
Herlihy, P. 1986. Odessa: A History 1794-1914. Cambridge MA.
Hirsch, E. 1995. Landscape: Between Space and Place. The Anthropology of Landscape. Perspectives on Place and Space, eds. E. Hirsch and M. O'Hanlon, pp. 1-30. Oxford.
Kharkhordin, O. 1997. Reveal and Dissimulate: A Genealogy of Private Life in Soviet Russia. Public and Private in Thought and Action: Perspectives on a Grand Dichotomy, eds. J. Weintraub, pp. 333-63. Chicago and London.
Lambek, M. 2002. The Weight of the Past: Living With History in Mahajanga, Madagascar. New York.
Lemon, A. 2000. Talking Transit and Spectating Transition: The Moscow Metro. Altering States: Ethnographies of Transition in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union, eds. D. Berdahl, M. Bunzl, and M. Lampland, pp. 14-39. Ann Arbor.
Mbembe, A. 2001. On the Postcolony. University of California Press. Berkeley.
Meyers, F. R. 1991. Pintupi Country, Pintupi Self: Sentiment, Place and Politics among Western Desert Aborigines. Berkeley.
Mueggler, E. 2001. The Age of Wild Ghosts: Memory, Violence and Place in Southwestern China. Berkeley.
Munn, N. 1990. Constructing Regional Worlds of Experience: Kula Exchange, Witchcraft and Gawan Local Event. Man 25:1-17.
Ofer, D. 1993. The Holocaust in Transnistria: A Special Case of Genocide. Holocaust in the Soviet Union: Studies and Sources on the Destruction of Jews in the Nazi Occupied Territories of the USSR, eds. L. Dobroszycki and J. S. Gurock, pp. 133-53. London.
Pandya, V. 1990. Movement and Space: Andamanese Cartography. American Ethnologist 17(4):775-97.
Reed, A. 2002. City of Details: Interpreting the Personality of London. Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 8:127-41.
Rojek, C. 1997. Indexing, Dragging and the Social Construction of Tourist Sights. Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory, eds. C. Rojek and J. Urry, pp. 55-74. London.
Stewart, C. 2003. Dreams of Treasure: Temporality, Historicization and the Unconscious. Anthropolo-gical Theory 3(4):481-500.
Stewart, K. 1996. A Space on the Side of the Road. Princeton.

Sylvester, R. P. 2000. Making and Appearance: Urban "Types" and the Creation of Respectability in Odessa's Popular Press, 1912-1914. Slavic Review 27(2):131-57.
——— 2001. City of Thieves: Moldavanka, Criminality and Respectability in Prerevolutionary Odessa. Journal of Urban History 27(2):131-57.
Topchiev, A. G. (ed.) 1994. Odessa: Gorod—agglomeratsi—portovo-promyshlenyi kompleks. Odessa.
Wanner, C. 1998. Burden of Dreams: History and Identity in Post-Soviet Ukraine. University Park PA.
Yoneyama, L. 1999. Hiroshima Traces: Time, Space, and the Dialectics of Memory. Berkeley.
Yurchak, A. 1997. The Cynical Reason of Late Socialism: Power, Pretense and the Anekdot. Public Culture 9:161-88.
——— 2003. Soviet Hegemony of Form: Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More. Comparative Studies in Society and History 43(3):480-510.