criticism" (p. 9), with particular reference to the treatment accorded by these critics to the works of Dostoevsky.

The title of the book is misleading—not much is said about Dostoevsky, the bulk of the running exposition being devoted to a detailed presentation of the critics' respective ideological positions. In the chapter on Chernyshevsky only three pages of twenty-four concern the critic's attitude toward Dostoevsky's art; and only twelve pages of thirty-one in "Vissarion Grigorevič [*sic*] Belinskij (1811–1848)" describe Belinsky's criticism of the novelist. Even those chapters that more or less directly concern Dostoevsky as a writer (on Dobroliubov, Pisarev, and Mikhailovsky), though indicative of Mr. Proctor's excellent research and profound knowledge of facts, contain very little evaluation of the critics' treatment of Dostoevsky's work.

There are also some oversimplifications in the book, an example of which is an alleged analogy between Dostoevsky and the "utilitarian" critics whom he opposed (p. 106). Dostoevsky indeed encountered some problems similar to theirs by wanting literature "to promulgate what he considered to be truth" (p. 106), but Dostoevsky's truth differed so greatly from theirs that it formed the very basis of their frequently vociferous attacks on the novelist.

I have my doubts that "the news of Belinskij's death seems to have provoked one of Dostoevskij's early epileptic attacks" (p. 63); or that Dostoevsky recommended Belinsky as a model literary critic to an adolescent reader (p. 63); or that L. B. Dubelt of the secret police expressed "violent regret that Belinskij was dead, adding, 'We would have rotted him in prison'" (p. 65).

Proctor's study includes a good selected bibliography, conveniently divided into several sections, but there is no index. The book will in all probability be more useful for students of Belinsky and his school of literary criticism than for Dostoevsky scholars.

TEMIRA PACHMUSS
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

CHEKHOV: A COLLECTION OF CRITICAL ESSAYS. Edited by *Robert Louis Jackson.* Twentieth Century Views. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1967. ix, 213 pp. $4.95, cloth. $1.95, paper.

THE ISLAND: A JOURNEY TO SAKHALIN. By *Anton Chekhov.* Translated by *Luba* and *Michael Terpak.* Introduction by *Robert Payne.* New York: Washington Square Press, 1967. xl, 375 pp. $6.95.

In his introduction Robert Jackson sees as a fundamental philosophical orientation and basic theme in Chekhov the clash of will and environment, freedom and necessity, as revealed through his unheroic minor personalities. The introduction also includes a brief history of Chekhov criticism which is concise but suffers from some important omissions. Thus significant recent studies carried out in the Soviet Union in connection with the preparation of the academic edition of Chekhov's works are not mentioned. An assessment of the textual criticism of E. Polotskaia and A. Chudakov and some discussion of Chudakov's structural approach to Chekhov would have been particularly appropriate. Jackson's discussion of Chekhov's relation to Pushkin is interesting and points to an important problem. Chekhov's return to the moderation, rationality, sobriety, and economy of Pushkin is viewed as an antidote to the moral and spiritual extremism of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky. Chekhov's affinity to Pushkin is indeed comprehensive, and bears

stressing; for example, the unheroic hero of *The Bronze Horseman* and the satirical treatment of romanticism in *The Queen of Spades* are re-echoed and further developed in Chekhov's writings.

The first essay of the collection, Boris Eikhenbaum's "Chekhov at Large" (1944), seeks to establish the thematic relation of Chekhov's untraditional heroes to the ineffective protagonists in the works of Pisemsky and Leskov. Although such a general relation can easily be established, its significance must not be overstated. Certainly the gulf between Chekhov's classically simple style and Leskov's ornamental prose is immense. Again, Chekhov's true affinity is rather with Pushkin, by virtue of both style *and* theme.

