The Sanctuary to late Soviet reality and combining it with philosophical reflections from *The Brothers Karamazov* about the nefarious consequences of godlessness and amorality. The book also contains an essay about Balabanov's adaptation of Franz Kafka's *The Castle*, by Valery Zusman, and one on the history of Balabanov's failed attempt to make a film adaptation of Vladimir Nabokov's *Laughter in the Dark*, by Yuri Leving. In another chapter, Mark Lipovetsky provides an overview of the "cultural renaissance" of Balabanov's hometown, Sverdlovsk/Ekaterinburg, in the 1980s and 1990s, as a context for the beginnings of the Balabanov's career.

Included in the collection are also twenty-six interviews to friends, actors, collaborators, and family members, and to Balabanov himself, conducted by White and other Russian and European scholars and critics; four translations of English-language reviews of Balabanov's films; several documents, primarily from Balabanov's school years; and a screenplay for an unrealized movie, *The Clay Pit* (first published in the Russian original), with commentaries by Anna Nieman. The interviews provide a glimpse into the main phases of Balabanov's life—including his school years and connections with Sverdlovsk's music scene; the life-long collaboration with Sergey Selianov and his production company, CTB; the tragedy of Karmadon, where several of Balabanov's closest friends and collaborators, including his fetish actor, Sergei Bodrov Jr., lost their lives; his self-destruction and alcoholism; and his turn to nationalism and religiosity. They also reveal concrete details of Balabanov's approach to different aspects of filmmaking: from screenwriting to post-production, his work with actors, and directing style.

The essays in the collection use these interviews primarily to substantiate claims about Balabanov's plans, sources, and ideas about his own movies. However, this kind of biographical or ethnographic materials could also be further integrated into a discussion of Balabanov's works, providing added insight on, say, the representation and performance of violence or sexuality in his films (through concrete interactions with actors and other collaborators); the tension between, on the one hand, realistic acting and a documentary impulse and, on the other, surreal and parodic elements of his cinematography; the paradoxical, at the same time desperate and comical, and almost physical attraction to the darkness and decadence of Russian or post-Soviet reality that Balabanov's films display (along with the horror and criticism of said reality). In this sense, *B2* can indeed serve as a useful primary source for future students and scholars of the director's work.

Versions of the essays by White and Lipovetsky included in the collection have also been published elsewhere in English, in article or chapter forms. White's interviews to the actors Ray Toler and Lisa Rayel Jeffrey (*Brother 2*), Ian Kelly (*War*), and a few others, as well as a shortened English translation of Anna Nieman's interview to Balabanov's editor, Tatiana Kuzmicheva, have appeared in *KinoKultura*.

Fabrizio Fenghi
Brown University

Adaptatsiia kak symptom: Russkaia klassika na postsovetskom ekrane. By Lioudmila Fedorova. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2022. 368 pp. ₽420, paper.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2023.84

In this study, *Adaptation as a Symptom: The Russian Classic on the Post-Soviet Screen*, Lioudmila Fedorova offers an original and productive approach to post-Soviet reworkings of classic literature into film. She interprets these adaptations as both symptoms

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2023.84 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of trauma and efforts to heal it, as directors repeatedly turn to nineteenth-century texts to work through the disintegration of the Soviet Union and other cataclysmic events. Her examination of adaptations through the prism of trauma illuminates significant patterns in these diverse films, as she outlines the various directors' attempts to connect traumatic episodes within the literary works to broader social, cultural, and historical currents.

Fedorova clarifies particular traits of each author that have attracted the attention of recent filmmakers. Aleksandr Pushkin's life and works, she shows in the first chapter, contain a cluster of motifs, such as his relations to the tsar, his duel, the cult that followed his death, and the imposter figure in *Boris Godunov* and elsewhere that offered directors rich material. Many post-Soviet adaptations highlight the juxtapositions of Russian and European elements in Pushkin's works in order to define national identity, at times, as in Aleksei Sakharov's *Baryshnia-krest′ianka* (1995), emphasizing the poet's patriotism and critique of the west while minimizing his irony in relation to Russia. Nikolai Gogol′'s works, Fedorova notes, laid the foundation for blockbuster genres, such as the horror film ("Viy"), the Western (*Taras Bulba*), and the road movie (*Dead Souls*). However, she claims, Gogol′'s cinematic qualities turn out to be elusive, as adaptations too often focus on one of his ideas, while his texts undermine such a unitary focus. In *The Case of Dead Souls* (2005), by contrast, Pavel Lungin and Yuri Arabov's creative departures from Gogol′'s novel allow for a more productive dialogue, as they establish ironic parallels between Chichikov's roguery and post-Soviet capitalism.

