

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

BOOK REVIEWS

(understood as the works which Tolstoy published between 1852 and 1863). De Haard devotes a short section to each of these works, including such less often read works as "Notes of a Marker," "Snowstorm," "Lucerne," and "Albert". There are longer discussions of the autobiographical trilogy, the war stories, "Family Happiness," and "The Cossacks". These discussions of individual works are the strong point of the book and make it worthwhile reading for anyone who studies or teaches Tolstoy. De Haard employs numerous well-chosen examples from Tolstoy's works and letters and from the critical writings of his contemporaries to demonstrate that Tolstoy generally avoided traditional plotting and that both Tolstoy and his readers were aware of this characteristic of his writing. De Haard links this tendency with Tolstoy's own world view and with the general movement away from romanticism in Russian letters at the time. His careful analyses show that Tolstoy uses traditional plot structures only for his own purposes, usually with parodic intent. De Haard makes a number of interesting observations about the manner in which the anti-narrative impulse manifests itself in individual stories and in different aspects of Tolstoy's narrative structures.

De Haard defines the traditional fabula as containing a clear-cut intrigue with obvious causality and protagonists who are engaged in conflict over well-defined goals. The traditional plot employs devices which create mystery, climactic situations, and both action-suspense and meaning-suspense. Authors who emphasize plot generally use various expressive devices to heighten the dramatic effects produced by the action. Tolstoy avoids such effects by employing an objective authorial voice whose presence in the text dissolves all mystery and undercuts all suspense. He also reduces the causal connections within his fabula and provides a different treatment of themes, such as love, wealth, death and power, which are the most common goals of the protagonists of a plotted narrative. De Haard argues that Tolstoy either does not use the traditional fabula and plot or else uses them as attributes of characters and world views to which Tolstoy is seeking an alternative. In the trilogy, for example, love is more of a non-event than an event. The characters expect dramatic transformations from events which turn out to lack dramatic potential. It is not that they fail in their pursuit of a goal, but that the goal turns out to have been based on a misunderstanding of themselves and others. De Haard asserts that by depicting growing up not as a sequence of climactic events, but as a process of non-events Tolstoy parodies those individuals and literary traditions which see life itself as plotted.

A similar orientation can be seen in Tolstoy's depiction of other characters and in his attitude toward time and

causality. In his war stories, Tolstoy casts a bad light on those Byronic characters who view their own life as a series of plot situations and see war as a heroic pageant of dramatic events in which one can display one's heroism. He also depicts the ease with which an eager audience can be taken in by the tales of those with this view of war. These illusions are contrasted with the modest heroism of veteran soldiers and the harsh reality of events. The dying woman in "Three Deaths" similarly thinks of her life as a plotted existence with a sequence of extraordinary events in opposition to the simple deaths of the peasant and the tree. In "The Cossacks" both Olenin and the Cossacks are deprived of the mysterious aura characteristic of romantic poems about the conflict between nature and civilization. Olenin's attempt to do good by helping Lukashka also ends in failure. De Haard concludes that Tolstoy's anti-narrative tendencies are a result of his belief that goal-directed actions are self-deceiving and disruptive of the general order of life. Tolstoy's stories replace the causality and temporality of the traditional plotted narrative with his view of life as an essentially unknowable process. His stories therefore depict different ways of life and different existences as interconnected on the paradigmatic level, not arranged into a temporal or a causal sequence on the syntagmatic level. De Haard suggests that the Sebastopol sketches can best be described as examples of achrony, rather than synchrony or diachrony. Events are seen as we move from space to space. They are not linked by obvious temporal and causal connections, and they are not happening simultaneously. The implication of de Haard's study is that the world of Tolstoy's stories is one in which the meaning of life emerges from our awareness of the infinite processes which are going on at the same time and interacting with each other in ways which are fundamentally unknowable. Fabula and plot, particularly as they were understood by the romantics, are false to life itself.

Unfortunately, de Haard does not really explore the implications of his own work. His book suffers from a lack of clarity about its own goals. The book could have developed in a number of directions. The discussion of fabula and *siuzhet*, including de Haard's interesting suggestion that fabula should not be conceived as pre-artistic material, but as a set of character motivations and goals which are themselves a part of the literary tradition, could have been developed into a set of general assertions about narrative theory. However, de Haard does not make any consistent use of his own theoretical formulations. De Haard's comments in the "Preface" that it was time for an objective evaluation of Tolstoy's early works could have developed into a discussion of their literary merits and flaws or at least of their place within Tolstoy's overall development. However, this also does not happen.

BOOK REVIEWS

Finally, de Haard makes a number of important comments throughout his text and in his four page conclusion about the philosophical sources and implications of Tolstoy's narrative technique. These could have been developed into a major work on Tolstoy's thought and writing. De Haard, instead, produces a formalistic study of Tolstoy's narrative structures, one which is full of interesting observations about individual issues and stories, but which lacks a sense of overall purpose and significance.

James N. Roney
Juniata College