

FEMINISTS ASSAULT ERNEST HEMINGWAY

(1899-1961)

“Hemingway is a figure that casts a tremendous shadow...In the United States, it’s a cottage industry to produce books about how terrible Hemingway was. So when Harry Crews or Jim Harrison or I are called Hemingwayesque [mainly by Feminists], it’s merely a way of saying, ‘We don’t like this writer’...There is a deep, deep hatred of Ernest Hemingway in the American literary community. And they should just admit it....Nothing needs to be said in defense of him; his influence will continue to erode his enemies’ bastions.”

Thomas McGuane
Interview
The Missouri Review 9.1 (1985-86)

FEMINIST STEREOTYPE

"Do you concur that men are chauvinist pigs?"
"No more than that women are chauvinist sows."

Mary Welch Hemingway
The Way It Was
(Knopf 1976) 536



Feminists reduced Hemingway to an “icon of masculinity”—a stereotypical Macho Man: “With the rise of the women’s movement in the 1960s and of feminist criticism in departments of literature, Hemingway became **Enemy Number One** for many critics, who accused him of perpetuating sexist stereotypes in his writing.” (Rena Sanderson, *The Cambridge Companion to Hemingway*, 1996: 171) “Hemingway’s work must be distrusted from the outset, not simply because he debases women and glorifies masculinity, but because within his self-imposed limitation of defining masculinity and femininity he fails to transcend superficial cultural definitions....He treats exclusively male conflicts.” (Marcia Holly, *Feminist Literary Criticism*, 1975: 43-4) “Since he rarely wrote of women with sympathy, and virtually never with subtlety and understanding, feminist charges of misogyny are surely justified.” (Joyce Carol Oates, “The Hemingway Mystique,” *Woman Writer*, 1988: 303).

On the contrary, throughout his career Hemingway repeatedly identified with women characters and dramatized their problems while criticizing males in their lives: See especially the women in "Up in Michigan," "On the Quai at Smyrna," "Indian Camp," "The End of Something," "Cat in the Rain," "Hills Like White Elephants," "The Light of the World," *The Sun Also Rises*, *A Farewell to Arms*, *To Have and Have Not*, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, and *The Garden of Eden*. Actually, Hemingway is the most egalitarian writer in American literary history. Feminists are the sexists.

"When potential readers reject Hemingway as indifferent to minorities [He had many Italian, Spanish, French, and Cuban friends, in particular, and spoke their languages.] 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," Susan F. Beegel explains. Beegel graphed the number of "scholarly articles and books about Hemingway produced annually from 1961 until 1991" as rising steadily except for a dip in 1984-85, when Feminists and other leftists "overreacted to Reaganism with an intolerance labeled 'political correctness,' an effort to silence alternative views and dictate values." Due to Feminist intimidation, "In the early 1980s literary critics as a whole seemed uninterested in Hemingway." (*Cambridge Companion*: 290, 286) "The feminists who follow this tack [that Catherine is an unreal fantasy though based on a real woman] assume the same premises as the most chauvinist of male critics who are glad to see Catherine dead....The history of the critical views of Catherine Barkley is a case study of the ways in which the personal and cultural values of critics, their unstated premises and hidden (even unconscious) agenda can color and cloud our perception." (Sandra Whipple Spanier, *New Essays on A Farewell to Arms*, 1990: 78, 100)

At the same time that Hemingway was stereotyped as a sexist Macho Man who debased women he was also cartooned as immature (short pants), stupid (small head), brutal (big black mustache), and devilish (five wedding rings, though married four times).



FEMINIST SEXUAL POLITICS

"The main attempt of Kate Millet's *Sexual Politics* is to show the correlation between literature (and by the way, criticism) and *reactionary* political attitudes of which *sexism* is one expression...Millet correctly maintains that it is the cultural agents who are ultimately more responsible than the law for the perpetuation of the established order. She indicts three major novelists, Mailer, Miller and Lawrence, as *counter revolutionary politicians*. These three are only part of [the] present century's *Virility School*. We must add Roth, *Hemingway*, Jones, Algren, O'Hara and many others to the list. One feminist writer has observed that this movement in twentieth-century literature 'is a direct response, indeed a male cultural backlash, to the growing threat to male supremacy'." [Italics added.]

Fraya Katz-Stoker [Communist]
"The Other Criticism: Feminism vs. Formalism"
Images of Women in Fiction: Feminist Perspectives

ed. Susan Koppelman Cornillon
(Bowling Green 1973) 324

"*Hemingway's* work must be *distrusted from the outset*, not simply because *he debases women* and glorifies masculinity, but because within his self-imposed limitation of defining masculinity and femininity he fails to transcend superficial cultural definitions....With Hemingway, identification with the theme is impossible since *he treats exclusively male conflicts*...Stated in the extreme, Hemingway's themes...revolve around how to be masculine (*macho*), not how to be human." [Italics added.]

Marcia Holly
Feminist Literary Criticism
(U Kentucky 1975) 43-4

MODERNISM

"Any emphasis, either of pride or of shame, laid consciously upon the sex of a writer is not only irritating, but superfluous."

Virginia Woolf
Review of *The Women Novelists* by R. Brimley Johnson (1918)

CONTRARY TO STEREOTYPE

"Up in Michigan"

One of the first stories Hemingway ever wrote contradicts the stereotype of him by dramatizing the perspective of a vulnerable girl and affirming her character while criticizing an insensitive selfish male. The stereotype prevailed nevertheless, no matter what he wrote.

The story and the title polarize the man and the girl: He is "up" in a phallic sense, she is "up" in a spiritual sense. The title may also be a sardonic allusion to a line in a popular song of the day: "How I'd like to be again / Way up in Michigan." Jim Gilmore is a blacksmith, an occupation associated with dirt, heat and banging. He washes himself in cold water at the pump. Having come down from Canada also associates him with cold. He is both hot and cold to the vulnerable girl Liz Coates. He is also a hunter. She is infatuated by the older man, who seems to regard her as analogous to the deer he hunts down. He takes advantage of Liz one evening when she consents to go for a cozy walk down to the dock of the bay. Jim embodies the common traits that Feminists attribute to all males, especially Hemingway.

Feminists have said that Liz should have kicked his butt into the bay and filed a charge of rape. Hemingway makes her a better person than that--in fact a moral exemplar. Liz accepts responsibility for her own choices and actions and does not blame the man. This is why Feminists hate the story. "Liz leaned over and kissed his cheek." She is not angry or vindictive, she is disillusioned. "Liz started to cry" as a mist comes up from the bay, making the personal a part of the larger natural order in which moods are transitory. She goes back and tries again to wake him up, pleading to no avail. In fact, Jim "curled a little tighter" into himself. Then Liz transcends Nature. She transcends the natural reaction of many women in such a situation through empathy: "Liz took off her coat and leaned over and covered him with it. She tucked it around him neatly and carefully." Though she is cold, she tries to warm Jim. Ironically, just when "everything felt gone," Liz displays how much she possesses in spirit. She is the first character in Hemingway to display "grace under pressure"—she is the first exemplar of his credo.

According to a legend of the English Renaissance, Sir Walter Raleigh once covered a mud puddle with his coat for Queen Elizabeth to step upon in crossing a street. The act became an emblem of the traditional chivalry that later informed Victorianism, retaining the connotation of woman as a queen, as expressed by Margaret Fuller, Emily Dickinson and other Victorian women. Just as Jim inverts Socrates, Elizabeth *Coates* inverts the chivalric tradition since Queen Elizabeth (*Liz*) by taking the male role, but when she covers dirty Jim with her coat she is casting him as the mud puddle. Liz does not step on him like a queen or a Feminist, instead she climbs above him up the path.

It may seem that Jim has gotten away with something, but consider: (1) in the morning he will have to return her coat to Liz at the Smiths where she works; (2) when he does this he will no doubt be observed by Mrs. Smith; (3) since he eats at the Smiths, he will have to face Liz every day in the presence of the Smiths; (4) he will not know whether Liz will tell the Smiths what happened; (5) if she does tell them he will be blamed, which could result in his eviction and ruin his blacksmith business; (6) Mrs. Smith is a "very large clean woman"; whereas (7) Jim will hereafter be shunned as a dirty guy.

"The End of Something"

Another young female exemplar is Marjorie in "The End of Something." A young couple is out fishing when the boy Nick, who has been teaching Marjorie how to fish, displays a common male inability to accept the girl's becoming equal to him. "The first paragraph is about the end of the mill in Horton's Bay after the timber runs out. The ruin of the mill is analogous to the romance of Nick and Marjorie: Nothing is left except "its foundations showing through the swampy second-growth." The fish are not biting but Marjorie catches a perch with her hands. She has faith and does not give up. Her grit and tenacity are expressed in the image of her rowing the boat "out over the channel-bank, holding the line in her teeth." Marjorie has developed her masculine side and attained a psychological balance. She is still feminine in her deference to his expertise, but it is obvious that by now she could fish without him.

