

## ANALYSIS

*Garden of Eden* (1986)

(unfinished--censored and stolen by Feminists)

Ernest Hemingway

(1899-1961)

## LITERARY CRIME

“The truth about editing the work of a dead writer in such circumstances is that you can only cut to affirm his strengths, to reiterate the strategies of style for which he is known; whereas he himself may have been writing to transcend them. This cannot have been the book Hemingway envisioned... It should have been published for what it is, a piece of something, part of a design.”

E. L. Doctorow

“Braver than We Thought”

*The New York Times Book Review* (18 May 1986) 1, 44-45

reprinted in Linda Wagner, ed.

*Ernest Hemingway: Six Decades of Criticism* (Michigan State 1987) 330

quoted by Susan M. Seitz

“The propriety of publishing, as a commercial endeavor, what a dead writer declined to see into print is, of course, dubious. The previous forages into the Hemingway trove have unfortunately tended to heighten our appreciation not of his talent but of his psychopathology.”

John Updike

“The Sinister Sex”

*The New Yorker* 30

(June 1986) 85

“Were the scrupulous craftsman still alive, no case of vodka could ease the pain the publication of this novel [*The Garden of Eden*] would cause [him].”

Lorian Hemingway

“Ernest Hemingway’s Farewell to Art”

*Rolling Stone* (5 June 1986) 41-42

quoted by Susan M. Seitz

*The Posthumous Editing of Ernest Hemingway’s Fiction*

Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts (1993)

“I can report that Hemingway’s publisher has committed a literary crime. There is no way that the manuscript that I read, an extraordinary mass of unfinished work, could have been made into a smooth popular novel without the literary equivalent of ‘colorization’... [Scribner’s] has transformed these unfinished experiments into the stuff of potboilers and pulp....

Nobody can finish an unfinished novel for a writer, and nobody should presume to try... *The Garden of Eden* was to have been nothing less than Ernest Hemingway’s final summation on art and literature, on the nature of love and the body, on the possibilities of human life. But you won’t find any of these strong conceptions in the book that Scribner’s has published in his name. To paraphrase the publisher, in almost no significant respect is this book its author’s. With all its disfigurements and omissions, its heightening of the trivial and its diminishment of the great themes of Hemingway’s final years, this volume is a travesty.”

Barbara Probst Solomon

“Where’s Papa?”

*The New Republic* (9 March 1987) 31, 34

quoted by Susan M. Seitz

The year 1986 saw publication of a Hemingway novel, *The Garden of Eden*, as well as Mary's death in November. The year 1987 brought *The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway*, a volume in progress during Mary's final illness. With the possible exception of *Dateline: Toronto*, all of these books were hastily and disastrously edited; they are rife with glaring omissions and misrepresentations of manuscript materials. Reviews of these posthumous publications, as well as scholarly indignation about the poor quality of their editing, represented one factor in the scholarly surge.

Despite such difficulties, the appearance of *The Garden of Eden* was one of the most important benchmarks in Hemingway studies. Although textual scholars concur that the novel Scribner's published is only one-third of the novel Hemingway wrote, its treatment of feminine madness, male androgyny, bisexuality, and lesbianism was sufficient to prompt a radical reassessment of Hemingway's canonical output. These themes, of course, are omnipresent in the work published during Hemingway's lifetime, but nowhere treated with the candor of *Eden*, which brings them to the fore....

When potential readers reject Hemingway as indifferent to minorities and hostile to women, they are often responding not to Hemingway's fiction, but to the indifference and hostility of some of his early critics, and a negative image of the author those influential first admirers unintentionally projected... The unconscious and deliberate biases of some early readers would make it hard for some subsequent readers to approach Hemingway at all."

Susan F. Beegel

"Conclusion: The Critical Reputation of Ernest Hemingway"

*The Cambridge Companion to Ernest Hemingway*, ed. Scott Donaldson  
(Cambridge U 1996) 290

"In *The Garden of Eden*, another posthumous novel, an Edenic honeymoon is corrupted by modern ambiguities of sexual roles and by the jealousy of a young wife for the creativity of her writer husband, a creativity that shuts her out. Here Hemingway builds upon material that might have belonged in or followed *A Moveable Feast*, including his perceptions of his and of Scott and Zelda Fitzgerald's doomed relationships. As with a good deal of his later, mostly unfinished work, *The Garden of Eden* was much edited in the process of preparation for publication.

Its consideration of sexuality and of gender roles comes through clearly, and it reaches a positive ending, one probably not inherent in the drafts. The novel's consideration of the dilemmas of the creative artist is perhaps more muted, though still present. *The Garden of Eden* has achieved considerable popular attention because it seems to hint at a Hemingway persona less assured and macho than the one constructed during the writer's life, though little in it really surprises readers of Hemingway's earlier novels. But even in its published state, the achievements of David Bourne, its protagonist, come at a very great cost to himself and to those he loves."

Frederic J. Svoboda

"The Great Themes in Hemingway"

*A Historical Guide to Ernest Hemingway*, ed. Linda Wagner-Martin  
(Oxford 2000) 169-70

"In *The Garden of Eden*, David and Catherine honeymoon in almost complete isolation—until the beautiful and supposedly lesbian Marita becomes their companion. Attracted initially by Catherine, Marita eventually succumbs to David's charm, and the novel ends with Marita and David becoming a passionate, heterosexual couple. By this time, Catherine has gone mad. The extra couple—Barbara and Nick—that appeared in the full version of the novel were cut by the work's editor; so Hemingway's sexual text seems comparatively straightforward. In effect, Marita's dangerous lesbian or bisexual tendency is changed through her love for the typically masculine David. She is a satisfied good lover of the heterosexual variety."

Linda Wagner-Martin

"The Intertextual Hemingway"

*Historical Guide* (2000) 191

“Sadly, Hemingway’s literary reputation has declined with the posthumous publication of his other works, perhaps unjustly so.... Editors have altered, deleted, added, and rearranged substantial amounts of material from Hemingway’s often unformed and unfinished writings.... *The Garden of Eden*, the most recent addition to the Hemingway bookshelf, has also garnered its fair share of criticism and controversy. Tom Jenks edited Hemingway’s 1,500-page manuscript of androgyny, sexuality, and love down to just 247 pages, claiming that ‘everything in here is his [Hemingway’s—this is a lie]. I cut and rearranged, but I added nothing, rewrote nothing’ (quoted in Pooley 50). However, scholars pouring over Hemingway’s original manuscript lament Jenks’s cutting of important scenes and subplots that tie the narrative together. As Michael Reynolds sums up, the novel ‘bears so little resemblance to the book Hemingway wrote that scholars can speak only to the manuscript versions’....

Ironically, it will be those very scholars and critics whom the author distrusted who will ultimately take on the responsibility of recovering and preserving the authentic Hemingway from the editorial distortions of these posthumous publications.... Most agree that the need for clarity and accuracy in the Hemingway canon is long overdue.”

