closing story, from the young Tolstoy's exquisitely metaphorical journey toward the front lines at Sevastopol to Alyosha the Pot's sudden fall from the roof, the Norton edition dramatically shows that in the immense traverse of fifty years the author's mind never turned far from the pathos of human mortality.

The pattern of these stories is clear: submission means election. But writing itself, as "History of Yesterday," "Sevastopol in May," and "Kreutzer Sonata" show, is itself a form of submission, and the natural and human forces which require submission are vanquished not by God but by the sanctifying pen of the writer. Hence the anachronism that will startle any reader new to Tolstoy. Tolstoy's recognizable brand of nineteenth-century determinism is strangely untrammeled by the various activist philosophies like Marxism, reform Darwinism, and French naturalism with which his age sought to redirect it, but invested instead with the post-Symbolist, functionally agnostic consciousness of Proust and Joyce, in whose hands the immense engine of mind receives its own consecration by being "written." This Tolstoyan anachronism is less obscured in the stories than in the novels.

Katz's selection thus serves to magnify certain sides of Tolstoy's complex legacy. But though unavoidably a fragmentary vision of the author, it is a clear one, and in this reviewer's eyes convincing enough to establish itself as natural. The Norton volume offers an excellent embarcation point for any reader of Tolstoy's stories, and should provide a reliable standard for Tolstoy anthologies for many years.

John M. Kopper
Dartmouth College

Gary Adelman, Anna Karenina: The Bitterness of Ecstasy. Twayne's Masterwork Series. Boston: J.K. Hall, 1990. xix + 151 pp.

In the maiden issue of the Tolstoy Studies Journal, Gary Saul Morson presented his Eleven Theses on Anna ("Prosaics and Anna Karenina," TSJ, v.I, 1988, 1-12). They comprise a startling departure from much conventional wisdom about the novel. Morson claims that the hero of the book ("hero" in the sense of exemplar of the book's governing values) is Dolly; that the villain is that incurable bon vivant and everyone's good friend Stiva Oblonsky; that the reason we sympathize with Anna (and assume that Tolstoy intends us to do so) is not because Tolstoy "falls in love with his heroine" but because his didactic strategy (quite ice-cold) is to tell the story

increasingly through her wilfully warped perspective. And finally, Morson claims that Anna's whole omen-ridden, melodramatic approach to life, which brings her to disaster and so many others to the brink of it, is emblematic of a larger Tolstoyan truth: that the best-lived life is the life without stories, and the dramatic "plot interest" of any sort is an index of moral error. "Happy families are all alike" because they are full of decent and invisible activities, which, for most readers of nineteenth-century novels, were not fit subjects for a story.

The value of a provocative, integrated reading like Morson's (even if contestable) becomes clear when we confront yet another retell of the unsatisfying conventional wisdoms--which is what Gary Adelman gives us, by and large, in his new volume. To be sure, the Twayne's Masterwork Series is not the place to look for any special scholarship or originality; novels are apparently farmed out to literature professors in any discipline (Adelman is a professor of English). He weaves his reading of Anna Karenina out of personal reactions plus a handful of authoritative quotes (by Lukács, Thomas Mann, D.H. Lawrence, Wasiolek), and these tend to be the oversimplified inherited ones. The result is a doughy pastiche. Turgenev, Thomas Mann and Piotr Tkachov are cited on a single page as undifferentiated critics of equal reliability (13), and some of the critics Adelman cites serve their subject very poorly indeed.

Marxist-Leninist criticism, for example, gets unnecessarily broad coverage. Lenin is often cited, and Georgy Lukács merits four full pages [130-34] as one of five critics discussed at length in the final section. The space Adelman devotes (without protest) to "class" and "capitalist-sensitive" readings can produce some pretty dumb lines--like these by Lukács, who is paraphrased as saying that Anna "is crushed by the callousness and hypocrisy of her husband and society and by the growing coldness of her lover--that is, by the social forces unleashed by the growth of capitalism in post-emancipation Russia" (132). The "that is" in that sentence is especially remarkable; as if hypocrisy and alterations in love depended upon the class struggle. But more importantly, the sentiment imbedded by such "class-conscious critics" is echoed in Adelman's own commentary ("the opulent world enables Anna's illicit passion to ripen," 60), and this contradicts his more intelligent assumptions elsewhere that the strong and gifted Anna is, and is designed by Tolstoy to be, responsible for herself. Some Freudian readings [e.g. by Armstrong, 96-98], when probing ones are available, also do little to enhance the critical level of the volume.

