

WHO WROTE *THE QUIET DON*?: A REVIEW ARTICLE

Herman Ermolaev, Princeton University

Under the title *Qui a écrit "le Don paisible"?* the anonymous French translation of Roy Medvedev's study *Zagadki tvorčeskoj biografii Mixaila Šoloxova (Riddles of Mixail Šoloxov's Creative Biography)* came out in the summer of 1975.¹ Written in October-December 1974, immediately after the appearance of D., *Stremja "Tixogo Dona": Zagadki romana* (Paris: YMCA, 1974),² it represents the second major publication on the controversial subject of the authorship of *The Quiet Don*. Because Medvedev is a more thorough, cautious, and impartial investigator, his study is clearly superior to D's. As expected from an historian and an "insider," he brings in some hitherto unpublished or hard-to-obtain documents and information, such as the text of the Bolshevik directive of 29 January 1919, the implementation of which caused the outbreak of the Upper Don uprising against the Bolshevik regime (24); a telegram of a Cossack General concerning the strength and spirit of the insurgent Cossacks (198); and the disclosure that the author of the invective "Ob odnom nezasluženo vozroždennom imeni" (*Sovetskaja Rossija*, 14 Aug. 1966) directed against Fedor Krjukov and signed A. Podol'skij was F. Šaxmagonov, a former secretary of Šoloxov (38). At the same time Medvedev acquaints the reader with a variety of views on the authorship of *The Quiet Don* by quoting liberally from private letters of his Soviet correspondents, whose names he leaves undisclosed. He is well read in Soviet critical literature on Šoloxov and does not hesitate to point out its ideological bias. He is equally objective in the presentation of unofficial opinions on *The Quiet Don*, such as those of D. and Aleksej Kosterin. In the polemic with the latter he also shows his courage and independence of thinking by stating that the errors and crimes committed by the Bolsheviks in 1918-19 made the Don Cossacks join the White side and prolonged the civil war for at least one year (257-58). In the face of all these good points, Medvedev's study suffers from a glaring defect: a rather scarce use of materials published during the civil war by the Whites and an absence of references to White Russian émigré sources. Medvedev obviously had only a very limited access to these sources, without which no serious investigation of the historical background of *The Quiet Don* can be complete.

In his research Medvedev proceeds from the belief that any great literary work contains distinctive biographical, ideological, and artistic traits reflecting the author's personality at the time the work was being written. Taken together these traits constitute what the translator termed "portrait-robot" of the author and what Medvedev might have called "slepok s avtorskoj ličnosti."³ *The Quiet Don*, according to Medvedev, contains fifty or sixty such distinctive traits. Only five or six of them are attributable to Šoloxov (114), while Fedor Dmitrievič Krjukov (1870-1920), the author of numerous stories, sketches, and essays about the Don Cossacks, can be credited with at least forty or forty-five (155). Although Medvedev does not claim to have arrived at a definite conclusion, his strong preference for Krjukov as the pos-

sible author of *The Quiet Don* is quite obvious, especially since he does not consider any other names and dismisses Solženicyn's conjecture that *The Quiet Don* might have been the work of an unknown genius who reached his creative peak during the civil war and perished soon after its end (273).

The reasons for Šoloxov's low score in Medvedev's rating are first of all biographical and ideological. The image of the author arising from the pages of *The Quiet Don* has in Medvedev's eyes little in common with the young Šoloxov, a non-Cossack by blood and upbringing who took no part either in World War I or the civil war and who had no chance of knowing intimately the situation in the White camp, especially in its top echelon. Nor could he have created the historical background of *The Quiet Don* with the aid of printed sources, which were very scarce at the time the first three volumes were being written. Neither, Medvedev points out, had Šoloxov exhibited anything but a strong pro-Soviet feeling both in his fiction and topical writings before or after the appearance of *The Quiet Don*, nor had he created anything approaching the philosophical and artistic level of that novel. Since I have already dealt with such contentions in my discussion of Solženicyn's preface to *Stremja "Tixogo Dona,"*⁴ I shall limit myself to commenting on those points that require corrections or elaborations.

Medvedev repeatedly refers to Šoloxov as a member of the Komsomol and puts great weight on the argument that the political sympathies of the author of *The Quiet Don* could not stem from a person of Communist persuasion. This argument, however, is somewhat weakened by the probability that Šoloxov never joined the Komsomol⁵ and that three volumes of *The Quiet Don* had been written before he became a Communist party candidate at the end of 1930. Medvedev discerns a fundamental difference between Šoloxov's stories of the mid-twenties and *The Quiet Don* in the choice of protagonists and in the attitude toward the Cossacks. The protagonists in the stories, he says, are people of the new regime, members of the Party, Komsomol, and food-collecting detachments. Šoloxov displays no admiration for the Cossack way of life and portrays the Cossacks as archenemies of the Soviets. They beat the peasants, who seized their land, and kill local Soviet officials and food collectors. Good Cossacks—the Red ones—appear only in two or three stories (94). These statements suffer from certain oversimplifications and exaggerations. The scenes of the Cossacks brutally slaughtering the Reds can also be found in *The Quiet Don* (III, 208, 350–56, 358–63; IV, 31–32).⁶ Of the sixteen stories depicting a political killing eight have Cossacks as victims and four show the Reds murdering their adversaries ("Šibalkovo semja," "Prodkomissar," "Baxčevnik," "Odin jazyk"). It is questionable that the sentiment of triumphant Communism is absolutely alien to the author of *The Quiet Don*, as Medvedev asserts (226). On the contrary, in the narrative of *The Quiet Don* Communist ideology is called "a great human truth" (II, 48), Red soldiers are fighting "for the Soviet power, for Communism, for the liberation of working people from oppression, for doing away with wars forever on this earth" (III, 292),⁷ and the Cossack resistance to the Red conquest is termed an "inglorious war against the Russian people" (IV, 279). Of course one may suggest that these pronouncements could have been inserted by Šoloxov into a plagiarized text. However, such a suggestion, unless supported by solid evidence, would be no more valid than the contention that the above pronouncements have always been a part of the original text written by Šoloxov. Šoloxov's stories appear to Medvedev to be profoundly subjective. Not one of them, he maintains, displays the impartiality and detachment characteristic of *The Quiet Don* (109). This is an overstatement. Medvedev fails to take into account such stories as "Semejnij čelovek," "Čužaja krov'," "Obida," and "Veter" where an objective portrayal of emotional and behavioral complexities takes precedence over political bias.