Kelli A. Larson

“Bibliographical Essay: Lies, Damned Lies, and Hemingway Criticism”  
*Historical Guide* (2000) 218-20

#### ANDROGYNY

“As [his] letters show, in his private life Hemingway was performing the same experiments with androgyny as his characters do in *Garden*. For Hemingway, androgyny did not mean merging with the opposite sex to become one amorphous gender; rather, as expressed in *Garden* and in his private life, Hemingway’s view of androgyny is characterized by the male identifying and accessing his traditionally repressed feminine qualities, while the female does the same with her inherent male traits. Just as Hemingway adopted the feminine persona of ‘Catherine’ and Mary became the masculine ‘Pete’ in their private sexual universe, so too in *Garden* do Catherine Bourne and her husband David exchange sexual identities while making love, with each attempting to be both male and female. Catherine says to David: “...you’re my girl Catherine. Will you change and be my girl and let me take you?” ‘You’re Catherine.’ ‘No. I’m Peter. You’re my wonderful Catherine.’” As we will see, such androgynous experimentation will be dangerous for Catherine because she is torn between being either a ‘boy’ or a ‘girl’; she will be unsuccessful at integrating both parts of her personality in a true androgynous fashion. The Bournes also dye their hair as Hemingway dyed his and as he wished Mary to dye hers....

On June 12, 1948, he stated the theme of *Garden* in a letter to his friend Buck Lanham as ‘the happiness of the Garden that a man must lose’.... The Scribner’s version of *Garden* tells the story of the young American writer David Bourne, on his honeymoon on the French Riviera in the 1920s with his wife, Catherine. At first they are happy and content with eating, drinking, making love and being in love, but soon Catherine desires to begin experimenting with androgynous sexuality. She takes the male role in bed while David adopts the female role, and they begin to dress alike in fishermen’s shirts, slacks and espadrilles. Catherine convinces David to cut and dye his hair to match hers, and then she brings a young lesbian woman, Marita, into their relationship for them to share. As Catherine’s mental health begins to deteriorate, David resumes his writing. He starts several stories about his boyhood in Africa, which are deftly interwoven into the main narrative. David falls in love with Marita, Catherine goes crazy and burns his manuscripts, and by the end of the story Catherine has left David and Marita together while David is able to reconstruct his lost stories and to write again....”

Susan M. Seitz

“The Posthumous Editing of Ernest Hemingway’s Fiction”  
Ph.D. Dissertation, U Massachusetts (1993) 162-64, 167

#### UNQUALIFIED EDITOR

“Jenks neither prepared in any special way for the edit nor was he in any sense an expert on Hemingway. He claims to be ‘just a working fiction editor...just a guy interested in storytelling, and in language.’ He did not re-read Hemingway, nor did he look at any of the standard works on scholarly

editing. He had not 'read a Hemingway novel in years...and he still hasn't read *Islands in the Stream*.' Jenks' qualifications for editing Hemingway were that he 'dropped out of college...worked on construction jobs for a decade before finishing school and mov[ed] quickly from Columbia to the *Paris Review* to *Esquire* to Scribner's.' Jenks consulted no one for advice on how to do the edit, nor was he given any direction by Scribner's about what sort of book to produce.... Charles Scribner, Jr. says that Jenks was chosen to do the edit precisely because of his lack of regard for the Hemingway cult.... Jenks approached the edit purely from the standpoint of a commercial fiction editor.... 'I did not edit with a "scholarly conscience"...

Seitz, 175-77

#### CORRUPT EDITING

"Those reviewers who did not like the book cited several problems with the novel, but were chiefly concerned with the fact that of Hemingway's original 200,000 word manuscript of 46 chapters, only 65,000 words and 30 chapters remained. Scribner's *Garden* is not the novel that Hemingway wrote. It is a drastically altered, cut down version of Hemingway's sprawling yet fascinating work.... Of all Hemingway's posthumous works, *Garden* is the one which most clearly shows the negative impact of commercial editing on Hemingway's posthumous texts. As a result, Hemingway's experiments with theme and style have been suppressed in order to make the work conform to the known Hemingway canon....

The African story of the elephant hunt was especially singled out for praise. Critics agreed that 'The splicing and counterpoint of the African story-within-a-story are managed quite brilliantly.' This was one of the few elements of the novel which Jenks did not change. Critics thought that the metafictional aspect of the story was a daring experiment on Hemingway's part that was clearly successful: 'Hemingway's novel melts into the short story David writes—a superb piece about a father and son hunting elephant on an African safari. The story is broken up throughout the book, starting with quick sentences and ending with long gripping passages, so the reader feels the writer's dislocation—drawn into Africa, thrown back into France, with two women waiting'....

Once critics had gotten a glimpse of what Hemingway had written and compared it to Jenks' edition, the tone of the reviews changed drastically: 'I can report that Hemingway's publisher has committed a literary crime'.... Many of the problems noted about the novel can be attributed to Jenks' drastic editing. David's character was attacked as being passive and 'totally subject to the powers of women, hapless before temptation and unable to take action in the face of adversity,' while Catherine was seen as nothing more than 'a cardboard wife...this skeleton of a plot carries scant characterization'....

The ending, too, was denounced, because 'Jenks altered the novel so that it runs counter to the pattern of tragedy Hemingway had been preparing... Hemingway had very deliberately been constructing a tragic novel with his multiple tales of betrayal, jealousy and guilt'; after reading Jenks' version, anyone will 'be struck by the difference between the optimism of its final chapter and the endings of any other Hemingway novel...[the original ending] would have concluded the novel in a typically tragic Hemingway fashion.' The conclusion of many critics was that Scribner's had done a grave disservice to Hemingway and his reputation and that the novel should not have been published in the manner that it was. The publication of *Garden* was viewed as another step in the process of the commercialization of Hemingway....

Jenks' edition resembles Hemingway's in the Catherine and David Bourne plot, but it is missing several key elements. Hemingway's version has David, Catherine, and Marita as its central characters, but there is also an important subplot involving a painter named Nick Sheldon and his wife, Barbara, friends of the Bournes who live in Paris and who also experiment with androgyny, exchanging sex roles and cutting their hair to match. They have a friend named Andy Murray who is missing from the Jenks edition, who functions as the third member of a romantic triangle, much like Marita. Andy has an affair with Barbara, Nick is killed and Barbara ends up committing suicide. In addition, the Bournes and Sheldons are inspired in their androgynous experimentation by a Rodin statue which they see in Paris; this is also missing from Jenks' version. Finally, at the end of Hemingway's *Garden* Catherine and David are reunited, not split apart. The cuts made by Jenks add up to a radically altered *Garden* which is very different in scope and meaning from the book that Hemingway intended....

Two thirds of the manuscript is missing. These massive cuts fall into three broad categories: thematic losses, structural losses, and the loss of Hemingway's original ending. There are other problems as well, involving interpolated scenes and dialogue, additions, cuts of whole chapters and the combination of chapters. Hemingway's authorial intentions have been trampled in order to produce a commercially viable text, resulting in a book that is Jenks', not Hemingway's.