Nick has lost his appetite and has to be coaxed to eat. When he anticipates that there is going to be a moon, Marjorie responds happily, "I know it." Resentful, he accuses her: "You know everything. He feels threatened and is unable to accept Marjorie as an equal. Actually, as an immature male, he now feels inferior to her: "You know everything. That's the trouble." Marjorie fights his bull with grace under pressure, then makes a kill. Egocentric and insecure, he exaggerates his importance in her life: "I've taught you everything." Then she proves herself a Hemingway kind of girl: "'Oh, shut up...There comes the moon." She has gumption and is romantic besides, a balance of masculine and feminine qualities. When he sulks, denying that he knows what is bothering him, she insists on the truth.

Nick is still just an adolescent: "It isn't fun any more." Marjorie is already mature: "Isn't love any fun?" When he says No and sits there with his head in his hands, "Marjorie stood up." The speed of her departure is conveyed by the leap from her standing up to calling back to him from a distance: "I'm going to take the boat," Marjorie called to him. "You can walk back around the point." Nick has been walking around the point throughout the story. Marjorie by contrast is direct and honest. When he offers to push the boat out for her, she makes *her* point: "You don't need to." We last see her rowing away in the moonlight.

When she is gone, we are surprised to see Nick's friend Bill come out of the woods. It becomes clear that the two boys have planned this scenario in order to get rid of Marjorie. We have seen the end of the mill, the end of the romance, the end of Marjorie's respect for Nick, and the end of his innocence. He pretended not to know what was the matter out of cowardice. Now he feels so rotten he tells Bill to go away for while as he faces his guilt: He lied and strung her along and then ambushed her. He dumped her because she learned what he had taught her. Love could have been heavenly, but the story ends by evoking his feeling like "hell."

"Cat in the Rain"

The vignette preceding the story is a prelude to a bullfight, just as the opening of the story is the prelude to a domestic "fight." The horse of a picador has been gored by a bull and is spilling its guts. The wife in the story resembles the picador on the white horse and her husband is analogous to the bull that "could not make up its mind to charge." The exaggerated contrast between the violent scene in the bullring and the scene in the hotel room makes the complaints of the woman seem trivial and petty as seen by the man, whereas the goring of the horse is the *objective correlative* for the feelings of the girl. If we recognize the analogy it intensifies and better evokes what she feels. The horse is gored before the vignette begins. By analogy, when the story begins we may infer that the husband has hurt his wife's feelings in some way. Unlike the bull, he probably did not intend the hurt, since he is portrayed as sensitive to his wife—up to a point. In contrast to the bull in the vignette, the husband is lying down.

“Cat in the Rain” is one of Hemingway’s most egalitarian stories contradicting the macho stereotype. An American couple is staying among strangers in a hotel in Europe, unfamiliar with their environment. They do not seem to know each other very well either. Their room faces the sea and gardens containing a war monument that is mentioned three times in the first paragraph. A garden is a traditional metaphor of the heart. There is conflict if not a war going on in the hearts of the couple, figuratively expressed by the rain falling in the gardens that makes them an unpleasant place to be. Repetition in the style suggests that their conflict is ongoing like the waves that “broke in a long line in the rain and slipped back down the beach to come up and break again in a long line in the rain.”

The wife asserts her intention to go out and get a cat huddled under a table in the rain, prompting her husband to offer to get it for her. “No I’ll get it,” she insists. Gender stereotypes are reversed as the girl is going out after something while the man is lying down. The reversal is emphasized by the fact that he is reversed on the bed, with his head “propped up with the two pillows at the foot of the bed.” His being propped up, his passive reading, and the softness of two pillows associate him with femininity and with the traditional position of women in the Victorian paradigm. At the same time the “girl”—she is not mature--asserts her masculine side by declaring her independence and capability. She goes down to get the cat, but she misses it because she talks about it too much, hesitates, and waits for the shelter of an umbrella. If she had been more assertive and simply gone directly out after the cat she might have gotten what she was after. In contrast the cat has left its shelter and must have gotten wet going out into the rain.

The European is at a distance from her “in the far end” of his office. “She liked his dignity. She liked the way he wanted to serve her.” But she would not like the traditional role of a European wife, since she has asserted her desire for independence. She would not let her husband serve her by going after the cat out in the rain. She is in an egalitarian marriage and is wearing her hair “clipped close like a boy’s.” When the European bows to her, “something felt very small and tight inside the girl.” Feeling something “small and tight” inside her is an image of the cat huddled under the table. Paradoxically, “The padrone made her feel very small and at the same time really important. She had a momentary feeling of being of supreme importance.” She does not feel as important being an equal. The story dramatizes the problematic transition from the Victorian paradigm, still dominant in Europe in the 1920s, to the modern paradigm of gender roles and relations between the sexes.

Back in her room, she continues to identify with the cat: “It isn’t any fun to be a poor kitty out in the rain.” She projects her self-pity onto the cat and it becomes an image of the self that escapes her, a psychological wholeness represented by the cat, because it has both masculine independence and the feminine characteristics of cats. She picks up a mirror and studies the two sides of her profile. She decides that she wants to let her hair grow longer and in conversation with her husband she becomes more feminine. The two men in the story correspond to the two sides of her psychological profile, the European who treats her in a traditional way that makes her feel of “supreme importance” versus her American husband George, who is inclined to treat her as an equal.

Throughout the story, George is reclining on the bed reading while his wife is up and after something. She is striving so much to develop her masculine side that her femininity is deprived. When she asks him if he would like her to let her hair grow long, he says “I like it the way it is”—their lifestyle as well as her hair. He likes not having to serve her. But she feels incomplete, and when she complains, “I get so tired of looking like a boy,” he adapts a little: “George shifted his position in the bed.” As if shifting positions for sexual intercourse. He becomes more attentive, up to a point: “He hadn’t looked away from her since she started to speak.” When she appeals to him for more attention, he cannot respond satisfactorily because his sensitivity, his feminine side, is undeveloped. The best the American man can do is say “You look pretty darn nice.” We may be sure that the European gentleman could do much better than that in catering to her feelings with sweet words, sentiments and romantic gestures. Equality kills romance. Worse, the wife and the husband are equally arrested in psychological development by an egalitarian American marriage based on masculine independence that excludes femininity.

She goes to the window and looks out into the rain. “It was getting dark.” The darkness evokes her deeper self, her unconscious, the horse in the vignette. In dreams and visions, horses are common symbols of unconscious forces, as in *Black Elk Speaks*. When her husband says “I like it the way it is,” she is hurt

because it means he wants to continue to treat her as an equal, which takes a lot less time than being romantic. His simple statement of how he feels affects her deepest feelings for him like the goring of the horse in the vignette. Now she spills her guts. She goes on and on about how she wants to feel and about the things she wants, running on and on: "And I want to eat at a table with my own silver and I want candles. And I want it to be spring and I want to brush my hair out in front of a mirror and I want a kitty and I want some new clothes." Imagine the old fisherman Santiago whining "I want a fish, I want a big fish, I want a really big fish and I want it to be spring and I want a new boat."

This couple has probably been through variations of this scene before. The husband knows that he cannot satisfy his wife, that she wants what she does not have and that he cannot give her. Everything she specifies that she wants and does not have is a reproach to him. She is a picky girl who picked him in the first place and now is picking at him like the picador in the vignette jabbing the bull with a pic. She may be essentially innocent like the white horse, but she is also the rider. Her husband in the role of the bull is so provoked he finally charges: "'Oh, shut up and get something to read,' George said. He was reading again." Treating her as an equal, he tells her to do what he is doing.

At the end, a maid brings a cat to the wife, but it is not the same cat as the one out in the rain. This cat is not wet. It is "big" whereas the cat outside was "small." This is not the cat she wants. What she wants cannot be given to her, which is what frustrates George about her demands. The cat the maid brings to her just as she brought the umbrella is a "tortoise-shell" cat, suggesting that like the tortoise in the fable, an inside cat is a winner in a long slow race with a vulnerable cat out in the rain.

Some critics suggest that what the wife needs is a baby, but that would make pointless the contrast between her two profiles evoked in the mirror and by the two men. A baby would not fulfill her need for independent masculine expression represented by the cat outside, in contrast to the cat given to her inside. To get what she wants she will have to go out after it on her own, which may require that she leave the shelter of her marriage and get wet, just as the cat leaves the shelter of the table. Although she wants to settle down, she also wants to have "fun," as she indicates repeatedly in the story. Rather than a baby, it is more likely she will go out catting and have an affair with a European.