Leonid Grossman's essay, "The Naturalism of Chekhov" (1914), examines the influence of the French naturalists on Chekhov. Despite some revealing insights, the methodology and general orientation of this essay appear antiquated and simplistic today. Dmitri Chizhevsky (Tschižewskij), in his particularly interesting essay, "Chekhov in the Development of Russian Literature" (1960), discusses Chekhov's style in relation to his world view, and is especially concerned with how his impressionism is related to his ideology. Vsevolod Meyerhold's "Naturalistic Theater and Theater of Mood" (1908) turns to problems of the staging of Chekhov's drama of mood. A. Skaftymov's "Principles of Structure in Chekhov's Plays" (1958), like Chizhevsky's essay, seeks to associate Chekhov's style with his world view, and to identify his dramatic structure with his perception of life as an uneventful flow of events, which is held to be the "direct and fundamental object of the creative act of representation." S. D. Balukhaty's rigorous description of the dramatic form of *The Cherry Orchard*, originally part of his study on Chekhov's drama (*Problemy dramaturgicheskogo analiza: Chekhov*, 1927), demonstrates the strengths and limitations of the Formalist method. Berdnikov's analysis of *Ivanov* (1957) discusses its departure from the tendentious "realistic" play but fails to demonstrate the connections between the different versions of *Ivanov* and Chekhov's later "actionless" plays.

Robert Jackson's "*The Seagull*: The Empty Well, the Dry Lake, and the Cold Cave," the only essay of the collection not published earlier, presents a Freudian analysis of Konstantin, who is unable to cope with life (he cannot break away from his mother's womblike protection), and interprets Nina's ability to take her life into her own hands in an archetypal context. Nina has found truth outside of Plato's cave, while the unfortunate prisoners left behind in the Russian countryside perceive only shadows and images, as did the original mythical victims. While the oedipal and archetypal explanations are not unjustified, they are so general that we must ask if they do more than establish once again that Chekhov truly discusses the human condition. Moreover, the Platonic analogy must be very loosely construed here to be defended at all. In Plato's allegory the wanderer is "reluctantly dragged" into the intellectual world, while Nina most willingly escapes her constricted life for new experiences which alter her view of life and of herself. In this very general sense, however, the myth could apply equally to the protagonists of many other works of literature: Chekhov's "Ward No. 6" and "The Betrothed," Pushkin's *Prisoner of the Caucasus* and *The Gypsies*, Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, Dostoevsky's *Idiot* and *The Possessed*, Goethe's *Faust*, and many of Hermann Hesse's novels are just a few examples.

Ermilov's essay on *Uncle Vanya* (1948) is one of the more successful works of this mediocre Soviet critic, yet it says so little of significance that its inclusion seems difficult to justify. M. N. Stroeva's essay (1955) on the production of *The*

Three Sisters in the Moscow Art Theater, which presents parts of Stanislavsky's promptbook and provides insights into the methods of the director and fresh understanding of the play, is an important contribution. Francis Fergusson's essay on *The Cherry Orchard* from his *Idea of a Theater* (1949) is an example of a sophisticated approach to Chekhov's dramaturgy, which discusses its uniqueness and its connections with Russian and Western literary traditions. Nils Å. Nilsson's essay (1960) discusses the significance of intonation, rhythm, and other paralinguistic aspects of Chekhov's dramaturgy, which are viewed as one means of breaking out of the dilemma of the inadequacy of words—a dilemma that also troubled Meyerhold and Richard Wagner.

The collection ends with the section "Reflections on Chekhov" composed of two essays of a more personal and general nature ("The Duality of Chekhov" by John Gassner and "The Chekhovian Sense of Life" from the *Journal* of Charles du Bos) and one personal reminiscence (Gorky).

Any selection of essays in such an anthology is always partially arbitrary. If Jackson's purpose was to present a broad spectrum of writing on Chekhov, however, then he seems to have placed disproportionate emphasis on Chekhov's plays (nine essays of fifteen, while only three are partly or wholly devoted to the stories). One misses such significant works on Chekhov's prose as Chudakov's essay on the prose of the young Chekhov ("Povestvovanie rannego Chekhova: Literaturnyi muzei A. P. Chekhova," *Sbornik statei i materialov*, no. 4, 1967) and his important study of Chekhov's stylistic development ("Ob evoliutsii stilia prozy Chekhova," *Slavianskaia filologiia*, Moscow, 1963), which are not even mentioned in the brief bibliography.

In 1889 Chekhov visited the Russian penal colony of Sakhalin to study the life of prisoners and exiles in this Russian "Devil's Island." Affected by the brutality and suffering he witnessed there, he became somewhat disenchanted with the Tolstoyan doctrine of nonresistance, which he treats satirically in a number of stories written after his return from the Far East. Chekhov's voluminous report of his findings, probably the first Russian scientific sociological study, was published in 1893. It is usually ignored in studies of Chekhov's *oeuvre* because of the difficulty of placing it within the totality of his creative writings. However, this work is not unrelated to the body of Chekhov's work. He was a scientist as well as a creative writer, as all his works illustrate. *Sakhalin*, although a scientific study, still embodies themes and stylistic techniques from his stories and plays. An intensive sympathy for human suffering presented in a studiedly unsentimental manner, and an uncanny ear for dialogue, which emerges in the reproduction of some of the prisoners' life stories, connect this study to Chekhov's stories and plays.