As Fedorova demonstrates, Lev Tolstoi's "The Prisoner of the Caucasus" and *Anna Karenina* in particular provide directors with opportunities to reimagine the Other in contemporary Russia. Sergei Bodrov's *The Prisoner of the Mountains* (1996) and Aleksei Uchitel's *The Captive* (2008) reexamine the long-standing Caucasian prisoner myth, emphasizing the interdependence of Russia and the east, although neither director, she claims, successfully presents the Chechen perspective. Fedorova finds that post-Soviet directors of *Anna Karenina* films, in contrast to the sympathy of earlier filmmakers for the heroine, focus on the victims of Anna's affair and suicide—Vronsky, Karenin, and her two children—thereby shifting attention to traumatized characters. Some of these adaptations, such as *Anna Karenina: Vronsky's Story* (2017), in which Karen Shakhnazarov interweaves Vronsky's reminiscences of Anna with the Russo-Japanese War, juxtapose survivors' suffering with historical trauma.

Fedorova astutely notes that the post-Soviet preference for straightforward adaptations of Fedor Dostoevskii's works has compelled directors to reduce the polyphonic complexity of his novels, as the novelist's ideas are filtered through his non-fictional statements. Films such as Roman Kachanov's grotesque parody of *The Idiot* in *Down House* (2001) notwithstanding, most Dostoevskii adaptations emulate Vladimir Bortko's close transposition of his source text in *The Idiot* (2003), which inaugurated the popular televised serial genre. These purportedly objective presentations of Dostoevskii's texts, however, in fact propagate an official, patriotic ideology.

Directors of Anton Chekhov adaptations, for Fedorova, viewed the emerging capitalism of the 1990s in light of the writer's own portrayal of a disappearing old world, depicting the "new Lopakhins" as absurd, eccentric, or criminal. In the case of *Three Sisters*, adapted more often than any other Chekhov work in the past three decades, she focuses on the directors' creative reenvisioning of the writer's center/periphery contrast. In Alexander Zeldovich and Vladimir Sorokin's setting of Chekhov's action in the hierarchical Stalinist capital in *Moscow* (2000), for example, Moscow—rather than an idealized location—becomes an empty center that gives the characters no sense of freedom.

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2023.84 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Throughout *Adaptation as a Symptom*, Fedorova provides thorough, well-informed, and persuasive discussions of the films, fruitfully examining how each filmmaker interprets the given author, what aspects of the source text s/he highlights, and what other intertexts are involved. Her descriptions of the adaptations' post-Soviet contexts at times do not fully detail the relevant political circumstances. More could be said, for instance, on the recent conflicts that, along with the Russo-Japanese War, may have indirectly shaped Shakhnazarov's *Anna Karenina*, and the specifics of the Boris El′tsin and Vladimir Putin eras that have given Dostoevskii's *The Devils*, as she notes, such contemporary political relevance. These reservations notwithstanding, Fedorova has made an important contribution in this volume, and her research should be of great value to scholars of post-Soviet film, adaptation theory, and trauma studies.

Alexander Burry
Ohio State University

***Air Raid*.** By Polina Barskova. Trans. Valzhyna Mort. Ugly Duckling Presse, 2021. 160 pp. Notes. $16.00, paper.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2023.85

The context for my reading these poems changed in the midst of reading them as Russia launched its war on Ukraine, and their primary subject, the siege of Leningrad, shifted in my mind from a "holy place" (святое место) that one does not touch but with reverence to something murkier and more ambiguous. After Kharkiv, Sumy, Chernihiv, and Mariupol (I hope the list will not have grown any longer by the time these words appear in print), it is hard to imagine anyone approaching the 900 days in quite the same way as before. Perhaps these poems will help.

In the author-translator exchange that serves as both a mutual interview and an afterword to the volume, Polina Barskova notes, "I want, ideally, translations of my poems to be wild" (138). With the exception of a small handful—for example, "Catullus 68A Lisbon," which could be used in a comparative stylistics course for advanced language students looking line by line—she gets her wish. Indeed, occasionally the translated versions of the Russian poems are so adventurous that some readers might wonder whether the term "translation" adequately describes them. For these moments, an advanced translation seminar with a group of experienced poet-translators would provide the ideal audience, as questions of interpretation and poetic invention become central.

The range between these two approaches is thus quite extensive, with some lines appearing conventional and easy to parse in terms of the ways they correspond to the source text and others reaching for sounds and senses that are, one presumes, personal associations of the translator, Valzhyna Mort, with what she has read and felt in Barskova's poems. This is what I mean by the centrality of interpretation and poetic invention, and it is a translation strategy elaborated on and endorsed by the poet and her translator, where Mort tells the poet, "What can be read as my 'liberties' and 'creative license,'' to me are moments of most semantic fidelity to the freedom and creativity of your poems." To which Barskova adds: "My main requirement, and mostly for myself, rather than for my translator, is that of freedom—I need to feel that we are free in this process, that the translator has their unique, idiosyncratic relationship with my text" (137–38). Fidelity, then, is fidelity to freedom, and the translator's "idiosyncratic relationship" with the source becomes especially important.

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2023.84 Published online by Cambridge University Press