In general, it is unsettling for Slavists to see how easily second-hand accounts of famous Tolstoy episodes can get

bent out of shape in an outsider's paraphrase. Adelman calls Tolstoy a "violent anti-humanist" (31) whose attitude toward the role of women was hostile and static throughout his life (37); he was a "reactionary" and political anarchist; in marriage he was a tyrant who "reproached [his wife] repeatedly for idleness and frigidity; 'doll' was his pejorative nickname for her" (28).

More serious than these banal generalizations, however, are the larger implications of Adelman's theses, often clichéd and underconsidered, and in places indicating an embarrassingly casual reading of the novel. Tolstoy, we learn, is not so much in control of the novel as controlled by it (65); he cannot help loving his heroine and ultimately "cannot plead a case against Anna" (58). According to Adelman, who seems to admire but only partially grasp Isaiah Berlin's hedgehog/fox idea, Tolstoy's very narrative technique works on behalf of "ambiguity rather than moral clarity" (10)--so to seek a strong single-voiced ethical position in the novel is a mistake. Not surprisingly, therefore, he reads the novel's opening sentence ("Happy families are all alike...") in a distressingly shortsighted way (49), as an aphorism mandating "one right way to live, one model for happiness in marriage" found in the Levin plot alone. (The aphorism is not about the content of happiness at all, that's the point.) Likewise, the significance of the Mikhailov-in-Italy scenes (85), in essence an early draft on the theme "What is [proper] Art?," seems to have passed Adelman by entirely; in Anna's turning from the religious canvas to the two boys fishing, for example, he detects Tolstoy's disapproval and an implication that "Anna should turn from this summer idyll and take up her cross" (alternative interpretations, no better, follow). Adelman appears to misread both the personal strength and the pivotal alternative to the "love plot" represented by Varenka (she is "drab, emotionally limp, and hardly likely to be attractive to men," 67). Vronsky's complexity is hardly given the time of day, although his life is profoundly changed by his commitment to Anna and he is willing to make sacrifices for it (instead there is an odd reference [73] to subtle homosexual advances from Serpukhovskoy, which Vronsky boldly resists). And Adelman chronically undervalues Karenin, whose genuine dilemmas and authentic--if provisional--conversion experiences are crudely dismissed as "a fear of sexual impotence" (88) or as collapse into "Babylon and its obscene priestess [Lydia Ivanova] (103).

Adelman has some good insights and instincts as well, and these must be given their due. He understands that the novel is ultimately an indictment of passion (72) and as such much influenced by Schopenhauer (116-17). He links Anna closely with her brother Stiva (56), acknowledging their family resemblance and compatible corruptions--with, on Anna's side,

the dangerous additive of conscience. And Adelman gets Levin's "bliss" just right when he describes it as "unforced work," as rhythm and harmony that requires no active engaging of the will or intellect; to my mind, he is proper to link this bliss with "the agrarian aristocrat's paternal ideal...Obedience is not forced" (70). He is also correct in stressing Tolstoy's commitment to continual separation from the intelligentsia, in fact, from any of the group thinking of his time.

Adelman's book is not for our courses in Russian Literature. But it is an instructive window on how the outside world--and especially English departments--reads the classic texts that we attempt to teach in their more native contexts. What one misses most of all is any sense of Tolstoy the creator in the Russian Empire of his time; why he had such trouble finishing the novel, how its themes and subtexts resonate in Tolstoy's other works, earlier and later. If Adelman wanted to enrich his reading with something from the Hegel-Marx-Lenin tradition, he would have done better to leave Lukács, Lenin, and their vulgar Marxisms alone in favor of D.S. Mirsky, whose 1929 essay "Some Remarks on Tolstoy" combines that best insights from both East and West. "His mind was essentially dialectical, in the Hegelian sense," Mirsky wrote of Tolstoy. "But, unlike Hegel's system, Tolstoy's mind did not surmount the contradiction of 'thesis' and 'antithesis' by any synthesis. Instead of Hegel's 'triads,' Tolstoy was arranged in a small number of irreducible and intensely hostile 'dyads'...Dualism is the hallmark of the ethical man." The ethical characters in Anna Karenina--Levin, Dolly, at times (confusedly) Karenin and at the end even Vronsky--all understand that. They have weighed the evidence, made a decision (whether good or bad) and opened their eyes to the consequences. The mark of an Oblonsky, on the contrary, is perpetual evasion or failure to pose the question.

Caryl Emerson
Princeton University

Eric de Haard. Narrative and Anti-Narrative Structures in Lev Tolstoy's Early Works. Studies in Slavic Literature and Poetics, volume XVI. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1989. 210 pp. Paper.

Tolstoy's hostility toward literary narratives and traditional plot devices is well-known. Eric de Haard reformulates Boris Tomashevsky's distinction between fabula and siuzhet to describe Tolstoy's avoidance of complex fabular sequences and narrative suspense in the early works