Šoloxov's inability to create *The Quiet Don* is, according to Medvedev, evident in the unbridgeable philosophical and artistic gap separating that novel from the rest of Šoloxov's writings, beginning with volume 1 of *Virgin Soil Uplturned*. In Medvedev's judgment, the narrow class orientation of this work is of a lower moral value than the universal humanism of *The Quiet Don* (221), "The Science of Hatred" is "extremely partial" (235), *They Fought for Their Country* is marked by astounding mediocrity (236), "The Fate of a Man" is highly overpraised by Soviet critics to camouflage the paucity of Šoloxov's literary production after World War II (235), and volume 2 of *Virgin Soil Uplturned* is much weaker than volume 1, and in it Šoloxov appears to have lost all his ability to tell the truth to the extent that not a single page of volume 2 is worthy of the author of *The Quiet Don* (226, 232). Šoloxov's journalistic writings are for Medvedev "dogmatic and reactionary," displaying a shocking poverty of language and thought (239). It is hard to disagree with Medvedev's evaluation of all the above-mentioned works. One can only wish that he had probed deeper into the causes of Šoloxov's moral and artistic decline and made allowances for the circumstances under which a Soviet author writes and publishes. It is, for example, very unlikely that the censors would have passed volume 1 of *Virgin Soil Uplturned* had it contained a more detailed description of the tragic conflicts which arose in the early stages of collectivization and which, Medvedev believes, Šoloxov treated too hastily (214). It would have been impossible to publish "The Science of Hatred" and "The Fate of a Man" had Šoloxov, in accordance with Medvedev's wishes, explored in depth the real reasons why millions of Soviet troops were taken prisoner by the Germans (235). Although Medvedev seems at times to demand too much from Šoloxov and although one can give several reasons for the writer's moral and artistic decline, the fact remains that there is indeed a big difference between the balanced objectivity of *The Quiet Don* and the heavy ideological slant of nearly all of Šoloxov's writings, which generates understandable doubts about the authorship of *The Quiet Don*. A possible explanation for this discrepancy is that almost three fourths of *The Quiet Don* was written during the period when Šoloxov perhaps was not in a strongly pro-Soviet frame of mind. Before beginning his work on *The Quiet Don*, he might have already been somewhat disappointed in the Soviet regime because he had not been accepted into a *rabfak* (*rabočij fakul'tet*) in Moscow. The desire to study in this school, which prepared workers and peasants for institutions of higher learning, figured prominently in his decision to come to Moscow in 1922. The entrance requirements Šoloxov could not satisfy were: experience of working in industry, and a recommendation from the Komsomol (Ležnev, 41). Upon his return to the Don region in May 1924, he lived for two years close to his father-in-law, Petr Gromoslavskij, a well-to-do Cossack who had been a sexton and stanitsa ataman before the Revolution. In 1923 Gromoslavskij again became a sexton, and the critic Isaj Ležnev characterizes him as a "wavering, politically unstable person" (33). In the fall of 1926 Šoloxov moved to Vešenskaja and kept in contact with the Cossacks of that area, collecting materials for *The Quiet Don*. Thus the principal work on the novel, from the end of 1925 to 1930, was done in a conservative and predominantly anti-Soviet milieu. Besides, this work coincided with the period of NEP when many people, especially such conservative elements as the Cossacks, cherished hopes that the Soviet regime would eventually abandon its Communist dogmas. All this could have weakened Šoloxov's original devotion to the Soviet regime. It could also have contributed to the development in *The Quiet Don* of an objectivity whose elements were already present in some of his stories. With the beginning of collectivization, when there was no middle way to follow, Šoloxov sided with the regime and subsequently bound himself to it by joining the Party and by propagating its views in his writings. This could not but seriously impair his objectivity and the artistic quality

of his works. Šoloxov's moral and artistic degeneration should not necessarily be viewed as evidence that he was not capable of creating *The Quiet Don*. It can, instead, be regarded as a case of inevitable deterioration of a great talent in the service of a mendacious political power. There can be a variety of reasons why a masterpiece or simply a good literary work is not matched or surpassed by subsequent works, especially in the Soviet conditions after the NEP. In their works published since 1930, Babel', Vsevolod Ivanov, Oleša, Pil'njak, and Leonov have not equaled the quality or significance of their own best writings of the 1920's. And what would be the difference between Anna Axmatova's early and late art if instead of creating, clandestinely, such masterpieces as the *Requiem*, she would have continued writing in the vein of *In Praise of Peace (Slava miru)* where one finds lines like "I blagodarnogo naroda / On slyšit golos: 'My prišli / Skazat': gde Stalin, tam svoboda, / Mir i veličie zemli!"⁸

Qui a écrit "le Don paisible"? is the first published study which investigates in considerable detail the biography, philosophy, and writings of F. D. Krjukov in relation to the controversy over the authorship of *The Quiet Don*. No doubt, Medvedev is right in emphasizing Krjukov's intimate knowledge of the Cossack way of life. A son of the ataman of the stanitsa Glazunovskaja in Ust'-Medvedickij District, Krjukov was raised in a typical Cossack atmosphere. He traveled through the Don country, studied its history and economics, and represented its interests in the First State Duma. He had the knowledge and personal experience necessary for the portrayal of the pre-revolutionary life of the Cossacks as depicted in volumes 1 and 2 of *The Quiet Don*. It is, however, not clear whether Krjukov actually worked on an epic novel and, if he did, how much of it was completed. Available information on these points varies a great deal. According to the Soviet critic Vladimir Moložavenko, Krjukov had been working on a large novel about the Cossack life before World War I, but the work was interrupted by his being drafted into the army.⁹ B. N. Dvinjaninov says that Krjukov worked on such a novel in 1917–18.¹⁰ P. Margušin, who worked with Krjukov in the newspaper *Donskie vedomosti* in 1919, recalls that Krjukov talked to him about his plans to write a novel about the Bolshevik invasion of the Don region and sent him on a trip to collect materials for it.¹¹ Krjukov's countryman, the writer Sergej Serapin (Pinus), assures us that Krjukov took along to his grave a *War and Peace* of his time which he was thinking of writing (*zadumyval*).¹² Medvedev is inclined to share the opinions of Moložavenko and Dvinjaninov. Even if Krjukov did begin to write a novel before the Revolution, one may still wonder why he would choose the Vešenskaja region as its setting. About seventy-five miles away from Glazunovskaja, Vešenskaja belonged to the neighboring Doneckij District and there is no evidence that Krjukov was interested in that stanitsa before or during World War I. His stories and sketches about the Cossacks were as a rule set in his native region. He could have developed an interest for Vešenskaja in the spring of 1919 when it became the center of the Upper Don uprising and he, being the Secretary of the Don Cossacks Parliament (Vojskovoij Krug) at that time, appealed to the insurgents to hold out. Even if this interest were strong enough to make him decide to change the setting for the first two volumes of his hypothetical novel and—the main thing—to devote the third volume to the Upper Don uprising, Krjukov would have had very little time to study this uprising in detail, let alone describe it as extensively as it is done in *The Quiet Don*. The earliest he could have gone to Vešenskaja would have been in June 1919, immediately after the defeat of the Reds. He was reported by eyewitnesses to have visited Glazunovskaja about this time and later in August,¹³ but nothing has been said about his going to Vešenskaja. Soon thereafter Krjukov was drawn into the vortex of war. In September the front moved to Glazunovskaja and he joined an Ust'-Medvedickaja

White Cossack unit. Returning about a month later to Novočerkassk, he took part in the sessions of the Vojskovoij Krug.¹⁴ Before the seizure of Novočerkassk by the Bolsheviks on January 7, 1920 (New Style), he left with the retreating Whites and died of typhus or pleurisy on February 20 (March 4), 1920, in or near Novokor-sunskaja (Kuban' region), not in Egorlykskaja (Don region), as Medvedev states (142). It is very doubtful that in such conditions Krjukov could have prepared a rough draft and, perhaps, written a few isolated chapters of volume 3 and the beginning of volume 4, as Medvedev thinks (272). (Medvedev does, however, allow that part 8 of volume 4 could have been written by Šoloxov.)