Hemingway began "Cat in the Rain" while staying at a hotel in Italy with his first wife Hadley. The story originated from a rainy day with Hadley. As it turned out eventually, they both had affairs. He continued to love Hadley but they were incompatible in a longterm marriage. Then in succession he married three independent professional women—all writers—one of whom was so independent as a war correspondent they rarely saw each other. The ideal woman in his fiction is both a career woman and feminine, capable of true love--Catherine Barkley in *A Farewell to Arms*. In his androgynous experiments with his last wife Mary, Hemingway called himself Catherine—or Cat. "She loves me to be her girls, which I love to be," he said. Androgyny is a subject dramatized in his last unfinished novel *The Garden of Eden*—which got censored by Feminists. The main woman character, Catherine, is depicted as a liberated modern woman who has degenerated from the heroic wartime nurse Catherine of *A Farewell to Arms* into a narcissistic hedonist who wants to do nothing but have fun.

"Hills Like White Elephants"

It is not indicated whether the woman will decide to get an abortion. Hemingway leaves that decision up to her. In that sense the story is pro-choice. However, the story is politically incorrect in affirming that the unborn are holy. In this story a pregnant girl has been exploited by an older man but she asserts her independence, *becoming a feminist!* She fights and kills the man's bull--with grace under pressure--reducing him to the equivalent of her baggage.

"On the Quai at Smyrna"

Both "On the Quai at Smyrna" and the second vignette in *In Our Time* dramatize the massacre of fleeing Greeks by Turks in 1922. British ships are anchored in the harbor to block an expected Turkish invasion of Constantinople and to evacuate Greek survivors starving to death on the quai. The British commanding officer is focused instead on silencing the Greeks who are calling public attention to the massacre by

screaming on the pier. "We used to turn the searchlight on them to quiet them." The Brits in effect collude with the Turks committing atrocities against the Greeks. To the British commander what is worst about the massacre is not the atrocities but what he has to witness--"the women with dead babies"--he makes the babies seem a waste disposal problem: "Wouldn't give them up. Nothing you could do about it. Had to take them away finally." In contrast to the males on the British ship above it all with their searchlight, Greek women survivors are giving birth to more babies down in "the darkest place in the hold." These mothers enact the indomitable human spirit carrying on through the worst circumstances, as they are currently in Ukraine, while their babies represent undying hope: "Surprising how few of them died." Here, the callous male cruelty is Hemingway's indictment of "toxic masculinity" as suffered by women.

"The Short, Happy Life of Francis Macomber"

Two of his best stories emerged from his experiences on safari, "The Snows of Kilimanjaro" and "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber," which became his most popular short story. Macomber is an American husband who gets shot from behind by his wife Margot. Feminist critics identified with Margot and condemned Hemingway as a "misogynist" based only on this one character, disregarding the diversity of admirable women in his fiction. Hemingway learned from covering politics that "A big lie is more plausible than truth." In contrast to Feminists, the British hunting guide in the story is egalitarian in criticizing *both* genders. Margot is modeled on a rich adulteress Hemingway knew. She is the only "bitch" in his fiction, though Feminist critics refer to "a line of bitch goddesses" in his work. Margot is hardly a goddess. Nor is Miss Van Campen the head nurse in *A Farewell to Arms*, whose bitchy conduct is her professional prerogative. Brett Ashley is a pathetic lost soul who in the end is capable of "deciding not to be a bitch."

The reasons to infer that Margot is to blame for killing her husband, whether deliberately or with subconscious intent--"accidentally on purpose," the shooting equivalent of a Freudian slip--include: (1) the *guide*, Wilson the code hero, clearly blames her; (2) she does not deny it; (3) she has the motives of retaining her security, money, and power; (4) this interpretation confirms the theme of bitter conflict between the genders; (5) the story would become pointless if it were merely an accident; (6) she hit Macomber with precision from a distance; (7) she hit him near the base of his skull execution style; (8) she precluded her loss of power over her husband with a Mannlicher (*Man*-licker); (9) Hemingway himself said he believed "that the incidence of husbands shot accidentally by wives who are bitches and really work at it is very low." Although Margot is the social type of a "rich bitch," she has become a metaphor of the Feminist literary critics who demonized Hemingway and took shots at him from behind his back. Unlike them, Hemingway is egalitarian, saying of Margot and Francis, "she had done the best she could for many years back and the way they were together now was no one person's fault."

"The Snows of Kilimanjaro"

The bastards in Hemingway's fiction far outnumber Margot. Harry the writer in "Snows" is literally rotten. Hemingway is traditional in criticizing males far more often than women, while at the same time he is egalitarian in judging each character by the same moral standards regardless of gender. Usually, in the tradition of Realism, he renders his male protagonists as generic types such as young Nick Adams in order to dramatize universal truths. Harry the writer is exceptional in representing an autobiographical purgation of rot: "If he wrote it he could get rid of it. He had gotten rid of many things by writing them."

Evidence of autobiography: (1) The reference to "poor Julian" was originally "poor Scott." Hemingway changed the name in response to Fitzgerald's request to Max Perkins. The personal specificity in this passage indicates that in this story Hemingway is countering Fitzgerald's awe of the rich as one writer to another. Furthermore, many of his self-criticisms applied to his friend Scott as well. They both had the traditional tragic flaw of hubris: "I didn't pay any attention to it because I never infect." (2) Harry's self-criticism corresponds to Hemingway's during the early 1930s in particular with respect to his own writing and to his relationship with Pauline. Harry got infected by the superficial values of the rich and indulged himself, wasting his talent "by not using it, by betrayals of himself and what he believed in, by drinking so much that he blunted the edge of his perceptions, by laziness, by sloth, and by snobbery....It was a talent all right but instead of using it, he had traded on it." He spoils and rots on the lowlands and never reaches his

peak. (3) The explicit symbol in the epigraph of the leopard frozen on the mountain is unique in Hemingway—"the House of God." As a writer he had tried to be like a "priest of God" and to write prose with such purity it would never spoil, as if frozen at the peak. That would be immortality. Hemingway felt that, instead, he had spoiled himself, he was betraying his mission and his soul, like Harry. He felt rotten. Most of all because he was blaming and taking out his anger on his wife.

The wife in the story is rich like Pauline but older, with a previous marriage and children and lovers before she met Harry. The autobiographical parallel is not absolute. Its essence is that the writer is blaming his wife for what he did to himself: She "was not pretty" and he married her for her money. She has done everything he wanted her to, yet he calls her "this good, this rich bitch, this kindly caretaker and destroyer of his talent. Nonsense. He had destroyed his talent himself." He is rotten for blaming her: "It wasn't this woman's fault"; "It was not her fault that when he went to her he was already over"; "She was always thoughtful"; "She was a damned nice woman too"; "She was very good to him. He had been cruel and unjust in the afternoon. She was a fine woman, marvelous really." Feminists count the wife in "the line of bitch goddesses," ironically taking the word of the rotten male who admits she does not deserve his abuse. Harry is the opposite of Catherine Barkley in *A Farewell to Arms*, who proves her love by preserving her relationship with Frederick under the pressure of great pain and dies with grace. In contrast Harry turns "into a devil" because he is selfish: "'I don't like to leave anything,' the man said. 'I don't like to leave things behind'." In the end he is too ugly from rot for her to look at.

"The Dr. and the Dr.'s Wife"

The discussion of "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife" by Thomas Strychacz is typical of politically correct literary analysis during the Feminist Period (1970-present). Strychacz claims that (1) the story is a criticism of white men (white women are innocent) for stealing Indian land; (2) this critic blames white men for advancing civilization; (3) he emphasizes the doctor's loss of "male authority," a favorite theme of Feminists; (4) he avoids criticizing the wife, which would offend Feminists; (5) he does not even mention the similarity of the couple to Hemingway's own parents because that would imply criticism of both the wife and Grace Hemingway, with whom Feminist critics have identified; (6) he interprets the doctor's handling of his gun as "masturbatory" rather than evidence that he is contemplating suicide partly because of his wife--a thought as intolerable to Feminists as it was to Grace Hemingway; (7) he makes false statements about explicit facts in the text; (8) he ignores previously published objective analyses; and (9) instead he recommends the subjective Feminist Judith Fetterley, who grossly misreads Hemingway and accuses him of being a "misogynist." Strychacz makes it seem as if the story is entitled "The Doctor and the Indian" rather than "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife."

This story about retreating from realities is preceded by a vignette rendering an historic retreat of Greeks from the Turks. The doctor "always assumed" that the lumbermen would not come for the logs that broke free of their booms and drifted ashore onto his land. "Always" implies that he has been right every time. Most people would claim the right to dispose of debris that invades their property and lies unclaimed indefinitely. Doc Adams has been salvaging logs that otherwise would rot and go to waste, rather than cut down living trees for firewood. He is a conservationist. Dick Boulton has been paid to cut up the stray logs repeatedly and has never complained before. What has changed? "Well, Dick owes me a lot of money for pulling his squaw through pneumonia and I guess he wanted a row so he wouldn't have to take it out in work." Doc has given Dick employment, a lot of credit and his wife's life.

