

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
800-521-0600

**UMI<sup>®</sup>**





**Université d'Ottawa • University of Ottawa**



**The Male Writer and the Feminine Text:  
Hemingway's Major Novels from a Cixousian Perspective**

by

**Marc A. Hewson, B.A., M.A.**

**Thesis submitted to  
the School of Graduate Studies and Research  
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the  
Ph.D. degree in English Literature**

**University of Ottawa  
Ottawa, Canada**

**© Marc A. Hewson, Ottawa, Canada, 2001**



**National Library  
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and  
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et  
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada**

*Your file Votre référence*

*Our file Notre référence*

**The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.**

**The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.**

**L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.**

**L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.**

0-612-66154-7

**Canada**

## Acknowledgements

My first thanks go to my advisor, Dr. Jacqueline Tavernier-Courbin for all of her assistance in making this thesis what it is, though she bears no responsibility for what it is not. In truth, it is rather unfair to describe Dr. Tavernier merely as my advisor on this project for she has worked with me in all facets of my career almost from the time I arrived at the University of Ottawa. I am indebted to her, then, not just for her supervisory aid but also for her encouragement, wisdom, and friendship over the last five years.

Secondly, I must thank the John F. Kennedy Foundation and the John F. Kennedy Library for the Ernest Hemingway Research Grant I was awarded to facilitate my work on *The Garden of Eden*. Without their financial assistance, the manuscript research included in chapter five would not have been possible. While at the library, I was assisted admirably by then-curator Stephen Plotkin, who answered all of my questions patiently and in detail. Thanks are also due to the evaluators at *The Hemingway Review*, whose comments were invaluable in revising chapter three.

My last thanks go to my family, whose continuing support of all kinds made these years easier than they would otherwise have been. Especially, I am thankful to (and for) my wife, Kirsten. Though she comes last in this list, she is first in importance, and it is safe to say that without her intellectual and emotional aid this dissertation would not have happened. She has kept me grounded and focused, and for that I am ever grateful.

## Abstract

This dissertation addresses Hemingway's developing understanding of gender and sexual identity in four major novels — *The Sun Also Rises*, *A Farewell to Arms*, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, and *The Garden of Eden* — using Cixousian theories about the construction of self-definition. Applying Cixous's ideas of inherent bisexuality and *écriture féminine*, the thesis posits Hemingway as a possible member of her elite group of biologically male but psychologically feminine authors to suggest that, as his career advanced, he tried increasingly to define himself in unsettling but crucial ways.

Such characters as Brett Ashley and Jake Barnes began the investigation into mediated gender and sexual identity that lasted until the end of his creative life, while Catherine Barkley and Frederic Henry's love established the importance of open and honest sexual relationships as methods of self-discovery. Hemingway's extension of loving relationships by way of the brief but intense affair between Maria and Robert Jordan marked a further movement towards a Cixousian sense of bisexual feminine writing as the lovers focus on life instead of death. Finally, Catherine Bourne's desire to create an anti-patriarchal image of the feminine exposes her creator's own wish to reject restrictive masculine identity in order to try to come to grips with his femininity.

Ultimately, of course, Hemingway could not overcome his gender training and admit those of his needs and desires that defied societal standards of masculine behavior. In his writing, however, he indulged in gender-bending and alternative sexuality as a way to express himself creatively. These fictive experiments, often accompanied by real-life counterparts, suggest how much Hemingway wanted to understand men's and women's places in the modern world; and the conclusions to which he came look remarkably like Cixous's. Tracing the similarities between her theories and Hemingway's writing, we might

recognize how pervasive Hemingway's questions were and how deeply he wanted to answer them. This attempt to recalibrate the commonly held opinions about Hemingway's life and writing allows us to see more clearly what was at stake for him in the creation of his art by exposing him as a nascent, if unconscious, writer of *écriture féminine*.

## Abbreviations

*NBW* — Cixous, *The Newly Born Woman*

*FY* — Reynolds, *Hemingway: The Final Years*

*PY* — Reynolds, *Hemingway: The Paris Years*

*SL* — *Selected Letters*, Baker, ed.

*YH* — Reynolds, *The Young Hemingway*

## Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction: <i>Hemingway and Who!?!</i>	1
Chapter I <i>Theoretically Speaking: Hemingway, Cixous and Gender</i>	14
Chapter II: <i><u>The Sun Also Rises</u>: Beginning the Search for Self</i>	42
Chapter III: <i><u>A Farewell to Arms</u>: Rejecting Patriarchal Models</i>	80
Chapter IV: <i><u>For Whom the Bell Tolls</u>: Loving in a Feminine Mode</i>	114
Chapter V: <i><u>The Garden of Eden</u>: Exploring Feminine Writing</i>	150
Conclusion: <i>Reconstructing Hemingway</i>	197
Notes	204
Bibliography	235