Many passages in *The Quiet Don* seem to Medvedev to mirror Krjukov's personal experiences during World War I and the civil war. A good number of such analogies are based on vague and erroneous assumptions, however. According to Medvedev, Krjukov was at the front in August and September of 1914 as a reporter. Then he returned to the front several times with the medical detachment of the State Duma and in the autumn of 1916 was called to active duty as an officer. There is no question in Medvedev's mind that Krjukov was able to witness personally all the war episodes evoked or described in *The Quiet Don* (133-34). But the picture arising from Krjukov's own heavily autobiographical writings of the World War I period is somewhat different. He spent the first three months of the war predominantly in Glazu-novskaja and Petrograd. Late in the fall of 1914 he left the Don region for the Turkish front and after a long journey joined the Third Hospital of the State Duma in the Kars area, and he stayed with it for about two weeks in the winter of 1915 near the battle zone. His second and last visit to the front during World War I took place in the winter of 1916 when he spent about two months in Galicia with the same State Duma hospital, making occasional visits to the front lines. During the largest part of 1916 and the beginning of 1917 he lived primarily in Petrograd, where he witnessed the February Revolution.¹⁵ This excludes any possibility that he was drafted in the fall of 1916. Had Krjukov joined the fighting troops as an officer at that time, it is very unlikely that he would have avoided telling about it in his writings. Furthermore, chances are he would not have been drafted because of his age and nearsightedness, the latter being the reason for his exemption from military service in his youth. These circumstances cast doubt on Medvedev's assertion that in the spring of 1918 Krjukov fought in the ranks of the Don Army as an artillery officer (138), and that this experience is reflected in chapters 8-10 of volume 3, particularly in the scene of Grigorij Melexov meeting an artillery captain on the battlefield in chapter 8. It is not clear whether Medvedev supports his assertion about Krjukov's serving as an officer by a reference to an unavailable collection *Rodimyj kraj*, published in Ust'-Medvedickaja in 1918 as a tribute to the twenty-fifth anniversary of Krjukov's literary activity, or whether he uses this reference only to support his subsequent statement that Krjukov was wounded and immobilized for several months during his service in the Don Army in the spring of 1918. I have not encountered any source about Krjukov's being an artillery officer. This is true of several articles about him in the November 18 (Dec. 1), 1918, issue of the Rostov journal *Donskaja volna*, an issue dedicated to him in connection with his anniversary. It is also true of an apparently trustworthy account of General Svjatoslav Golubincev who reports that Krjukov took part in the anti-Bolshevik uprising in the spring of 1918, joined Golubincev's unit as a volunteer, and suffered a slight concussion from an artillery shell in June of the same year.¹⁶ The troops with which Krjukov served at that time did not belong to the Don Army, as Medvedev says, but to the Liberation Army of Free Villages and Stanitsas of the Ust'-Medvedickij District (Golubincev, 67). Elsewhere Medvedev erroneously asserts that the fighting for Ust'-

Medvedickaja described in volume 4 is the same fighting in which Krjukov took part after joining the Ust'-Medvedickaja detachment in the fall of 1919 (139). But the fighting described in the novel took place in June 1919 during the advance of the Whites when Krjukov was in Novočerkassk. If Krjukov's participation in those war events which are depicted in *The Quiet Don* is not as great as claimed by Medvedev, one must wonder also about the validity of inferences derived by comparing Krjukov's military career with the war scenes in the novel. Judging by Medvedev's own standards, the validity should suffer a great deal, for he believes that *The Quiet Don*, just like *War and Peace* or *August 1914*, could have been written only by an author with personal combat experience. Regardless of whether one shares Medvedev's belief or not, the fact is that both Krjukov and Šoloxov, who fought the anti-Bolshevik partisans while serving in a food-collecting detachment, had seen some action. To what extent their rather modest combat experiences could have helped them to draw the war scenes of *The Quiet Don* and to what extent these experiences could have been supplemented by outside sources and by their own creative imaginations are moot questions. Krjukov knew much more than Šoloxov about World War I from his personal experiences, but Šoloxov was perhaps more familiar with the Upper Don Uprising, for he had the opportunity to observe it and to rely on oral accounts of its participants, particularly Xarlampij Ermakov, whose military career served as a model for Grigorij Melexov's. Written and oral sources about World War I processed by Šoloxov's superior imagination could have yielded the battle scenes found in volumes 1 and 2. Compared on the basis of their war experiences, Šoloxov, with more talent and more time for writing, emerges as at least as strong a candidate for the authorship of *The Quiet Don* as Krjukov.

In addition to Krjukov's military record, Medvedev points to his service in the Don Cossacks government as having given him an excellent opportunity to observe many important events which took place from June 1917 to June 1918 (68, 115, 136–37) and which are found primarily in volume 2 of *The Quiet Don*. Medvedev's arguments, however, are seriously impaired by his erroneous contention that Krjukov was elected Secretary of Vojskovoj Krug in the summer of 1917 and was therefore close to the Cossack government during the following months. Krjukov became Secretary of the Krug in August 1918,¹⁷ and one has to disagree with Medvedev that he could have seen the following occurrences: the negotiations between Ataman Aleksej Kaledin's government and the Red Cossack delegation in Novočerkassk on January 15(28), 1918 (II, 240–52); Kaledin's suicide in Novočerkassk on January 29 (February 11), 1918 (II, 292–94); the withdrawal of Field Ataman Petr Popov from Novočerkassk and his negotiations in Ol'ginskaja with the Volunteer Army command, February 12–13 (25–26), 1918 (II, 306–11); and the meeting between Ataman Petr Krasnov and the Volunteer Army generals on May 15(28), 1918, in Manyčskaja (III, 40–44). At the time these events were taking place, Krjukov was far away, in or near Glazunovskaja.¹⁸ Nevertheless, Krjukov had the opportunity to learn about some of these events from printed sources. In *Donskaja volna*, for example, he could have read F. G. Kosov's detailed account of Kaledin's negotiations with the Red Cossacks and Field Ataman Popov's reminiscences about his meeting with the White generals in Ol'ginskaja.¹⁹ In all probability it was from Kosov's account that the author of *The Quiet Don* borrowed the texts of documents and numerous lines of dialogue verbatim. But there appears to be at least one more source for the portrayal of Kaledin's meeting with the Red Cossacks, and this source—Georgij Janov's article “‘Paritet’”—came out after Krjukov's death. The textural similarities between the article and the novel speak for themselves. Janov: “S razrešenija Atamana iz prisutstvujuščix na

