

the prologue is the only part of the novel that is pure fiction; the rest of the novel is, in his words, "crude reality." The reader is left therefore in that imprecise world between what seems unreal but could be true, between the fantastic as believable reality, and reality as imaginative fiction. Above all, *Del amor* is a celebration of unrequited love that, according to García Márquez, is the most important thing in life and in the world. The novel recalls the role of love in *El amor en los tiempos del cólera* (1985), and enhances the reader's vision of Cartagena seen in each of his last three novels.

García Márquez says that he never rereads his books after their publication, but it is a safe bet that thousands of his readers will read *Del amor y otros demonios* not just once, but over and over again. It is a guidebook to one of the continent's most interesting cities as well as a voyage back in time to the eighteenth century.

Marcel Proust

"Briquebec": Prototipe d'*A l'ombre des jeunes filles en fleurs*

Texte établi et présenté par Richard Bales

Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989. Pp. xxvi + 4 + 304

Reviewed by Anthony R. Pugh

"Briquebec" is one of the names Proust gave to his Normandy seaside resort before he settled on "Balbec." The Normandy sojourn occupies the second half of "A l'ombre des jeunes filles en fleurs" (the second part of *A la recherche du temps perdu*), and the title comes from the second half of that sojourn, where the adolescent Narrator-hero is attracted to and fascinated by a group of young girls who are also spending their summer holidays in the region. It has long been common knowledge that in the proofs of the novel which were set up by Bernard Grasset in 1913, there were no girls present in the Normandy section. Richard Bales has had the idea of going back to the typescript of 1912 which Grasset used, and giving us a careful transcription, with the manuscript corrections and additions clearly distinguished from the typed text.

Despite the intense work done on Proust's manuscripts in the last thirty years, the typescripts have been neglected. Bales himself has given us some extracts in the past, the variants of the new Pléiade edition contain much information, though it is scattered, but otherwise we have only a major article by Robert Brydges in the *Bulletin d'Informations proustiennes* for 1984, Wada's unpublished Paris thesis on the evolution of "Combray" (1986), and a handful of incidental mentions. Yet the typescript is a very significant stage in the shaping of *La Recherche*, and one can only applaud the decision to make part of it widely available.

Anyone who has looked at the 700-page typescript in the Bibliothèque Nationale quickly realizes that there are problems; Bales's attempt to minimize the difficulties (ix) is not really convincing. There are two official copies, and parts of another. All are imperfect. Pages are missing, but they can usually be reconstituted

by using the other set. Some pages were typed more than once. There are gaps, implying difficulty reading Proust's handwriting. Each of the two copies bears corrections by Proust, most (but not all) of which are then copied onto the other copy. The ideal transcription would, by a series of footnotes, point out errors and fill the gaps, and would indicate clearly on which copy the modifications were made.

Unfortunately, Bales does not face this challenge. He has taken as his text the so-called second typescript, calling upon the first only where a page is missing. He seems to regard his chosen typescript as a fairly settled block of text, for which only the additions and the deletions need to be recorded, without distinction.

As a straight transcription of the second typescript, the work has been done extremely well, and the typeface used by the Clarendon Press is exceptionally clear. I have spotted only one error: the word "rassemblaient" on p. 131 (239/638) should be singular, the antecedent being "cette région qui" on p. 171 (the original 637). In order to distinguish the original typing from the changes made to it, Bales has devised a simple typographical code: words struck out are in italics, words added are in boldface. The principal text is given on the recto pages, while the verso give, in the form of numbered notes, the variants. One would expect that the rectos would give the original layer, and the verso the additions. But no; sometimes the suppressions are on the recto and the additions which replace them on the verso, sometimes the reverse, for no discernible reason. This greatly impedes one's attempts to read the basic layer without distraction.

If one is to reconstitute the basic layer, however, one has to do more than just restore the suppressions and omit the additions. Apart from stylistic changes, the corrections Proust made are frequently structural. Sometimes whole paragraphs have been moved, and the original order can be deduced from an examination of the first and last words on the page, particularly when the words in question have been struck out, plus the original page numbers, which were changed when the order was modified. Here Bales is less reliable. Though he gives the different numbers, he sometimes forgets to distinguish, by bolding, between the first and the subsequent layers. Nor does he give any notes to help us solve these jigsaw puzzles.

In fact there are very few references to anything lying outside the typescript itself. Bales is strangely silent about the manuscripts (two exercise books and a handwritten copy of the last part) which were at the basis of the typescript. It is quite untrue to say that "de larges extraits sont publiés dans la nouvelle édition de la Pléiade" (xi); the Pléiade edition is disappointingly reticent about them. Was Bales perhaps guessing as to what would happen in the second volume of the Pléiade, containing the Balbec section? Although that volume came out in 1988, Bales seems to have written his introduction with only vol. I before him; the reference in note 2 is really inadequate, and should be supplemented by II, 1314-35. Without notes elucidating difficulties in the light of the manuscripts, some features of Bales's "Bricquebec" are very difficult to understand. Consultation of the manuscript would also have prevented a few errors (like the statement on p. 123 that the sequel is missing). It is a pity too that he was not able to consult the *mémoire* of S. Kurozawa (1988), modest in scope, but perceptive about several problems which Bales conveniently ignores. More surprisingly, he seems not to know

Françoise Leriche's important article (*BIP* 1986) which shows that the typescript was done in June, not January, 1912.

In short, this is a useful publication which with a bit more thought could have been made very much more useful than it actually is.

Edward Wasiolek.

*Fathers and Sons: Russia at the Crossroads*

New York: Twayne, 1993. Pp. 125. \$22.95; \$7.95

Reviewed by Allan Reid

*Fathers and Sons* (1862) is arguably Turgenev's finest novel but, like its author, it is frequently underappreciated, even by specialists. Written at the very moment when Alexander II's program of social reform was at its sharpest focus—the liberation of the serfs took place in 1861—it provides a dynamic portrait of generational conflict both on a universal plane, and in the context of Russia's emerging social and political formations which tended to follow generational lines. Ivan Goncharov had given some shape to this issue in his first novel *A Common Story* (1847), but his narrative, first of all, was set in that earlier period before the much sharper and more inclusive lines of the fifties and sixties had been drawn, and, secondly, he was less interested in examining the specific social questions with the same precision as Turgenev, being more concerned with a certain universal problem of recurrence or cyclicity. One sure indicator of the effectiveness of Turgenev's novel was the variety and power of the reaction which it generated.

Edward Wasiolek has written a useful and concise study of this important novel as part of Twayne's Masterwork Studies. It fills a significant gap in the literature on Turgenev and this novel in particular. The title represents in an effective manner the main themes of *Fathers and Sons* by indicating both the generational and the socio-historical dimensions. The book itself also shifts back and forth between these two axes, as well as between the axes of aesthetic and social considerations. Besides a chronology, a brief bibliography, and an index, it is divided into two sections: the first, shorter section treats the literary and historical background, while the second offers a systematic and critical reading.

The sections are divided thematically into manageable, bite-size chapters which, though not always exhaustive, and even occasionally too schematic, address the most pressing questions for a first-time, and for even a more seasoned, reader of Turgenev's novel. Wasiolek provides enough of a background to make the context of the novel much more accessible, and challenges many traditional and less tenable views of the novel. In the process, he makes some assumptions about standard readings of the novel which are not clearly consonant with most contemporary readers. I do not believe that today's readers are as taken with Bazarov as he would have us suspect, nor are they as ill-disposed to Odintsova as he implies. This is reflected in the bibliography where less than one-fifth of the