**Introduction:**  
**Hemingway and Who!?!**

When I am asked the nature of my doctoral research, anyone with even limited knowledge of literature and literary theory is astonished by my response that I am investigating Hemingway as a male writer of Cixous's *écriture féminine*, feminine writing that attempts to avoid the political power struggles between men and women inherent in a male-dominated world.<sup>1</sup> "What possible connection can there be between the two," people ask — and no short answer can really do justice to the question. I admit that, at first glance, a coupling of America's supposed premier literary misogynist with one of France's premier feminist thinkers seems a dubious prospect, one that appears doomed to failure (if only because so many people, in both Hemingway Studies and Women's Studies, could be expected automatically to reject it). What, if anything, can there be to justify such a study as this? Indeed, when the very idea of a connection first crossed my mind, I was certain that it would prove unfruitful. As I progressed, however, and as more bases of comparison between the two writers began to manifest themselves, what started as a whimsical notion began to gain solidity. Despite the fact that the two had never before been systematically

linked, I started to recognize the importance to current trends in Hemingway Studies of forging bonds with a feminist point of view.<sup>2</sup> The more I considered, the surer I became that some very intriguing and important assessments of Hemingway's life and writing could be developed using a Cixousian perspective.

Thanks to the work of a number of innovative scholars, as well as to the changing sensibilities in literary studies generally, it has become clear that the Hemingway we thought we knew is not a completely accurate portrait of the man. Since the publication of *The Garden of Eden* in 1986, and the subsequent opening of the manuscripts to scholars in the late 1980s, opinion about Hemingway has started to shift. In the fifteen years since *Garden's* arrival on the scene, there has been a radical sea change in academic attitude towards Hemingway, at least among Hemingway scholars.<sup>3</sup> Admittedly, the general public and even some doubting academicians have been less willing to alter their opinion as to his basic conception of male-female relationships and his views of women, maintaining what Comley and Scholes dub the common view of Hemingway as "an embodiment of monolithic masculinity" (ix). However, even suspicious readers must acknowledge that the shadow cast by *Garden* and the other posthumously available works changes the light in which Hemingway must be viewed. That necessity alone might make a cursory connection between Hemingway and feminism possible, perhaps even urgent, while the further prospect of linking him with Cixous suggested itself to me as I began to realize the extent to which I — and most other pre-*Garden* readers — had misjudged him, as both a man and an author (though admittedly Hemingway himself went far to force that misinterpretation on us).

The result of recent critical examinations of his work (not just of *Garden* but of all

the novels and many of the stories) has been to recognize that, despite earlier analysis of his writing and despite his own loud protestations, Hemingway was never as secure or culturally masculine a man as he led readers to believe. The fears and doubts he endured for much of his life and to which he ceaselessly returned in his writing bespeak an abiding interest in matters of personal and professional identity construction. As increasingly more scholars in the last two decades have begun to examine Hemingway's concern with self-definition, it has become ever clearer that, as both a man and an author, he had numerous questions about what it meant to be a gendered and sexed being in modern Western society. From debates about his sexuality to arguments over his relative masculinity or femininity, many new and exciting gender-related studies of Hemingway have flourished.

Of course, criticism of Hemingway is no stranger to theories of self-definition. Early analysis of his work during his own lifetime stressed a "psychic defense" theory that viewed the narratives as attempts to write out the terror he felt after his wounding on the Piave River in Italy during his World-War-I ambulance service. This notion, first explored by Edmund Wilson was picked up by other critics like Malcolm Cowley and Philip Young and would become a mainstay of Hemingway criticism for some time.<sup>4</sup> The wound theory's basic tenet is that writing was a defense for Hemingway, that all of his heroes are men somehow caught in dangerous positions (of varying sorts) who must try to find the proper means of saving themselves, usually by blocking out the terrible situation; thus Jake Barnes's retreat to Burguete to avoid the awkwardness and pain of a physically impossible relationship with Brett Ashley, or David Bourne's throwing over of Catherine for Marita as an escape from a confining and artistically stultifying relationship, or Nick Adams's refusal to fish the treacherous swamp in "Big Two-Hearted River." In recent years, this has led to

an understanding of Hemingway's doubts about the possibility of human self-definition in a modern world of such complexity and confusion as ours. In particular, critics have begun to explain Hemingway's discomfort with notions of gender and sexual identity as the driving force behind his defensive artistry, suggesting that it is his doubts that drove him to attempt to create a solid identity for himself through his writing and his public image.

Drawing on both biographical and literary materials, for example, Mark Spilka has figured Hemingway as a man deeply ambivalent about his own and others' gender identities, intrigued yet troubled by notions of androgyny. Spilka examines Hemingway's life and familial and cultural influences to suggest that the idea of "a mixture or exchange of traditionally male and female traits, roles, activities, and sexual positions" for men and women was both a lure and a trap for the author (*Quarrel* 4). He argues that a "look at Hemingway's boyhood reading, [as well as his personal history,] . . . helps to show how he was raised by a blend of feminine and masculine versions of manhood which later became submerged and dominant strains, respectively, in his published fiction" (*Quarrel* 5). Ultimately, Spilka sees Hemingway's quarrel with androgyny as the spark behind his creation of a defensive fiction meant to help him maintain or re-establish his inner sense of masculinity — "a wounding condition, that is to say, against which Hemingway's artistic bow has always been manfully strung" (*Quarrel* 5), much as his well-advertised adventures were designed to shore up the public view of his manliness.

