

the period from January 21, 1681 to the end of February 1684. He also includes selections which provide religious, cultural, economic, and military background to that campaign.

The book is divided into six parts. The introduction, which contains a critical analysis of Ottoman and Crimean sources and their historiography, should be most useful to specialists. Part 1 contains excerpts from the chronicle of Silahdar Mehmed Aga (1658–1723), published in Istanbul in 1928 by Ahmed Refik under the title *Silahdar tarichi (Silahdar's Chronicle)*. Part 2 contains a selection from the memoirs of Dzhebedzhi Hasan Esiri, written in 1725 under the title "The Criterion of States and the Judgment of Nations," only part of which was published in 1912 by M. Arif. Part 3 presents the "History of the Vienna Campaign" by Husein Hezarfenn (1611–91). In 1685, one of the two existing "Vienna Campaign" manuscripts was translated into French by F. de la Croix and utilized in his book, *Guerres des Turcs avec la Pologne, la Moscovie et la Hongrie* (1689). An Italian translation of the manuscript by J. M. Talman, entitled "Breve storia . . .," appeared in 1709. Part 4 consists of the author's translation of the "Chronicle of Events" written by Defterdar Sary Mahmed (1656[?]-1717), which is published here for the first time. Part 5 deals with the "Chronicle of Mahmed Gerej" and presents information about the Vienna campaign from the Crimean Tatars' point of view. The final part contains four letters written by Kara Mustafa at the time of the campaign.

The translations are well done and retain the flavor of the originals, but too many Turkic terms are used. Even though they are explained in the text, they could have been replaced by corresponding Polish terms. This would have contributed to the clarity of the text and to the flow of the narration. In addition, a good index would have made the book more useful to researchers.

An important contribution, *Kara Mustafa pod Wiedniem* will have to be consulted by all serious students of Ottoman history and the history of the Vienna campaign. Those interested in Polish history might note that some of the direct references to Polish forces made by the Turkish authors support historians' earlier conclusion that the Polish forces under King Jan III Sobieski played a central and positive role in the delivery of Vienna and the recapture of conquered territories.

C. M. NOWAK  
*Bridgewater State College*

CHEKHOV: A STUDY OF THE MAJOR STORIES AND PLAYS. By *Beverly Hahn*. Major European Authors series. New York and London: Cambridge University Press, 1977. xiv, 351 pp. \$19.95.

How many studies on Chekhov have appeared since his death? After World War II? Within the last year? An innumerable amount, and their number continues to grow. Cambridge University Press alone has, within a few years, published three works on this writer. The reader may wonder if Beverly Hahn's book is necessary. The first reaction is to answer in the negative, because the book repeats a great deal of facts and views that interested readers know only too well. The book inevitably includes the same letter from Grigorovich to Chekhov of March 1886 and Chekhov's reply, and the one Chekhov wrote to Pleshcheev in October 1889 ("I am not a liberal, not a conservative . . ."), as well as short analyses of stories that have been studied countless times (for example, "Misery," "The Huntsman," "Enemies"). Chapters are devoted to plays that have been commented upon at length and in depth. The author even had the audacity to include a chapter on "Chekhov and Tolstoy" (juxtaposing, of course, "A Dreary Story" and "The Death of Ivan Ilyich"), a theme that is too hackneyed even for student papers. This is one of those books on Chekhov in which he is presented as a superb, impeccable writer, without critical indications of his

limitations (with a few exceptions, for example, *The Seagull* is evaluated rather negatively on page 315).

Another serious objection is the author's inadequate knowledge of Russian, despite statements such as, "the endorsing syntax works against our being able to feel the . . . sympathy . . ." (p. 259). How can one judge a writer's syntax and draw conclusions from it on the basis of a translation? Hahn is completely unaware of all the literature on Chekhov written in Russian or in any language other than English, and even the English titles in her biography are incomplete. When Bitsilli, Derman, Roskin, Chukovskii, Chudakov, as well as Thomas Winner, Nils Å. Nilsson, and Karl Kramer (to mention just a few) are unknown to the author, numerous reiterations and rediscoveries (in the chapter on *Three Sisters*, for example) are unavoidable. Had she been familiar with some of these studies, she would not have stated that Chekhov's stories "have received scant formal attention outside Russia and the Russian departments of universities" (p. 10). Chekhov's letters are quoted not from any of the large English editions (let alone from the original) but from S. Friedland's very limited selection.

The above criticism notwithstanding, the book has many positive features. Beverly Hahn certainly has a strong empathy for Chekhov and his work. Her general thesis is that he was a true humanist, but she never defines this term, which is too broad, too vague, and too hackneyed to be used without qualification. Apparently, she means that he was a compassionate man, a writer "for whom the most immediate personal value in life will probably be love and fulfilled relationships generally" (p. 68). She emphasizes that Chekhov is an author full of warm feelings for (or abhorrence of, as the case may be) his characters, who have "nothing to do with Chekhov the 'dispassionate observer' referred to so frequently by critics" (p. 88). Her observations, such as on Chekhov's irony (p. 59), are sometimes striking. The subtitle is misleading: What are his major stories, and why are only a few of the best known stories discussed or even mentioned? Ms. Hahn has made an interesting choice, however. She discusses at length several stories which have not been analyzed too often: "Easter Eve" is included, as is "Lights," a story Chekhov did not even include in his collected works, but to which Hahn devotes an entire chapter. It is not surprising that there are chapters on Chekhov's women in which Ms. Hahn expresses a difference of opinion with Virginia Llewelyn Smith, the author of a recent book on this aspect of Chekhov—and chapters on "The [Name Day] Party," "The Lady with the Dog," "A Woman's Kingdom," and *Three Sisters*, in which female characters are central. The way Ms. Hahn draws Tolstoy into the discussion of "The Name Day Party" and "The Lady with the Dog" is illuminating. There are numerous, occasionally valuable comparisons and juxtapositions with English writers, for example, with D. H. Lawrence in the chapter "A Woman's Kingdom." The only non-English author discussed more extensively (in the last chapter) is Henrik Ibsen.

Hahn's Chekhov has its shortcomings, and it rehashes previous work, but it contains lucid insights and analytic comments that secure it a specific place in the extensive and expanding library of Chekhov criticism.

THOMAS EEKMAN

*University of California, Los Angeles*

DEFAMILIARIZATION IN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE. By R. H. Stacy.  
Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1977. xii, 193 pp. \$14.00.

This is a deft, erudite, and well-written gloss on Viktor Shklovskii's dictum that "estrangement is almost always present wherever there is an image." Noting with approval Shklovskii's "almost," Professor Stacy mentions several areas where estrangement is usually not encountered—in "the preparation of a corpse for ritual display in a funeral parlor, the introduction to books, 'how-to-do-it' books, and bird, flower, plant,