Strychacz bases his interpretation on the moral credibility of the least moral character in the story: Dick Boulton is a "very lazy" dishonest bully. True, legally speaking, the situation is ambiguous. The logs *do* belong to the lumbermen, as Dick declares after cleaning them off: "It belongs to White and McNally." Three times he accuses Doc Adams of stealing the logs from the lumbermen to provoke him into a fight. "Dick was a big man. He knew how big he was. He liked to get into fights." If Doc could have controlled his emotions—"his face was red" like a muleta—he could have let this bull pass by with grace under pressure by replying, "I'm salvaging logs that would go to waste." Instead, he is intimidated, loses control, makes an empty threat and walks away from the bull redfaced and humiliated. Hemingway saw his first bullfight in 1923, wrote this story in 1924, and calls attention to the metaphor by using literal bullfighting vignettes following this story in *In Our Time* (1925). One of the things he called his mother was Miss Stein,

comparing her to the famous Gertrude, who first recommended bullfights to him. Implicitly, Hemingway felt that he had to fight a lot of bull from his mother Grace, with grace under pressure.

Strychacz claims that because White is an owner of the logs, the story is about white men stealing land from Indians a century before. On the contrary, Dick Boulton does not claim that Indians own the logs. His accusation that Doc is “stealing” the logs is based on legal ownership in the present. This is why his accusation makes Doc “very uncomfortable.” The name White acknowledges that whites now own logs from land once inhabited by Indians, but Boulton is a blunt man, not a symbolist. He is not expressing an ethnic grievance, he is trying to avoid work by provoking a fight.

The interpretation by Strychacz is based on his assumption that Dick Boulton is an Indian: “...three Indians arrive in the doctor’s garden...” However, in fact, Dick is a “half-breed.” What is more, many locals believe that “he was really a white man.” Hemingway here discourages the reader from attributing Dick’s bad behavior to his being an Indian, whereas Strychacz attributes the worst behavior in the story to an “Indian.” Yet, according to politically correct dogma, by picking a fight, Dick is behaving more like a white man than like an Indian. And he is the one carrying “three axes.” Yet Strychacz blames the conservationist doctor for “aggressive exploitation of natural resources.”

Doc Adams retreats to his cottage, where he is irritated by the sight of medical journals he should have read but has not even unwrapped. This evasion of professional responsibility is consistent with his evasion of moral responsibility in response to the bull of Dick. These evasions are followed by a third when he denies that he lost his temper. Hemingway discretely differentiates his own mother from the doctor’s wife by making Mrs. Adams a Christian Scientist—an irony implying that she does not believe in her husband and considers him dispensable. Her tone is condescending as she lectures him like a child. Though citing scripture is a stock response suggesting rigid dogmatism, the scripture she quotes in this instance is, ironically, consistent with Hemingway’s moral imperative to control emotions like a bullfighter controls a bull. “He who ruleth his spirit is greater than he that taketh a city.” If he did rule his spirit Doc could have had a moral victory over the bully Boulton on a lesser scale than that of the bullfighter Romero when he gets beaten up by Robert Cohn in *The Sun Also Rises*.

The wife is the temperamental opposite of the bully Boulton, yet she is a bully too. Both of them “ruleth” the Doc. And she “ruleth” her own spirit by hiding in bed in a darkened room with the blinds drawn, closed off from the facts of life—from everything embodied in Boulton—in her own little world. Yet, ironically, she urges her husband, “Please don’t try to keep anything from me.” So he tells her and she refuses to believe him, demonstrating why he keeps things from her. She even denies that anyone would do what the reader has just seen Dick do. She is a pacifist liberal who refuses to face human nature, disrespects her husband and maintains a supine posture of superiority. The balance in the title “The Doctor and the Doctor’s Wife” suggests what Hemingway later says of Francis and Margot Macomber, that “the way they were together now was no one person’s fault.” At the same time, however, the story hints ominously that the doctor is so depressed, his wife might eventually drive him to suicide. She is a genteel man-licker killing her husband slowly and less directly than Margot kills her husband.

The doctor and his wife have separate bedrooms in separate worlds. He sits alone on his bed, loads his shotgun with shells, then pumps them out again—once. He feels violent but does not “go off at half cock.” The shells are “yellow” like he feels. Strychacz calls this single action “masturbatory.” Actually the mood is just the opposite: Doc is feeling impotent, cowardly and suicidal, not sexual. Strychacz argues that by passively emptying his gun Doc is trying to regain his manhood by demonstrating the “technological prowess that ‘won the West’ for white settlers.” This critic believes that the pioneers masturbated their way West. He is as far out of touch with reality as the doctor’s wife. Both take the side of Dick Boulton and accuse Doc of being in the wrong. Their false accusations make them both parallel to Boulton. In reducing the story to manhood and masturbation Strychacz is as crude as Dick.

The futile dialogue while Doc handles his shotgun builds tension and suspense until he “put the shotgun in the corner behind the dresser”—so that if he loses control of his emotions again it will be out of easy reach to use on himself as his final evasion. His only cure. When she asks him to tell Nick she wants to see him, Doc does not answer her. He is still angry. He does not face her bull, just as he did not face the bull of

Boulton. In bullfighting the cowardly bull is more dangerous than a fearless bull, implying that Mrs. Adams is more dangerous than Boulton. Again Doc walks away. He goes outside allowing the screendoor to slam behind him as a retort to his wife, like the bang of a gun—a final slamming of the door. He knew it would slam, undoubtedly having heard it a thousand times.

But then Doc apologizes, “outside her window with the blinds drawn.” In contrast, reversing gender stereotypes, his wife is insensitive, indifferent and oblivious to his feelings—as Doc was to the Indian mother giving birth in “Indian Camp,” a counterpoint to this story. His wife’s acceptance of his apology makes her seem to be the tolerant, sensitive and charitable one. Doc walks away “in the heat” and into the dark hemlock woods, the word *hemlock* connoting his spiritual death. Cooling off in the woods, he finds Nick reading, which seems to identify the boy more with his mother than with his father, who does not even read his medical journals, except that he is reading in the woods rather than in a darkened room with the blinds drawn. Doing as she asked, Doc tells Nick that his mother wants to see him. In the end he is able to rebel against his wife only passively, by allowing Nick to choose for himself.

“His father looked down at him.” Nick still looks up to his father and wants to be with him. Doc takes Nick’s book and puts it into his pocket, affirming experience in Nature in contrast to lying in bed in a darkened room with the blinds drawn. Nick is already more bold than his father, knowledgeable about wildlife and eager to explore. Their roles are reversing. Nick is now leading his father into the dark woods to observe black squirrels, the darkness evoking ultimate death and the sinister challenges of Nature, like the swamp, later, in “Big Two-Hearted River.”

Doc is unarmed in the dark woods but his shotgun is loaded and waiting. Hemingway once said that he killed wild game so that he would not kill himself. His father committed suicide in 1928, he committed suicide himself in 1961 using a shotgun, his sister Ursula committed suicide in 1966, his brother Leicester in 1982, and his granddaughter Margaux in 1996.

Politically correct Feminist critics like Strychacz were all in bed together in a darkened room with the blinds drawn refusing to look at facts and citing instead the scripture of their ideology.

The Sun Also Rises

The Sun Also Rises was censored in some parts of America. In a letter to him his mother called his novel “one of the filthiest books of the year....I could not keep my silence any longer, if any word from me might help you to find yourself....I love you, dear, and still believe you will do something worthwhile. Try to find Him and your real work.” She sounds just like the mother in “Soldier’s Home.” She embodies all in middle-class America that made her son and many like him expatriates. In 1928 Hemingway got word that his father had killed himself. His mother Grace sent him a chocolate cake and the revolver his father had used to shoot himself in the head. As implied in “The Doctor and the Doctor’s Wife,” Hemingway had anticipated this event and he blamed his overbearing mother. Thereafter, he said he hated his mother, yet he continued throughout his life to be a gracious and dutiful son, caring for her financially, telephoning her regularly, communicating with her far more often than most sons do with their mothers, especially after the 1960s. It is difficult for Feminists to condemn all the women characters in Hemingway as “unreal” because nearly all of them were famously based on real women, including Brett Ashley.

A Farewell to Arms

Some critics would not tolerate Hemingway transcending the Realism expected of him with an allegory of love in the tradition of Hawthorne. Allegory requires some degree of abstraction. Catherine is rendered first with Realism as an independent, brave, self-sacrificing nurse wounded herself by the loss of her fiancé. She is gradually idealized for exhibiting specific virtues. What is most exemplary about her in the end is her spirit—her bravery and grace under pressure. Cynical male critics such as Edmund Wilson and Leslie Fiedler, followed later by Feminists, belittled Catherine as nothing more than a male erotic fantasy—merely a “love goddess.” They saw nothing spiritual. People who have never felt love often scorn it in others, like the nasty nurse Miss Van Campen. True love transcends faults. Romantic lovers idealize each other, they talk like Frederick and Catherine.

