

Egan, David R. and Melinda A. Egan. *Leo Tolstoy: An Annotated Bibliography of English Language Sources from 1978 to 2002*. Lanham, Maryland etc.: Scarecrow Press, 2005. 313 pp.

In 1979 the Egans published *Leo Tolstoy: An Annotated Bibliography of English Language Sources to 1978* to which they have now published a sequel covering the subsequent quarter-century. This second volume runs to 1249 entries as against 2054 in the first. But a higher proportion of them are annotated (all except doctoral dissertations, introductions and prefaces to Tolstoy's works, and sources published in 2003 or unavailable to the authors); this is partly because the earlier volume included many more reviews (listed, however, under the book reviewed). The annotations are not critical, attempting merely to indicate the contents or argument of the given book or article. The whole is divided into thirteen sections or chapters (as against ten earlier), but only those on the Early and Later Fiction contain subdivisions (for individual works), since the subdivision into kinds of publication is not repeated.

At the end of the book are to be found: a list of anthologies of Tolstoy criticism (and Michael Katz' edition of *Tolstoy's Short Fiction* because it contains critical materials too), which, together with the separate items they contain, are given and annotated in the main listing; a Bibliography of Reference Books (to which could be added further volumes of Garth Terry's *Bibliographies of East European Languages and Literatures* and *The Year's Work in Modern Language Studies*, although its Slavonic Sections have often been omitted); an Author Index; and the valuable Subject Index that includes over 300 main headings as well as more than 600 subheadings. The Introduction welcomes the advent of the *Tolstoy Studies Journal*, whose series of articles on Recent Publications and Annotated Bibliography by

Mark Conliffe and others is also an extremely valuable resource.

To begin with a confession, my first action on receiving this book was to check on my own contributions to Tolstoy studies. They were all there, sorted into appropriate categories and with no errors of bibliographical detail that I noticed. I could quarrel with the selections and emphases of the annotations, but they were reasonably well done. I was slightly chagrined at the omission from the Subject Index of divorce (#624), Bradon, Mary Elizabeth (#211) and at least one reference to *How Much Land Does a Man Need?* (#212). Checking against the Bibliography in my *Karenina Companion* showed that the Egans had made a few additions and no omissions; but it also alerted me to a few instances (#494, #496, #631, also #868, #908) where they give inaccurate bibliographical details. Maybe most authors would conduct a similar search and probably they would come to similar conclusions. But there can be little doubt that this is the wrong way to begin work on a review. What we need to know is how useful such a book is; i.e., how helpful (or otherwise) it is for someone who has a topic or a question to research and therefore approaches the book from the other end.

If one's concern is with a given major work of fiction, then the bibliography provides a particular section: for *War and Peace* it runs to 150 entries, 126 of which are annotated; for *Master and Man* it has only six entries with five of them annotated. For a work like *Confession*, however, one has to resort to the Subject Index where one is referred to entries in several sections. For more general topics, a spot check revealed that language, translations, style and imagery all appeared in the Index under the main heading of "fiction"; brotherhood, the topic of an anthology (#1046), had a heading of its own; as did both peace and pacifism, while war appeared only as *War and Peace*. Among possible candidates for inclusion are Marlinskii (#1150) and courage

(#285, #1148). One wonders whether some system of cross-referencing (used only in #1008/808) would not have been helpful (e.g. for #898). As it is, this job has to be done by the Subject Index, where I was perhaps unduly surprised to find a couple of references to "Simpson, O. J." (under *The Kreutzer Sonata*). Some personal names, as we have seen, are not picked up, while others mentioned only once are indexed. When one has found the appropriate titles, the annotations are quite good, although they are, naturally, limited in length and detail, with no more space allowed for books than for articles. As we have also seen, bibliographical details are occasionally inaccurate. The fact, indeed, that our computers do not question mistyped numerals has facilitated a few further errors: besides a reference to "the years 1895-1889" (#1045), the date of *Lucerne* is given as 1757 (#274). The computer may be to blame too for some wrong words: e.g., Comparison for Companion (#778); consisted for consistent (#803); dialects for dialectics (#1213).

Thus we are heavily indebted to the Egans whose labors succeed pretty well in pointing researchers to the relevant secondary literature within the limits of time and language. Yet much depends on the quality of the annotations which, unfortunately, contain too many slips to inspire complete confidence. I found eleven names reproduced inaccurately and nine errors in titles (to give just one example that fits both categories: #1193 lists the title as "Tolstoy or Dostoevsky"). The use of "Ilych" apparently as a surname (#654-744 *passim*) and the occurrence of "In Memorium" (#361) and "edited by Herausgegeben von" (#674) suggest linguistic deficiency. Quotations are imprecise (#285, #425, #643). And inexcusable are the references to a (non-existent) horse-race in George Eliot's *Adam Bede* (#525) and to Rainer Maria Rilke as a "French novelist" (#711). It is ironical that the publisher's Advance Book Information calls Mrs. Egan "Melissa" as

well as giving an incorrect number of pages and of sections.

In fine, this Bibliography represents much toil and will be extremely useful to anyone who wants to find out about Tolstoy and is limited to the English language, so long as too much faith is not placed in its details: its annotations are indicators of where to look rather than a substitute for looking.

C. J. G. Turner
University of British Columbia