Perhaps the most important cuts in the Jenks' edition are the ones which relate to what Hemingway envisioned as the theme of the novel: 'the happiness of the Garden that a man must lose.' The important implication of this sentence is that things must *change*; nothing can remain the same forever. This is one of the significances of Adam's and Eve's fall from paradise. They did not know what the meaning of paradise was until they were expelled from it. They experienced a fall into knowledge which had to come about through a change. In Hemingway's version, he emphasizes this theme through a central symbol, Rodin's statue of Ovid's *Metamorphosis*, in which two naked figures are engaged in a carnal embrace, 'one reclining in the grasp of the other, who is leaning over and embracing the first...both figures have female breasts and short hair. Their genitalia are obscured, making it difficult to identify the figures by gender or name.' The meaning of the statue is that:

it represents self-initiated rebirth—a type of metamorphosis. It suggests that one can remake oneself in the same way that the serpent suggested that Eve would become a god and recreate herself with the knowledge provided by the fruit.... [K. J. Peters, "The Thematic Integrity of *The Garden of Eden*," *The Hemingway Review* 10 (2) (Spring 1991) 17]

Through self-originated change comes metamorphosis, the creation of a new androgynous self. Hemingway was drawn to this statue because:

Of its success in depicting a continuous chain of transformation and transcendence. Catherine and David are meant to join that chain, a chain of love fused with art, in which men and women exchanging roles becomes part of a larger cosmos. (Obviously, 'Bourne is intended as a pun—born and reborn, as in metamorphosis.) [Barbara Probst Solomon, "Where's Papa?" *The New Republic* 9 (March 1987)]

This is the heart of Hemingway's *Garden*, yet since Jenks has cut all mention of the Rodin statue, he has effectively cut the heart out of the novel. It is clear that Hemingway intended the statue to be the central symbol of his theme, since he places the mention of it in the first chapter of the work, in the crucial love scene between Catherine and David where they first exchange sex roles. This is the beginning of their fall, of Catherine's self-initiated metamorphosis into an androgynous being.... In the Jenks version of this scene, all mention of the Rodin statue has been cut. The emphasis on the theme of metamorphosis is thus lost, which changes the meaning of the book. In Jenks' *Garden*, the altered theme of the work could be stated as:

The age-old view of woman as the cause of original sin. Catherine is a spoiler whose taste in forbidden fruit threatens the private Eden of David's art. It is the place where he struggles with his own lost innocence. [R.Z. Sheppard, "The Old Man and the Sea Change," *Time* (26 May 1986) 77]

While Hemingway certainly intended this meaning in the novel as well, since he makes Catherine the initiator of the change, he tempered that view with his emphasis on metamorphosis. The loss of the Rodin statue undercuts a potentially feminist theme in the book, the theme of the woman attempting to create an identity separate from her husband through a rejection of her traditional sexual role. One effect of the cut of the Rodin reference is the diminishment of Catherine's struggle to form her own identity as separate but equal to David's. This becomes crucial towards the end of the novel, when Catherine burns David's manuscripts. In the Jenks version, her act makes her seem like a crazy, destructive bitch, yet another in the long line of Hemingway's 'bitch goddesses' such as Margot Macomber. Catherine burns the manuscripts ostensibly because 'I paid for them...I paid the money to do them.' However, this is not the real reason for her act.

Catherine does not burn all David's manuscripts, but only the African stories about his father and his boyhood. David has also been working on a narrative of their honeymoon, a chronicle of their love life and

androgynous experiments. After Catherine burns the manuscripts, she tells David that 'Now you can go right on with the narrative and there will be nothing to interrupt you. You can start in the morning.' The narrative has become Catherine's project. It is the representation of her new identity, and she has all sorts of plans for it: 'First we have to start seeing about getting the book out. I'm going to have to have the manuscript typed up to where it is now and see about getting illustrations. I have to see artists and make the arrangements.'

Catherine desperately needs David to continue with the narrative because that is where her identity is now. In her experiments with androgyny, by cutting and dyeing her hair and by sleeping with David as a 'boy' and with Marita as a 'girl,' she has tried to form a new identity but has ended up fragmenting herself so badly that she is on the brink of insanity. In a sense, the narrative is her lifeline; she needs David to write her identity into existence, to give her something solid to hold on to so that she won't crack up completely. Catherine tells David that 'I can't write things, David... But I'll tell them to someone who can write them for me. If you really loved me you'd be happy to.' Just as David expresses his creativity and creates his identity through his writing (which is always autobiographical), Catherine too needs an outlet for her creativity and a way to give herself an identity. In her day, rich, bright young women were wives and mothers, two roles that Catherine does not want.

Rejecting the traditional roles of wife and mother, Catherine instead takes on the role of artist when she creates her own identity; she becomes her own art object. Catherine knows that she has no artistic talent in the usual sense of the word, and so cannot compete with David on that level.... Instead of creating her identity through art, she has made her *self* her own creation through her experiments with androgyny... As the story advances, Catherine begins to fail in her attempt at a metamorphosis into a new identity, and she needs David to recreate her identity for her. Jenks' cut of the Rodin statue diminishes this theme and results in the reader's view of Catherine as simply a destructive Eve who is responsible for the lovers' fall from paradise. It takes the focus off the theme of change and puts it back onto woman as the destroyer of man, a canonical image of women in Hemingway. In Hemingway's *Garden*, he was writing to transcend that view of women. Jenks' cuts suppress this new direction in Hemingway's work.

Jenks also cut another reference to a central art symbol in Hemingway's version, Hieronymus Bosch's allegorical painting, the *Garden of Earthly Delights*. While in Madrid, Catherine goes to the Prado to view this painting and it has a strong effect on her.... The Bosch painting is in three panels. The left panel depicts the Garden of Eden and Adam and Eve before the fall, the center panel depicts the Garden of Earthly Delights full of all sorts of characters engaged in sexual acts, and the right panel shows a Musical Hell where the fallen sinners are tortured. Catherine's fascination with this painting is meant to draw our attention to the theme of Catherine's and David's fall. The structure of the painting also mirrors the structure of the book. The beginning of the novel, before Catherine initiates the sexual reversals, represents the lovers' paradise of The Garden of Eden. The middle of the novel, where Catherine and David exchange identities and welcome a third woman into their relationship represents The Garden of Earthly Delights, which chiefly depicts the sins of the flesh. Finally, the end of the novel in Hemingway's version depicts the fall and destruction of the main characters. Both the Sheldons are dead, while Catherine has gone crazy and David functions not as her lover but as her keeper. Both are trapped in a living hell. These echoes are lost in the Jenks' version.

