

Russia," "Rebels, Dreamers, 'Saints,'" "Kustodiev's Russia," "Grotesque Ivans," "'Entropy' and Revolution," "Men between Yesterday and Tomorrow," "Simplicity and Perfection," and "The Turn to the Past." Although the author notes many influences, similarities, and differences between Zamiatin's work and that of his contemporaries—both Russian and Western—the author's principal emphasis is, quite properly, on the works themselves. The wealth of structural diversity and stylistic richness in the works is clearly demonstrated. From this pattern, however, no over-riding image or idea develops, and the reader is left to conclude for himself, for example, how Zamiatin's style and method might be "heretical."

The technical execution of the survey seems virtually flawless—copious and clear footnotes, few proofreading errors, and a list of German translations which should prove helpful. Unfortunately, the absence of an index of Zamiatin's works greatly reduces the survey's potential as a reference work.

Zamiatin's work is well served by this survey, the only drawback of which is Leech-Anspach's invisibility. Had she expressed more of her own views, the analyses would have seemed less impersonal, Zamiatin would have emerged more clearly from his works, and the survey's grasp would have extended to its reach.

ROBERT T. WHITTAKER  
Lehman College, CUNY

PROBLEMS IN THE LITERARY BIOGRAPHY OF MIKHAIL SHOLOKHOV. By *Roy A. Medvedev*. Translated by *A. D. P. Briggs*. New York and London: Cambridge University Press, 1977 [1975]. viii, 227 pp. \$14.95.

Rumors that someone other than Sholokhov wrote *The Quiet Don* began to circulate almost as soon as the first chapters appeared in 1928. In an effort to scotch the rumors, RAPP created a special investigating committee, which announced in *Pravda* (March 29, 1929) that the reports were false. The rumors, however, refused to be silenced and were reinforced in 1974 by the publication of a book called *Stremia Tikhogo Dona: Zagadki romana*, written by a Soviet scholar known only as "D", who died before completing the manuscript. In his preface to that book, Solzhenitsyn, already known as an ardent fan of Sholokhov's "Sud'ba cheloveka," expressed his own view that Sholokhov could hardly have written *The Quiet Don*.

Subsequently, in 1975, a French translation of Medvedev's book appeared, and it is now available in English. Medvedev's superb and fascinating work includes a detailed analysis of the book written by "D". He agrees with "D" that *The Quiet Don* is the work of two writers—Sholokhov and someone else, probably Fedor Kriukov—but he challenges much of the analysis and information reported by "D". Both of these books have been brilliantly reviewed by Professor Ermolaev (*Slavic and East European Journal*, 18, no. 3 [Fall 1974]: 299–310, and 20, no. 3 [Fall 1976]: 293–307). Medvedev has responded to Ermolaev's two review articles (*SEEJ*, 21, no. 1 [Spring 1977]: 104–16), continuing an exchange of views that is truly enlightening. Another noteworthy response to the two books is Geir Kjetsaa's article, "Storms on the Quiet Don: A Pilot Study" (*Scando-Slavica*, 22 [1976]), which describes a tentative computer analysis that seems to support Sholokhov's position.

Amid the reaction to Medvedev's book, however, two of his fundamental assumptions have received little or no comment: (1) that the underlying ideology of *The Quiet Don*, especially in its first two volumes, is anti-Bolshevik; and (2) that the general philosophy of the author is a "humanism which embraces all mankind," through an "underlying emotional tone that delivers a decisive protest against murder and violence from any quarter and whatever the ideological justification." Even in the first two volumes, the author of *The Quiet Don* portrays Melikhov as right when he accepts bolshevism and wrong when he rejects it. Garanzha reveals "truths hitherto unknown to Gregor" and "Gregor's mind awoke." Gregor then returns home, "and

all this subtle, complex *poison* of flattery, respect and admiration gradually submerged and erased from his consciousness the *truth* which Garanzha had implanted. Gregor returned to Tatarsk one man and went back to the front another. His own Cossack national traditions, sucked in with his mother's milk and loved all his life, rose above the *greater human truth*" (emphasis added). Then, through a process undisclosed in the narrative, Gregor reverts to bolshevism, but then he falls under the influence of the separatist Izvarin, who hates the proletariat. It is Podtelkov, another Bolshevik, who replaces Izvarin as the dominant ideological influence on Gregor, but Podtelkov's massacre of Chernetsov and his men repels Gregor, who deserts and returns to Tatarsk. In the powerful scene that ends the second volume, Gregor is cursed by the captured Podtelkov, who is then gruesomely hanged after making a final speech about the eventual triumph of the toiling masses. The author of *The Quiet Don* clearly sympathizes far more with Podtelkov than with Chernetsov, and he obviously prefers the position of Podtelkov to that of Gregor.

When Ermolaev observes that bolshevism is designated as the truth in the first half of *The Quiet Don*, Medvedev replies that this and similar passages may be interpolations actually written by Sholokhov, but the preference for the Bolshevik position, though usually covert and sometimes remote, is pervasive. Moreover, it surfaces blatantly in the scene where Valet releases a German soldier whom he has captured (chapter 11 of "War") and the German, with a joyous proletarian smile, says, "You're letting me go? Oh, now I understand . . . You're a Russian worker? A Social Democrat like me? Yes . . . ? My brother, how can I ever forget . . . ? I cannot find words . . . But you're a fine lad . . . I . . ." Ideologically, this is the crudest scene in the entire novel.

The second unchallenged assumption relates to the humanism of the novel. In this case, it is useful to examine the scene where Aksinia bears a child and perhaps to compare it to the scene where Tonia gives birth in *Doctor Zhivago*. It is even more instructive to look closely at the depiction of violence in *The Quiet Don*. If, in the Red Cavalry cycle, Babel's narrator occasionally demonstrates an uncomfortable amount of raw curiosity in the presence of harmed humans, the description of harm in *The Quiet Don* leaves the reader with the unpleasant impression that the events are being related with a certain amount of relish. All of these descriptions arise from a view of man that underscores his animal nature. No one has written more perceptively on the two aspects of *The Quiet Don*—its humanism and its ideology—than Helen Muchnic, whose essay (in her book, *From Gorky to Pasternak* [New York, 1961], pp. 304–40) should be read along with the aforementioned recent commentaries on Sholokhov.

Perhaps the peculiar shifts and discrepancies found in *The Quiet Don* can be explained in another way. It may be that in Gregor, as in Anna Karenina and Kavalero, we have a protagonist whom the author intellectually condemns but emotionally condones. In any case, the mystery remains; the rumors persist. And Sholokhov shows no signs of willingness to provide information that might settle the matter once and for all.

RICHARD SHELDON  
Dartmouth College

A DOUBLE LIFE. By *Karolina Pavlova*. Translated and with an introduction by *Barbara Heldt Monter*. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1978. xxii, 111 pp. \$10.00, cloth. \$3.65, paper.

*Dvoinaia zhizn'* (1848) is not exactly a novel, but a Romantic hybrid, part "physiological sketch" in prose, part Romantic idealism in poetry. Pavlova subtitled the work "Ocherk." Each of the ten chapters narrates with auctorial irony a day in the life of Cecilia von Lindenborn, who is duped into marrying a man who only wanted her for