For Whom the Bell Tolls

For Whom the Bell Tolls is his most expansive novel, with many colorful developed characters and liberated prose and action on an epic scale, in contrast to his economical short stories. The powerful woman leading the guerilla band has the name of his boat the *Pilar*. Feminist critics who stereotyped Hemingway as a "misogynist" gave him no credit for affirming Pilar as a strong heroic independent woman leading a guerilla band of males in the Spanish Civil War and they belittled the traumatized girl Maria, a victim of gang rape by the Fascists.

FEMINIST INTERPRETATION

The following is an example of the false stereotyping of Hemingway. This Feminist argues that he was not really a brave man, that his image as a Macho Man was a pose he adopted to hide and compensate for his fear of women, because he knew that the "mannish" women in his life and writing were "superior" to him. She also implies that superior "mannish" women have "possible lesbian inclinations."

"Hemingway wrote *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940) at the end of a decade of attacks on his work and his person. In a sense, the novel confronts the *fear of emasculation*, the fear of powerlessness and of loss; loss of identity, of courage, of sexuality...[The Feminist critic replaces the main subject of the novel with her own dogma. Ignoring the facts of the story, she attributes all the fears she cites to the threat of women rather than to the threats of war.] Throughout the novel, the characters speak literally and metaphorically of *cojones*—Spanish for 'balls'—and of what befalls the man who loses them.

As conceived in this book (and throughout the 1930s in Hemingway's life and fiction), *the danger of emasculation comes from the mannish woman* [Not from the enemy in the wars?] who challenges the man's sexual and artistic authority. [If Hemingway was so frightened of women, why did he marry them four times? Why did he marry three strong independent career women, two of them war correspondents? Why did he have eleven different "mannish" lesbian friends during the twenties in Paris? He said "Me and Gertrude are like brothers." If he was so afraid of Pilar, why did he name his boat after her?] The stories of Kashkin, Finito, and Pablo all present foreboding examples of emasculation. In the most extreme case, the man emasculated by a bullying woman, like Jordan's father (and Hemingway's), is driven to shoot himself (339). But Jordan, unlike his predecessors (Kashkin and Hemingway's own father), retains his manly identity through his courageous behavior.

What makes Jordan's success possible is that in this novel the threatening woman and the romantic heroine are not the same. That is, Hemingway resolved his own long-standing fear of emasculation [What is the evidence for this?] by splitting the intimidating woman of his earlier fiction into two separate characters. In Pilar and Maria, he created separate embodiments of those female qualities he feared and those he loved. Pilar is an incarnation of the archetypal woman in her most fearsome guise....Thus identified with the cycles of births and death (and the sea), Pilar may be read as the archetypal Great Mother, both nurturing and terrifying (Gladstein 66-72).

Jordan respects Pilar for her solidity and endurance—he compares her to a mountain (136)—but he also *fears her as a rival* [What is the evidence for this? Quote the text.] Her experience makes her a superb teacher, mentor, and leader to the guerilla band. She epitomizes the *mannish* woman whose *superiority* threatens the man's performance. [She emasculates her cowardly husband but there is no evidence that Jordan or Hemingway consider Pilar "superior" to *them*.] In age and maturity, confidence, nurturance, leadership ability, and material appearance she resembles both Hemingway's mother [Hemingway would get a terrific laugh out of this comparison of Pilar to his mother.] She resembles them as well in her *possible* lesbian inclinations [Cite evidence], making her a potential sexual rival to Jordan for Maria's favors (154-55; Gould 73-75). [Possibly, if you wrote the novel instead of Hemingway. Italics added.]

Rena Sanderson

"Hemingway and Gender History"

The Cambridge Companion to Hemingway



HEMINGWARP

Since the 1960s, American academic culture has been inclined like popular culture to treat literature as raw material for exploitation. The campaign in universities to devalue Hemingway has occurred in a context of replacing literary history from a scholarly perspective with social history from a political perspective. The macho stereotype of Hemingway proved so useful in American universities as a focal point of gender criticism that in many English departments he is treated not as the most influential stylist in the history of fiction, but as the principal literary scapegoat for the sins of white males. To his detractors, attitudes toward Hemingway are a test of political correctness, while to informed readers, they are a measure of literacy. In an academic climate that encourages subjectivity, criticism unsupported by evidence, the Hemingway macho stereotype mandates prejudice. His work must be "distrusted from the outset."

Such critics object to Hemingway's concept of manhood, but they are rarely specific, except to ridicule macho characters such as Robert Cohn and Jim Gilmore. To look carefully at Hemingway is to see that in "The End of Something," the boy Nick Adams *fails* to be a man because he deceives his girlfriend Marjorie out of cowardice and cannot accept her as an equal. In *The Sun Also Rises*, Jake Barnes fights no literal bulls; he is a spiritual hero, physically impotent and somewhat androgynous, not a macho man. In *A Farewell to Arms*, Frederick Henry runs away from the war and develops agape through his spiritual love of Catherine Barkley, who educates him. In *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, the Spanish Civil War guerrilla band is led by a woman. In *The Garden of Eden*, gender role-reversal is explored.

Some critics object to Hemingway's women characters for being weak, passive, submissive and dependent projections of his male fantasy. In fact, there are no such women characters in his fiction. Maria in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, the usual example cited, is a traumatized victim of gang rape by Fascist soldiers modeled on actual cases. Catherine Barkley in *A Farewell to Arms*, another example sometimes cited, is a nurse on the Italian front who makes her own decisions, takes the lead in her relationship with Frederick Henry, is more experienced than him, refuses to marry him, and becomes the spiritual exemplar in the novel. Critics overlook the strong, independent women Hemingway favors in his fiction, such as Marjorie in "The End of Something" and the woman in "Hills Like White Elephants," but especially the powerful Pilar in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, who dominates her cowardly husband and runs the guerrilla band. Pilar was Hemingway's nickname for his second wife Pauline. Other critics make an opposite complaint, that his female characters are too strong, heroic, and idealized rather than "real" women, yet biographers have connected most of Hemingway's major female characters to traits and behaviors of women he knew or married.

The aversion to Hemingway in American universities dominated by Feminists is provoked by the macho stereotype, by his looks, and by his subject matter, though he wrote more about women's issues than is generally known. It is true that his prose style, for all its diversity, is consistently masculine in that he uses

little subordination in his sentences. The rhythms are powerful, and the rarely varied subject/verb/predicate syntax contributes to an authoritative tone. Although his style expresses a strong masculinity, there is also a psychological wholeness evident in his fiction, a *balance* of masculine and feminine as conveyed in “Cat in the Rain.” He expresses femininity through his themes, through his male characters individuating into the feminine, through his values of the heart, and through the subtlety, refinement and grace of his art. In these ways Hemingway is more feminine than most Feminists.

Worldwide, Hemingway has become the most popular literary writer of the 20th century. Meanwhile, anti-white-male university English departments in the United States scorn Hemingway and have steadily declined in popularity and respect. They attract fewer majors and an ongoing deluge of ridicule for incompetence overall, for politicizing the curriculum and for abandoning literary history, objective scholarship and traditional standards of excellence.

Michael Hollister
Palo Alto Review
(Spring 2000)

DESECRATION

Hemingway remained loyal to his publisher throughout his whole career and made a lot of money for the Scribner family. After his death, Scribner’s repaid him by disregarding his wishes and desecrating his canon, publishing unfinished manuscripts edited dishonestly in ways that reinforced the false stereotype of Hemingway, as by making Thomas Hudson unsympathetic in *Islands in the Stream* (1970). In 1986 Feminist editors at Scribner’s published the censored version of his unfinished last novel *The Garden of Eden*, a surprising exploration of androgyny that exploded the stereotype of the Macho Man, obliging Feminists to admit that they had been wrong about him all along.

Academics who wanted permission from Feminists to publish on Hemingway seized upon the theme of androgyny. “Clearly it is no longer an embarrassment in intellectual circles to be identified as someone who has written about Hemingway, and suddenly those who write about him no longer feel the need to be as defensive of their subject as they once were.” (Jackson J. Benson, *New Critical Approaches to the Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway*, Duke 1990: xiv) For decades Feminists had condemned Hemingway as too masculine, now some academics tried to put him in a dress like his mother did. Emasculation made him politically correct. As Dorothy Parker once said while he was alive, “Probably of no other living man has so much tripe been penned and spoken.”