zasedanii vystupil pod"esaul Šein, georgievskij kavaler vsex četyrex stepenej znaka otličija voennogo ordena. Iz rjadovyx kazakov dosluživšijsja na vojne do pod"esaul'skogo čina." (*Donskaja letopis'*, no. 2, 190). *The Quiet Don*: "S razrešenija Kaledina iz publiky vystupil pod"esaul Šein, georgievskij kavaler vsex četyrex stepenej, iz rjadovyx kazakov dosluživšijsja do čina pod"esaula" (II, 248). Thus the description of Kaledin's negotiations in *The Quiet Don* should be attributed to someone other than Krjukov. Šoloxov, on the other hand, could have read both Janov's article and the reprint of Kosov's account since they appeared in the same issue of *Donskaja letopis'*. By the same token Šoloxov must be considered a more likely author of the passage portraying the meeting in Ol'ginskaja. For this passage General Aleksandr Lukomskij's reminiscences, published two years after Krjukov's death, seem to be a much more important source than Popov's account. This can be illustrated by the following comparison. Lukomskij: "Čto Donskoj otrjad ne možet pokinut' territoriju Dona i čto on, gen. Popov, sčitaet, čto otrjadu lučše vsego, prikryvajas' s severa r. Donom . . . pereždat' sobytija v rajone zimovnikov."²⁰ *The Quiet Don*: "Ja ne mogu pokinut' territoriju Donskoj oblasti i idti kuda-to na Kuban'. Prikryvajas' s severa Donom, my v rajone zimovnikov pereždem sobytija." (II, 308.) *The Quiet Don* also shows a heavy dependence on Lukomskij's reminiscences for its descriptions of General Kornilov's movement, particularly in chapters 13, 18, and 20 of part 4. In one instance thirty-seven words beginning with "Esl' ja ne ošibajus'" were incorporated into the novel word for word.²¹ For the scene of Kaledin's suicide the author of *The Quiet Don* relied above all on Janov's "Paritet." Here is an example of obvious adaptation. Janov: "Na kojke 'Kol't.' Na spinke stula akkuratno položennyj frenč. Na stolike časy-braslet."²² *The Quiet Don*: "Vozle kojki na spinke stula akkuratno povešen frenč, na stolike—časy-braslet" (II, 294). The depiction of Krasnov's meeting with the Volunteer Army generals, as well as many other aspects of his activity can be traced back to the Ataman's own lengthy essay "Vsevelikoe Vojsko Donskoe" published in 1922. As proof of a close link between the essay and the novel one can point out the nearly identical phrases in the enumeration of the members of Krasnov's delegation (III, 40–41) or compare the following excerpts. Krasnov: "General Alekseev byl soveršenno bol'noj. Ezda na avtomobile ego ukačala. Bezučastno, zakryv glaza, on sidel za stolom, oblokotivšis' na ladoni."²³ *The Quiet Don*: "Alekseev . . . prišel k stolu; podperev belymi ladonjami obvislye ščeki, bezučastno zakryl glaza. Ego ukačala ezda v avtomobile" (III, 41.) A booklet entitled *Orly revoljucii*, written by a political worker, A. A. Frenkel', was probably used by the author of *The Quiet Don* more extensively than any other Soviet publication. Being primarily an eyewitness account of Podtelkov's expedition, *Orly revoljucii*, provided numerous details for the portrayal of that expedition in chapters 26–28 of part 5.²⁴ Here there is no disagreement between myself and Medvedev, who liberally quotes from Frenkel's booklet and likewise concludes that Šoloxov used it for *The Quiet Don* (208). There are strong indications that some information about the military operations in the Don region during the winter of 1918 came into the novel from a voluminous work of Vladimir Antonov-Ovseenko who was in charge of these operations on the Red side.²⁵

All the above examples lead one to a conclusion that *The Quiet Don*, especially volume 2, reflects a considerable dependence on White émigré and Soviet sources published in the early 1920's when Krjukov was no longer alive. But the question of how could Šoloxov come into possession of the White émigré publications is not easy to answer, and as long as he keeps silent one has no choice but to speculate about it. He might have obtained the émigré publications through his father-in-law

Gromoslavskij who as a writer of sorts, a sexton, and former ataman was apparently a fairly influential figure in his locality. The émigré publications could have been brought from abroad by a repatriated White Cossack or they could have been acquired by Soviet libraries, accessible to Šoloxov. Whatever the case may be, the fact remains that large portions of volume 2 must have been written in 1923–27 and this, by the way, presents a strong argument against the longstanding allegation that Šoloxov had appropriated the manuscript of *The Quiet Don* while conducting searches during his service in the village revolutionary committee or in the food-collecting detachment in 1920–22. If one rejects the possibility of Šoloxov getting hold of White émigré sources, one has to assume that at least volume 2 was either written abroad by someone who subsequently returned with it to his homeland or by someone in Russia who had access to these sources. Since these assumptions would only create a myriad of new speculations and lead us away from the subject of this review, let us return to Medvedev and deal with the more tangible aspects of the Krjukov-Šoloxov controversy.

One of the principal themes of *The Quiet Don*, if not its leitmotiv, is, in Medvedev's opinion, the relationship between the Cossacks and the non-Cossacks (*inogorodnie*). On this point Medvedev fully sides with D. in insisting that the author of *The Quiet Don* manifested profound love for the Cossacks, especially the hard-working ones, and was hostile toward the non-Cossacks (44–47, 87, 258–63). Medvedev associates these feelings with Krjukov rather than with Šoloxov. Undoubtedly Krjukov loved the Cossacks more than any other nationality, but he displayed no visible hostility towards the non-Cossacks and his feelings for them should not be identified with characters in his writings or in *The Quiet Don* who are hostile to the non-Cossacks. Medvedev did just that by attributing to Krjukov—and, moreover, attributing by mistake—the thoughts of an old Cossack from the sketch “Novoe” (262–63). Judging by his writings, Krjukov was a just, tolerant, and sensitive man, free from narrow nationalistic feelings. In his article “Dorogie mogily” he spoke with great admiration about the Russian soul. His heart ached for Russia when he saw the average Cossack's indifference to it at a session of Vojskovoj Krug in 1918. He was touchingly sympathetic to a non-Cossack family whose son had to go to war; he showed compassion for the Turkish soldiers; he was deeply moved by the self-sacrifice of a Jewish nurse and regretted the underprivileged status of the Jews.²⁶

One of the characteristic political views of the author of *The Quiet Don* reveals itself, in Medvedev's words, in the merciless condemnation of the “imperialist war,” of the Russian generals and officers, and especially of General Krasnov (69). This attitude, however, cannot be considered characteristic of Krjukov. Not a single line in his writings contains a condemnation of the “imperialist war.” From the very beginning of World War I he regarded it as a patriotic duty of every Russian to defend his country and he deplored the disintegration of the Russian Army in 1917. The condemnation of an “imperialist war” would be more typical of a Soviet writer of the 1920's. Since the depiction of the Russian generals in the novel was primarily based on materials published after Krjukov's death, the question of his attitude toward the generals becomes irrelevant. Besides, most of the generals and many officers are portrayed with appreciable impartiality. General Krasnov is reported by the émigré writer Boris Širjaev as having said that he held Šoloxov in great esteem for writing the truth in *The Quiet Don* and that the facts concerning his own personality were presented truthfully.²⁷ That the generals are portrayed with a great deal of fairness can be partly explained by the fact that the author of *The Quiet Don* relied heavily on their memoirs.

