

extent and illustrates a number of his points by reference to Chekhov's stories. The articles by Thomas Winner and Savely Senderovich try to give more rigorous definition to the analogy. Winner points to the highly syncretic nature of Chekhov's art, which provokes analogies not only with painting but with music and incorporates elements from myth and folk art. Winner links this syncretic tendency in choice of form and material to the characteristic structure of Chekhov's works with their seeming lack of action and reliance upon repetitions to achieve significant form. Savely Senderovich takes a hard look at the analogy to Impressionist painting and tries to put it on a sounder methodological footing. His observation that many of the qualities that define Impressionism in painting are peculiar to the act of painting as such serves to clear the air. He proposes a "morphological" approach to the analogy, by which aspects of Chekhov's writings can be compared to Impressionist painting on the grounds of similarity in deep function, rather than because of superficial resemblances such as use of color. Many of his comparisons are illuminating. I fear, however, that when he analogizes Chekhov's "overthrow of spiritual perspective" to the Impressionists' overthrow of geometrical perspective on the canvas, he stretches the method to its breaking point.

PATRICIA CARDEN  
Cornell University

EVGENIJ ZAMJATIN: HÄRETIKER IM NAMEN DES MENSCHEN. By Gabriele Leech-Anspach. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1976. x, 119 pp. DM 58, paper.

This short survey (119 pages) covers a vast amount of ground. Divided into three tightly organized and concise sections, the text opens with a twenty-four-page biographical introduction, which emphasizes the politics of Zamiatin's literary career. Continuing with a section on theoretical writings (14 pages), the author summarizes Zamiatin's philosophical, stylistic, and aesthetic views. The work culminates in the major section, "Stories, Novels, and Plays" (70 pages), in which virtually all of Zamiatin's fiction and drama are analyzed, or at least characterized. That Gabriele Leech-Anspach treats eighty-four different works in only eighty-five pages suggests the intensity of this tour de force. Eleven pages of bibliography and indexes conclude the survey. A reference handbook on Zamiatin's life and work could hardly be more compact or complete.

A solid, reliable work which follows established scholarship and criticism, this survey serves the general German reader who may be familiar with *We*, but not with Zamiatin's other works. (Only a small portion of his writings has been translated into German, much of it by Ms. Leech-Anspach herself.) Although written for the generalist, the work yields few generalized insights. A survey can collect and summarize material, but without a controlling idea it cannot discriminate among accumulated data or distinguish crucial events and works from less important ones. The subtitle suggests such a generalization. Unfortunately, neither the image of Zamiatin as a heretic nor the suggestion that his heresy was humanitarian emerges clearly.

The biographical section pays more attention to the context and effects of Zamiatin's actions than to their origins or intent. The brief description of Zamiatin's theoretical writings relates them to ideas of Belyi, Blok, Remizov, Ivanov-Razumnik, Fedin, Gorky, Sholokhov, Leskov, L. Tolstoy, as well as to H. G. Wells, Anatole France, Nietzsche, Bergson, Sartre, Bernard Shaw, and Upton Sinclair. But again, context overwhelms content. Zamiatin certainly viewed the true artist as a heretic, but the reader is not shown how this concept applied to Zamiatin himself.

The analysis and summary of Zamiatin's prose and dramatic works proceed thematically and structurally, rather than chronologically, under the headings "Dark

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 (*SE EJ*, 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