The Feminist editors at Scribner’s censored *The Garden of Eden* (1986) and rewrote it, gutting the art in the book and reversing the meaning in order to sustain the false Feminist stereotype of Hemingway as a misogynist. “Sadly...editors have altered, deleted, added, and rearranged substantial amounts of material” in all his unfinished manuscripts. (Kelli A. Larson, *A Historical Guide to Ernest Hemingway*, Oxford 2000: 218) “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.” (Susan M. Seitz, “The Posthumous Editing of Ernest Hemingway’s Fiction,” Ph.D. diss., U Massachusetts, 1993: 212)

Michael Hollister (2012)

FEMINIST PERSPECTIVE

“With the rise of the women’s movement in the 1960s and of feminist criticism in departments of literature, Hemingway became **Enemy Number One** for many critics, who accused him of perpetuating sexist stereotypes in his writing (Fetterley; Rogers). The early feminist attacks unquestionably diminished his literary reputation in some academic circles and reduced the study of his work in high school and university classrooms. These same attacks, however, led to a broader reevaluation of his work.

The resulting rereadings have given new visibility to Hemingway's female characters (and their strengths) and have revealed his own sensitivity to gender issues, thus casting doubts on the old assumption that his writings were one-sidedly masculine (Martin, 'Brett Ashley'; Wagner; Wexler; Whitlow). That assumption has been further undermined by the claim that Hemingway had unresolved androgynous inclinations (Lynn; Spilka), a claim possibly supported by *The Garden of Eden*, the novel whose incomplete manuscript became available for study in the mid-1970s and which was published in abridged form in 1986. It remains to be seen whether this 'new' Hemingway, the writer who treated gender issues in their full diversity and complexity, will win over his feminist critics and recover *his once central place* in the canon (Balbert; Merrill)...[Note the assumption that Feminists now dictate the canon. Italics added.]

To Hemingway and to many others, [Gertrude Stein] was a kind of literary mother. In fact, she has been compared to Hemingway's actual mother Grace not only in age and appearance but also in self-confidence, artistic ambitions, homosexual preferences (Grace was suspected of having an affair with another woman), and the complicated response both women provoked in the writer from Oak Park. During Hemingway's youth, his most serious relationships involved older, more mature women. His first passions—the nurse Agnes von Kurowsky, his first wife Hadley, Duff Twysden (the model for Brett Ashley), and his second wife Pauline—were all several years older than he was....

His father's suicide in December 1928 bitterly reminded him of the failure of his parents' marriage, a failure Hemingway blamed on his mother's bullying and on his father's inability to stand up to her....By this time...his own marriage to Hadley was over, and he was remarried to Pauline. Years later, when he reflected back on these events, Hemingway stated flatly that his mother 'forced [his] father to suicide' (*SL* 670). And in his autobiographical *A Moveable Feast*, published posthumously in 1964, he blamed Pauline for the destruction of his first marriage but also presented himself, unflatteringly, as a passive victim of circumstances. It may be that he found his father's passivity within himself, and he reacted by constructing a more active, courageous, masculine persona....

Hemingway fashioned an ideal—at once modern and nostalgic—of reciprocity between the sexes, an ideal he pursued in his fiction for his entire career....To the advanced young man of the time, this New Woman must have seemed the perfect companion—fearless, bright, eager to participate in work, in play, in marital sex (Schneider and Schneider 148). We know that Hemingway welcomed and praised tomboyish qualities in his four wives—Hadley's hiking, skiing, and easygoing companionship, Pauline's riding and shooting, Martha's hunting, and Mary's expertise as deep-sea fisherwoman. Quite clearly, the New Woman contributed heavily to Hemingway's own image of the ideal woman....

His search for complementary relations between the sexes expresses itself in a wide range of fictional females. The modern, complex woman (e.g., Lady Brett Ashley [*SAR*]), although appealing in many ways, does not normally achieve true reciprocity with a man. Hemingway shows that between the New Woman and the New Man there are, in the language of today's divorce court, 'irreconcilable differences.' The modern woman who complements the modern man is the rare exception (Catherine Barkley [*FTA*], Marie Morgan [*THAHN*]). In Hemingway's later fiction the contradictory features of the modern woman are split into separate characters: Her negative traits are clearly identified and rejected, and her desirable characteristics are enlarged into positive female figures (e.g., Maria [*FWBT*], and Renata [*ARIT*] who in their relationships with men return the longing for union. In her most developed form, Hemingway's ideal woman is a wishful restoration of the boyish New Woman of the 1910s and 1920s purged of the features that caused intimidation, conflict, and the threat of emasculation. Just as Hemingway's 'philosophical primitivism' may be understood as an antidote to modern civilization, Hemingway's fictive women may be seen as his wishful makeover of modern women....

Another common but mistaken assumption about Hemingway's fiction is that he automatically sides with his fictional males. In fact, the stories in his first collection are consistently sympathetic to women, who are often revealed to be more mature than their mates. Although in their own world Hemingway's men have an implied code of stoic manliness by which to define themselves, in their relationships to women that code does not assure success. In these early stories the men seem very passive in response to women; they are either indifferent or insensitive...Brett resembles a traditional man in her sexual expectations, and Jake resembles a traditional woman in his sexual unavailability and his uncomplaining tolerance of others'

inconsiderations. The reversal, both overt and implied, in their gender roles signals that something has gone awry between the sexes....

Although Hemingway has been condemned for depicting women as 'bitches,' very few such women actually appear in his writings, and almost exclusively during the 1930s. The few times that Hemingway embodies his fears of powerful women in a fictive 'bitch,' he is attacking not only or primarily the woman but rather male passivity and dependence on women—traits he found in himself. Writing retrospectively in 1943, he admitted: 'Take as good a woman as Pauline—a hell of a wonderful woman—and once she turns mean. Although, of course, it is your own actions that turn her mean. Mine I mean' (SL 554). In the safari stories 'The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber' and 'The Snows of Kilimanjaro,' primitive nature and the proximity of death cut through the pretenses and lies of civilized life, forcing men to confront the truth about themselves—especially the truth about their unmanly response to women...Ultimately, both stories find fault with the man rather than with the woman....

As early as December 1936, Hemingway met and began an affair with Martha Gellhorn. During 1939 and 1940, while he was working on *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, he made the final break with Pauline and openly displayed his commitment to Martha, his third wife. But the very qualities he admired in Martha—courage, independence, and political engagement—caused her to leave him on lengthy assignments as a roving war correspondent for *Collier's*, absences that made Hemingway aware of his emotional dependence on her (Lynn 481). And her competition with him as a journalist and writer was largely responsible for the marriage's failure (SL 576)."

Rena Sanderson
"Hemingway and Gender History"
The Cambridge Companion to Hemingway
ed. Scott Donaldson
(Cambridge U 1996) 171, 173-76, 179, 182, 185-86

The Nick Adams Stories

"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* [false stereotype] Hemingway, the Hemingway that readers expect....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 standards 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 [false stereotype] of Hemingway." [Italics added.]

Islands in the Stream (unfinished)

"*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."

Susan M. Seitz
"The Posthumous Editing of Ernest Hemingway's Fiction"
Ph.D. dissertation, U Massachusetts (1993)

The Garden of Eden (unfinished)

This complex psychological novel is about two sexual triangles involving two married couples—the Bournes and the Sheldons—and one unattached man and one unattached woman. It probably derives from Hemingway's experience of a triangle in 1925 when his wife Hadley's friend Pauline joined his household and broke up his marriage. Hemingway and Hadley most resemble the Sheldons, the unattached male resembles John Dos Passos and the story plays off of *Tender Is the Night* (1934) by Scott Fitzgerald. The novel is set on the French Riviera and the characters, including three artistic men, are comparable to the hedonists in *The Sun Also Rises*, but without the excuse of having been wounded in a war. Though living in the 1920s they are essentially Postmodern wastelanders like the idle rich in "The Snows of Kilimanjaro," "The Waste Land" and *The Great Gatsby*.

Hemingway experimented with androgyny in his marriage to Mary Welch, developing the feminine side of himself as he had been doing in his fiction all his life. "She loves me to be her girls, which I love to be," he wrote. He even dyed his hair and called himself Catherine, after Catherine Barkley in *A Farewell to Arms*. Mary said later in *The Way It Was* (1976), "In our mutual sensory delights we were smoothly interlocking parts of a single entity, the big cogwheel and the smaller cogwheel....Maybe we were androgynous." Developing both sides of oneself is involved when lovers become "One" like Catherine and Frederick. In *The Garden of Eden*, however, androgyny is selfish and promiscuous, leading to betrayal, guilt, loss of identity, near madness and suicide—tragedies all around. The hedonists turn their Edenic lives into a living Hell. The character named Catherine represents the degeneration of modern woman from the traditional ideals embodied in Catherine Barkley to the loss of any ability to love truly at all, to selfish narcissism and near insanity.

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.” [Italics added.]