More recently, critics like Comley and Scholes have suggested that the complex gender and sexual identities in what they call the Hemingway Text evidence the subtlety of the author's work and the necessity of recognizing the cultural influences at work in his writing:

we are concerned with the representations of human character in Hemingway's writing, especially with how characters are constructed along lines of gender and sexual behavior. Our notion of the Hemingway Text, then, puts Hemingway's writing and the facts of his life at the center and situates around this center various other cultural elements that must enter into any reading of that writing. (xi)

In addition, their definition of gender as "a system of sexual differentiation that is partly biological and partly cultural" (ix) builds upon Spilka's to bring more theoretical rigor to an analysis of Hemingway's ideas about human identity construction. They explore the author's uneasy relationship with systems of social and personal self-definition as it recurrently manifests itself in his work and his private life, from his uneasy familial relationships to his difficulties with homosexuality. Their questioning of such heretofore underdeveloped areas as Hemingway's "interest in races and peoples seen as 'darker' and more 'primitive' than Euro-Americans . . . and . . . [his] fascination (attraction and repulsion) with transgressive sexuality" (75) has helped revolutionize Hemingway studies. As they explain, "[t]he Hemingway you were taught about in high school is dead. *Viva el nuevo Hemingway*" (146). It is this call to re-assess Hemingway that has revolutionized current critical study.

On the shoulders of such scholarship as Spilka's and Comley and Scholes's, a new generation of Hemingway critics has begun to emerge, defining his work and his life in intriguing (and often surprising) new ways. With the same desire as Comley and Scholes — to reconfigure the now-outdated view of Hemingway as a confident and secure man — and with the same inkling that "many of his *personal* concerns reflected, in an exaggerated form, wider *cultural* concerns of his day" (4), Carl Eby explores the author from a classically psychoanalytical perspective. He explains that "an appreciation for Hemingway's psychosexual concerns is not only essential for understanding his own or his characters'

unconscious motivations; it is also essential for understanding his *subject matter* insofar as human sexuality and gender identity remained major concerns throughout his career” (2). Eby’s supposition that Hemingway’s work is predicated on (but not restricted to) his “gender instability, narcissism, erotic attachment to hair, latent homosexuality, castration anxiety, and Oedipus complex — not to mention such related issues as his construction of masculinity, his divided attitude toward women, his eroticization of race, and his passion for secret-keeping” (3-4) — has important things to say about our previous beliefs concerning the recurring motifs in both his life and his work. Given its inherently patriarchal bias, though, Eby’s case is an interesting one in terms of the increasing permissiveness in Hemingway scholarship. The use of a primarily Freudian system of interpretation might even run the risk of backtracking on the ground that has been gained recently. It is in partial response to such potentially reductive arguments as Eby’s that a positive feminist response to Hemingway suggests itself. A tonic for Eby’s masculine theorists might be suggested by the importation of Cixousian ideas into Hemingway Studies, bearing in mind that Cixous’s primary desire is to uncover the problems of gender identity in a male-dominated world.

Precisely such a need to recognize Hemingway’s exposure of the troubles of social identity construction (although without mention of Cixous’s similar project) has been made recently by Debra Modellmog. Her investigation of the author’s conflicted relationship with issues of gender, sexuality and able-bodiedness seeks to define Hemingway as a man at once dissatisfied with and trapped by cultural prescriptions, and her powerful new readings of his major texts, aided by insightful reference to his personal relationships, make us question almost everything we thought we knew about the psychosexuality of the

twentieth century's most influential and well-known American writer.<sup>5</sup> By underlining the dual need to “comprehend how identities, including authorial identities, are formed and to measure the social and political effects of constructing an identity in a particular way” (*Reading Desire* 8), Modellmog makes us realize that the long-held ideas about Hemingway's life and fiction need to be rethought. Her hope is that an awareness of the stakes of literary production will modify our understanding of writers' tendencies. She therefore asks us to “analyze authorial constructions, the ones we . . . bring to a text as well as the ones we . . . take away from it.” The enterprise Modellmog undertakes forces new discussions of Hemingway's and our conceptions of his life and fiction by problematizing current theories, and exposes the extent to which his fiction and marketability were (and still are) based on his and our rehearsal of standardized postures of masculinity. Her new approach, mindful as it is of our motivations in analyzing literature in specific ways, demonstrates the need for a reevaluation of Hemingway's work as a whole, and even encourages, though obliquely, the use of theories like Cixous's to accomplish it. While Eby's study can be said to offer a negative incentive for incorporating feminist literary theory, then, Modellmog's positive challenge to recalibrate our own views almost necessitates a radical project such as the one I am carrying out here.