Another result of the cuts of the Rodin and Bosch references is the gutting of the Christian theme of the work. David's and Catherine's reactions to these works of art show the fact that they recognize that they are falling into sin, yet they intentionally continue on the path to hell. The left panel of the Bosch depicts the Tree of Knowledge in The Garden of Eden, the starting place for Eve's fall. Once Catherine and David partake of the knowledge of the Rodin statue, their own fall begins.... This theme is diminished in the Jenks' edition. For example, in the first chapter of the manuscript Catherine speculates about the difference between sex before and after marriage: "'It's fun without sin,' she said. 'But the sin does give it a certain quality.'" Jenks cuts this line, as well as others that indicate both David and Catherine's recognition of their fall. Later, as things begin to escalate, the main characters increasingly drink absinthe, which in the Bible

Is a symbol of sin...divine punishment...and disaster... The Christian symbolism surrounding absinthe (wormwood, gall, vinegar) suggests that one who drinks the bitter draught accepts the bitterness of life and death, just as Christ drank vinegar before his death. [Peters, 29]

Jenks cut many drinking scenes from the novel containing such lines as Catherine's response to David when he asks her to describe a drink: "'What did it taste like?' 'Somebody else's gall and my own wormwood,' she said." Catherine and David's association with absinthe clearly marks them as fallen, but many of these references are missing in the Jenks edition.

David, too, recognizes that he is participating willingly in his own damnation, that it is not all Catherine's fault. After one of their sex change scenes, David thinks: 'He had never thought that he could do what he did now happily and completely and he did without thinking and with delight what he could never do and would never do.' David is clearly a willing participant here. Jenks' excisions of the references to Rodin and Bosch as well as the cuts of David's and Catherine's recognition of their own fall reduce the impact of Hemingway's theme. Instead of a tragic, contemporary re-enactment of the fall of Adam and Eve, we have 'a tale of self-abuse, betrayal, and guilt without any real motive, explanation, or justification.' Jenks has cut 'the realization of sin, necessary for punishment; and the final punishment of the main and sub-plot characters,' with the result that often times these characters seem shallow and narcissistic. Ultimately, at least David is rewarded rather than punished for his sin, for he gets a new woman and regains his ability to write well.

Another equally significant structural cut which Jenks made to Hemingway's version is the loss of an entire subplot and three main characters in the manuscript, the painter Nick Sheldon, his wife Barbara, and their friend, the writer Andy Murray. Hemingway intended this subplot to directly mirror, foreshadow and emphasize the disintegration and fall of the Bournes. The Sheldons were meant to function as a counterpoint to illustrate the Bournes' fall. In Hemingway's version, Nick and Barbara are far ahead of David and Catherine in their experiments with androgyny. Nick has grown his hair out to match his wife's, and they too experiment sexually, exchanging sex roles in bed with Barbara taking the dominant male position. David is a friend of the Sheldons and introduces Catherine to them, sparking a lesbian attraction between the two women that will eventually lead Catherine to bring the lesbian Marita into her own relationship with David. The Sheldon plot takes a tragic turn when they fall into a romantic triangle similar to that of David, Catherine and Marita.... Eventually, Barbara commits suicide and Andy is left writing the narrative of his experience with the Sheldons.

Jenks felt that the Sheldon subplot 'went nowhere.' Because he was cutting to keep the focus on David and Catherine, he viewed the Sheldons as distractions from the story that had no pace in the book he was editing. In Jenks' estimation, 'Hemingway had planned to unite the two plot threads at the end, but he never did. So it was up to me to take the Sheldons out of the book.' Nick and Barbara appear in all the versions of the book drafted by Hemingway, so he clearly intended them as integral to the work. However, he had never integrated them fully into the novel....

The loss of the Sheldon-Murray subplot accounts for much of what Jenks left out of *Garden*. Because Hemingway had integrated the Sheldons into the early part of the book, Jenks had to start cutting almost from the beginning: '[Jenks] found it difficult to remove them from the early, polished chapters—but he yanked them out all the same, filling the holes with lines lifted from other sections.' [Eric Pooley, "Papa's New Baby," *New York* (28 April 1986) 59] Early on in the manuscript, David and Catherine go to a café where they meet Nick and Barbara. Since Jenks had chosen to jettison these characters, he had to edit the scene creatively: 'I had to remove the two characters they met in the café, so I healed the gap by taking narrative from a different eating scene that I didn't have room to use.' [Pooley, 59].

The loss of the Sheldon-Murray subplot is crucial because it was meant to mirror and foreshadow the all of the Bournes. Jenks cut all of Hemingway's Book II, which chronicles Nick and Barbara and their hair and sex experiments in Paris. These are very reminiscent of the scenes of Catherine and David, yet already it is apparent that such androgynous experimentation is taking its toll on Barbara's mental health. After a day in which Nick cuts his hair to match Barbara's and they make love androgynously, Barbara wakes Nick in the middle of the night to make love again and afterwards has a long, Joycean stream of

consciousness monologue that shows her instability.... Such scenes set the reader up for the disintegration of Catherine's personality later on. Further on in Book III, Barbara confides to David her fears for herself and for Catherine. She tells him that she's attracted to Catherine and that David should 'get her out of here'.... By cutting such scenes Jenks has removed these ominous foreshadows of both Barbara's and then Catherine's approaching insanity through their flirtation with androgyny.

The removal of both Nick Sheldon and Andy Murray from the manuscript also results in the loss of two doubles or foils for the character of David Bourne. Both of them are artists and function as 'twins' for David. Nick uses his art to keep him inviolate from the dangers of sexual risk-taking. While he too is troubled by the androgynous experiments, he is able to escape into his painting to keep himself whole. However, David is unable to use his work purely as an escape, because part of what he is writing is the narrative of his and Catherine's life together. As the writer double for David, Andy is actually the more important character. Both he and David realize that as writers they function best when their personal lives are disasters; in fact, personal pain is what makes their writing strong....

After the fall, when David and Catherine have cut and dyed their hair to match, in a passage that Jenks has cut from the manuscript David looks at himself in the mirror shaving and thinks: 'You're not so confused no matter whatever else you are. You straightened out somewhat for better or for much worse... Now let's see if you can write. He wrote well...' The theme of personal pain making artistic gain is mirrored in the Andy Murray plot. Andy has been in love with Barbara for a long time, but hasn't done anything about it because she's married to his friend Nick. Yet when Barbara seduces Andy, he does not resist, and when Nick is killed in a road accident, Andy takes care of Barbara during her nervous breakdown. Oddly enough, he finds in the midst of all his personal troubles that 'The strangest thing was that no matter how bad things were I could write. Try to figure that out. But it was true. I do not think I ever wrote better.' However, Jenks cuts out the Andy Murray subplot and many of the references to this in the Bourne plot, so that the mirroring effect of this theme, as well as the doubling of Barbara and Catherine, are lost in the Jenks edition. This drastically alters the structure of the novel by cutting off Hemingway's counterpoint between the Bournes and the Sheldons.

Another major cut in the Jenks edition is the loss of Hemingway's original ending for the book. Before he completed the novel, Hemingway had written in 1958 what he termed a 'provisional ending' for the book when he thought he might not live to finish rewriting it. Although some critics have viewed this material as two separate endings, in actuality it is a single ending in two parts. One part traces the conclusion of the Sheldon plot with Nick's death, Barbara's suicide and Andy's writing of their story. In the other, Catherine and David are reunited at some later date, after she has left David and Marita together in the Jenks version. Jenks rejected these endings as unsatisfactory. He could not use the Sheldon chapter because he had cut them from the story, and for some reason he chose to reject the Bourne ending as well. Jenks took instead the first four pages of the 48 page typescript of Hemingway's chapter 46, ending where David begins to successfully rewrite one of his burned African stories.

