

childhood, "paradise lost," "the remembrance of things past," and all reveal Nabokov's art in its simplest and most youthful form. Thus, this collection brings Nabokov's work into particularly sharp focus.

Nabokov's notes provide valuable auctorial reflections on his early work. They also contain bibliographical information (to which I add that the exact publication date of "The Doorbell" ["Zvonok"] in *Rul'* was May 22, 1927). Nabokov indicates that in translating he has also revamped and retitled some of these stories. There are, indeed, differences between the Russian and English versions which go beyond those of language. The English-language reader should, therefore, be wary in considering these "translations." The fortunate bilingual reader will find a comparison of the texts an exciting study in itself.

MARINA T. NAUMANN

Douglass College, Rutgers University

A CONCORDANCE TO THE RUSSIAN POETRY OF FEDOR I. TIUTCHEV. By *Borys Bilokur*. Providence: Brown University Press, 1975. xiv, 343 pp. \$20.00.

For close study of a poet's verse, perhaps no tool other than a reliable text is more important than a good concordance, which allows one to study in detail how the poet uses words. Tiutchev's importance as a poet, and especially the change in the way he used words during his career, makes a concordance to his poetry particularly welcome. Borys Bilokur has used the best text currently available, the volume edited by K. V. Pigarev, in F. I. Tiutchev, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (Biblioteka poeta, Bol'shaia serii, 2nd ed. [Leningrad, 1957]); the same text was used in Tiutchev's *Lirika* (2 vols., Moscow: "Nauka," 1965). The Tiutchev concordance is clearly printed in Cyrillic typescript, in two-column format, book size 8½ by 11 inches. Head word entries are by dictionary word form (whether or not that form actually appears in the verse), and a combined total use count is given for each head word. Actual uses are listed under each head word, in normal grammatical sequence, in the form of a significant context chosen ad hoc for each instance of the actual word forms used. The "complete context" for each use varies from a part-line to several lines; Bilokur states that the expansion caused by providing such contexts made it mandatory to omit contexts (and citations of individual use locations) for 131 word forms—although the words themselves and their frequency are listed on pages vi–vii. Citation location is by poem and line numbers; the poem numbers are identified in the Key to Poem Titles (pp. ix–xiv), an alphabetical listing by poem title or first line (not both, except for the Russian-language poems with non-Russian titles—for which the number is assigned by first line, and there is an additional list of the titles at the end). Neither the page number of a poem in the edition used nor date of composition is given. The final part of the book is a word frequency list by dictionary word form. The spot checking I have done indicates a commendably high degree of accuracy.

The lack of concordances to Russian poets has long been a handicap for scholars. The only work comparable to a concordance to a poet's complete verse that has been published in Russia is the *Slovar' iazyka Pushkina* (4 vols., 1956–61). It is much more than a concordance and also much less: more, because under the head words (by dictionary word form) it gives definitions together with examples in context; less, because the use listings (given by identified grammatical form)

are only locational. Outside Russia, four concordances to Russian poets have appeared so far, all in 1974 and 1975: Demetrius Kourbourlis's concordance to Pasternak (Cornell University Press, 1974), Bilokur's concordance to Tiutchev, and this reviewer's concordances (together with rhyme dictionaries) to Batiushkov and to Baratynskii (both, University of Wisconsin Press, 1975). All four of these concordances were in preparation and in press at the same time and their formats differ. Unlike the Tiutchev concordance, the three others were computer-printed in their final form, and give a line as context for each use. Space does not permit discussion here of the other differences, nor the advantages and disadvantages of each format. The appearance of the Tiutchev concordance, along with the others, makes possible a new stage in the study of Russian poetry.

J. THOMAS SHAW

University of Wisconsin, Madison

THE GREAT RUSSIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY OF IDIOMS AND SET EXPRESSIONS: OVER 8,600 RUSSIAN ENTRIES. By *Piotr Borkowski*. London: Piotr Borkowski, 1973. xx, 384 pp. £5.00 in UK. £5.50 post free, abroad. (Available from Piotr Borkowski, 146 Gunnersbury Lane, London, England W3 9BA)

This book is the answer to a Russian student's prayer. First of all, it gives good English equivalents for the Russian entries. Second, it is immeasurably larger and more complete (containing 8,600 entries) than any other similar Russian-English work. Third, all the entries are accented, and labeled to indicate stylistic levels and usage. Finally, the work is arranged in such a way that it is almost always easy to find the expression that one is looking for.

The arrangement of the book is one that would recommend itself to authors of similar works in other languages. Rather than taking up large amounts of space by listing each expression under each of the component words, Mr. Borkowski has evolved a simple and sensible system of listing items: if an expression has one or more nouns in it, the entry is under the first noun; if there is no noun but a verb occurs, the entry is under the first verb; if there are neither nouns nor verbs, the entry is under the first adjective, if any; and if the expression contains none of these categories, it is listed under the first word in it, with prepositions, conjunctions, numerals, and personal and possessive pronouns disregarded "as unimportant words." A number of minor rules take care of certain special cases, as well as when there is a very large number of entries under one word (for example, *ruka* with 127 entries). This means that *nachinat' tu zhe muzyku* is under *muzyku*; *kuda vy klonite* under *klonite*; and *kak na kur'erskikh* is under *kur'erskikh*.

In some cases the rules do not seem to have been applied strictly. Under *odin* we find *odin-edinstvennyi*, *odin vsled za drugim*, *kak odin*, *odno i tozhe* (sic! for *to zhe*), and *tut est' odno* "no," which according to his rules should be found under the adjectives *edinstvennyi* and *drugim*, the pronoun *to* (*zhe*), and the adverbs *kak* and *tut*. Even if Mr. Borkowski considers *odin* to be a pronoun, which of course it is morphologically, this would only account for the placement of *odno i tozhe*, and I doubt that most users would consider *odin* anything but a numeral.

In many cases the Russian expressions are first translated by an English expression of the same stylistic level, which is then followed by a more literal and stylistically neutral translation, making it comprehensible to those who might not