

Herzinger describes Lawrence's connection with the Edwardians, noting that his mentors, Ford Madox Ford and Edward Garnett, both leading Edwardians, introduced Lawrence into English cultural life. Lawrence soon became disenchanted with the Edwardians, however, and thought that the Georgians, whom he saw as being "passionate, personal, constructive, and joyful" (p. 52), could bring about the regeneration of English culture he so ardently desired. The greater part of this study focuses on Lawrence's relationship to this group. Herzinger points out certain affinities between Lawrence and the Georgians, in particular their common emphasis on the pastoral, their growing concern about the destructive effects of industrialism, and their search for community. He argues that Lawrence's early novels, *The White Peacock* and *The Trespasser*, are typically Georgian in many respects. As with the Edwardians, however, Lawrence became disillusioned with the Georgians. This is already evident in *The Rainbow*, but becomes even stronger at the outbreak of World War I. The war confirmed Lawrence's suspicions that the Georgian spirit of optimism was a false vision of reality: the Georgians, he thought, had become flaccid and sentimental; their natural vitality had deteriorated into an "artificial, aesthetically induced facsimile of it" (p. 118). Lawrence's bitter, pessimistic views about the future of England during these years is far removed from Georgian sensibility.

Herzinger then turns to Lawrence's relationship with Futurism, Imagism, "Amygism" (Ezra Pound's term for the Imagists once Amy Lowell had joined the group), and Vorticism. Futurism helped Lawrence break away from the Georgians and evolve a new style. Lawrence rejected, however, the pseudo-scientific tendency of the movement which led, he thought, to dissolution. Although Lawrence had close contacts with Imagism, "Amygism," and Vorticism, Herzinger does not believe that Lawrence actually learned anything new from these groups. What he gained from them was conceptual support for ideas that he had already developed on his own.

Finally, Herzinger describes Lawrence's brief and painful association with Cambridge and Bloomsbury through his short-lived friendship with Bertrand Russell. Lawrence disliked Bloomsbury intensely since it seemed to stand for everything that was inimical to a vital way of living. In Cambridge and Bloomsbury, Lawrence felt "he had located the evil genius behind the continuing decomposition of English character and English culture" (p. 176).

Herzinger successfully places Lawrence within the literary movements of his time. He shows that Lawrence assimilated many new ways of thought and expression from his association with these different literary groups. In fact, he argues that much of what is considered to be characteristically Lawrentian is a result of these assimilations. Far from being a "snarling outsider" (p. 16), Lawrence emerges from this study as being much "nearer the center of his era" (p. 182) than is generally assumed.

Jennifer E. Michaels

ROBERT LOUIS JACKSON  
*The Art of Dostoevsky: Deliriums and Nocturnes*  
 Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981. Pp. 380.

Although Dostoevsky's *Notes From the Dead House* was praised highly by his contemporaries, including such penetrating though differing intellectuals as Nietzsche and Tolstoi, the work has received considerably less critical attention than the other fiction of the "mature" Dostoevsky. Indeed, recent critics (Wasiolok, Holquist, Peace, among others) exclude *Notes From the Dead House* from Dostoevsky's "major fiction" and tend to ignore the work altogether. Now, in his latest book, *The Art of Dostoevsky*, the preeminent Dostoevsky scholar Robert Louis Jackson attempts to redress this critical imbalance (he devotes five chapters and over half his study's pages to the novel) and assign a seminal position to the work in Dostoevsky's postexile fiction.

Jackson, who admits a kinship "with the metaphysically and ontologically oriented group of Russian critics [Solov'ev, Rozanov, Ivanov, Berdjaev, among others]" (p. xii), reveals their influence in his philosophical approach to *Notes From the Dead House* as he focuses on the problems of evil, suffering, freedom, fate, conscience, moral responsibility, and environmental influence as they are reflected in Dostoevsky's conception and depiction of man. Jackson asserts that a discussion of these problems in the later Dostoevsky "cannot even be posed without the most searching examination of *House of the*

Dead and of Dostoevsky's whole orientation to his prison experience" (p. 11). And it is within this matrix that Jackson examines aspects of Part two of *Notes From the Underground*, *Crime and Punishment*, *The Gambler*, "A Gentle Creature," "A Boy at Christ's Christmas Party," "The Dream of a Ridiculous Man," "Bobok," and *The Brothers Karamazov*, in the second half of *The Art of Dostoevsky*.

