of them: among the intelligentsia, it was the object of both "erudite deliberation" and a method of critique. (25)

Like Vissarion Belinskii, Nikolai Chernyshevskii, Nikolai Dobroliubov, and Aleksandr Herzen, Lunacharskii believed satire to be an important political instrument. Unlike his predecessors, however, he was in the unique position to implement his theory of satire as both weapon (*oruzhie*) and tool (*orudie*). Specifically, Lunacharskii promoted satire as a means of discursively destroying "the outmoded, the residual, and the deviant," clearing away pre-revolutionary detritus to create *Lebensraum* for the nascent Soviet state. By analyzing Lunacharskii's theoretical writings on the functions of satire, Gérin emphasizes the mobilizing function of Soviet laughter, which was called upon to perform the difficult task of transforming Russia's "spontaneous masses" into a disciplined population well-versed in the emerging norms of Soviet ideology.

An interesting feature of Lunacharskii's understanding of satire is its reliance on cognitive dissonance. By calling attention to an issue only to immediately destroy it through mockery, Lunacharskii wrote, satire should evoke laughter while showing that the "evil" being criticized "does not merit serious attention" (33). Accordingly, as the 1920s gave way to the 1930s, Soviet satire often acted not only to identify social ills, but also to dehumanize political opponents—enacting a "symbolic destruction" that would soon assume a very real dimension (171).

Lunacharskii's writings form an effective framing device for Gérin's engagement with early Soviet visual culture. Chapter 2 connects Lunacharskii's ideas with the development of early Soviet illustrated satirical journals and poster art as outlets for mocking the flaws and pitfalls of post-revolutionary life. Chapter 3 treats the "emergence of a satirical scene" within circus and theater performance over the course of the 1920s (74), while Chapter 4 chronicles the decline of satire in early Soviet cinema after 1928. In Chapter 5, Gérin groups the rhetorical strategies of Soviet satirists into four categories: caricature, collage, parody, and irony, each of which receives detailed and theoretically-deft attention. *Devastation and Laughter's* final chapter shows that satire, being an inherently volatile modality, could never be brought under the total control of even Stalinist authority, which Gérin postulates as one of the reasons for its institutional decline in the Soviet context.

Devastation and Laughter sheds light on the origins, functions, and nature of early Soviet satire, and is especially useful as a study of Anatolii Lunacharskii. It is sure to be a helpful resource in a wide variety of subfields within Russian and east European studies, including but not limited to its author's field of origin, Art History.

Maya Vinokour
New York University

Redemption. By Friedrich Gorenstein. Trans. Andrew Bromfield. New York: Columbia University Press, 2018. xxviii, 199 pp. $30.00, hard bound, $14.95, paper, $13.99, E-book.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2020.63

Fridrikh Gorenshtein (1932–2002) was a Russian Jewish writer renowned in the early 1970s for his screenplay for Andrei Tarkovskii's film *Solaris*. He was known among Moscow writers and directors for largely unpublished fiction that broke with the literary conventions of the intelligentsia. This milieu knew Gorenshtein, too, for the unusual figure he cut: for his "shtetl" accent, his ornate sartorial style, and his disdain for Moscow-elite mores. Gorenshtein saw himself as a silenced outsider,

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2020.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

while writers like Vasilii Aksenov and Evgenii Popov saw him as a talented and captious insider.

Redemption, Andrew Bromfield's excellent new translation of the novel *Iskuplenie* (1967), reflects Gorenshtein's impatience with the norms of literature, language, and historiography in the Soviet 1960s and 1970s. Like other works by Gorenshtein, the novel belongs to the tradition of "southern" Russian prose, whereby writers such as Anton Chekhov and Isaak Babel′ imagined themselves as flouting the literary practices of Russia's capital cities, where they also found patrons and readers. *Iskuplenie* disrupts the narrative of World War II that stressed Soviet solidarity and largely failed to acknowledge the specifically Jewish tragedy. Works that did recognize the mass executions of Jews in Soviet territory rarely used humor as a strategy. A story of tragedy that borrows vaudeville devices, *Iskuplenie* breaks the conventions of Soviet war stories and mixes literary modes. It is an ethnography of the Soviet southwest; a catalog of the fabrics and foodstuffs that communicated postwar social status; and an account of the Holocaust in the Soviet Union. It is also the story of a set of murders, a *Bildungsroman* about a girl named Sashenka, and a love story between Sashenka and a Jewish fighter pilot whose family was murdered.

The translator's task is thus fraught with difficulties. A plot that revolves around Sashenka's denunciation of her mother and her transformation upon witnessing the exhumation of a Jewish dentist is difficult to square with comic elements that recall Fedor Dostoevskii's Fyodor Pavlovich Karamazov, Anton Chekhov's clumsier protagonists, and Mikhail Bakhtin's discussion of the menippea. It is impossible to tell where the author stands amid the novel's lofty speeches and awkward moments. The translator is compelled to decipher between irony and sympathy. Lofty theories about love and violence are articulated by a professor with no sense of his audience, but the text suggests that the author empathizes or perhaps agrees with him.