To shed more light upon the anti-Bolshevik image of the author of *The Quiet Don* Medvedev points to the usage of the words *perevorot v Petrograde* instead of *Oktjabr'*

skaja revoljucija (112) and *otec* instead of *pop* before priests' names (179). Medvedev, naturally, associates *perevorot v Petrograde* and *otec* with Krjukov. Although *perevorot v Petrograde* (II, 190) or *Oktjabr'skij perevorot* (II, 181, 200) are standard terms in the novel, there is no reason whatsoever to believe that they could not have come from Šoloxov's pen. Both terms were regularly used, notably in the 1920's, in a variety of authoritative Soviet publications, such as Frenkel's *Orly revoljucii* (7); *BSE*, vol. 7 ([1927], 125, 764); and Stalin's "Marksizm i voprosy jazykoznanija" (1950). Citing several examples of *otec Vissarion* and *pop Vissarion* from the narrative of the novel, Medvedev discerns in this inconsistency traces of a "hasty ideological revision" (178). He infers that *pop* must have been introduced by someone belonging to the Komsomol, while *otec* was obviously the choice of a Cossack writer respectful of the Cossacks' attachment to the church. First, the word *otec* was not affected by any "hasty ideological revision," but by a thorough editorial purge of the novel for the 1953 edition where it was either replaced by *pop* or deleted. In all these cases the original *otec* was restored by Šoloxov for the 1956 edition, and it has been retained in all subsequent editions. Second, the word *pop* in combination with the priest's name occurs also in the narrative of Krjukov's writings, e.g., in the story "O[tec]. Nelid" (1913) and the sketch "Novoe" (1917).

More indicative than the *pop-otec* usage are certain errors in *The Quiet Don* which could not have been made by Krjukov. The worst is designating Kaledin, Anatolij Nazarov, and Afrikan Bogaevskij each as "vojskovoij nakaznyj ataman" (II, 130) or "izbrannyj vojskovoij nakaznyj ataman" (II, 301; III, 366). These "Vojskovye Atamany," that is, the Atamans of All the Don Cossacks, were elected by Vojskovoij Krug during 1917–19 and therefore the combination of *izbrannyj* and *nakaznyj* (appointed) is a contradiction in terms betraying an ignorance of a basic fact of the Don Cossacks' history. From the time Peter the Great abolished the old tradition of electing the Atamans of All the Don Cossacks by a vote of Vojskovoij Krug, these Atamans were appointed by the Tsar and titled *nakaznyj*. Since the restoration of the old tradition in 1917, the term *nakaznyj* was dropped from their title. There is no question that Krjukov, being Secretary of Vojskovoij Krug, knew what *nakaznyj ataman* meant. The author of *The Quiet Don* simply associated the word *nakaznyj* with the concept of *glavnyj*. It is amazing—or is it really?—that the Soviet editors have failed as yet to detect this incongruity. The more knowledgeable Medvedev spotted one in the dialogue of the story "Kolovert'" and chided Šoloxov for his poor knowledge of Cossack administration (97), having apparently overlooked the same blunders in the narrative of *The Quiet Don*. Krjukov certainly knew better than to title the last appointed Ataman Count Grabbe a Baron (IV, 141); to use the first name Vasilij, instead of Kondratij, for the famous eighteenth-century Ataman Bulavin (*Oktjabr'*, 5, no. 2, [1928], 163); or to make a well-dressed gentleman sit with his hat on in the company of two ladies in a good restaurant on Nevskij Prospect in August of 1917 (II, 122). It is also unlikely that Krjukov would call a *podxorunžij* (sublieutenant) an officer (IV, 184) or would say that Grigorij Melexov was demoted in rank, and not in position (*Oktjabr'*, 6, no. 3, [1929], 57). The Cossacks who served in World War I maintain that Captain Listnickij in speaking to his superior should have used *Gospodin polkovnik!* instead of *Polkovnik!* (II, 106); that in the summer of 1917 the Cossacks addressed their officers by rank, not by *Gospodin komandir!* (II, 141); that the trail of a gun-carriage was called *xobot*, not *xvost* (III, 267).²⁸ Needless to say, Krjukov was in a better position to avoid these errors than Šoloxov.

The purely literary relationship between *The Quiet Don* and the works of Krjukov and Šoloxov is treated by Medvedev in less detail than the relationship between these

works based on biography and ideology of their authors. Save for brief observations on artistic connections between Šoloxov's stories of the mid-twenties and *The Quiet Don* (99, 266–69) and on the handling of characteristic details by Krjukov and by the author of *The Quiet Don* (146–47), Medvedev's literary argumentation consists of copious citing of similar landscape scenes from Krjukov's writings and *The Quiet Don* as mere illustrations of their artistic similarities and differences. Despite a number of obvious artistic dissimilarities between these works, Medvedev insists that Krjukov is the more likely author of *The Quiet Don* (142–44, 154). His talent, Medvedev contends, was steadily gaining in vigor and maturity, and, inspired by the momentous and dramatic events of the revolution and the war that swept the Don region, Krjukov would have been able to create a great epic, and use the artistic techniques required by a genre new to him.

A depiction of nature and the village in April twilight which Medvedev cites from Krjukov's lengthy story "Zyb'" (1909) represents one of the strongest arguments for his viewpoint (147–48). This passage indeed resembles landscape scenes in *The Quiet Don* in terms of the concurrent visual, aural, and olfactory perception of nature, as well as in terms of imagery, syntax, and individual words. The phrase "kryši četko risovalis' na rozovom stekle dogorajuščej zari" reminds one of *The Quiet Don* with its *četkie* silhouettes of people and objects viewed against the sky and with its frequent metaphorical combinations of two nouns like *steklo zari*. The phrases "mutnymi zerkalami zastyli ozera" and "prozvučali na mgnovenie zybkim serebrom nedosjagaemye golosa" have the following common traits with *The Quiet Don*: the use of words with the root *zyb'*, the characterization of voices as *serebrjanyj*, and the predilection for similes expressed by means of the instrumental case. Yet in contrast to *The Quiet Don*, even in this passage, Krjukov's language is smooth and literary without a single dialectal, unexpected, or hard-to-understand word. This peculiarity of his style can be illustrated by comparing a scene—the expression of joy and pride by an elderly Cossack upon receiving good news about his son—in Krjukov's story "Oficerša" (*Russkoe bogatstvo*, 37, no. 4 [April 1912], 12) with a similar scene in *The Quiet Don* (I, 357). To Krjukov's smooth and impersonal "*sprjativ konvert v pazuxu*," the author of *The Quiet Don* prefers a rough and energetic "*sgrabastav oba piš'ma*." Where Krjukov offers a set of inexpressive clichés—"perepolnennyj sčast'em, gordost'ju i želaniem izlit' izbytok likujuščego čuvstva pered vsem mirom," the author of *The Quiet Don* restricts himself to a brief and effective metaphor: "ošparenogo radost'ju." Krjukov's "černymi, nabuxšimi pal'cami" is an apt and simple description of detail, but it lacks that certain coarseness, dialectal flavor, and local color of its counterpart "podnimal torčmja kopytistuju ladon'" typical of *The Quiet Don*. The main difference between Krjukov and the author of *The Quiet Don*, which Medvedev has failed to comment upon, is the sympathy for the poor and humiliated permeating many of Krjukov's works. This sympathy is expressed at times in a lyrical and sentimental tone, calling to mind Karamzin and the nineteenth-century populists. At the same time the feeling of admiration is conveyed in a lofty and emotional diction. One looks in vain either in Šoloxov's stories or in *The Quiet Don* for passages written in this manner.