What is lost by the removal of this double ending is Hemingway's attempt to finalize the Sheldon and Bourne plots. In the Sheldon chapter, both Sheldons are 'punished' for their sins by death. When Nick is killed in a traffic accident, Barbara, suffering terrible remorse for having been unfaithful to him with Andy, commits suicide by drowning herself in Venice. The other artist in their romantic triangle, Andy Murray, is left to write the narrative of their days together. In relation to the Christian theme of the work, the loss of this chapter is crucial, for it was meant to show 'the fate of the subplot characters, who suffer the wages of their sin, the consequences of which parallel those of the Bournes.' [Peters, 26] The tragic end of the Sheldons is in keeping with the tragic endings of Hemingway's other novels: 'Like Catherine Barkley at the end of *A Farewell to Arms*, Barbara dies and leaves Andy the sadder but wiser protagonist who must ponder the meaning of their love affair. Like Jake Barnes, Andy attempts to write the story to gain a better perspective.' [Robert E. Fleming, "The Endings of Hemingway's *The Garden of Eden*," *American Literature* 61 (2) (May 1989) 267] Barbara's suicide is the final tragic foreshadow of what might happen to Catherine. At some point Hemingway had actually considered having Catherine kill herself instead, for the name 'Catherine' is signed to the suicide note in the holograph version, but it is crossed out and 'Barbara' is substituted.



The Bourne ending of seven pages opens with two unnamed characters sunning on a beach in the south of France. They are reminiscing about events that happened to them there not too long ago. As they talk, it becomes clear that these two are Catherine and David, who have been reunited. Marita is neither present nor mentioned. They review the sexual games of their past with irony; Catherine says 'Poor David we were so comic then. I can't even remember the name of the product it was we used to aid such miracles. I ought to have endorsed it with my picture.' Catherine has been to Switzerland for psychiatric treatment, but is still not 'cured': 'They don't know. They just say they know. That's all Switzerland is except cows and timepieces and goiters is people that don't know saying they know. Next time it will be worse.' They reminisce some more, and end by both agreeing to commit suicide if Catherine goes crazy again.

Seen in the light of the theme of the fall, this material is important because it shows Catherine and David in a living hell, paying for their sins. David is no longer a lover with an exciting, sexually wild wife; instead, he is the caretaker of an emotionally damaged woman to whom he is tied for life. Catherine's child-like wonder about sexual experimentation is gone; in its place is both cynicism and regret for the life that they both destroyed.... The direct echoes of the Garden theme here—her sin of pride, her creation of the world in her own image, her 'delight'—signal Catherine's attempt to at least understand her fall, even if such understanding cannot lead to redemption. Both characters will remain in their living hell, their only alternative being suicide.

The loss of both endings changes the meaning of Hemingway's version: 'The death of Barbara and the living death that the Bourne endure are the result of their shared sin and complete the story of the Garden' and the fall. [Peters, 28] The Jenks' version rejects this tragic ending in favor of a happier one. In the Jenks version, David and Maria become the new Adam and Eve, creating a new Garden in which they eat, sleep, drink, and make love with gusto and in which David can write again. David is rewarded for his sins, while Catherine, the destructive Eve, is expelled from the Garden. Hemingway wrote these happier events into his last chapter, yet he appended the tragic ending 'to intensify the shock of an ironic ending that would remind readers of a theme that had resounded throughout his work from the beginning: In the real life of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the winner takes nothing.' [Fleming, 270] Both Catherine and David were meant to be punished for their fall, but the Jenks edition ends up rewarding David for it.

In addition to these major changes affecting the theme, the structure, and the ending, Jenks is responsible for a host of other editorial interferences in *Garden*. Many readers have felt the character of David Bourne to be shallow and merely Catherine's tool: 'David Bourne does indeed come out sounding rather like the weak slave of a blond dominatrix. In truth, however, his passivity is owed to the editor rather than the author....' [Solomon, 32] Jenks cut several 'extraneous discussions of art, travel, and politics' from the manuscript, many of which were passages of David talking to Nick and Andy. Since David's male friends and their conversations are cut from the work, naturally David seems to be dominated by the women left in his world, Catherine and Marita.

Jenks has also tampered with Hemingway's structure and pacing of the novel, from the first chapter of the book onward.... There is virtually no chapter in Jenks' edition that is exactly the way that Hemingway wrote it. Characters have been cut, scenes have been dropped, later scenes are combined with earlier ones, dialogue from one character has been attributed to another, chapters have been combined, all in order to streamline the narrative.... Jenks has also added many line spaces and ellipses marks where he made cuts, both of which are marks of style that Hemingway did not habitually use. Jenks himself notes that 'the line spaces create a little bit of a cinematic feel, which is not Hemingway. The line spaces are the mark of the editor, not the writer.' Jenks made alterations to Hemingway's prose rhythms as well, prose rhythms which are the hallmark of the Hemingway style: 'I'd also find these wonderful experimental passages, long waves of rhythm—too long, and they had to be cut, but at any point a cut could break the wave, so I had to be careful.' Although these changes may have contributed to *Garden*'s triumph as a commercially successful bestseller, unfortunately the novel that Scribner's published is clearly not the novel which Hemingway authored.

Finally, contrary to the 'Publisher's Note' at the start of the book, there have been additions made to the book that are not Hemingway's work....in the first crucial sex scene of the novel, other words...have been added.... Hemingway wanted readers to envision their own version of the 'sin' in order to make it that

much more powerful.... Whatever Hemingway's intentions, Jenks has gone against them by adding these substantive changes to the text.... The theme, structure, and ending have all been radically altered, and every chapter of the novel bears several substantive changes. In cutting Hemingway's 200,000 word manuscript to 65,000, Jenks may have created a highly readable contemporary novel, but the work cannot be considered Hemingway's.

In this last novel, Hemingway was writing to transcend his myth and to experiment with his style. He attempted to create a female heroine in Catherine Bourne who was neither a love slave nor a bitch goddess, as his other heroines have been termed, yet Jenks' removal of the Rodin statue diminishes the metamorphosis theme and undercuts the levels of Catherine's complexity. As was the case with his unpublished Nick Adams stories, Hemingway's experiments in style and theme in *Garden* have been lost through cuts meant to make the work conform to the recognized Hemingway canon. Until a critical edition of *Garden* is produced which publishes Hemingway's novel as he left it, readers will not have the novel that Hemingway intended. Instead, what we have is a book authored by Tom Jenks."

Seitz, 155-203

"Based on a study of *The Nick Adams Stories*, *Islands in the Stream*, and *The Garden of Eden*, what generalizations can be made about the posthumous editing of Hemingway's fiction? It is clear that all three of these works have been edited according to the principles of commercial editing, rather than those of scholarly editing. Because of this, none of the three works represents Hemingway's final authorial intentions. In many instances the published texts diverge widely from the manuscripts that Hemingway left behind. Instead of editing these books with fidelity to Hemingway's final intentions, Hemingway's editors have chosen to edit according to what sells books. As a result, Hemingway's experiments in theme and style have been suppressed in order to make his works conform to the canonical Hemingway, the Hemingway that readers expect.