Rather than trying to smooth out the novel's heterogeneity, Bromfield accentuates the swings between big ideas and ungainliness by emphasizing elements of performance. Sometimes, the performance is physical. The "хромой «культурник» в кителе с петлицами танкиста" (1992, 158) who oversees a New Year's ball and might be described in English as a "cultural worker" or "organizer" becomes a "'master of ceremonies' with a limp" (14). Theatrical "hobbling" replaces his "walking" (*khodil*) across the dance hall. Verbal performance is equally pronounced. The professor's "*sobstvennaia rech′*," for instance, is translated as a "diatribe" (121).

Bromfield differentiates between the performances of the author and his characters by splitting *Iskuplenie* into three translations: penance, atonement, and redemption. Fanya, a drunken Catholic custodian, holds that the murderer's embarrassing illness in prison is his "penance." Fanya's belief that the murderer will "suffer eternal penance in hell" draws out the relentless punishment and apologetic performance embedded in *Iskuplenie* (48). The professor uses "atonement" to imagine the inevitable achievement of *Iskuplenie*. He explains what he calls a "biblical limit" and prophesies that "now, beyond that boundary, crossed at the price of millions of innocents, retribution and atonement will fuse and become one. . ." (164). The *Iskuplenie* in the title becomes *Redemption* and implies the ambiguity of Gorenshtein's stance. He may be using *iskuplenie* ironically to describe the impossibility of his flawed characters receiving the redemption they seek. He may thereby address the impossibility of redemption after the Holocaust. As "redemption," *iskuplenie* may also be used empathically towards characters muddling through the first postwar year the best they can, and it may recognize the acts of tenderness they muster amid that chaos. It may even suggest that verbal art after Iosif Stalin and the Holocaust offers its own form of redemption.

By maintaining these possibilities and drawing out the over-the-topness that characterizes his serious and comic modes, Bromfield has captured Gorenshtein's

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2020.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press

style. The paucity of English translations of Gorenshtein means that this style has been unavailable to the English reader. *Redemption* will thus interest not only Jewish Studies scholars but also popular and scholarly readerships that wish to see what the postwar literary imagination made possible.

Adrien Smith
Stanford University

Made under Pressure: Literary Translation in the Soviet Union, 1960–1991. By Natalia Kamovnikova. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 2019. xii, 272 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Index. $90.00, hard bound; $29.95, paper.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2020.64

Natalia Kamovnikova's book takes as its focus literary translation in the Soviet Union during its last three decades, from 1960 to the collapse of the communist system. It builds on a small but growing area of interest in Slavic studies in translation. Until recently, the history of translation in the Soviet Union has not been as well developed as for other countries; this work represents a valuable contribution to this developing literature, especially in its engagement with the theoretical literature on translation. Most studies of Soviet translation have to date dealt primarily with the text; Kamovnikova instead focuses on translators as individuals and on their social and cultural positioning. Using extensive oral history interviews, she presents a history of Soviet translation in the words of those most intimately involved in mediating between east and west.

The book begins by laying out the theoretical and historical contexts of translation into Russian before turning to translation and translators in more detail. Kamovnikova avoids presenting a simply diachronic account of the system in the last three decades of the Soviet Union, instead taking a thematic approach, which allows her to present cultural, professional, and political aspects of Soviet translators' work. This does, however, somewhat obscure the extent to which translation developed alongside the momentous changes that took place in Soviet society in the three decades under consideration here. Chapter 1 draws upon recent theoretical approaches in Translation Studies of censorship in authoritarian contexts, drawing important parallels between the Soviet Union and other societies. Wisely, Kamovnikova argues against conceiving of Soviet society as totalitarian, and indeed the detailed analysis in the following chapters shows the extent to which translation in a so-called "closed" society is a profoundly political yet often ambiguous activity that combines adhering to and breaking norms in a single action. Chapters 2 and 3 place Soviet translation history into the history of publishing and "subordination" (50) of literature. In doing so, the uniquely in-between status of translation in the authoritarian context is highlighted. Chapter 4 discusses translation as a profession. Kamovnikova exposes the translators' seminars as locations not only for professional networking and training, but also of creation of a kind of literary and cultural identity among translators—these were spaces where those who had been victimized by the regime could find professional status and build a community around themselves. She goes on in Chapter 5 to explore the professional status of translators and their often thorny relationship with the Union of Writers, showing that translation was frequently precarious and considered by translators to be a vocation. Chapter 6 shifts focus somewhat to the texts themselves and especially the use of interlinear trots by translators. The use of textual examples is enlightening here and helps to illuminate

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2020.63 Published online by Cambridge University Press