to Zamiatin’s archives and especially his voluminous correspondence has resulted in a full, balanced and meticulously detailed account of his life and work. Of particular value to scholars of this period are accounts of Zamiatin’s friendships and collaborations with Bulgakov, Akhmatova, Fedin, Annenkov, Kustodiev, Chukovsky and many other figures in Russian modernism. The photographs and illustrations included in the book add significantly to the story Curtis tells in this volume. It is a story that expands and enriches our understanding of early twentieth-century Russian and Soviet culture as a whole.

Stetson University

Karen L. Ryan


Vladimir Nabokov’s poetry was highly appreciated by many Russian émigré critics in the 1920s, yet only a small number of critics today believe that Nabokov’s lyric poetry matches his prose for ingenuity. In his book, Paul Morris challenges Alexander Dolinin’s opinion that ‘the verse exercises of the young Nabokov played an important role in the formation of his narrative style’ (p. 88) and aspires to demonstrate the centrality of poetry to Nabokov’s body of writing. Morris claims that ‘the lyric sensibility Nabokov developed in his verse pervades all of his writing’ (p. xvii). As Morris indicates, the aim of his study is twofold: ‘to offer a comprehensive view of Nabokov’s poetry’ and to identify the role of the lyric sensibility in Nabokov’s drama, short fiction and novels (p. xvi), especially in *The Gift* (1937–38), in which many poems were written by that novel’s protagonist, and in *Pale Fire* (1962), which opens with a 999-line iambic pentameter poem in rhymed couplets.

The book comprises the Introduction/chapter one that outlines the evolution of Nabokov as a poet and six chapters. Chapter two examines the reception of Nabokov’s poetry written both in Russian and in English; chapter three discusses in great detail Nabokov’s lyric voice and focuses on the presence of metaphysical traits in his poetry and identifies major themes used in his verse, including such topics as poetic inspirations, love, cosmic synchronization, encounters with the otherworld and the poeticization of everyday life; chapter four describes the lasting effect of poetry on Nabokov’s drama; chapter five explores the employment of Nabokov’s lyricism in short fiction, and chapters six and seven focus on Nabokov’s novels *The Gift* and *Pale Fire*.

The strength of Morris’s study lies in its thorough investigation of Nabokov’s lyric consciousness and Morris’s awareness of its thematic and structural


complexity that enhances an understanding of the writings of Nabokov affected by that complexity. Yet Morris’s exploration of Nabokov’s poetic persona is far from being exhaustive. While Morris rightly detects several important allusions in Nabokov’s verse to the poetry of Keats, Blok, Fet, Tiutchev and Belyi, they are not explored in depth. The role of Nabokov’s parodies and translations of Russian poetry in the development of his narrative style is not mentioned at all. Some of Morris’s statements appear superficial and unsupported by references. For example, the statement that Nabokov’s short story ‘A Guide to Berlin’ ‘seems to be more a prose poem than a short story’ (p. 260) is not supported by any references to the tradition of prose poems as had been developed in Russia and in France. It would be appropriate at least to compare the above story to Turgenev’s prose poems which were inspired by Baudelaire’s *Petits poèmes en prose*. The latter marked the beginnings of the genre in the 1860s. While Turgenev the fiction writer sought to enhance and heighten the ideas of his earlier prose narratives in his prose poems, it can be argued that the fragmentary and impressionistic style of Nabokov’s story, ‘A Guide to Berlin’, develops some of the mnemonic imagery of his verse written in emigration. Many references to Nabokov’s links with Russian Symbolism are not given adequate consideration and are mentioned in passing. A good example of lumping Nabokov together with major European and Russian poets can be seen in this passage: ‘As Nabokov himself indicated, he was formed by poetry of the Silver Age of Russian literature, and intimately familiar with the writing of Vladimir Solovev, Fedor Sologub, Konstantin Bal’mont, Viacheslav Ivanov, Andrei Belyi and Aleksandr Blok, to remain with the central figures of Russian Symbolism alone. As a wide and passionate reader of poetry, Nabokov was also knowledgeable of the writings of the French Symbolists and, through his deep admiration for such Russian poets of the nineteenth century as Fet and Tiutchev, the German romantics who had influenced Russian literature’ (p. 113). Surprisingly, there is no detailed discussion in Morris’s book of the touch from Edgar Allan Poe and Belyi that left a ghostly trace in Nabokov’s poetry and prose that rely on the use of parody. The notion of the lyric sensibility used in Morris’s book on many occasions is not explained properly. It appears to be loosely related to Pekka Tammi’s observation on the non-polyphonic quality of Nabokov’s novels discussed in the Introduction (p. xix). The book would have benefited from a more developed theoretical framework based on the engagement with many important theoreticians who wrote on the lyric, including such major figures as Mikhail Bakhtin, Theodor Adorno and Brian McHale, whose 2001 book, *Weak Narrativity: The Case of Avant-Garde Narrative Poetry*, would have helped Morris to analyse Nabokov’s narrative’s poems better.

Notwithstanding the above-mentioned shortcomings, Morris’s study will be of interest to anyone who is interested in Nabokov in particular and twentieth-century literary studies in general. Morris’s examination of Nabokov’s poetry
and its reception is undoubtedly one of the fullest accounts of Nabokov’s poetic achievements produced so far. The book also lays the ground for future studies related to the inter-relationship between prose and poetry in the twentieth century.

School of Languages, Literatures and Cultures
University of Edinburgh

Alexandra Smith


Four years after the controversial publication of *The Original of Laura*, a collection of studies edited by Yuri Leving, provides a stimulating insight into Nabokov’s posthumous, unfinished novel.

The book consists of five sections preceded by an introduction by Leving. The opening, ‘A Picture in Fragments’, consists of a chronology of the novel compiled by Leving and Brian Boyd which acquaints the reader with the main stages of the novel’s history. It is followed by a ‘round table discussion’ about the novel’s publication. This exchange between five Nabokov scholars (Galya Diment, Leland de la Durantaye, Michael Juliar, Eric Naiman and Olga Voronina) was conducted via email — a detail pleasantly reminiscent of Nabokov’s own interviews — and addresses the key issue of Dmitri Nabokov’s decision to publish his father’s unfinished manuscript, despite the latter’s unambiguous wish to see it destroyed if he could not complete it before his death. It also considers the book’s design, as well as the marketing strategy adopted to advertise it.

The second section, ‘Reading is Fun: Approaches to Analysis’, presents, more conventionally, a series of literary studies authored (in order of appearance) by Michael Wood, Gennady Barabtarlo, Ellen Pifer, Lara Delage-Toriel, Michael Rodgers, Barbara Wyllie and Paul Ardoin. Barabtarlo’s long and accurate analysis is particularly engaging. Also remarkable is Wyllie’s discussion of the novel’s narrative structure as well as her careful examination of the connections between Nabokov’s ‘Blue Fountain forest’ scene and Flaubert’s *L’Éducation sentimentale*, something radically new. Ardoin’s exploration of the novel’s complex paratext and the way in which he tackles the question of its posthumous publication is useful and thought-provoking, not only because of its many strengths but also because of its one weakness: a tendency to forget now and again that the text is *unfinished*. He continually refers to Nabokov’s manuscript as a book, in the same way one would *Lolita* or *Ada*, and yet it