None of the works analyzed here meets the standards of scholarly editing... In order to produce a text that would represent Hemingway's final intentions, his editors should have set their copy based on the latest manuscript version of these posthumous works. Hemingway's own additions and deletions should have been honored, and no cuts should have been made if he did not indicate them. The only acceptable editing would have been to correct spelling and punctuation.

In the case of *The Nick Adams Stories*, most of the above principles of scholarly editing have been violated. Hemingway did not want such a collection published and rejected the idea during his lifetime, indicating that he preferred to keep his Nick Adams stories in their original order, spread throughout several collections of short stories. Yet Scribner's went ahead and published *The Nick Adams Stories*, anthologizing Hemingway's stories in a new order, thereby disrupting the unity he had attempted to achieve with the Nick stories in the volume *In Our Time*. Scribner's also included material Hemingway had cut from such stories as 'Indian Camp,' thereby changing the original meaning of the story as Hemingway had left it. The poor copyediting of 'Summer People' resulted in a story in which the protagonist resembles other misogynous male characters in Hemingway's fiction (such as Robert Wilson in 'The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber'), rather than the caring, sensitive young man that Hemingway intended. Hemingway's prose experiment with stream of consciousness in 'Summer People' was negated by the alteration of his sentence structure and punctuation, while the explosive theme of incest in 'The Last Good Country' was suppressed, because both such experiments did not fit the canonical image of Hemingway.

*Islands in the Stream*, too, does not meet the standards for scholarly editing, and so does not represent Hemingway's final authorial intentions. The final portion of 'Bimini' has been cut, thereby altering our perception of Thomas Hudson and contributing to the reader's unsympathetic view of him. Hemingway had never completed his plan to go back over the manuscript and weld the three separate parts of it together to make it a novel; therefore, it was disingenuous of Scribner's and Mary Hemingway to publish the work as if it were a finished book. It is clearly a work in progress, and should have been presented as such to the reader.

The published text of *The Garden of Eden* is the one which diverges the farthest from Hemingway's authorial intentions. Tom Jenks has produced a 'reading text' of the manuscript which holds together very well, but it is not Hemingway's book. Jenks made massive cuts, resulting in the alteration of Hemingway's theme, structure, and ending of the novel. He cut major characters, an entire subplot, and many scenes and passages of dialogue which he considered extraneous. He combined chapters and scenes, taking bits of earlier scenes he had cut and incorporating them into later ones. He also at times attributed dialogue from one character to another in order to accomplish his streamlining of the narrative. This book, too, should have been published as a work in progress rather than a novel, since in it Hemingway was writing to transcend his myth and to experiment with his style. These imperatives have been cut from the work. Like *The Nick Adams Stories* and *Islands in the Stream*, Hemingway's experiments have been sacrificed in *The Garden of Eden* in order to create a text that readers would expect from Hemingway.

All of these works have been money makers for both Charles Scribner's Sons and the Hemingway estate, but they have not all contributed to Hemingway's literary reputation. While the publication of *The Nick Adams Stories* did not damage Hemingway, the critical disparagement of *Islands in the Stream* may have accelerated the decline in Hemingway's reputation which was spiraling ever lower in the 1970s [the beginning of the Feminist Period]. Hemingway's stock went up again in the 1980s and is still on the rise, thanks in part to the boom in Hemingway scholarship occasioned by the opening of the vast Ernest Hemingway collection at the John F. Kennedy Library in Boston. His manuscripts and letters are being studied and scholarly works and biographies are being published in record numbers. The publication of *The Garden of Eden*, too, has had an effect on Hemingway's reputation. While the Jenks version does not radically revise the now questionable stereotype of Hemingway as a misogynist, it does puncture the myth of his macho mystique through the male protagonist's experiment with androgyny.

We have seen how commercial concerns on the part of Mary Hemingway and Scribner's, poor scholarly judgment by Philip Young, and the lack of a 'scholar's conscience' on the part of Tom Jenks, have all contributed to books being published under Hemingway's name which do not represent the works he left behind. The publication of the unpublished work of any dead writer raises a host of difficult questions. Does the work represent the author's intentions at the height of his talent? If it does not, should it still be published? If the author were alive, would he consent to publication? Given the interest of readers and scholars, should the author's preference for non-publication be ignored? Hemingway's editors have struggled with all of these questions and many more, and have usually answered them in favor of financial gain rather than Hemingway's intentions. Considering Hemingway's stature in the canon of American literature, it is now time for all of his work, both that published during his life and that published posthumously, to appear in scholarly critical editions. Until this is done, we can not be assured that the Hemingway texts we read are true representations of the texts he wrote.

Until such critical editions of Hemingway's posthumous works are produced, we will never have Hemingway's work as he intended it. . . to appear in scholarly critical editions. Until this is done, we can not be assured that the Hemingway texts we read are true representations of the texts he wrote.

Until such critical editions of Hemingway's posthumous works are produced, we will never have Hemingway's work as he intended it. Perhaps Hemingway would now say about his posthumous publications what he once said to Maxwell Perkins about the posthumous publication of F. Scott Fitzgerald's *The Last Tycoon*: 'It is damned hard on Scott to publish something unfinished any way you look at it but I suppose the worms won't mind'."

Susan M. Seitz, 212-17

#### ANALYSIS OF JENKS NOVEL

"The other major work Hemingway left unfinished when he died was an ambitious and complex novel—perhaps written to compete with Fitzgerald's *Tender Is the Night*—that became the basis for the heavily edited published version of *The Garden of Eden*. As Hemingway planned the novel, the plot would have revolved around two sexual triangles composed of three artistic men, the wives of two of these men, and an unattached woman. The triangles would have been linked by the sexual involvement of the two wives with one another. As in *Islands in the Stream*, one of the two principal artists would have been a writer, the

other a painter. Hemingway nearly completed one of the triangle plots, composed large segments of the second, then wrote a brief chapter that he labeled a 'provisional ending' for the novel. When Scribner's editor Tom Jenks edited the large incomplete manuscript, he omitted the unfinished triangle involving the painter Nick Sheldon, his wife Barbara, and her lover Andrew Murray, presumably because too much of the story remained unfinished; he ignored the provisional ending by choice.

Incomplete as the resulting book is in relation to the entire manuscript, it adds two new dimensions to the Hemingway canon. It treats sexuality more frankly and examines the creative life more critically and at greater length than any other Hemingway book. The sexual theme, which treats a triangle in which two women and a man are romantically involved—the two women with each other and the man with each in turn—has received the most attention, but Hemingway's meditations on the life of the writer are perhaps even more significant.

Like *Tender Is the Night*, *The Garden of Eden* tells the story of a gifted young American expatriate who is torn between pursuing his career and becoming a caretaker for his wealthy wife. Fitzgerald's Dick Diver chooses to sacrifice his career as a psychologist to devote himself to the care of his wife Nicole. In a variation on this theme Hemingway's protagonist, David Bourne, refuses to abandon his writing to care for his wife Catherine, even when her madness threatens to end in suicide. Catherine reacts by becoming increasingly hostile to David's writing, finally burning his manuscripts while he is absent. Fitzgerald created two triangles by introducing Rosemary Hoyt, who becomes Dick Diver's lover, and Tommy Barban, who becomes Nicole's. Hemingway combines and complicates the roles in his triangle in the character of Marita, who becomes first the lover of Catherine and then of David.