As cultural studies have begun to shift our perception of what it means to live in a gendered world, using a theorist of gender to explore Hemingway's attitudes towards, and questions about, the relative definitions of masculinity and femininity seems appropriate. More than that, though, recourse to Cixous can help to demonstrate just how close Hemingway was in his writing to contemporary theorizing on gender identity. The implementation of a Cixousian perspective can offer us an entirely new Hemingway, a

Hemingway we never would have believed in before — a Hemingway concerned not merely with the problems that social constructions of gender and sexual identity create but also with the need to find solutions to them. By applying Cixous's ideas of *écriture féminine*, we can begin to recognize that Hemingway envisioned a world that would not try to reduce his complex attitudes towards personal identity into the simple equation of gender with sex. It is possible, by looking at the attitudes towards sexuality and gender in his major novels, to explain Hemingway as a nascent — albeit unconscious — creator of feminine writing in the mode Cixous defines, and to suggest that the increasingly desperate need he felt to answer his own questions about human self-definition led him closer and closer to a kinship with Cixous's theories as his life and career advanced. What follows, then, is an analysis of the ways in which Hemingway, as he developed as a man and writer, began to open himself to the possibility of a relationship to gender at odds with the masculine cultural model available to him.

My first chapter will serve to set up some initial similarities between Hemingway's writing and Cixous's ideas, dividing its attention between an elaboration of her general theories and an assessment of Hemingway's biographical predisposition to them. By closely analyzing Cixous's ideas at the outset and placing them beside a rudimentary account of Hemingway's early years, and by beginning to explore how her thoughts might be forecast in his writing, we can recognise that there is more than a mere passing acquaintance between the permissive notions of gender and sexual identity that become obvious in Hemingway's life and fiction and the detailed account of the problematic social construction of human self-definition that Cixous began to develop a decade or so after Hemingway's death. With these preliminaries in place, I will go on in the remaining chapters to discuss at

some length the manner in which proto-Cixousian themes weave their way into four of Hemingway's major texts, with the intention of exposing him as an increasingly good example of the male author of feminine writing whom Cixous posits as a bastion of non-politicized gender difference.

Chapter two, therefore, will offer a look at *The Sun Also Rises* (1926), Hemingway's first serious novel, which I will examine as evidence of his exasperation with the male cultural model of human identity formation.<sup>6</sup> Through a look at the mediated gender lives of Brett Ashley and Jake Barnes, I will argue Hemingway's realization of the confining patriarchal categories of masculinity and femininity. This will also provide the forum for discussing the way Jake, Brett, and Hemingway attempt to evade social conscription by focusing their attention on the respective needs of men and women to forego masculine definitions (men as selfish, women as selfless) if they are to come to any sort of peace within themselves. Though Hemingway ultimately denies the couple an easy relationship with each other, the fact that *Sun* so clearly describes the problems of the modern gendered world indicates a sympathy on the author's part with the same sort of opinion Cixous has about how the external world creates difficulties for individuals by making them conform to gender stereotypes.

With the move to Hemingway's next novel, *A Farewell to Arms* (1929), in chapter three, I will begin to establish the argument that Hemingway understood that one of the methods of evading cultural conscription lies in open, loving sexual relationships, in much the same manner that Cixous argues in favor of honest, apolitical interaction between men and women. My analysis of the novel will focus on Catherine Barkley's and Frederic Henry's growing dissatisfaction with their socially dictated identities to suggest that they are

prone to the sort of relationship Cixous advocates. Exploring their increasing love for one another against the backdrop of the receding war, I will argue that Hemingway's dream of heartfelt and communicative love supersedes his adherence to the masculine enterprise (symbolized in the novel by the war) and evidences a marked similarity with Cixous's ideas. The tragic conclusion of the novel with Catherine's death might thus be taken as less an indication of Hemingway's misogyny than as a recognition on his part of the utopian (and hence realistically impossible) nature of his desires, much in the way Cixous's theories have difficulty being applied to a real-world context.

The love affair between Robert Jordan and Maria in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940), which will be the focus of my fourth chapter, will continue my overall argument as to Hemingway's feminine tendencies in writing. The positive influence of love on men and women which he began in a rudimentary way in *Farewell* takes on even more significance in this novel. His granting to his hero and heroine a love that outlasts death, I will suggest, evidences his determination to believe in the importance of loves like Jordan and Maria's or Catherine and Frederic's, even if he realized their essential impossibility. Through an analysis of the complex of emotions and attitudes surrounding Jordan's, Maria's, and Pilar's relationships to each other, and through a concentration on Hemingway's book-long focus on the revivifying nature of love rather than on the inevitability of human death, I will forge a connection with Cixous's suggestion that only a feminine concentration on life, instead of a masculine concentration on death, can succeed in altering current views of gender relation. As an example of one of the few positive love affairs in Hemingway's fiction, *Bell* stands as a heightening of the author's commitment to a sense of life similar to Cixous's. The very fact that in this book Hemingway has his hero actively begin to

contemplate the feminine, by way of Jordan's thought about writing a book about women following the war, suggests just how close to the surface his gender concerns were by 1939.