Medvedev finds more stylistic differences between Šoloxov's stories and *The Quiet Don* than similarities. He is right in indicating that the descriptions of nature in the stories are not as colorful or animated as in *The Quiet Don*. But it is somewhat one-sided to cite only images associated with dullness, gloominess, and sickliness (99). Šoloxov's stories do contain such tender and lyrical images as "zvezdočka, zastenčivaja i smuščennaja, kak nevesta na pervyx smotrinax" ("Smertnyj vrag"), whereas *The*

Quiet Don has at least a dozen gloomy natural scenes like “rudoe, v sinix podtekax, trupno temnelo nad vetrjakom nebo” (I, 171). Taken as a whole, Šoloxov’s stories appear to have more features in common with *The Quiet Don* than do Krjukov’s works. If inversions, “chopped” prose, and dialecticisms are well-nigh absent from the narrative portions of Krjukov’s writings, they are quite common in Šoloxov’s stories and the first three volumes of *The Quiet Don*. If Krjukov’s stories are marked by lengthy dialogues, static descriptions, and the lack of dramatic and well-developed plots, most of Šoloxov’s stories feature dynamic plots and short, expressive dialogues. *The Quiet Don* shares with Šoloxov’s stories and *Virgin Soil Upturned* hundreds of identical or similar figures of speech. The stories, *The Quiet Don*, and—to a lesser extent—*Virgin Soil Upturned* contained in their earliest editions a great number of identical or similar blunders of grammatical, semantic, and stylistic nature. Here are a few examples. Stories: *doprež* instead of *doprež’* (31), *teljaty* (134), *staven’* (128), *zaostrenoj* (78), *putannymi* (108).²⁹ *The Quiet Don*: *doprež* (*Tixij Don*, III, [1st ed., 1933], 227), *pisar’ja* (*Oktjabr’*, 5, no. 4 [1928], 128), *ko vremju* (*Oktjabr’*, 6, no. 2 [1929], 113), *frenčev* (*Oktjabr’*, 9, no. 7 [1932], 10), *portmonet* (*Oktjabr’*, 5, no. 3 [1928], 192), *krašenoj medjankoj* (*Oktjabr’*, 5, no. 1 [1928], 139), *putannye* (*Oktjabr’*, 9, no. 1 [1932], 30). *Virgin Soil Upturned*: *doprež* (*Novyj mir*, 8, no. 3 [1932], 42), *krašenogo oxroj* and *šarovarov* (*Novyj Mir*, no. 1, 58, 68), *derevjažki* (*Novyj mir*, no. 5, 82). In both the stories and *The Quiet Don* one could find the wrong use of identical words. Thus *migat’* is mistaken for *mel’kat’*: “I pošel . . . , migaja rubaxoj” (79); “Dar’ja, mignuv podolom” (*Oktjabr’*, 5, no. 6 [1928], 55). *Pitaj’* for *pit’* or *vpityvat’*: “Pesčanik žadno pital rozovatuju penu i krov’” (*Smena*, 2, no. 11 [15 June 1925], 5); “kak solončak ne pitaet vodu, tak i serdce Grigorija ne pitalo žalosti” (*Oktjabr’*, 5, no. 5 [1928], 142). There are also cases of using *nenavistnyj* for *nenavidjaščij* and *odet’* for *nadet’*. Particularly striking is the substitution of *nemo* for *gluxo* to describe the dull sounds of guns, voices, thunder, and horse-shoes. There are at least nine of these errors in the stories, sixteen in *The Quiet Don*, two in *Virgin Soil Upturned*, and even one—“*nemo xlopali zenitki*”—in *They Fought for Their Country* (*Pravda*, 15 November 1943). This last *nemo* and one more in the story “*Obida*” (1925 or 1926), first published in 1962, are the only ones that have been retained until today. Extensive mishandling of prepositions in the earliest editions of the stories and *The Quiet Don* is another evidence of their kinship. Practically all of the cases show an ungrammatical use of one preposition instead of another which can be explained by the influence of the local dialect on a writer with modest formal education. There are about thirty such abnormalities in the stories and about a hundred in *The Quiet Don* involving over thirty varieties of faulty usage. Many of these varieties appear in both the stories and the novel. The most prominent mistake—almost half of all the cases—is the use of *nad* instead of *vdol’*, *mimo*, *u*, *okolo*, *po*, and *pod*. Typical examples: “nad pletnjami šarkajut nogi” (120); “On polz nad pletnem” (*Oktjabr’*, 5, no. 9–10 [1928], 155). *Virgin Soil Upturned* also had “postojal nad saraem” (*Novyj mir*, 8, no. 2 [1932], 100), but this novel and volume 4 of *The Quiet Don* had only a few errors involving prepositions because the editors began to catch them in *The Quiet Don* as early as 1928.

If, in Medvedev’s opinion, Šoloxov was unable to produce *The Quiet Don* because it is a masterpiece beyond his artistic reach, one can argue that Krjukov, a well-educated and experienced author, would not have written a work riddled with hundreds of transgressions against literary Russian. To illustrate one more point of similarity between *The Quiet Don* and Šoloxov’s works one could list numerous characteristic examples of the rate of recurrence of certain words. It would, however, be

sufficient to give two examples. The narrative text of the early editions of the first three volumes of *The Quiet Don* and of volume 1 of *Virgin Soil Upturned* does not contain a single *pozadi* neither as an adverb nor as a preposition—everywhere it is *szadi*. I was able to find two examples of *pozadi* in the early editions of Šoloxov's stories, but these could have been contributed by the editors. In Krjukov's writings *pozadi* occurs quite regularly. In Šoloxov's stories (not counting "Veter," which I was unable to obtain) only one of some 450 similes employs the word *točno* as a connective between the tenor and the vehicle; in *The Quiet Don* there is one *točno* in over 2000 similes (and one appears in a simple comparison); there is none in both volumes of *Virgin Soil Upturned* totaling some 940 similes. With Krjukov, on the contrary, *točno* is a favorite connective. It occurs, for example, nine times in "Kazačka" (1896), eleven in "K istočniku iscelenij" (1904), eight in "Zyb'" (1909), six in "Set' mirskaja" (1912), and six in "Oficerša" (1912). If Krjukov is believed to be the probable author of *The Quiet Don*, what explanation can be offered for his sudden abandonment of *točno*? Additional evidence against his hypothetical authorship has recently been furnished by a computer pilot study. It examined the length of sentences and the combinations of parts of speech using a limited number of selections from *The Quiet Don* and from the works of Šoloxov and Krjukov.³⁰

