

holy fools that Tolstoy once expressed to Strakhov: "If I were alone I would not be a monk, I would be a yurodivy, that is, I would not value anything and would not do anybody any harm" (137). By 1910, too much of Tolstoy was caught up in a war over who owned and valued what, and to those he loved he was doing too much harm. In fact, there was simply too much of everything in the Tolstoy household: too much fame, too much money, too much talent, too many children, too many guests, too many words. It is certainly true that a surfeit of prosaic things does not make for the spectacular and well-focused biography. But surfeit is exactly what Tolstoy generated, and what he came in his final years to fear. It is hard to assume, as Mme de Courcel does, that Tolstoy escaped only to take on more words. If anything, it was probably a flight empowered by a fantasy along the lines of Father Sergius: after trying everything else, lose your passport and go on living, but no one knows where. As Gary Saul Morson has pointed out in connection with Anna Karenina, a certain side of Tolstoy always understood plot "as an index of error" (TSJ, vol. 1, 1988, 5). Tolstoy escaping his family of forty-eight years to write his great book is a very big plot.

Caryl Emerson, Princeton University

Leo Tolstoy's 'War and Peace'. Modern Critical Interpretations.
Ed. and with an Introduction by Harold Bloom. New York:
Chelsea House, 1988. 144 pp.

Leo Tolstoy's 'War and Peace' is one of over a hundred collections of critical essays on major works of Western literature that Chelsea House is preparing under the editorial supervision of Harold Bloom. The laudable intention behind this massive undertaking is to help the modern student of literature who is overwhelmed these days by the sheer 'critical mass'. The seven essays — all published previously between 1966 and 1983 — selected for this volume are by: John Bayley, Robert L. Jackson, W. Gareth Jones, Edward Wasiolek, Patricia Carden, and Martin Price. All of them are well-written and explore such important questions as: Tolstoy's powers of representation, the dialectic of freedom and necessity, multiple narratives, memory, moral vision, and the place of theory in Tolstoy's novel. Along with the essays the editor has provided a brief introduction, a chronology of Tolstoy's life and literary career, a bibliography, and an index.

Despite the praiseworthy intentions, there are serious flaws in this anthology. The muddled introduction by Professor Bloom is a clear signal that this project was put together carelessly and in great haste. While the essays themselves are interesting and well worth the reading — or re-reading — they have been shorn of their original footnotes and even of page or section references to War and Peace. This can hardly have been done over concern about space, since at most, the references would have added ten pages to this slim volume. Scholarly essays, one thought, are meant to lead the reader back into

the text as well as on to other criticism, all of which is rendered impossible when the references are removed. Or, are we meant to take these 'modern critical interpretations' at face value, uncritically?

Some additional examples of the exciting recent work on War and Peace — by Gary Saul Morson, Richard Gustafson, and Donna Orwin, to name but a few — would have also been welcome. The minimalist bibliography pales in comparison to Munir Sendich's sixty-page-long list of work on War and Peace that was published in The Russian Language Journal in 1987 (the existence of which is not even mentioned in the volume under review).

The editor and publisher of this series need to decide what audience they have in mind; whatever the audience, whether undergraduate or senior scholar, the essays must be published intact. An attempt should be made to include recent criticism, and, finally, there should be an introduction that represents more than a brief session at the word-processor. Even the Sterling Professor of the Humanities at Yale owes Tolstoy and his literary colleagues more than that.

Kathleen Parthé, University of Rochester

A.K. Zholkovsky: Two Articles

"Lev Tolstoi i Mikhail Zoshchenko kak zerkalo i zazerkal'e russkoi revolutsii." Sintaksis, 16 (1986): 103-128.

"Three on Courtship, Corpses, and Culture: Tolstoj, 'Posle bala' — Zoshchenko, 'Dama s cvetami' — E. Ginzburg, 'Rai pod mikroskopom'." Wiener Slawistischer Almanakh, 22 (1988): 7-24.

These two articles cover a lot of ground, from textual analysis of particular works to a capsule history of Russian literature and culture. What unifies the articles, individually and taken together is their author's structuralist approach. Professor Zholkovsky takes the trouble to explain his methodology, and even those who do not share the philosophy that underlies it can learn from his application of it both to texts and to culture.

The basic division that Zholkovsky explores in both articles is that between nature and culture, or convention. Applying the insights of V.B. Shklovskii, to whose memory he dedicates the earlier of these pieces, he explores Tolstoy's attack on convention as it manifests itself in ostranenie and in the deliberately awkward speech of certain Tolstoy characters. He places this attack in an historical-philosophical context that goes back to Rousseau, and he also