

Church and Orthodox values gain importance, many members of the generation of war children try to regain their self-identification through religion.

Leingang's meticulously researched and edited study provides an enriching reading experience for anybody interested in the history of WWII, autobiographical and/or childhood studies, post-Soviet culture, and particularly, post-Soviet nostalgia.

LARISSA RUDOVA  
Pomona College

***Discourses of Regulation and Resistance: Censoring Translation in the Stalin and Khrushchev Era Soviet Union.*** By Samantha Sherry. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015. viii, 198 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. \$120.00, hard bound.

At the core of Samantha Sherry's welcome study are the two journals that were devoted to introducing Soviet readers to foreign literature: the Stalin-era *Internatsional'naiia literatura* (1933–1943), and the Khrushchev-era *Inostrannaia literatura*, begun in 1955. A brief survey of censorship theory, plus a description of Soviet censorship operations, provide the context for Sherry's examination of the translated literature in these two journals. Archival sources offer insight into the censorship process.

Sherry identifies three types of censorship: political, puritanical, and ideological. The first two designations she takes from Herman Ermolaev's 1997 *Censorship in Soviet Literature, 1917–1991*. "Ideological censorship" she narrowly defines to include only ideologemes—words like "red" or "struggle," whose cultural load made their usage sensitive. Sherry argues, for example, that a translator's choice to render the English "conquer" with "bor'ba" created an intertextuality with Soviet culture, and that in such cases censorship was not only about removing what was objectionable, but also about adding language to evoke Soviet ideology.

Sherry questions the conventional wisdom that translation was a safe haven for writers like Boris Pasternak who were blocked from publishing their own creative writing. Since most literary translations were from English, French, or German, they were politically sensitive and potentially dangerous for both translator and editor. Sometimes translators were arrested when changes in the party line caused books that had already been translated and published to be no longer acceptable. Until the mid-1930s, a foreign work could be published as long as it portrayed its society appropriately, but later on, works could only be published if they showed Soviet superiority and could be seen as a "single revolutionary literary canon" (74). Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* and James Joyce's *Ulysses* both were published in 1935 before being banned.

Free translation won out over literal translation to become the official translation method. This practice facilitated the "Sovietization" of foreign texts and made it difficult to untwine translation decisions from censorship decisions. Free translation could also be turned in the opposite direction, however. In her final chapter, "Resisting Censorship," Sherry analyzes Pasternak's translation of Shakespeare's *MacBeth* as Aesopian language in which Denmark's bleeding under a tyrant king also pointed toward the Soviet Union.

The abundant examples of original passages along with their published translations into Russian is one of the best features of Sherry's study. Sometimes changes were made without regard for whether the resulting text even made sense, as with Joseph Freeman's *An American Testament*. Of Upton Sinclair's *Dragon's Teeth* (1942), Sherry tells us, "despite being the central theme of the novel, Jewishness is almost

entirely absent from the Russian translation” (89). In other cases, the censorship of a limited number of individual words could make an author’s argument appear entirely different from the original.

Sherry warns against an excessively top-down understanding of how censorship worked in practice. The end product was the result of negotiation between *Glavlit* officials and translators or editors who tried to preserve as much of the original meaning as they could. In addition, a surfeit of both censorship guidelines and the number of officials involved could undercut censorship intentions. Perhaps less convincingly, Sherry points to possible instances of “unconscious self-censorship” (Pierre Bourdieu’s “habitus”), which following Beate Müller, she treats as identical to “internalization” of censorship norms (59). I think that an internalized behavior does not necessarily have to be an unconscious one.

In general, I found the discussion of censorship theory to have only minor relevance to Sherry’s findings. This points to a bit of a dilemma, which is no fault of Sherry’s. Theory is *de rigueur* among literary scholars, but what if one’s findings have little to do with current theories? Sherry’s investigation confirms that Soviet censorship was an external imposition—with detrimental effects that must be exposed and acknowledged—rather than a variation on the social constraints that exist in every culture with the effect of channeling speech and writing into a society’s comfort zones. To her credit, Sherry applies theory judiciously and sparingly.

There are occasional errors, including a line from Pasternak incorrectly rendered as “they are scared using rumors,” instead of “they are scared of creeping rumors” (150) and a misidentification of Nikolai Gumilev as Lev Gumilev (20). Yet, Sherry’s study advances our understanding of both censorship and translation in the Soviet period.

CAROL ANY  
Trinity College

***Uncensored: Samizdat Novels and the Quest for Autonomy in Soviet Dissidence.***

By Ann Komaromi. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015. xii, 254 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. \$39.95, paper bound.

Ann Komaromi’s fascinating book takes a new perspective on samizdat and dissidence. She focuses on three detailed case studies of novels by celebrated authors of unofficial literature: Vasilii Aksenov, Andrei Bitov and Venedikt Erofeev, which represent a space “for exploring new images of the self and society” (6). Komaromi combines literary analysis with the study of distribution and production practices in a richly nuanced description of unofficial literature that makes use of a wide range of archival and interview material. Linking the two levels of investigation allows Komaromi to offer a sophisticated new theoretical perspective on dissidence that reconsiders not only the boundary between official and non-official culture, but also that between political dissidence and autonomous art.

Komaromi’s study of Aksenov’s novel *Ozhog* [The Burn] shows his attempt to interrogate the Soviet system and deconstruct Soviet subjectivity through an avant-garde montage. Using his correspondence with the American publisher Ardis, which published a number of uncensored works, Komaromi shows how Aksenov saw his negotiations with the Soviet authorities about the work’s publication as part of a “strategic game” (72) intended to highlight their inflexibility and so increase the significance, and cultural capital, of his samizdat work. The nuances of the unofficial mode of circulation are brought to the fore; thus it becomes clear that Aksenov relied