

Although this book has much to offer, we are still in need of an analysis of Bunin that will make full use of the insights and the analytic tools of modern literary criticism.

EDWARD J. BROWN
Stanford University

THE WORLD OF YOUNG SHOLOKHOV: VISION OF VIOLENCE. By *Michael Klimenko*. North Quincy, Mass.: Christopher Publishing House, 1972. xiii, 287 pp. \$9.95.

For Professor Klimenko's purposes "young Sholokhov" means the author of *Tikhii Don*, which occupies by far the most attention, and of the early stories, some of which are considered as introduction to the main discussion. Even though its first volume was published in 1932, *Podniataia tselina* is deliberately excluded, because it "displayed a different concept of reality." Within such limits as these Klimenko essays definition of Sholokhov's attitude toward his characters and the events in which they feature. Some of the conclusions drawn prove highly contentious. Klimenko feels, for example, that in the stories Sholokhov "is not unduly fascinated by descriptions of cruelty" and claims an "international character" for the spirit of *Tikhii Don*. Occasionally he is led to present supposition (Sholokhov did not knowingly borrow certain elements from Tolstoy) as though it were factual. He can, moreover, be guilty of misleading exaggeration, as when stating that "Grigorii Melekhov, with a few exceptions in Parts Four and Five, appears on all the pages of the novel, from beginning to end."

Of greatest value are Klimenko's comments on the relation between the original *Donshchina* and the eventual *Tikhii Don* and on the mixture of affection and detachment in the characterization of Grigorii Melekhov. On the whole, however, Sholokhov's epic is considered too much in a vacuum, with little reference to other Soviet literature. Furthermore, there are unsupported generalizations regarding critical sources, as the author confesses disarmingly in his preface.

This volume is marred also by deficiencies in presentation. The English style too often suggests an indifferent translation; proofreading has been lax, particularly in the select bibliography (a reluctant addition, judging by a remark in the preface); and no index is supplied.

One would like to have welcomed wholeheartedly a less general study of Sholokhov than those by D. H. Stewart (whose name and works are cited incorrectly more than once) and C. G. Bearn (not mentioned at all). Yet the reservations which must be made about Klimenko's contribution to the Sholokhovian enigma rule out such response and permit only very circumscribed recommendation.

RICHARD HALLETT
University of Aberdeen

NABOKOV: A BIBLIOGRAPHY. By *Andrew Field*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973. xxvi, 249 pp. \$15.00.

This is the fourth bibliography of Nabokov's works to be published. The first, compiled by Dieter E. Zimmer, the German translator of Nabokov's English works, who worked without any knowledge of Russian beyond the alphabet, was

published in 1963 by Rowohlt Verlag as a present to the friends of Nabokov and of his German publisher. A revised and enlarged edition appeared in 1964. Although aiming at completeness and compiled with some help from Mrs. Véra Nabokov, it was still far from complete and not free from errors. In 1967 Andrew Field included a chapter entitled "In Place of a Bibliography" in his book *Nabokov: His Life in Art*. In it he attempted to fill the gaps in Zimmer's bibliography, without at the same time repeating all of its bibliographical features (thus he did not, for example, try to list all the numerous separate publications of Nabokov's Russian poems; nor did he supply their original titles or first lines).

Mr. Field's quasi bibliography also had many gaps and quite a number of errors. He now says that he regarded it as 98 or 99 percent complete, but that in the course of the next three years he brought to light scores of additional poems, many book reviews and articles, as well as some other items, not to speak of four short stories he had overlooked. Like Zimmer's work, Field's *Bibliography* aims at comprehensiveness and includes over twenty of Nabokov's pieces on lepidoptera and some of his chess problems (this list, however, is far from complete). Field is aware that his new bibliography is still incomplete, but he again cherishes the hope that it is close to the 98 or 99 percent mark and lists everything of importance. This may be so, but the present reviewer could add to it a number of separately published poems, including those in *Mednyi Vsadnik*, a 1923 Berlin almanac, which were never included in any collection. This publication is not even mentioned by Field. It figures in Ludmila Foster's bibliography of Russian émigré literature, but neither Nabokov's poems nor any other material in it seems to be listed therein.

There is no doubt, however, that this bibliography is an improvement on the previous ones, that it is the work of a truly dedicated Nabokov fan, and that an enormous amount of labor must have gone into its compilation. Yet as a bibliography it still leaves much to be desired, and it would have been better if Field had not hurried with its publication.