Susan F. Beegel
“Conclusion: The Critical Reputation of Ernest Hemingway”
The Cambridge Companion to Ernest Hemingway, ed. Scott Donaldson
(Cambridge U 1996) 290

“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



Susan M. Seitz

"The Posthumous Editing of Ernest Hemingway's Fiction"

Ph. D. dissertation, U Massachusetts (1993)

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....(Seitz 162-4, 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. [As intended by the Feminist editors] 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. [Italics added.]

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* [the false stereotype] image of women in Hemingway. In Hemingway's *Garden*, he was writing to transcend that view of women. Jenks' cuts suppress this *new direction* [It is not a "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 Bournes 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 20th 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...

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....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'."

Seitz 155, 203, 212-17



CROSSED PATHS
Edgar Allan Poe and Hemingway

FEMINISTS CENSOR MALES

"Feminists do exercise power in the form of moral censorship, determining limits to what is and is not sayable....Feminist moral authority acts as a censoring super-ego." (Zoe Sofia, *Arena Magazine* 4 (April/May 1993) "Long before the term 'political correctness' gained currency...ideological policing was a common feature of Women's Studies programs...now there is great pressure for conformity...graphically illustrated by widespread exclusion of male authors from course syllabi, assigned reading lists, and citations in scholarly papers...a systematic refusal to read or respond to male authors."

Daphne Patai & Noretta Koertge
former instructors of Women's Studies
Professing Feminism (1994) 2, 3, 5

"John Baker, Editor-in-Chief of *Publisher's Weekly*, points to a peculiar bias that hangs over many an editorial desk. 'A lot of editors in publishing are women,' he says, 'and there are certain authors they regard as anti-woman or misogynist. They will not accept work from these authors regardless of their actual status. They simply will not take them on.' It's certainly distasteful to read of a personal attack on one's gender, but don't these editors have a greater responsibility to readers than to censor because of personal distaste?"

SYSTEM OF CENSORSHIP

"For twenty-five years, give or take a few, we have lived with this system of silent censorship. We have seen the refinement and perfection of this system, in which publishers have joined hands...Now that rules of censorship have been codified, editors, writers, and illustrators know well in advance what is not acceptable. No one speaks of 'censoring' or 'banning' words or topics; they 'avoid' them. The effect is the same....By now, the rules and guidelines could be dismissed, and they would still function because they have been deeply internalized by the publishing industry. George Orwell and Franz Kafka would have understood this system perfectly; it works best when it permeates one's consciousness and no longer needs to be explained or defended. The goal of the language police is not just to stop us from using objectionable words but to stop us from having objectionable thoughts...."

Editors at the big publishing companies often agreed quietly with the feminists and civil rights groups that attacked their textbooks; by and large, the editors and the left-wing critics came from the same cosmopolitan worlds and held similar political views....Nor did they oppose feminist demands...which had the tacit or open support of their own female editors. In retrospect, this dynamic helps to explain why the major publishing companies swiftly accepted the sweeping...claims of feminist critics and willingly yielded to a code of censorship...Literary quality became secondary to representational issues....By the end of the 1980s, every publisher had complied with the demands of the critics."

Diane Ravitch
The Language Police (2003) 158, 87, 96

FEMINISTS REWRITE ANYTHING

"[Novelist Dale] Peck's argument is that 'editing has been corrupted by the new...mandates of publishing—or, at least, is more prone to a precautionary principle that dictates that if there are any reasons why a reader might not like something in a book, say an unsympathetic character, then there is a case for demanding the author get rid of the unsympathetic character.' 'The list of things you can't do grows longer and longer,' adds Lisa Dierbeck." (Trevor Butterworth, *Financial Times*, FT.com, 2011) "Lawrence Watson [assistant dean, Harvard]...said it was important that 'some great works be revised' because of their portrayal of women and minorities. 'We've got to take the, quote, great works, unquote, and rewrite them'."

Dinesh D'Souza
Illiberal Education (1991) 218-19

FEMINIST EXECUTIVES

By 1984 Scribner's had lost touch with the reading public and declined to the point that it was sold to Macmillan, sold its bookstore on Fifth Avenue, and moved into cheaper offices. Mildred Marmor was hired from Random House as Publisher and President and she brought in Christine Pevitt from the Literary Guild as Editor-in-Chief—examples of the many women rising to the top in publishing houses during the 1980s. In 1985 Scribner's had only one bestseller, *The Dangerous Summer* by Hemingway. Their best opportunity to make quick money was a long unfinished novel by Hemingway, *The Garden of Eden*. Scribner's had no editor willing or able to edit the book and had to go recruiting. They needed an editor willing to turn a complex unfinished literary novel into something sexy that would sell, someone willing to risk destroying his career by reducing Hemingway to trash. It had to be a man because everyone knew that Feminist women had been trashing Hemingway for decades.

MALE FEMINIST EDITOR

Marmor and Pevitt selected a fiction editor at *Esquire* named Tom Jenks who disliked Hemingway. Out of all the editors in the world they hired an inexperienced editor only 35 years old who had no scholarly or literary credentials and had never edited a novel before to edit the last novel by one of the greatest writers in world literature. Jenks was a construction worker for 10 years before graduating from college. For some reason he got accepted as a male editor by the Feminists running *The Paris Review* and then moved up to *Esquire*, once a men's magazine that published Hemingway, now a politically correct male Feminist publication catering to women. Out of all the editors in the world Jenks was selected from *Esquire* to give the appearance of fairness to Hemingway and to shift responsibility for butchering his book to a fall guy. The novelist William Kennedy wrote to Jenks cautioning him to "invest in a bulletproof vest." (Eric Pooley, "How Scribner's Crafted a Hemingway Novel" [1986], *narrative magazine.info/pages/eden*: 2/5/2011)

Jenks agreed to edit *The Garden of Eden* in order to get hired at Scribner's where he hoped to edit contemporary fiction. He said his first response to the job offer was, "I don't care if I never see another Hemingway story again." He did not want his prospective employers to think he liked Hemingway. Jenks says he declined the offer twice "believing that there was enough bad Hemingway in the world." As a rule editors are not assigned to edit writers they dislike. In the case of Hemingway, however, Jenks understood that it was a job requirement. Only an editor who had contempt for Hemingway would agree to steal,

editor, rewrite, and degrade his last novel to advance his own career, then accuse his victim of “self-aggrandizement.” Charles Scribner, Jr., who ran his formerly great family business into the ground, said that Jenks was hired in part because he was ignorant. He was not among those millions of readers and scholars with a high regard for Hemingway—“the Hemingway cult,” as Scribner called them, displaying his own contempt for the writer and his readers who had made millions for the Scribner family. (Pooley)

Jenks said he had not read *Islands in the Stream*, the dishonestly edited unfinished novel that Scribner’s exploited after Hemingway died and could not prevent it. That book got poor reviews and damaged Hemingway’s reputation, but Charles Scribner, Jr. was happy because it made him a lot of money anyway. Jenks acknowledged that he had not read any Hemingway novel in years. It is clear from his article in *Harper’s* (May 1999) that like other Feminists who have stereotyped Hemingway, Jenks has never read his writing at all. In fact, like most Feminists, he appears to have never read much literature by anyone. Only someone who had never taken an introduction to literature course would say that the darkness in Hemingway’s fiction is “infantile.”

Jenks could not have read the works cited above with attention and call Hemingway a “misogynist.” He is making a Feminist stock response—kneejerk conformity to slander—as he does in claiming that “Papa is hard on women unless they are subservient and adoring.” This contradicts his hype of *The Garden of Eden* praising the “new, sensitive Hemingway” who shows “tenderness and vulnerability.” Jenks talks out of one side of his mouth and then the other. Nor could he have read *A Farewell to Arms* and said, as he does in *Harper’s*, that there is no love or intimacy in Hemingway. He could not have read *The Sun Also Rises* (see Chapter XIX) and call Hemingway “anti-Semitic.” Jenks knows almost nothing about Hemingway except insulting falsehoods. His rewrite of *The Garden of Eden* illustrates how he advanced his career by making Feminist stock responses.

In his *Harper’s* piece Jenks demonstrates how far out of touch he is with literature, literary history and the popularity of writers. Patting the Nobel laureate on the head in condescension then biting his ankle, Jenks declares that Hemingway’s “literary importance is equivocal”—inferior to Eudora Welty. “He appeals especially to the young, or to that which remains adolescent in readers.” He is “a writer of few ideas,” too “stupid to think life out,” lacking “intellectual rigor,” a man “without reflection.” “Plotting, which depends on thinking, was never his strong point.” Hemingway “had only one character—himself.” An “icon of masculinity,” he was just a swaggering “adolescent” with “character disorders,” guilty of homophobia. He degenerated into a drunken “fat old man,” just “ridiculous” and “silly.”