My final chapter will center on *The Garden of Eden* (1986), assessing it as the culmination of Hemingway's writing in a feminine mode. Picking up from *Bell* the notion of the writer interested in the feminine, I will explore the ideas surrounding gender, sexuality, and artistry in Hemingway's most thought-provoking (though perhaps not his best) novel. Demonstrating his sympathy for the plight of Catherine Bourne as a woman struggling to define herself in a male world inimical to female self-definition (a nuanced and sustained portrait of modern womanhood Hemingway had previously rehearsed in Brett Ashley and Catherine Barkley) will help to uncover his realization of the marginalization to which women are prone. His further attempt to allow her some sort of artistic freedom as a means of gaining for herself the identity that men deny her, I will argue, is evidence of Hemingway's view that writing — like love — is another venue in which personal change is possible, a view echoed by Cixous's definition of *écriture féminine*. Using manuscript material to address the concerns that both Catherine and David have regarding gender and sexuality, I will explain that *Garden* (the book Hemingway wrote, not the one Scribner's published) is the most extensive record Hemingway left of his discomfort with culturally prescribed roles for men and women and is the most sustained artistic effort he made to right the balance.

In embarking upon such a study, I recognize the doubts it will surely raise from a number of quarters. I also recognize the impossibility of claiming Hemingway to be a conscious proponent of some embryonic Cixousian sentiment — not only because it would

be anachronistic but also because it would be impossible to claim that any one of these books is a deliberate condemnation of social masculinity. Yet I maintain that the marked similarities between what Hemingway wrote in the first half of the twentieth century and what Cixous has written in the last quarter of it concerning men's and women's respective relationships to gender and sexual self-identification can help us to flesh out further the *nuevo Hemingway* that so many scholars are now postulating. While attempting to couple Hemingway's writing with feminist concerns is bound to cause anxiety, doubt, and perhaps even anger, from feminists and Hemingway scholars alike, the project of re-evaluating his art and his life by means of the more tolerant structures of feminist theory can bring us closer to an understanding of the suffering Hemingway endured because of his conflicted sense of self. In fact, the use of a theorist like Cixous may even quell fears about Hemingway's possible closeness to feminism since it is in some ways misleading to describe Cixous as a feminist thinker.

As many scholars have noted, and as she herself has explained, her work moves beyond a merely male-versus-female or masculine-versus-feminine dichotomy in order to embrace difference in all its forms:

Throughout the world there are differences. Differences of behaviour, differences in relation to living. There are choices. . . . In [my] work, [I am] motivated by the inscription of these differences which cannot be contained by the labels man/woman, masculine/feminine. Difference transcends, it traverses everything that exists. It moves in a complex way through every expression, every creation, every (textual) production. (Cixous, "Conversations" 149)<sup>7</sup>

The usual distinctions made by feminism (or by the patriarchy, for that matter) are unable, according to Cixous, fully to embrace the question of difference. It might be favourable, then, to imagine her work as being an example of what we might call feminist humanism,

an attempt to address the problems of what it means to be human — and gendered — from a standpoint of openness to difference. The consequence for Hemingway studies of applying these ideas to the major novels is to offer a solid theoretical basis for the instances of mediated gender and sexuality that occur in many of them. In the end, a connection between Cixous and Hemingway aids us in recognizing not only that he was bucking against a restrictive society that tried to force specific gender and sex roles on him but also that, as he matured, he was ever more diligent in trying to find an alternative.

## Chapter I

### Theoretically Speaking: Hemingway, Cixous and Gender

We might best set up our inquiry into the possible meeting point of Hemingway and Cixous by recalling the vindictive response Gertrude Stein made in her pseudo-autobiography of Alice B. Toklas to Hemingway's snide comments about her after the disintegration of their friendship. "What a book would be the real story of Ernest Hemingway," she observed, "not those he writes but the confessions of the real Ernest Hemingway. It would be for another audience than the audience Hemingway now has but it would be very wonderful" (265-66). These were inflammatory words to write about a man like Hemingway (whose ego could compete with Stein's in both size and belligerence), implying as they do the falseness of the persona he presented to the world. Yet they were also prophetic, as has been demonstrated by the current trend of reassessing his work, particularly in terms of its conjunction of sexuality, gender and artistic creation. For her own part, Stein, too, turned a rather arrogant face towards the world, one far removed from the character she evinced in private, a fact of which Hemingway was aware, if his spiteful swipe at her in *A Moveable Feast* is to be believed. In "A Strange Enough Ending,"

the last section to have Stein as its subject, he recounts a trip to Gertrude and Alice's home in Paris:

I heard someone speaking to Miss Stein as I had never heard one person speak to another; never, anywhere, ever.

