used only light hands at their task, modernizing the bibliography and appending useful charts of characters' names as they change from draft to draft. Although of paramount value to Tolstoy readers, Tolstoy and the Genesis of "War and Peace" also stands as a cynosure of archival detective work, to be read by anyone untying a dusty folder to study an author's oeuvre. "What questions am I asking? Does the document before me help answer those questions? What makes the answers worth knowing?" Robin Feuer's memorial to this great student of Tolstoy, her career tragically curtailed, is as vital and moving as Kathryn Feuer found Tolstoy to be.

John M. Kopper
Dartmouth College


This multifaceted and stimulating volume is a collection of papers read at the 1994 Ottawa Chekhov symposium. My survey is of necessity selective.

According to the table of contents the volume is divided into four parts: I. Chekhov in Production, II. The Reception of Chekhov, III. Translations and Transformations, and IV. The Biography of Chekhov. The division into parts, however, is absent from the body of the volume. This editorial oversight is welcome because the division into parts does not reflect the content of the papers adequately. For example, John Tulloch's et al. paper, found in Part I, deals as much with the reception of Chekhov's drama as with its production.

J. Douglas Clayton's introduction is followed by a prefatory piece by Laurence Senelick, a synopsis of Senelick's now published book on worldwide productions of Chekhov's plays. In an attempt to explain Chekhov's enduring appeal, Senelick contrasts a titanic Tolstoy with a down-to-earth Chekhov. This contrast is unjustified. Chekhov's alleged "inability to write a novel," as somehow bringing him down to "our" level, is also a misunderstanding. Chekhov wrote several very long "short stories" - such as An Unknown Person's Story, The Three Years, and The Duet - which merit, by modern and post-modern standards, to be regarded as novels. Chekhov's appeal lies in the integrity of his art that shows concrete details as fulfillments of a timeless pattern. Such art invites fresh anagogic interpretations. Senelick senses that when he writes: "Whatever reality the estates and garrison towns of Chekhov's plays held for its original audiences, they have now taken a wider semiotic function. They transcend a specific society to become archetypal realms" (p. 16f.). It is due to that transcendence that the historical Chekhov "never stopped being Chekhov our contemporary" (p. 17).

Sharon Carnicke discusses Stanislavsky's production of Chekhov's Cherry Orchard as received by American theater critics during the early 1920s tour of the United States. She shows how Stanislavsky's melodramatic misinterpretation "sold" the play to American audiences who could not understand Russian but responded directly to Stanislavsky's low comedy and tearful sentimentality.
Georges Pitoëff’s stagings of Chekhov’s plays in France, described by Daniel Gerould, liberated Chekhov’s works from Stanislavsky’s elephantine “naturalism” and revealed their “timeless truth.” Gerould’s description made this reviewer envy the Parisian audience of Pitoëff’s 1929 staging of The Three Sisters. While Pitoëff was alien to the “overstuffed, star-ridden” traditions of the Parisian theatre, he remained true to Chekhov’s integrity and messianic purpose (recognized in Pitoëff’s productions by Benjamin Cremieux, see the important quote on p. 35).

John Tulloch et al. trace the influence of a critic (Raymond Williams) on a writer (Trevor Griffiths) adapting The Cherry Orchard for TV. Williams taught Griffiths that Chekhov “is attempting to dramatize a stagnant group, in which consciousness has . . . become . . . unconnecting” (p. 66). Griffiths, following Williams, misunderstands The Cherry Orchard as a naturalist play. That forces him to “postmodernize” it, emphasizing the “disjointed” and using “alienating strategies” which he describes as his “modest Brechtian input to the piece.” Nothing is more strikingly un-Chekhovian than Brecht.

Richard Borden’s collection of mini-reviews describes the post-Soviet pleasures of staging Chekhov with a vengeance as “the cultivation and elaboration of Chekhovian comedy.” The reader planning a Chekhov-centered theatrical expedition to Moscow around the anniversary year 2004 would do well to read Borden’s account, treating it as a preview and a long-term trend guide.

Serafima Roll’s thought-provoking comparison of Chekhov and Nina Sadur is replete with Soviet critical clichés. Made of wholesale labelings and explanations, the Soviet school prevents Roll from understanding either Chekhov or Sadur.

J. Douglas Clayton’s survey of Chekhov’s reception in Canada has an English section and a French one. The two receptions are as different as the languages the two sections are written in. Creating an Anglo-Canadian Chekhov has been difficult. “Canadian audiences, fed a diet of fast-action television shows, is [sic] ill-equipped to adjust to these rhythms” (p. 163). French writers and audiences, more attentive to the realities of climate, vastness of land, and patterns of small-town life, have noticed a “parenté” between Russia and Québec. This has much to do with the humane values of French culture, which it shares with the closely related Russian culture. French Canadian writers have written and produced an impressive number of works inspired by or derived from Chekhov. This contrasts with Chekhov’s relative infertility on the anglophone side of the language divide.

Lian Shu Li’s article provides a fascinating glimpse into the unliterary vicissitudes of the reception of Chekhov in mainland China. The communist victory on the Chinese mainland brought the Soviet literary canon into China, complete with its ready-made interpretations and assessments. Chekhov’s works, previously known mostly through Japanese translations to a select few, became part of the ever-growing Soviet Russian language and literature curriculum. This wave crested during the 1954 celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of Chekhov’s death, when Mao Dun, president of the Chinese Writers’ Union, called on Chinese readers to learn from the “realistic method” of “Chekhov the great democrat.” At the centennial of Chekhov’s birth (1960), which happened to coincide with the “Anti-Revisionist Campaign,” the same Mao Dun had to focus on Chekhov’s limitations as a petty-bourgeois intellectual.