

and enriched literary reading of the novel than . . . other critical approaches" rings hollow (p. 183). One is led to expect a new theory; one is given a digest of ideas advanced by others (Greimas, Genette, Derrida, Jameson, etc.). It is here, however, that this book will be found most useful. For if the separate chapters provide few new insights into the works in question, the discussions of critical theorists are always pertinent; they constitute a clear and practical introduction to contemporary debates. Above all, the author demonstrates that narrative landscape has a complex function in the novel. But her claim that only a "relational reading" can "grasp the full social and semiotic import of narrative landscape" (p. 191) requires more evidence than this study provides.

Michael Reynolds

THE YOUNG HEMINGWAY

Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986. Pp. 291, \$19.95

Reviewed by Raymond S. Nelson

Michael Reynolds has done a superb job of detailing Ernest Hemingway's first twenty-two years. He builds his account essentially on primary documents—letters, newspaper items, interviews, family records—and offers a readable and plausible story. The book is likely to become a basic tool, along with Carlos Baker's biography, for any student of Hemingway.

The narrative is distinguished by several qualities. One is the easy flow of material, as Reynolds pursues a given figure or theme over a period of years instead of holding rigidly to a single time line. The reader thus gets the impression of flashbacks or previews as the narrative unfolds. Reynolds focuses on the year 1919, for example, when Ernest spent the summer at Horton Bay in northern Michigan after his war wound and convalescence, but he does not hesitate to look forward on those pages to 1930 and 1933 when Hemingway would use those summer incidents in his stories.

The second distinctive is the excellent sense of unfolding history. Reynolds fills in the political, social, and economic climates in Oak Park, in Chicago, and in the country as a whole. Ernest and the family share in the larger currents of life, as a result, and their experiences fuse to some extent with their townspeople. Their stories are told in the context of the larger communities. The third distinctive is the identification of literary influences other than those usually mentioned: the Kansas City *Star*, Ring Lardner, Sherwood Anderson, and Gertrude Stein. Reynolds acknowledges these influences, but cites Teddy Roosevelt, Gabrielle d'Annunzio, Joseph Conrad, Havelock Ellis, Stewart Edward White, among others, as equally powerful influences in forming Hemingway's self-image and his literary dreams.

The fourth distinctive is the reassessment of Ernest Hemingway's relationships with family and friends. Grace Hall Hemingway, Ernest's mother, is presented with much greater sympathy and understanding than is usual, and Dr. Clarence Hemingway emerges as a much more pitiable figure than commonly thought. Hemingway's later relationships with his sisters was generally bad, and efforts by Marcelline, Sunny, and Leicester to clean up those relationships by their published accounts are generally discounted. Hemingway could not keep friends, a well-known fact, and Reynolds details more of such incidents.

Perhaps the most insistent and persistent theme of the book is Reynold's contention that Ernest Hemingway fabricated the persona that he became by dreaming and lying about virtually everything in his life. He romanticized everything, always. ". . . Hemingway invented himself, not from the whole cloth, but through embroidery and artful rearrangement. Late in life, with fame bringing him under close biographical scrutiny, he would become seemingly irrational about his early years, telling his family and friends not to answer any questions. He knew that his fictional early life would not match historical fact, but did little to correct it when he had the opportunity . . . As late as 1960, he prefaced his own memoir of the Paris years with the caution: 'If the reader prefers, this book may be regarded as fiction. But there is always the chance that such a book of fiction may throw some light on what has been written

as fact.' He was making up his life to the very end" (p. 257). This paragraph pulls the dominant note of the narrative together, a motif that is highlighted dozens of times in the course of the text.

Reynolds notes one other quirk of Hemingway's prose style, that of repetition of key words and phrases, and plays with that device himself as he wrote the biography. He repeats tags from popular songs, reiterates his central points, and generally experiments with his subject's technique of repetition. It works rather well.

The book is excellent and merits wide circulation and use, not only by scholars and aficionados, but by the general reading public.

Thomas G. Pavel

FICTIONAL WORLDS

Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986. Pp. 178,
\$20.00

Reviewed by Jerry A. Varsava

As Thomas Pavel correctly notes in his preface, a preoccupation with their formal and rhetorical properties over the last few decades has led to a neglect, if not actual derogation, of the semantic aspects of literary works. Of late, however, the ever-increasing interest in thematics—marked, variously, by the new importance of feminist criticism, hermeneutics, and ideological critique—has effectively lifted the "moratorium" on the study of referential issues (p. 10). In the spirit of these latter "schools," though in a manner distinctly different, *Fictional Worlds* seeks to complement the consideration of literary form by appending to it a "viable account of literary content" (p. vii). To do so, Pavel turns to semantics, speech-act theory, philosophical logic, and possible-world epistemology.

In the first instance, Pavel is concerned with the ontology of fictional worlds. Clearly, in order to assert for fictional worlds a "real-world" relevance or referentiality, Pavel must identify within the two worlds strong commonalities, commonalities denied, for example, by Bertrand Russell and other analytic philosophers who claim that statements about nonexistent entities, e.g., literary characters, are illogical because we can only make claims about things that *are*. In Chapters 2 and 3, Pavel evaluates this "segregationist" view of the relationship between fictional worlds and the real world before going on to posit, alternatively, the notion of "salient structures," the enabling concept of Pavel's ontology of fictional worlds. "Salient structures" have two frames of reference, a "primary universe," i.e., the real world, and a "secondary universe," i.e., a fictional world. These universes do not enter into an isomorphism because the secondary universe has features that the primary universe does not. However, notwithstanding the absence of identity, correspondences do exist between the two worlds. In realist works, Pavel suggests, the correspondences are relatively transparent while they are less so in allegories. Citing the analyses of Max Weber, Roger Caillois, and Mircea Eliade, among others, Pavel likens his dualistic ontological model to religious consciousness which posits, of course, alternative worlds—the profane and the sacred—which are both similar and different.

Supported as it is by rigorous argumentation, barely glossed here, Pavel's "integrationist" ontology of fictional worlds convincingly demonstrates how a reader finds both entry to and escape from an imaginary textual realm. Using common-sense knowledge and customary modes of inference while ever remaining responsive to emotions, the reader "travels" to the fictional world. When confronted with the domains and events of the fictional text, the reader, like any real-world traveler, sorts and sifts, identifying the secondary universe's correspondences to and departures from the reader's primary universe. Pavel's argument confirms what most readers feel, I think, intuitively, namely that in the process of reading we enter into a relationship with the world of the text that is in many ways similar to the relationship we construct with our "real world." As Pavel says, we not only suspend our disbelief during the