Then Miss Stein's voice came pleading and begging, and saying, "Don't, pussy. Don't. Don't, please don't. Please don't, pussy." . . .

. . . I . . . tried not to hear anymore as I left but it was still going on and the only way I could not hear it was to be gone. It was bad to hear and the answers were worse. (118-19)

The upshot of the vignette is to deflate the image Stein created of herself as a self-controlled and dominant force by hinting at the fact that she was virtually in thrall to Alice and her demands.<sup>1</sup> Whether Hemingway in fact overheard such a conversation as he claims is less important, though, than what the story implies — namely, that he knew Stein's self-assurance to be a mask.

Given that questions of gender identity and sexuality were never far from the surface of Hemingway's work or personal life, it is perhaps more than coincidental that he should repay Stein's prediction about him by mocking her self-sufficiency and her pomposity (not to mention her sexual preference). If Stein was guilty of hiding behind a gendered mask, Hemingway was no less so. Indeed, the persona he carefully developed over the years to hide from the public — and from himself, it might be fair to add — revolves around notions of gender, of how men and women are meant to act in the modern Western world. The figure Hemingway cut as a drinker, a sportsman, and a *bon vivant* relied on the patriarchal construct of the expert male, the man well versed in the manly arts who is always able (and eager) to expound wisdom on any subject. His adoption of this stereotype is perhaps best distilled in the nickname "Papa," which he took for himself at the tender age of twenty-seven — and the public Hemingway certainly came across as the

paternalistic voice of authority on any number of topics from fishing to fine dining, from boxing to bull-fighting.<sup>2</sup> The audacity not only of choosing his own nickname but of choosing such a self-aggrandizing one is a reminder of the sort of person Hemingway wanted the world to believe he was. Yet chinks in his macho (and smug) armor were visible, as Stein's insights confirm. It was indeed only a matter of time before the world found out Hemingway's real story. Over the last fifteen years, we have come to understand and to delineate better his sometimes confusing, and often confused, ideas about human identity, and in this context the comments Stein made about her former pupil become all the more interesting. Her evaluation rightly focuses on two of Hemingway's most enduring traits, his secretiveness and his interest in self-definition, a tandem that is surely at the heart of his doubts about himself and his world.<sup>3</sup>

The questions of sexuality and gender which Stein was inadvertently pointing to as the most crucial elements in an analysis of Hemingway's work have long been a part of critical debate on him, though rarely in the consciously theoretical manner of the last decade. This focus comes as little surprise, of course, considering that these matters occur in almost every text. The fact that Hemingway came of age at the same time as there was a blossoming of psychological inquiry into sexuality surely accounts for part of his interest. It is an intriguing and suggestive detail, for example, that he was born right around the time that Freud's ideas about human development and identity were starting also to take shape.<sup>4</sup> As the themes of Hemingway's later work prove, this is no unimportant coincidence. In many ways, Hemingway was as interested as Freud in coming to terms with ideas of human self-definition, though he certainly lacked Freud's scientific expertise and supposed clinical detachment. Partly because of Freud, in the first years of the twentieth century people were

beginning openly to question earlier sexual assumptions, and, though there is no evidence that Hemingway was knowledgeable about Freud's theories (much less enamoured of them), it is difficult to conceive that the general interest in matters sexual and psychological could have escaped him.<sup>5</sup>

The psychology of sex was in the air for intelligent people in the early years of the century, aided by the growing popularity of the work of such men as Freud, Richard von Krafft-Ebing, and Havelock Ellis. With revaluations of human sexuality beginning to create a stir in quarters far removed from the scientific societies and institutions that had formerly debated the workings of the human mind, and with psychology coming into the purview of average people, Hemingway was no more immune to debates about sex than others. Thus while Freud seems not to have sparked Hemingway's interest, just the opposite is true of Ellis.<sup>6</sup> Actually Ellis was quite suited to Hemingway's own sexual disposition, according to Hemingway biographer Michael Reynolds, a fact that might account for his preference for the British expert over Freud:

how like the writer [Hemingway] became that he should have read Ellis so studiously. Freud might explain the psychology of sexual behavior, but Ellis gave his readers a potpourri of Krafft-Ebing, case histories, clinical descriptions, and classical references. The psychologists were interested in the *why* of behavior; Ellis, like Hemingway, was interested in the *what*. (*YH* 122)

Certainly Ellis's frankness would intrigue and stimulate most twenty-one-year-old men, and a personal interest may also be presumed, given that many of the behaviors Ellis discusses are visible in Hemingway's fiction and private life.<sup>7</sup> Beyond the obvious lure of titillation that Ellis might have had, Hemingway's choice of him over Freud is important, Reynolds goes on to explain, due to the fact that, while "Hemingway was not uninterested in the psychological motivations of his characters [,] . . . [the] central concern in his mature

fiction would be with how his characters spoke and acted, not why they behaved as they did" (YH 122).

