the genetic metaphor, which unfortunately titles the third chapter, is a misleading anachronism, Ronner's interpretations of confession in Dostoevskii yield many other felicitous terms ("inner compulsion to confess," "confession as motive") and original insights (Ronner argues, for instance, that Raskolnikov recruits Porfiry's service as a coercive catalyst for confession (153). At times Ronner's admiration for Dostoevskii may make it seem like she shares his blanket dismissal of the mundane externalities of earthly justice systems. However, Ronner's careful analysis of Miranda's erosion in police practice shows that she makes deft use of Dostoevskii *to complement*, rather than *to replace*, the focus on external forces with the inner forces compelling confession.

The fourth chapter brings Ronner's discussion of the American justice system even closer to the present. Her tone turns urgent: "Although the Court had chopped Miranda to smithereens, what little was left did apply to inmates. In two decisions, however, Maryland vs. Shatzer [2010], and Howes vs. Fields [2012], the Supreme Court categorically ousted Miranda from our prisons" (243). Ronner than expertly walks us through the erosion the Miranda protection in prisons. While the story could in the hands of a less able writer turn the reader off as a long, depressing list of bureaucratic loopholes designed to further disempower the powerless, Ronner manages to hold the reader's empathy and attention by providing real stories of the prisoners behind the changing legislation. She also spells out what hides behind the cover up of euphemistic legalese that had almost lulled me to sleep reading the Shatzer decision: "When prisoners request counsel, all the interrogator needs to do is ship them back to their cell, count fourteen days, and then start over without counsel present (247)." Come this sentence, I was wide-awake. And once again, she brings in Dostoevskii. After a brief description of *Dead House*, she notes: "today's readers tend to relegate the novel to the genre of historical anomaly, or as a portrayal of an archaic penal system, worlds apart from our own" (251). She jumps into the next sentence, leaving us no recourse to "such thinking [which is] delusion and denial, a way to deflect the unsettling likenesses between Dostoevsky's Omsk fortress and our own prisons (251)." She again lets Dostoevskii shine his light on the erosion of free will and human dignity in the Omsk prison, only to show that what we would like to cordon off as archaic and Russian is a dehumanization only too familiar behind our proliferating prison walls. At times the reader of *Dostoevsky and the Law* feels that the book's powerful conclusions had been reached before all the particular analyses of the novels were carried out. This makes the book less dialogic than one might expect from a devotee of Dostoevskii. The reader is richly compensated, however, by a passionately argued book that is supported by rigorous legal and literary research.

Cristina Vatulescu
New York University

Sowjetische Kindheit im Zweiten Weltkrieg: Generationsentwürfe im Kontext nationaler Erinnerungskultur. By Oxane Leingang. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2014. x, 324pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Index. €48.00, hard bound.

In her monograph, rendered in English as "Soviet Childhood During WWII: Sketches of a Generation in the Context of the National Culture of Remembrance," Oxane Leingang explores how the generation of war children reflects on their traumatic experiences as adults in the post-Soviet era. Through an extensive study of personal war accounts, autobiographical and literary texts, most of which have not been translated

https://doi.org/10.5612/slavicreview.75.3.0797 Published online by Cambridge University Press

either into German or English, she constructs a profile of the generation whose wartime experiences were excluded from Soviet commemoration culture.

Leingang argues that in the Soviet Union, the official discourse about the "Great Patriotic War" privileged the heroism and collective struggle of the Soviet people against the Nazis over narratives of individual suffering and trauma. It was not until *perestroika* that war memorialization entered "a stage of dispute" (6) between the embittered war survivors and the government that treated any deviation from the official myth of the Great Victory as a sacrilege. In the late 1980s and 1990s, the generation of previously silent war children finally received an opportunity to share their stories. The importance of this development is hard to overestimate, and one of the first publications to liberate the voice of this generation, Svetlana Aleksievich's book, *The Last Witnesses: A Hundred of Unchildlike Lullabys* (1985), sold millions of copies.

Leingang's analysis of the narratives of war children unfolds against the background of a useful overview of critical approaches to the autobiographical genre. In her own view, autobiographies that relate both childhood and adult experiences and use the narrator as both a subject and an object of the story do not necessarily distort facts. Since the decentralization of the modern subject makes subjectivity and identity obsolete notions, autobiographical texts written by authors distanced from their child experience provide a valid witness account of history.

Leingang's monograph is divided into seven sections that describe narratives of different groups of war children: orphans, children who lived through the siege of Leningrad, child soldiers, forced child laborers in Germany (Ostarbeiter), children who spent the war in the Russian hinterland, witnesses of the battle of Stalingrad, and lastly, Holocaust survivors. Leingang carefully uses examples from literary and autobiographical sources to avoid a one-sided perspective on war childhood. Thus, for instance, in the section on orphanages, her analysis contains examples from the narratives of two highly critical authors of the regime, Anatolii Pristavkin and Mikhail Nikolaev, who spent their war childhood in Soviet orphanages. In their texts, the reader sees the "erosion of the heroic semantics" of the official model of war memoirs, as both authors present orphans as innocent and defenseless victims of the state that claims that orphanages were "laboratories" for the creation of new Soviet men (42). Yet, the same section includes an example of a more traditional memoir, published by Alla Belova, which presents a positive picture of war orphanages and supports the Soviet heroic mythology.

In subsequent sections, however, Leingang leans toward demonstrating how the wave of new autobiographical accounts digressed from and undermined official Soviet remembrance culture, as former child soldiers, forced laborers, and survivors of the Holocaust consistently de-heroicized the myth of happy childhood. These new memoirs initiated the process of rethinking the culture of remembrance that finally moved away from the "we" toward "privatizing" individual memories (283) and giving a legitimate place to formerly marginalized experiences.

With the rise of post-Soviet nostalgia and the Russian government's emphasis on patriotic education, however, the myth of the Great Patriotic War has been revived once again. For this reason, as Leingang explains, shadowy aspects of the "glorious past" have become unwelcome in today's culture of remembrance. As in Soviet days, for many contemporary Russians, the heroes of war and its victims stand at opposite ends of the culture of remembrance, and many remaining members of the war generation themselves increasingly embrace the government's policy of nationalism and patriotism while their updated war accounts show the signs of old Soviet heroic rhetoric. Leingang points out that between the discourses of heroism and patriotism and their critique, one should not overlook a movement that seeks to restore Russian national identity associated with the village culture and Orthodox Christianity. As the Russian

https://doi.org/10.5612/slavicreview.75.3.0797 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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′naia 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

https://doi.org/10.5612/slavicreview.75.3.0797 Published online by Cambridge University Press