Until the appearance of the Terpaks' translation we lacked a complete English version of this important work. Unfortunately the translation is not accurate, and mistakes are frequently the result of carelessness or even a misunderstanding of the Russian original. To cite but a few examples: ". . . na berege ego byli namyty gromadnye kuchi derev'ev, obrushivshikhsia v vodu" (Chekhov, *PSS*, 10:42), "Its banks were luxuriant with tremendous stands of trees reaching down to the water" (p. 42); "Moskovskaia kanava" (10:42), "The Moscow Canal" (p. 45); "Ona sostavliaet predmest'e posta" (10:43), "It lies in the suburbs of the post" (p. 42); *materik*, "homeland" (p. 44); "Kak izvestno, eto udobstvo u gromadnogo bol'shinstva russkikh liudei nakhodit'sia v polnom prezrenii" (10:55), "As everyone knows, this accommodation is located in full sight of the overwhelming

majority of Russian homes" (p. 56); ". . . velichaet vasim vysokim blagorodiem, *no* govorit *ty*" (10:66), "He called me 'your worship' *and* addressed me in the second person singular" (p. 68); "Zdes' ne tol'ko skam'i i steny zadvorkov, no dazhe liubovnye pis'ma otvratitel'nye" (10:71), "There are disgusting scribbles on the benches and backyard walls, and there are also love letters" (p. 76); "tak kak bol'shinstvo ego selenii lezhit na reke Tym" (10:107), "because its settlements lie along the Tym river" (p. 115).

It would also have been better if the translators had retained Chekhov's paragraph arrangements instead of altering them in what seems to be a haphazard manner.

THOMAS G. WINNER
Brown University

THE NOVELS OF MARK ALEKSANDROVIČ ALDANOV. By *C. Nicholas Lee*. Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 76. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1969. 386 pp. 63 Dutch guilders.

This is, in some ways, an unusual—not to say strange—book. To begin with, there is a minor unusualness about its title: instead of the first and the last name of the author discussed, as is usual in English-language works, or the initials and the last name, as is usual in Russian, it gives all three names: the first, the patronymic, and the last. The arrangement of the book is also unusual. As the title indicates, it is a book not about Aldanov but about his novels; nevertheless, it is rather unusual to reduce the biographical material about a relatively little-known writer to such a minimum: less than two pages, entitled "Biographical Remarks." The rest of the body of the book consists of a two-page preface, a short introduction (seven pages), a somewhat longer conclusion (fourteen pages), and sixteen chapters, each of which deals with one of Aldanov's fictional works. This does not cover all of his fiction, but the major part of it—his thirteen novels and three "philosophical tales" (*The Tenth Symphony*, *Punch Vodka*, and "For Thee the Best" ["Mogila voina"]). Aldanov's few short stories, which are neither historical nor "philosophical," and his nonfictional works are not discussed. All the chapters about the novels are divided into three sections: "A. Action," "B. Characters," and "C. Style." In the chapters about the three "philosophical tales" the "B" and "C" are replaced, respectively, by "Themes" and "Symbols." In his introduction the author tries to explain and justify this somewhat artificial schematic arrangement, with references to Aldanov's own writings about the art of the novel and to some other works on the theory of literature.

The consistent "parallel" treatment adopted by Professor Lee has both its advantages and weaknesses. It enables him to expose very clearly the similarities and the differences between Aldanov's individual works, as well as certain ties between them (some of them have the same characters cropping up again or introduce descendants or ancestors of earlier characters). On the other hand, it results in a certain schematic rigidity of the whole critical analysis. Sometimes one cannot see the forest for the trees, especially under the headings "Action" and "Style." Some of the expected critical generalizations are relegated to the conclusion. The plots of Aldanov's novels are retold with an unnecessary profusion of details—a criticism the author foresaw in his short preface and discounted in advance. Nevertheless it remains, I think, valid. Under the heading "Style" there is much that is simply repetitious, and there is, in fact, very little genuine stylistic analysis: apart from some rather hackneyed general remarks about Aldanov's artistic *écriture* (the words "simple" and "limpid" are those most frequently used to characterize it), a