This denial of Hemingway's interest in psychological motivation, however, may be muddying the waters. While it is true that his overt concerns in fiction were not turned towards understanding his characters or himself in clear and precise terms, it is impossible to deny that in much of his work Hemingway does appear to comprehend the reasons for his characters' actions and beliefs, albeit on some less-than-conscious level. For instance, Catherine Bourne's frustration with social conventions and cultural definitions of human identity in *The Garden of Eden* hints at Hemingway's own need to cry out against such things, while Robert Jordan's refusal to let his impending death spoil his time with Maria suggests the writer's desire to remain optimistic about the cathartic potential of human relationships. Of course, trying to transform Hemingway into a deliberately political artist in terms of his investigations into gender and sexuality is an almost impossible task. However, it must be conceded that, as he aged, he appears to have been dealing more closely with his doubts about human existence and human artistry, in an attempt (though ultimately a vain one) to answer them once and for all.

While his interest in Freudian methods of investigation may be suspect, then, a glance at the developing sensibilities in his major novels indicates that, for the length of his career, Hemingway was indeed interested in psychology and personal motivation. And it is this fact that suggests an intellectual sympathy for beliefs like those Cixous would later theorize. Her arguments as to writing's ability to help the writer reject societal definitions of personal identity do appear to come through in books like *The Sun Also Rises*, *A Farewell to Arms*, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, and *The Garden of Eden*, establishing a

plausible argument that Hemingway did indeed develop an interest in human psychological motivation as his life and writing progressed. From *Sun* to *Garden* he moved ever closer to being that rarest of artists for Cixous, a man able — if not always consciously willing — to let his femininity be reflected in his writing. By exploring his developing sensitivity to questions of personal, sexual, and even artistic identity in the major works (questions that look remarkably like those Cixous was to pose years later), we can come to recognize Hemingway's discomfort with available definitions of gender and his desire to define himself by a less strict code.

Cixous's part in this is made clearer if we recognize that her theory is one of inclusiveness rather than of exclusivity. Without a doubt, she is eager to defend society against the evils of masculine privilege; however, her method is not to circle the feminist wagons or light out for a feminine territory. Instead, she envisions a *rapprochement* between male and female, the creation of a society that admits both genders and sexes without fear of discrimination, and, significantly for our connection of her ideas with Hemingway's novels, it is through writing, she believes, that this can be achieved. While words represent for Cixous a tool with which male society has effected the subjugation of women, she wants not to create a new feminine-only speech, but rather to modify language so as to render the political importance of gender difference obsolete. As Sellers points out, for Cixous "a feminine economy of writing does not . . . mean the negation or obliteration of the self since this would merely reverse the dialectic between self and other" (18). In other words, to construct an inverse system to phallogentrism would succeed only in substituting one tyranny for another.

Instead, Cixous has hopes of "getting rid of words like 'feminine' and 'masculine,'

'femininity' and 'masculinity,' even 'man' and 'woman'" altogether (*NBW* 129). Her hope is not to destroy the concept of gender difference, but to obliterate the politically weighted terms by which it is expressed. Instead of falsifying experience by using such loaded terms, politically neutral language would allow people to accept difference as creative and powerful, rather than as a challenge to be overcome (from whatever gendered or political side).<sup>8</sup> "Language distracts us," she argues. "We let ourselves be led aside by grammar, we let ourselves be distanced from objects by sentences, we let language double us, let it throw itself surreptitiously in front of objects before we can attain them" (Quoted in Conley, *Hélène Cixous* 79). Hemingway knew this, too, as is implied by his public use of a non-intellectual manner of speaking to dissociate himself from what he often considered the effeminate world of literature. Clearly, the complicating of traditional ideas about the distinction between masculinity and femininity is very much at stake in any attempt to view Hemingway as a conflicted writer worried about the categories of identity available to people. The further fact that Hemingway made his explorations through his art also fits well with Cixous's ideas about the possible uses of writing.

Literature becomes for Cixous the primary method of escaping the false distinction between men and women. It is in writing, she believes, that the political machinations inherent in gender relations are left behind:

Everyone knows that a place exists which is not economically or politically indebted to all the vileness and compromise. That is not obliged to reproduce the system. That is writing. If there is a somewhere else that can escape the infernal repetition, it lies in that direction, where *it* writes itself, where *it* dreams, where *it* invents new worlds. (*NBW* 72)