If one is inclined to solve the authorship controversy in favor of Krjukov, one has to explain how his manuscript and/or drafts of *The Quiet Don* fell into the hands of Šoloxov. Medvedev has two versions. The first represents the account of the writer Dmitrij Petrov-Birjuk about the letters written during 1937–38 to the Rostov newspapers and authorities by several Cossacks claiming that Šoloxov received the manuscripts from Petr Gromoslavskij, who allegedly was present at Krjukov's death (34–35).³¹ This version contradicts the information about Gromoslavskij given by Ležnev. According to this critic, at the time of the White retreat from the Don, Gromoslavskij served a sentence in a Novočerkassk prison for having fought on the Red side and was freed by the advancing Red Army (*Put'*, 32). Information about Krjukov's last days which I was able to obtain makes no mention of Gromoslavskij accompanying Krjukov during the retreat, but further investigation is needed. The second version, with the poet Dmitrij Morskoj as the original source, states that at the beginning of 1920's Krjukov's sister brought a suitcase filled with some papers pertaining to the Cossacks to Dem'jan Bednyj. Bednyj in turn gave them to Serafimovič and the implication is that the latter might have handed them over to Šoloxov (36). It is impossible to check the authenticity of this information. Even if one were to assume that it is correct, the big question still remains: whose manuscripts, if any, and to what extent, did Šoloxov use, properly or improperly, for *The Quiet Don*?

Lack of space prevents me from listing Medvedev's factual errors and inaccuracies. Half a dozen of them are related to history and over thirty to literature, including wrong statements about the time the works were written or published, the time, extent, and nature of political revisions in *The Quiet Don*, and the details of plots. The most deplorable feature of *Qui a écrit* is the extraordinarily large number of errors or, possibly, misprints pertaining to publication data and page numbers which appear in the footnotes. More than an average number of misprints occur in transcriptions of Russian words and among faulty translations are the titles of the stories "Rodinka" (91) and "Šibalkovo semja" (92).

Although Medvedev has failed to give persuasive evidence that Krjukov is the more likely author of *The Quiet Don* than Šoloxov, he has written an interesting, thought-provoking, and—in certain aspects—pioneering study. One wonders what direction it would have taken had the White émigré sources been available to him.

NOTES

- 1 Preface by Žores Medvedev (Paris: Christian Bourgois, 1975), 273. The Russian title is taken from Žores Medvedev's article "O knige Roja A. Medvedeva *Zagadki tvorčeskoj biografii Mixaila Šoloxova*," *Novoe russkoe slovo*, 14, 15, 16 Jan. 1975.
- 2 See my review article "Riddles of *The Quiet Don*," *SEEJ*, 18 (1974), 299–310.
- 3 This term appears in "O knige," 15 Jan. 1975.
- 4 "Riddles of *The Quiet Don*," 299–300.
- 5 One may occasionally find assertions that Šoloxov was a "junoša-komsomolec" (Aleksandr Serafimovič, quoted in Valentin Osipov, "Nastavnik—značit drug," *Smena*, 52, no. 10 [May 1975], 8) or that he organized a Komsomol cell in a stanitsa in 1920 (A. Dement'ev et al., *Russkaja sovjetskaja literatura: Posobie dlja srednej školy*, 14th ed. [M.: Prosveščenie, 1965], 208). Such assertions are, however, in contradiction with what Šoloxov said when interviewed by the critic Konstantin Prijma: "Junost' moja složilas' kak-to tak, čto ja, dejstvitel'no, ne byl v komsomole. Vstupil srazu v partiju" (Editorial commentary, Mixail Šoloxov, *Sobranie sočinenij* [8 vols.; M.: GIXL, 1956–60], I, 338, quoted from Prijma, "Šoloxov v Veškax," *Sovetskij Kazaxstan*, no. 5 [May 1955], 75). See also I. Ležnev, *Put' Šoloxova: Tvorčeskaja biografija* (M.: Sov. pisatel', 1958), 41.
- 6 References are to Mixail Šoloxov, *Sobranie sočinenij* (8 vols.; M.: GIXL, 1956–60). Roman numerals indicate volume numbers of *The Quiet Don*. Volume 1 includes parts 1–3, volume 2 parts 4–5, volume 3 part 6, and volume 4 parts 7–8. Subsequent references will be made to this edition, except where the referred material was at some point corrected or removed from the novel. In such cases the references will be made to the earliest printed edition serialized as follows: volume 1 in *Oktjabr'*, nos. 1–4, 1928; volume 2 in *Oktjabr'*, nos. 5–10, 1928; volume 3 in *Oktjabr'*, nos. 1–3, 1929, and nos. 1–8, 10, 1932; vol. 4 in *Novyj mir*, nos. 11, 12, 1937; nos. 1–3, 1938; and nos. 2–3, 1940.
- 7 Italicized words were removed in 1933, perhaps because a virtually identical sentence occurs four lines later.
- 8 *Sočinenija*, ed. G. P. Struve and B. A. Filippov (2 vols.: Munich: Inter-Language Literary Associates, 1965–68), II, 151.
- 9 "Ob odnom nezasluzhenno zabytom imeni," *Molot* (Rostov-on-Don), 13 Aug. 1965. Reprinted in D., *Stremja "Tixogo Dona"*, 183. Moložavenko, as will be shown, is wrong in saying that Krjukov was drafted.
- 10 "Pis'ma A. S. Serafimoviča k F. D. Krjukovu," in *A. S. Serafimovič (1863–1963): Materialy*, ed. L. A. Gladkovskaja et al. (Volgograd: Volgogradskij pedagogičeskij institut, 1963), 149.
- 11 Letter to the Editor, *Novoe russkoe slovo*, 28 Sept. 1974.
- 12 "Pamjati F. D. Krjukova," *Spolox* (Melitopol'), 5 [18?] Sept. 1920. Reprinted in *Rodimyj kraj*, 10, no. 45 (Paris, March-April 1963), 22.
- 13 S. Filimonov, "Vospominanija o F. D. Krjukove," *Kazačij put'*, 2, no. 53 (Prague, 14 March 1925), 5; D. Vorotynskij, "F. D. Krjukov: Vospominanija i vstreči," *Vol'noe kazačestvo*, 5, no. 73 (Prague, 25 Jan. 1931), 17.
- 14 For all the above information see report of the Don Army in *Žizn'* (Rostov-on-Don), 21 Aug. (3 Sept.) 1919; V. Proskurin, "K karakteristike tvorčestva i ličnosti F. D. Krjukova," *Russkaja literatura*, 9, no. 4, 1966, 183; "Vojskovoj Krug," *Večernee vremja* (Rostov-on-Don), 19 Oct. (1 Nov.) and 30 Nov. (13 Dec.) 1919; "Bol'šoj Vojskovoj Krug," *Priazovskij kraj* (Rostov-on-Don), 1 (14) Dec. 1919; "Vojskovoj Krug," *Parus* (Rostov-on-Don), 1 (14) Dec. 1919.

