

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

list has a publication date of 1980 or later. On the other hand, there has not been a lot of interesting writing on Turgenev.

Wasiolek succeeds well in introducing the debates on aesthetics and social philosophy which motivate much of the action of the novel. The figure of Chernyshevsky looms large in his discussions, and Dmitry Pisarev plays his role as well. Dobroliubov is nearly absent, and one wonders why, although this is not a serious defect. Wasiolek courageously pays considerable attention to Chernyshevsky's tedious aesthetics, as well as to his literary response to *Fathers and Sons* in his novel *What is to Be Done*. A slight shortcoming emerges here insofar as Wasiolek does not come to terms with Turgenev's own artistic and philosophic relationship to positivism outside of his interactions with Chernyshevsky. This is, of course, a complex and thorny problem, and perhaps it is better left to a more specialized study.

Wasiolek has done a fine job of presenting a complex socio-historical and literary-aesthetic scenario in a manner which will encourage the interest of new readers of Turgenev as well as stimulate more specialized ones to reassess the dynamics of the fascinating characters who have made this novel so enduring.

Toby Avard Foshay

*Wyndham Lewis and the Avant-Garde: The Politics of the Intellect*

Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992. Pp. 177. \$34.95

Reviewed by Axel Knoenagel

Wyndham Lewis has been one of the more difficult twentieth-century authors to neatly fit into a critical compartment. Temporally parallel to the period of high modernism and, during the vortocist phase, on the leading edge of modernism, Lewis's texts nonetheless exhibit too many differences from and conscious distances to the modernist canon to be included in that movement. Foshay approaches Lewis by regarding him not as a modernist but—following Peter Bürger's *The Theory of the Avant-Garde*—as an avant-gardist in constant debate with the main artistic and political issues of his time. In his attempt to place Lewis artistically and philosophically, Foshay sets out to "trace Lewis's critical and creative development" (20) in the form of a cursory reading of Lewis's most important works in the light of their biographical context.

Two issues dominate Foshay's study of Lewis's texts: Lewis's insistence on experience rather than aesthetics as the basis and reference point for art, and the central relevance of Nietzschean concepts for the shaping of Lewis's philosophy as it found expression in his novels and essays. In his survey of Lewis's oeuvre, Foshay omits the vortocist phase and concerns himself with the literature written, as Lewis himself stated repeatedly, under the impression of his participation in the First World War. Reading the parable *The Caliph's Design* (1919), Foshay identifies Lewis's belief that "by breaking out of its institutional thralldom, art can achieve an *organic*, living experimentalism, and so transform culture as to lead to