Just as astute readers of *Tender Is the Night* were able to identify sources for Fitzgerald's characters—the author and his wife Zelda, and Gerald and Sara Murphy—readers of *Garden* will note biographical sources for characters and events in the novel. Catherine Bourne looks a great deal like Pauline Pfeiffer Hemingway, and her burning the manuscripts echoes Hadley Richardson Hemingway's accidental loss of a small piece of luggage containing all of Hemingway's manuscripts in 1922. Like David, Hemingway was a rising but penniless author when he married Pauline in 1927. When he first began the novel just after World War II, Hemingway was first engaged and then newly married to his fourth wife Mary, a petite woman, whose name is given to the third member of the *Garden* triangle, Marita, or 'little Mary.' The manuscript novel multiplied the autobiographical elements. Nick and Barbara Sheldon are near-photographic recreations of Hemingway and Hadley as they appeared in the early 1920s, and Andy Murray is closely modeled on John Dos Passos.

The sexual theme of the novel and the theme of David as successful artist but unsuccessful husband are inextricably linked. At the beginning of the novel, the Bournes are on their honeymoon, and though David is not writing he knows that he will soon return to his career. He has some misgivings which at first seem unjustified, about how Catherine will take his immersion in his work. When he begins to write steadily, however, Catherine indulges in sexual games to try to win back his attention. When her first attempts to upstage David's writing fail, Catherine engages in increasingly bizarre behavior, and when her sexual escapades fail to win him back, she descends to insanity.

Catherine's first sexual ploy is to assume the dominant male role in their lovemaking and to encourage David to attune himself mentally to a passive female role. She has her hair cut short like a British schoolboy's and bleached; she speaks in public about undergoing a metamorphosis into a male. She next tries to objectify her sexual interchangeability with David by transforming him into an image of herself. She entices him into having his hair cut exactly like hers and bleached so that the couple, who have already been mistaken for brother and sister, become apparent twins. Catherine attempts to counter what she views as David's obsession with an artistic endeavor of her own, with their lives as the canvas upon which she paints. She will later propose collaboration in his art as another way of countering his solitary pursuit.

When David persists in his writing, Catherine makes the acquaintance of Marita, a younger woman the Bournes meet in the company of another woman of approximately her own age who displays signs of sexual jealousy when Marita speaks to the Bournes. Catherine immediately recognizes Marita's bisexuality, first teasing David by suggesting that Marita is in love with him and then speculating that

Marita may be in love with her, as other women have unsuccessfully been in the past. In spite of (or because of) her perception that Marita may be in love with both David and her, Catherine soon invites Marita, her hair now cut exactly like Catherine's and David's, to stay at the same country hotel where they are living, and to make a threesome with the Bournes at meals and on excursions to the beach.

Shortly after Catherine brings Marita into the hotel, David finds the two women in bed together. Far from hiding the affair she is having with Marita, Catherine insists on telling David in detail about her sexual feelings for the younger woman. At the same time, she encourages David to become interested in Marita, referring to both of them as his wives, suggesting that they all swim naked together, and even inviting David into bed with the two of them at the same time.

The sexual plot in the published novel ends when Catherine leaves David and Marita alone in the south of France. She proposes to take the couple's Bugatti—bought with her own money—but David, recalling that Catherine's father 'killed himself in a car' (61), possibly on purpose, convinces her to take the train. This is the only suggestion in the published novel that Catherine may be suicidal, although the manuscript is explicit on the point. David and Marita end the bizarre love story by reverting to a life of heterosexual monogamy as David attempts to rebuild his literary career.

Hemingway's provisional ending, like that of *The Old Man and the Sea* as ending for *Islands in the Stream*, would probably have been appended rather abruptly to the text. It pictures a couple on the beach, zooms in on them as if with a modern movie camera, and discloses that they are David and Catherine, not David and Marita as might have been expected. In spite of her recent release from an institution in Switzerland, Catherine assumes that she will again succumb to madness, and she extracts a promise from David that if things go bad for her again, he will join her in a suicide pact. David has come to resemble Dick Diver in his role of caretaker rather than lover. Had this ending been attached to the novel as Scribner's published it, the novel would have seemed of a piece with all of Hemingway's other work, illustrating the 1930s theme of 'winner take nothing.'

Parallel to the triangular love story in *The Garden of Eden* is a story about David as artist that is perhaps even more striking. The novel takes up a theme that Hemingway had touched upon as early as 'The Sea Change' (1931) and another theme that is central to 'The Snows of Kilimanjaro' (1936); on the first page of the manuscript of *Garden* David is given the same name as the protagonist of 'The Sea Change,' Phil, and he is preoccupied with not letting the fate of Harry, of 'Snows,' befall him. Phil betrays his humanity by parasitically feeding off the emotional and sexual life of the woman he has been in love with, planning to use her story in his fiction. Conversely, Harry allows his wealthy wife to consume much of his vitality as a writer and dies without finishing some of his best stories, betrayed by the comfortable life that marriage to a wealthy woman has made possible. Further, there is a metafictional layer to *Garden* that appears nowhere else in Hemingway's fiction. Although he has treated writers elsewhere, he does not depict them engaged in the act of creating literature. In *Garden* he does just that.

When David and Catherine are first introduced, they are on their honeymoon and life seems idyllic to Catherine. David, on the other hand, knows that trouble lies ahead for them when he turns to his writing again. He recognizes that writers are selfish, stealing time from their loved ones to devote to their work, and he resolves to make it clear to Catherine that he regrets the isolation imposed by his art. Nevertheless, by the second chapter of the novel, David and Catherine have their first quarrel over David's writing, brought on by the arrival of a package of press clippings forwarded by his publisher. With uncanny intuition, Catherine tells David that the clippings frighten her, that they depict another man from the David Bourne she married, and that they could destroy David.

David realizes that Catherine is dangerously close to the truth. It is not so much the clippings that threaten their marriage as it is what they represent—David's obsession with the act of writing itself rather than his wish for the acclaim his work may bring him. The couple conclude the argument with an apparently innocuous agreement. They will retire to a remote area where there will be few distractions. David will write, and Catherine will amuse herself. But as the novel progresses, David's work increasingly estranges him from Catherine, who fights to retain him not only by distracting him with her sexuality but by offering to become his artistic collaborator.

If hawks do not share, as Hemingway observed in *A Moveable Feast*, neither do artists. David, who early in his marriage had cautioned himself about spending too much time on his writing, loses his sense of proportion once he is in the grip of one of his stories. He conveys a sense of his superiority over Catherine because he has devoted himself to an artistic project while she is hedonistically enjoying herself, and she bristles over his air of satisfaction after doing a good morning's work. When he is in his writing room, he literally forgets Catherine and his increasingly troubled marriage and moves from France back to Africa (the setting of his fiction) in much the same way that Hemingway, recalling his early years in Paris, wrote of leaving Paris behind and transporting himself to northern Michigan.