Jackson, who is superbly acquainted with Dostoevsky's aesthetic views and philosophical anthropology, moves fluidly between close textual analysis and Dostoevsky's extraliterary comments extracted from letters, notebooks, and published articles to arrive at his conclusions. Jackson's pivotal discussion of *Notes From the Dead House* reveals this critical methodology. To Dostoevsky's assertion that a basic idea of Victor Hugo's art consists in "a Christian and supremely moral idea" of "the restoration of the fallen man, crushed by the yoke of circumstances . . . [of] Quasimodo . . . the embodiment of the oppressed and despised French people of medieval times, dumb and disfigured . . . but in whom there sleeps . . . a love and a thirst for justice . . . and a consciousness of its truth and its still untested, boundless strength" (p. 37), Jackson parallels the observation of Gorjančikov (the narrator of *Notes From the Dead House*): "How much youth has been buried wrongfully within these walls . . . These really were exceptional people . . . perhaps the most highly gifted and strongest of our people" (pp. 37-38). From this juxtaposition Jackson concludes that "the disfigured and at least outwardly coarse Russian convict is the Quasimodo of the Russian people" (p. 38). He asserts further that as the word Quasimodo evokes overtones of resurrection, so, too, does Gorjančikov's comment point to Dostoevsky's attempt to resurrect the Russian people and revive their "vast untested creative potential" through his artistic revelation of "the intrinsic humanity of Russian man" and "the long obscured image of God" in the Russian criminal (pp. 38-39). This conclusion is followed by Jackson's summation of the essence of the content and accomplishment of *Notes From the Dead House*: "The central social, or Christian theme of *House of the Dead*, then—the restoration of fallen man—points to its aesthetic premises, or its poetic. It points to the view that reality, or the 'whole truth' of man, is only accessible to an art that is capable of penetrating the naturalistic, time-bound reality of the historical moment and disclosing man in the aspect of his timeless humanity. The exultant words

at the end of *House of the Dead*, 'resurrection from the dead,' serve as a metaphor for the whole accomplishment of the book: the raising of the Russian people" (p. 39).

I have cited this particular analysis in some detail (although it is still abbreviated) not only because it is essential to Jackson's interpretation of the novel (and of Dostoevsky's later works) but also because it reveals, I believe, the strengths and weaknesses of the "metaphysical" orientation to criticism. Perhaps the greatest shortcoming here and in the criticism of the "metaphysically oriented" critics generally lies in the blurred blend of Dostoevsky's thought, characters' opinions, and critic's conclusions into rather sweeping philosophical conclusions that, at times, extend beyond the novel's text. In the passage cited it is difficult to determine whose notion it is that the truth of man is only accessible to a certain penetrating form of art or that *Notes From the Dead House* resurrects and raises the Russian people. Can it be said for certain that Dostoevsky, Gorjančikov, or Jackson (or all three) draw this conclusion? And would a close textual analysis of the novel, without benefit of Dostoevsky's extraliterary commentary (and Jackson's interpretation of it) yield conclusions of such philosophical breadth? Perhaps, but the very fact that I ask these questions reveal my own doubts. On the other hand, Jackson's conclusions that *Notes From the Dead House* is essentially a novel, among other things, about resurrection and the discovery and portrayal of God's image in the downtrodden man are surely correct and are embryonic themes crucially important to Dostoevsky's subsequent fiction.

I would be remiss in this review if I did not mention that many of Jackson's observations are based on extensive, close textual analyses. His discussions of man's relationship to freedom and unfreedom is penetrating and evocative throughout this study but particularly in his analysis of *Notes From the Underground* and *The Gambler*. However, most important, Jackson correctly affirms *Notes From the Dead House* as a seminal work in Dostoevsky's mature period, the importance of which scholars must now reassess.

Gene D. Fitzgerald