

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

act of reading but, in fact, suspend our awareness of the fact that such a suspension has occurred (p. 89).

To illustrate and support his theoretical claims, Pavel draws widely from the classics of Western literature, particularly from Greek and Renaissance tragedy. For this broad, traditional canon he successfully establishes a theoretical justification for claiming referentiality. However, for such upstart, noncanonical genres as surrealism and contemporary metafiction, Pavel denies referentiality, suggesting that such literature is purely autotelic (pp. 84-85). In this latter regard, he falls victim to a conventional bias against experimental literature that proposes for it existential irrelevance and purposelessness. Yet, is there not at the heart of many experimental fictions a considered critique of how and why we construct particular world views? Do not Borges and Calvino address epistemological issues in many of their short fiction fantasies? Metafictions are clearly about literature but they are also about the "conventionality" of human discourse and understanding. Consequently, it remains an important task to postulate for their "secondary universes," as well as for those of surrealism (for different reasons), identity and difference vis-à-vis the reader's own "primary universe." Certainly the vigor and persuasiveness of Pavel's theorizing in *Fictional Worlds* would seem to both authorize and encourage such projects.

E. P. Walkiewicz

JOHN BARTH

Boston: Twayne, 1986. Pp. 170.

Reviewed by Robert F. Kiernan

Who has persuaded editors of the Twayne series that their readers need the stimulus of an intertextual headline every three pages? Those with which Walkiewicz's *John Barth* have been peppered include a whimsical "My Maryland," a redoubtable "Menippean Satire and Monomyth," and a prosaic "Relationships to *Tristram Shandy*." Clarity is not the purpose of such headlines: "Relationships to *Tristram Shandy*" introduces a single, unimportant paragraph while standing guard over more than three pages of text. Nor are they deployed consistently: some chapters use the names of Barth's fictions to break the tedium of standard print, while other chapters are punctuated with enigmatic quotations, and still others proceed without interruption. It is a tribute to the general intelligence of Walkiewicz's text that one guesses the heavy hand of an editor.

Indeed, Walkiewicz has written a scholarly treatise of some academical distinction—a much more sober work than the intertextual headlines signify. He has read the novels and short stories with careful attention to their rhetoric, discovering order in their whirligig metaphysics. Not one to be distracted by the incidental felicity, he focuses resolutely upon significant aspects of technique and structure and explicates them along orthodox, somewhat familiar lines. Barth's essays "The Literature of Exhaustion" and "The Literature of Replenishment" inform his considerations deeply. If on no other basis, this viewing of the oeuvre through Barth's pronouncements is justified by Walkiewicz's contention that the fictions echo the famous essays in their cyclic process of replenishment-exhaustion-replenishment.

But the proportions of Walkiewicz's study misrepresent Barth's oeuvre. *The Floating Opera* and *The End of the Road* are accorded separate chapters of sixteen and twelve pages respectively—a generous allotment for these short, minor, and relatively easy novels. Inexplicably, the 781-page *LETTERS* and the recent *Sabbatical* are treated together in a single chapter that accords them only thirteen and six pages respectively, despite *LETTERS* offering major problems of explication and *Sabbatical* deserving more than breezy dismissal. A similar distortion of the oeuvre results from Walkiewicz's preoccupation with the theories of Joseph Campbell and Northrop Frye in his effort to conceptualize what Harry Levin used to call an overplot. So high-minded and abstract is this level of argument in Walkiewicz's book that the humor of Barth's fiction is lost in the process—its grammatical quirkiness, for instance; its exuberant allegiance to Demos; its rendering of mythos as fabliau.