- 15 For all the above information on Krjukov's whereabouts from the beginning of the war until February 1917, see his "V glubokom tylu," *Russkie vedomosti*, 21 Sept. (4 Oct.), 26 Oct. (8 Nov.), 2 (15) Nov., 1914; "S južnoj storony," 6 (19) Nov. 1914; "Za Karsom," 18 Feb. (3 March), 22 Feb. (7 March), 1915; "Pamjati kn. Gelovani," 24 Feb. (9 March), 1915; "U boevoj linii" and "V sfere voennoj obydenosti," serialized from Feb. 5 (18) to July 8 (21), 1916; "Po voennym obstojatel'stvam," 15 (28) Nov. 1917; and "Obval," *Russkie zapiski*, 42, nos. 2–3 (Feb.-March 1917), 350–74.
- 16 *Russkaja Vandeja: Očerki graždanskoj vojny na Donu, 1917–1920 gg.* (Munich: Alexandra Arciuk, 1959), 14, 64.
- 17 K. Kakljugin, "Donskoj ataman P. N. Krasnov i ego vremja," in *Donskaja letopis': Sbornik mater'jalov po novejšej istorii donskogo kazačestva so vremeni russkoj revolucii 1917 goda*, ed. Donskaja istoričeskaja komissija, no. 3 (Belgrade: Savič, 1924), 101; anon. biographical report on Krjukov, *Donskaja volna*, 1, no. 23 (Rostov-on-Don, 18 Nov. [1 Dec.] 1918), 1.
- 18 P. Skačkov, "Istoričeskaja spravka: K proizvedeniju F. Krjukova 'Rodimyj kraj,'" in *Donskaja letopis'*, no. 1 (Vienna: Lingva, 1923), 275–80; Filimonov, 3–4; P. F. Krjukov, "Dva aresta F. D. Krjukova," *Kazačij istoričeskij sbornik*, no. 9 (Paris, Oct. 1959), 27–30. P. F. Krjukov is the adopted son of F. D. Krjukov.
- 19 Kosov, "Podtelkov v Novočerkasske," *Donskaja volna*, 1, no. 27 (16 [29] Dec. 1918), 6–11. Reprinted in *Donskaja letopis'*, no. 2, 306–18; Popov, "Iz istorii osvobođenija Dona: Zapiski poxodnogo atamana," *Donskaja volna*, 1, no. 14 (9 [22] Sept. 1918), 1–3.
- 20 "Iz vospominanij," *Arxiv russkoj revolucii*, ed. I. V. Gessen (Berlin: Slovo, 1922), V, 153. That the author of *The Quiet Don* used Lukomskij's, rather than Popov's reminiscences is corroborated by Popov's unpublished letter to Sergej A. Paxomov written in the summer of 1952. In the same letter Popov rules out the possibility that *The Quiet Don* might have been written by Krjukov. A copy of Popov's letter was made available to me by Mr. Paxomov.
- 21 See Lukomskij, 105 and *The Quiet Don*, II, 128. Brian Murphy, "Sholokhov and Lukomsky," *Journal of Russian Studies*, 12, no. 19 (Bradford, 1970), 36–41 refers to Lukomskij's *Vospominanija* published as a book (Berlin: Otto Kirchner, 1922) as the source used by Šoloxov. It is possible, however, that the author of *The Quiet Don* used the text published in *Arxiv* (V, 1922) since the same issue contained an essay which was obviously well known to him—P. N. Krasnov, "Vsevelikoe Vojsko Donskoe."
- 22 *Donskaja letopis'*, no. 2, 199. According to Colin Bearne, the scene of Kaledin's suicide was based, with some divergences, on N. M. Mel'nikov's article "Aleksej Maksimovič Kaledin," *Donskaja letopis'*, no. 1, 15–42. See "Sholokhov and His Sources," *Journal of Russian Studies*, 13, no. 22 (1971), 10–18. Although there are some similarities between Mel'nikov's article and the novel in regard to Kaledin's suicide, the author of *The Quiet Don* appears to have used Janov's "Paritet" much more extensively.
- 23 *Arxiv russkoj revolucii*, V, 200. It is worth noting that the author of *The Quiet Don* deals predominantly with such aspects of Krasnov's activities which Krjukov could not have witnessed. At the same time he ignores such events in Krasnov's career as his role in the Vojskovoj Krug in the fall of 1918 or his dramatic resignation in February of 1919, which Krjukov did observe. In this connection one wonders why *The Quiet Don* does not reflect Krjukov's major experiences from World War I, for example, the Duma hospital or the Turkish front, or his subse-

- quent experiences as a member of the Cossack government.
- 24 *Orly revoljucii* (Rostov-on-Don: Donskoe oblastnoe agentstvo centropočati V.C.I.K. sovetov, 1920), 19–31.
 - 25 See *Tixij Don*, II, 250–53, 289–90 and *Zapiski o graždanskoj vojne* (4 vols.; M.: Vysšij voennyj redakcionnyj sovet, 1924–33), I, 203–05, 211–12, 215, 230–32.
 - 26 For all these points see his “Dorogie mogily,” *Russkie vedomosti*, 21 March (3 April), 1915; “Vojskovoij Krug i Rossija,” *Donskaja volna*, 1, no. 16 (30 Sept. [13 Oct.] 1918), 4–5; “Siluèty,” *Russkie zapiski*, 40, no. 11 (Nov. 1915), 167–86; “Okolo vojny,” no. 3 (March 1915), 222–26.
 - 27 “Volja k pravde,” *Časovoj*, 38, No. 476 (Brussels, Feb. 1966), 18. For an idea how a White émigré source was adapted for *The Quiet Don* see Brian Murphy, “Sholokhov and Lukomsky.”
 - 28 V. L., “O ‘Tixom Done’ M. Šoloxova,” *Rodimyj kraj*, 13, no. 63 (March–April 1966), 40. Several Cossacks who served during World War I confirmed the accuracy of the above examples in conversations with me. V. L. gives more examples of similar errors in *The Quiet Don* and he is probably right in most cases. A few of his examples, however, are debatable or simply wrong.
 - 29 The page references are from M. Šoloxov, *Donskie rasskazy*, preface A. Serafimovič (M.: Novaja Moskva, 1926). Unless otherwise indicated, all subsequent page references to Šoloxov’s stories will be taken from this edition.
 - 30 The computer study is being conducted by a joint Swedish-Norwegian team of scholars. Information about the study is taken from the manuscript of Professor Geir Kjetsaa’s article “Storm on the Quiet Don: A pilot study” kindly sent to me by the author.
 - 31 In note 2 to my review article “Riddles of *The Quiet Don*” I stated that Roj Medvedev was reported by his brother Žores as saying in the manuscript of *Zagadki* that Petrov-Birjuk had refused to sign the 1929 letter of Serafimovič and others clearing Šoloxov of plagiarism charges. This information was not confirmed in *Qui a écrit*.