The difference is that the process is idyllic as recalled in *A Moveable Feast* but ruinous in *Garden*. Writing becomes a narcotic to David, who begins to use it as an escape mechanism. His reality becomes Africa to such an extent that on one occasion, when he hears the sound of a car intruding from the real world, he is startled by it. In the beginning of the book, he was concerned about how his writing would affect Catherine; now he is oblivious to her growing mental illness for large periods of his days. His obsession with privacy is emphasized by his habit of locking his work in a suitcase in a locked room, as if to underscore the compartmentalization of his life. His isolation threatens to undermine his humanity. When Marita speaks of other important things in life besides his writing, David reflects that 'there are no other things' (140).

Catherine seeks to become part of David's hidden life by offering up her own privacy on the altar of his art. She suggests that he take up as his subject their life together. She will even help him by providing exciting incidents such as the triangle with Marita. By cooperating with the writer's tendency towards voyeurism, Catherine exacerbates one serious flaw of the artist, the tendency to use other people rather than to deal with them on human terms. Catherine also offers to underwrite the cost of the new book's publication and its illustration by emerging modern painters. David begins the account, which the two call their 'narrative,' but once he turns to a difficult story about his father that has been simmering in his subconscious for years, he sees the marital narrative for what it is—a sterile literary exercise. He then stops work on it, an act that Catherine interprets as desertion of her personally.

A similar view of David's writing as the core of his nature is present in the triangle plot. Although Catherine encourages David to sleep with Marita, she is seriously offended by Marita's defense of David's obsessive work on a recently completed story. She becomes enraged when she learns that David has allowed Marita to read the story before he has shown it to her. She tears the little exercise book containing the story in half, foreshadowing her later destruction of all the manuscripts.

Finally, in *Garden* as in no other work, Hemingway dwells on the act of writing, exploring the workings of a writer's mind as he probes his way into the treatment of a story. From his depiction of David as a triumphant young writer to a nearly defeated one struggling against writer's block, Hemingway deals with the working problems of the artist, employing, varying, and enlarging on concepts that he had expressed in interviews or written about in his fiction.

Near the beginning of *Garden*, David's creativity has been bottled up by his artistic inactivity during his courtship of Catherine, their marriage, and their honeymoon. When he begins to write, the work flows easily, but David admonishes himself not to let the creative process become oversimplified. He tells himself that he must recognize the complexity of the human issues he is dealing with and then write about them in deceptively simple terms. The passage might serve as a defense against the charge once made by William Faulkner that Hemingway rated lower than many modernists because of the simplicity of his writing—or, as Faulkner put it, his failure to take chances in his art.

In the next chapter, as David continues his work, Hemingway varies one of the symbols—which he had used previously and would use again in interviews and nonfiction—to explain his employing unstated factors that underlie the surface of his fiction. David thinks of his own writing not, like Hemingway, in terms of an iceberg and its huge underwater mass held by its lesser mass above the waterline, but in terms of apparently placid water that hides a potentially dangerous reef. The uninitiated will perceive only the smooth surface, but David knows that he has concealed a reef, and he creates a 'light feathering' (42) on the surface that will alert the sensitive reader to the 'sinister' layer concealed below.

The manuscript of the novel emphasizes David's creative life and the problems he confronts, in composing fiction. Writing about Africa, for example, David faces the same dilemma Hemingway had expressed in nautical terms in *The Old Man and the Sea* and in his Nobel Prize acceptance speech. Driven out beyond previous literary tradition, David realizes that he must invent ways to write about his African experience because no previous novelist in English has preceded him in depicting the culture of the black Africans he had grown up with. And he must allow the tribal secrets he knows to inform his writing without betraying the confidence of the Africans who had shared their lives with him.

David also has his own personal reticences to work out. He and his father have become estranged in spite of the fact that, like Nick Adams and his father, they were once very close. David realizes that his most powerful memories—his most valuable literary assets—are tied to his father and to the sense of betrayal connected to his recollections of their relationship. Yet he can use this material only by taking a certain psychological risk. Especially in the manuscript, but to a lesser degree in the published version of the novel, the reader is able to follow David as he explores the labyrinth of his emotions concerning his father, giving a sense of the process of discovery that comes to the writer while he is working.

At the same time, the text reflects back on Hemingway as author. For while he depicts David as a writer dredging up the painful details of his past and putting them down on paper, he must recall his own estrangement from his father. And as Hemingway depicts David uncomfortably setting down the 'narrative' of his troubled marriage with Catherine, he must draw on another of the most painful experiences of his own life, the breakup of his marriage to Hadley and the beginnings of his romance with Pauline—the real-life triangle that inspired his literary menage a trois.

There are many other reflections of Hemingway's self-consciousness about his art in *Garden*. Both the positive and negative features of the creative life—the joy mingled with exhaustion that comes at the end of a day's work, reminiscent of some of the passages in *A Moveable Feast*—are woven into the narrative. So are darker reflections. At times it seems that David's only life is his life as a writer: He returns to real life with regret, leaving behind his writing until he can pick it up again the next day. David's writer's block after Catherine has destroyed his manuscripts has a clear parallel in sexual impotence. Some of Marita's comforting words when he reports a fruitless day's attempts to work suggest what she might say to him after a sexual failure. Thus, much of *Garden* treats the creation of literature. As in no other Hemingway work, the reader gets the sense of watching over the shoulder of the artist as he produces a work about the creation of art. In this respect, *The Garden of Eden*, had it been finished, could have marked Hemingway's emergence from modernism into postmodernism....

While it is true that the years from 1946 to his death in 1961 did not see the publication of another big novel, Hemingway never stopped attempting to grow, or in his own terms, to explore the territory far out beyond where the artist could go. If he was not successful, at least he sought his own limit, the point at which his literary reach exceeded his grasp."

Robert E. Fleming  
"Hemingway's Later Fiction: Breaking New Ground"  
*The Cambridge Companion to Hemingway*, ed. Scott Donaldson  
(Cambridge U 1996) 140-47

#### FEMINIST DISMISSAL

"Unlike many of his fans, Hemingway at least explored options before deciding, as he does in *The Garden of Eden*, that such women must be relegated to the world of the insane or designated as lesbian and, therefore, marginalized as 'other.' By interrogating the fashion of machismo, his final text moves to place him ideologically in the last half of the twentieth century where, as Marjorie Gerber suggests, 'the cultural fascination of cross-dressing...is not always consciously [her italics] related to homosexuality, although homosexuality...might be viewed as the repressed that always returns.' By the time Hemingway's final text appeared, however, the fashions of the 1980s proclaimed androgyny as an exciting option so that the fashion ideology of his final patriarchal garden seems hopelessly dated."

Marilyn Elkins  
"The Fashion of *Machismo*"

*A Historical Guide to Ernest Hemingway*, ed. Linda Wagner-Martin  
(Oxford 2000) 111

Michael Hollister (2015)