Methodologically speaking, it was wrong, I think, to list the titles of Russian stories and poems (or the first lines of the latter) in English, with the original Russian (in transliteration) in parentheses, no matter how tempting it was to give prominence to those English renderings in Nabokov's own metrical equivalents. Considering, also, that the overwhelming majority of Nabokov's separately published poems appeared in the Berlin *Rul'*, it was highly uneconomical to spell out each time that newspaper's name, both in English and in Russian (and again, the Russian should have come first), instead of using an abbreviation (*R*), with an appropriate explanation. This contributed to an undue swelling of the bibliography. Abbreviations of titles could also have been used in some other sections of the book. There are also various inconsistencies (in some cases, for instance, dedications of poems are mentioned, in others they are not), inadequate cross references, and errors testifying to insufficient background knowledge. The two weakest sections are the one on "Emigré Reviews of Nabokov" and the one called "Russian Emigré Journals—An Appendix." The former is too chancy, with some important omissions. In the latter there are both gaps and numerous inaccuracies. Field is not aware that the émigré periodical *Russkaia Mysl'*, published between 1921 and 1924 in Sofia, Prague, and Berlin, and resumed in 1927 in Paris (this one Paris issue is ignored by Field), was a continuation of the prerevolutionary monthly of that name, edited by Peter Struve. *Rossia i Slavianstvo*, which

replaced *Rossiiia* but was not the same paper, continued to be published until early 1934. *Segodnia* (Riga) went on appearing through the 1930s. The post-World War II *Grani* is not Munich-based: it was and is published in Frankfurt am Main. There is no justification whatever for listing *Vestnik Evropy*, the famous prerevolutionary periodical, among émigré journals.

One may also mention the following howlers. “Krest’ianskaia Rossiia” (in Prague) was not a *religious* association. Could Field have confused the words *krest’ianskii* and *khristsianskii*? This mistake reminded me of how the same Field, in translating Tertz-Siniavsky’s “Mysli vrasplokh,” took the name of Plotinus (Plotin in Russian) for the word *plotnik* and rendered it as “Carpenter”! And to say that the Russian émigré press “belatedly” accepted the change from the Gregorian calendar *between 1923 and 1924* is pure nonsense: no Russian publications in the West ever used the Gregorian calendar alone; the use of *two* “styles” is something quite different.

Field speaks with pride of the “preciseness” of his work, even granted its incompleteness. But from a bibliography one expects a higher standard of preciseness and reliability. One particular entry in Field’s book aroused this reviewer’s curiosity and prompted him to undertake some detective work on his own. The result was that he found some faulty cross referencing on Field’s part and also discovered some information which Field did not impart to his readers.

One lesson to be learned from this bibliography is to discover once again that so much of Russian émigré periodical literature has not been preserved even in the best libraries in the West. Some of Nabokov’s early writings, as Field rightly points out, may have been irretrievably lost through this unpardonable and deliberate neglect of Russian émigré literature.

GLEB STRUVE

University of California, Berkeley (Emeritus)

ZA KRASOTU VREMEN GRIADUSHCHIKH: POEZIIA VASILIIA FEDOROVA. By *I. Denisova*. Moscow: “Moskovskii rabochii,” 1971. 136 pp. 30 kopeks, paper.

This commentary on the work of a rather limited Gorky Prize winner (1968) is intended for an educated general audience and seeks to demonstrate that his poetry speaks the truth that makes men free (e.g., *istina, krasota, narodnost', dolg, stremlenie, bor'ba, podvig*). Although Denisova displays some ingenuity in interpreting from an ideological perspective Fedorov’s intensely private love lyrics, which often depict the loneliness, sorrow, bitterness, and despair occasioned by lost or unrequited love, her implacable Marxian optimism causes her to overlook at times extensive evidence of Fedorov’s undeluded awareness of human moral weaknesses. In remarking on her book’s title (p. 5), which derives from the last four lines of *Venus Sold* (1956), she simply omits the dissonant fourth line: “Za krasotu / Liudei zhivushchikh, / Za krasotu vremen griadushchikh / My zaplatili krasotoi.” Yet this combination of lyrical faith and tough pessimism defines the unstable center of Fedorov’s poetry: the personal and historical struggles are good, true, beautiful—and endless, because evil is indestructible. *Beethoven* (1961) elaborates allegorically Fedorov’s Marxian conception of the artist’s vocation. Beauty and goodness being inseparable, the great composer wars with Evil by attempting to harmonize nature’s discordant sounds—and he finally succeeds, establishing