

guilt. But this metaphor is not transcendent; like Hazel Motes it does not fit into Mr. Kessler's scheme; and he dismisses it out of hand.

Despite the fact that the functioning and most successful metaphors in O'Connor grow directly out of Roman Catholic doctrine, deeply felt and stunningly placed for the most part on Protestant characters, this study has little to do with doctrine but much to do with believing and belief. Since such matters extend beyond language as well as reality, Kessler's concentration on metaphor is immensely helpful. Where she was weak—in finding the right metaphor for endings—she knew that too. "Metaphor was O'Connor's instrument for accommodating transcendent vision to the traditional materials of prose fiction," Kessler concludes, "and if in the end the marriage was unable consistently to dissolve different shapes into a composite whole, her raids on the inarticulate remain among the most powerful in contemporary literature" (p. 159).

William Mills Todd III

*FICTION AND SOCIETY IN THE AGE OF PUSHKIN*

Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1986. Pp. 265.

Reviewed by Edward Wasiolek

This is a study of the role salon society played in forming the literature of Russia in the first four decades of the nineteenth century, a time of rapid change in Russian cultural life. What had been formed in centuries in Western Europe had to be formed in decades in Russia: the secularization of culture, the development of a national literature, the growth of education and the universities, the intrusion of the government bureaucracy into all areas of life and resistance to that bureaucracy, and the shift from patronage to "trade" in literary matters. Among the institutions that were making themselves felt in the first four decades of the nineteenth century, the government bureaucracy, the church, commercial interests, the universities and salon society, Todd chooses to anchor his study in salon society, perhaps on the grounds that the other institutions all found their way into salon society, and had their immediate impact on the writer by way of the discourse that went on in salon society. It was there that these matters were discussed, weighed, judged, accepted, and rejected. Specifically, Pushkin's *Eugene Onegin*, Lermontov's *A Hero of Our Time*, and Gogol's *Dead Souls* are analyzed as illustrations of the way that polite society molded the space in which literature worked out, made palpable, and actualized the forms that were discussed and acted out on the social stage.

*Eugene Onegin* is, as Todd eloquently and persuasively shows, a rich and expressive vehicle of the multiple tones, gestures, forms, and discourses that were being explored in Russian culture and polite society at the time. It also held up a mirror to society, because the relationship between literary work and society was reciprocal; Pushkin's narrative poem molded the society as much as the society molded it. Todd's argument works less well with Lermontov's *A Hero of Our Time* and Gogol's *Dead Souls*. Lermontov held salon society in contempt, and Gogol's relationship to it by class and interaction was less visible. Todd's argument is that Pechorin's contempt for society is part of Lermontov's transformation of society's harmonizing rituals into viciously competitive rituals. Pechorin follows society's script even as he condemns it and attempts to distance himself from it. As for Gogol, Todd shows that Gogol actively sought the company of important people of polite society and kept an active correspondence with some of them when he was outside their company. *Dead Souls* questions the ideological processes of polite society: *honnete homme*, harmonization of social antagonisms, spatial configuration (provincial cosmopolitanism), and the very functioning of language itself. The novel questions these not directly but by mimicking society's discourses, playing with them, highlighting them, and showing their shortcomings.

Apart from the intrinsic merit of this study, that is, the persuasive argument that literature and polite society carried on a formative intercourse in the first decades of the century, I was taken by the nature of the study itself, that is, by a study that concerned itself with the relationship between society and literature, or the institutions of society and literature. That such a relationship exists and is a fruitful object of study is surely without doubt. Yet for some time in our century, such studies have been discouraged, or when permitted pursued

in an arid and mechanical fashion. Todd's study sits on the margins of critical studies today; it is in keeping with recent critical trends to connect literature with what is "outside" of it, but he does not deny that there is an inside and an outside. Yet, his method is out of keeping with the trend to "literarize" what literature is extended to. Contemporary criticism seeks to deny the privileged and autonomous status of "disciplines" and yet to establish "literature" as the privileged and enabling condition of other disciplines. One is firmly in the realm of historical facticity in Todd's study, and there is no attempt by way of the juggling of rhetorical properties to make salon discourse and literary discourse the same. His methodology is in keeping with the later critical works of Tynianov and the insistence on separate contexts of discourse in dialogue and interaction. He is aware that in privileging salon society he has made a methodological leap of faith, that one could just as easily have privileged commercial developments, linguistic change, government bureaucracy, the growth of universities, and the breakdown of class. There is no way that he can "prove" that his choice is better than the others, nor need he; for the worth of his choice is in the working out. And it is very good indeed.

Ernest Hemingway

*THE GARDEN OF EDEN*

New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1986. Pp. 247

Reviewed by R. S. Nelson

*The Garden of Eden* is arranged in four books and covers a long summer in time. David Bourne, a gifted writer, has just married a wealthy girl, Catherine, and they are honeymooning in southern France. They enjoy their lazy, leisurely lives, drinking and lovemaking. Then unaccountably, Catherine has her hair cut short like David's and wants to be a "boy." She flip-flops, being "a boy" one day and "a girl" the next, and David puts up with her whims. She does not want him to write, but wants them to travel, and he agrees. In Book II David does begin to write, and Catherine appears to acquiesce, but she runs off to do her own thing in response. She has her hair cut even shorter, and pushes the "boy" bit. David does not quite know how to cope with her irrational outbursts, her boredom with being "a girl," her irritability, and he begins to address her as "Devil." In Book III Catherine has her hair bleached white, and persuades David to have his hair bleached also. They have all the while been sunbathing naked on remote beaches so that they—particularly Catherine—are deeply browned. Being very dark becomes a fetish. In a café they meet Marita, an attractive tall young woman, whom Catherine invites to join them. Marita soon has her hair cut short and becomes a lover to both Catherine and David. By this time David has established a regular schedule of writing most of the mornings, and the story begins to include summaries of his writing. The stories fuse with the action of the novel itself. He has abandoned the Narrative, Catherine's and his story, in favor of several short stories set in Africa. Marita loves the African stories, and Catherine hates them. She wants the Narrative finished. As Book III ends, Catherine is actively pursuing publication arrangements—far too prematurely—and David and Marita are more deeply involved in each other. Catherine erratically blesses and damns them. Book IV opens with catastrophe: Catherine has burned the rave reviews on David's last book, but most catastrophically, burned all the short stories David has slaved over for weeks. He is remarkably self-contained in his response to her, however, and in remorse she wants to pay him double what they would have sold for. They seem to become reconciled, but Catherine after some days departs for Paris, leaving David with Marita. David tries to rewrite the stories, but cannot. Then, after particularly satisfying lovemaking with Marita, he is able to begin writing the stories easily, almost miraculously. The novel ends with David rejoicing in the way the story lines are flowing.

*The Garden of Eden* is obviously Hemingway in style and theme. The elemental declarative sentences, the staccato dialogue, the muted tropes and figures, are all recognizably Hemingway. The sexual themes so common to his major novels are present again, but with a difference. The love scenes are more explicit than in any other published work, and the lesbian dimension represents a sharp shift from attitudes expressed in early stories such as *In Our Time*. The novel reads like an erotic fantasy: if one beautiful, passionate woman is good, how much