CRITICAL REACTION

“Hemingway’s publisher has committed a literary crime...this volume is a travesty.” (Barbara Probst Solomon, “Where’s Papa?” *The New Republic* (9 March 1987: 30) “This cannot have been the book Hemingway envisioned.” (E. L. Doctorow, “Braver than We Thought,” *The New York Times Book Review* (18 May 1986): 1,44-45) “Were the scrupulous craftsman still alive, no case of vodka could ease the pain the publication of this novel would cause.” (Lorian Hemingway, “Ernest Hemingway’s Farewell to Art,” *Rolling Stone* 275, 5 June 1986: 42) “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.” (Susan M. Seitz, “The Posthumous Editing of Ernest Hemingway’s Fiction,” Ph.D. diss., U. Massachusetts, 1993: 180-81) “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.’” (Kelli A. Larson, *A Historical Guide to Ernest Hemingway*, Oxford, 2000: 218)

FEMINIST REVISIONS

As documented by Susan Seitz in her dissertation, Jenks censored two thirds of the book, cut out half the characters, removed whole sections, combined chapters, rearranged passages, interpolated scenes, switched dialogue from one character to another, added words to sex scenes, removed the main symbols, changed the tragic ending to a happy one, and reversed the meaning of the novel. Cutting out half the characters—the

Sheldons and their friend Andy—eliminated dramatic interactions and thematic parallels between the Sheldons and the Bournes that gave psychological depth, complexity, and dramatic force to the novel. It also removed aesthetic counterpoint, thematic development, significant characterization, and irony. Jenks stripped a complex psychological novel down to a sex romp. As reported by Eric Pooley, “Jenks had to make the book his own.” Then, no kidding, Jenks actually said, “I did only what I thought Hemingway would have done.” After trashing *The Garden of Eden*, in his *Harper’s* article Jenks went on to trash the author and all his other works.

Jenks censored two thirds of the manuscript in order to (1) produce a commercial novel that is short, shallow, and sexy—“a good read”; (2) please his employers and other Feminists whose approval he needed to continue advancing his career; and (3) censor literary content to reduce Hemingway’s critical stature, to justify his own rewrite and to reinforce the Feminist stereotype of Hemingway as a “misogynist” while hyping the book like a tabloid expose—Misogynist Caught in Women’s Clothes. “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.” Also, “Hemingway’s experiments with theme and style have been suppressed.... Jenks made alterations to Hemingway’s prose rhythms as well...” (Seitz 180, 155, 200)

Three male characters and three female characters, a balance expressing Hemingway’s egalitarianism, were reduced to only one male and two females, giving the most Feminist character a starring role. David the only male left is reduced to a passive wimp “totally subject to the powers of women, hapless before temptation and unable to take action in the face of adversity.” (E. L. Doctorow 328-29) “Many readers have felt the character of David Bourne to be shallow and merely Catherine’s tool (Seitz 199): ‘David Bourne does indeed come out sounding rather like the weak slave of a blond dominatrix.’” (Solomon 32) “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.” (Seitz 199) This subordination of the only male character is consistent with the groupthink of Feminist editors documented by Diane Ravitch in *The Language Police* (2003): To avoid censorship by Feminist editors, writers should not portray any male characters as “strong” or “brave.” They should not depict “men as capable leaders,” “in active problem-solving roles,” nor “in positions of greater authority than women” (Ravitch 183).

Jenks removed the main symbols that express the meanings of Hemingway’s novel, Rodin’s statue of Ovid’s *Metamorphosis* and Hieronymous Bosch’s allegorical painting *Garden of Earthly Delights*. “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....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.’ [Seitz quoting R. Z. Sheppard, “The Old Man and the Sea Change,” *Time* (26 May 1986) 77] “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...” (Seitz 182, 184) Hemingway created a complex woman character, one of many in his fiction, and a Feminist editor censored her characterization in order to sustain the false stereotype of him as a misogynist.

The title *The Garden of Eden* comes from the Bible, prefiguring a Fall, and *Garden of Earthly Delights* explains the Christian meaning of the novel, depicting sins of the flesh leading to a Fall into a living hell. “The structure of the painting...mirrors the structure of the book.” (Seitz 187) Jenks censored Christianity and made his rewrite of the book politically correct—secular, atheistic, shallow, and Feminist. He cut dialogue in which the characters know they are damned. Censoring religion and morality, Jenks glamorizes having promiscuous fun in bed and identifies with the hedonists, whereas Hemingway condemns them as damned like Brett Ashley and Mike Campbell in *The Sun Also Rises*. Yet Jenks accuses Hemingway of being a hedonist. Jenks has acknowledged that he had no “scholarly conscience” and he has demonstrated that he has no conscience at all.

“The ending, too, was denounced, because ‘Jenks altered the novel so that it runs counter to the pattern of tragedy Hemingway had been preparing’....” (Seitz quoting Doctorow 172) “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' (K. J. Peters, "The Thematic Integrity of *The Garden of Eden*," *The Hemingway Review* 10.2, Spring 1991: 17), with the result that often times these characters seem shallow and narcissistic. Ultimately, David is rewarded rather than punished for his sin, for he gets a new woman and regains his ability to write....Both Catherine and David were meant to be punished for their fall." (Seitz 189, 199) Jenks rewards David for being a compliant male tool--like himself.

INSANITY

Jenks is like David in the book, dominated by women and doing whatever his Catherine wants. At the same time, Catherine's destruction of David's manuscripts is comparable to the Feminist destruction of *The Garden of Eden*—and many other books--by intolerant Feminist editors who only want to read about themselves. Her narcissism is rewarded with money, freedom, independence, fun in bed, and martyrdom. She is not altogether insane, just on the verge. Her near insanity gives her distinction. Since everything is the fault of men, among Feminists insanity is victimization, self-pity is empowering and survival heroic. *The Mad Woman in the Attic* is a popular book among Feminist academics and "The Yellow Wallpaper" a revered text. To many Feminists logic is oppressive and sanity Patriarchal. It is ironically apt that this corrupted Atheist text echoes the Christian allegory of Adam and Eve, validation of Hemingway's themes in his version of the novel.

Michael Hollister (2012)



FEMINIST DISMISSAL

Jenks reduced *The Garden of Eden* to his own depth: the level of superficial pop culture, saying, "The book seems so modern--the characters' haircuts, their clothes, their style. It's 1986's obsession with androgyny. Not Michael Jackson, but almost." By reducing the book to a fashion statement, Jenks set it up for easy dismissal by Feminists, as merely a display of cross-dressing. Just as the Feminist editors intended, the Feminist Marilyn Elkins blames Hemingway rather than Jenks for the falsified heroine:

"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 [matriarchal] garden seems hopelessly dated."

Marilyn Elkins

"The Fashion of *Machismo*"

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

KILLING THE FEMINIST BULL

“The decade of the 1960s saw the publication of nearly four hundred scholarly articles and books with Ernest Hemingway as their subject....Statistics show that Hemingway’s critical reputation met the challenges of the 1970s with ease. The decade saw production of some 729 scholarly books and articles about his work and life, up 42 percent from the 1960s. In part, Hemingway’s fictional treatment of World War I and its aftermath assisted him posthumously in bridging the gap between World War II and Vietnam generations....The number of women scholars at work on Hemingway rose from 7 percent of the whole in the 1960s to 13 percent in the 1970s [many of them Feminists making false charges and smearing him as a misogynist]...The 1970s also marked the real beginning of a phenomenon known as the ‘Hemingway industry.’ So many critics were now at work on Hemingway that the available spectrum of generalist journals could not accommodate their productivity....

[Feminists] overreacted to Reaganism with an intolerance labeled ‘political correctness,’ an effort to silence alternative views and dictate values....In the early 1980s literary critics as a whole seemed uninterested in Hemingway [because they were intimidated by intolerant Feminists]...Critics interested in multiculturalism tended to ignore the author as ‘politically incorrect’....During the 1980s the involvement of women in Hemingway studies continued to grow...Many focused on rehabilitating Hemingway for feminist readers, on making him ‘correct’....

The appearance of *The Garden of Eden*...was sufficient to prompt a radical reassessment....From 1985 through 1991, the last year of this survey, the productivity of Hemingway scholars surged upward more sharply than ever before, doubling, and in some years almost tripling the output seen in the energetic period of canonization immediately following Hemingway’s death....With so many new questions to answer, Hemingway scholarship exploded, and today the flawed text of *The Garden of Eden* is almost as often read and criticized as *The Sun Also Rises* and *A Farewell to Arms*. The novel’s complex gender issues did more than any number of feminist apologies to make Hemingway politically correct [and] dispel the notion of his intolerance...” [This acknowledges that Feminists were wrong about Hemingway all along. They taught and published falsehoods for decades. Now all their lies and false criticism will remain in the libraries as a huge mistake--an orgy of sexism.]

Susan F. Beegel

“Conclusion: The Critical Reputation of Ernest Hemingway”

The Cambridge Companion to Hemingway

ed. Scott Donaldson

(Cambridge 1996) 274, 280, 282-83, 286-87, 288-90

Michael Hollister (2015)