The newly invented world Cixous envisions comes about through writing that is sensitive to the fact of difference's not being a means to power, in other words, through a feminine

writing. Feminine writing is unfazed by difference, Cixous argues. It does not try to co-opt difference for political ends. Rather, it revels in difference as a means of bringing together opposing masculine and feminine factions. In a feminine piece of writing, “[e]ach [faction] would take the risk of *other*, of difference, without feeling threatened by the existence of an otherness, rather, delighting to increase through the unknown that is there to discover, to respect, to favor, to cherish” (NBW 78). Reading becomes for Cixous a search for this kind of writing that allows “a recognition of one by the other,” a movement away from the dialectical model of gender difference that forces hierarchy. The importance of this idea to Hemingway Studies is easily gauged given that in much of his work Hemingway, too, seems eager to complicate the typical (and simplistic) gender distinctions made by masculine cultural practice. Catherine Bourne’s desperate need to forge her own identity rather than have it forged for her, Robert Jordan’s assurance to Maria that they are a part of one another even in death, Frederic Henry’s introduction by Catherine Barkley to a committed and loving relationship, and Brett Ashley’s refusal to abide by masculine codes of dress and appearance, all signal a tendency on Hemingway’s part to explore questions of sexuality, gender and personal identity along different lines than his society typically endorsed.

Of course, Cixous’s naming this function of writing in gendered terms seems at first to deny the thrust of part of her argument and may appear also to invalidate Hemingway’s writing as an example of feminine artistry. Like Hemingway, Cixous herself is by no means free from the tendency of language to essentialize differences. For instance, Conley points out that, although for Cixous “the political gesture of writing consists in pushing back death and its phantasms[,] . . . in [her] early texts . . . there is a tendency to equate

death with the masculine and life with the feminine” (*Writing* 16). The hierarchizing of gender experience Cixous performs, though, is not so inimical to existence as patriarchal gender ranking; while *écriture féminine* denies primacy to a masculine economy of repression and power struggles, it is still involved in a system of exchange with the male principle. Unlike masculine models of writing that deny the other (both inside and outside the self), therefore, writing of a feminine kind refuses the monolithic position of unassailable subjectivity, refuses culturally defined notions of unity. As Sellers notes, for example, Cixous’s feminine writer “adopts a number of places simultaneously” (12). In this way, feminine writing necessitates a sympathy for the external in that the self must experience the other in a system of exchange. Thus, for feminist humanism, the interplay between male and female, masculine and feminine, or, more broadly, between self and other is (or should be) based always on reciprocity: “[w]hereas a masculine economy requires a strict delineation of property (from the ownership of one’s body onwards to the ownership of the fruits of one’s labour and so on), a feminine economy is one (of proximity) of taking the other into oneself and being taken into the other also. A feminine economy is about mutual knowing” (Still 57). In creating women like Catherine Barkley or Catherine Bourne, both of whom desire to create open and lasting bonds with their mates by means of sexual or gender experimentation, Hemingway exposes a similar belief in the need for people to reach beyond themselves.

The exchange between masculinity and femininity in Cixous’s theory countermands the laws of the patriarchy, denying the Lacanian notion that human life is based on loss. For Cixous, the possibility of finding or producing *écriture féminine* entails the shrugging off of Lacan’s idea of desire as negative, founded on lack, separation and death. Instead,

feminine writing is a praising of life — “an action, having an efficacy,” according to Conley (*Writing* 16). What feminine writing does is to open up possibilities rather than to shut them off as masculine writing tends to do. Yet in a curious twist, it allows readers in expressly by means of a system of loss. That is to say, the reader of *écriture féminine* loses his or her feeling of self-containment and self-adequation, gives up self-sufficiency to allow an interchange with the other. There is, of course, a fidelity to traditional Lacanian tenets inherent in this notion. As Lacan makes clear, language creates the splitting of the subject into self and other — the mother/child bond broken into its separate components of mother and child. However, counter to Lacanian principles that posit the detrimental effect this has on the child, Cixous wants to show that the exchange between reader and text (or reader and writer, to move back a step so as to involve two people) is not a damnation to separation but a salvation. Feminine writing is salvific because it encourages a transformation in and of the reader and because it allows an entry into a relationship with the external world that is otherwise not open to us.

Writing thus becomes for Cixous “a having without limits, without restriction; but without any ‘deposit,’ a having that doesn’t withhold or possess, a having-love that sustains itself with loving, in the blood rapport” (“Coming to Writing” 4). This having or sharing in turn becomes the site where pleasure is found — “where separation doesn’t separate; where absence is animated, taken back from silence and stillness. In the assault of love on nothingness.” Such an understanding of love as the destruction of oblivion can also help to establish an affinity between Cixous’s theories and Hemingway’s writing if we recall the themes of “A Clean Well-Lighted Place.” In this story, Hemingway is fundamentally concerned with the encroachment of nothingness on human life. The old man’s need to stay

late in the café as a measure against isolation and the older waiter's parodic version of the Lord's Prayer, with its repetition of *nada*, give evidence of Hemingway's views on human interaction and our need to maintain communication — precisely the thing Cixous is desirous of creating through feminine writing.

Of course, it is not simply, perhaps not even primarily, through fraternal male interaction such as we find in this story that Hemingway explores the notion of human relationships. Given that he was deeply concerned with gender identity and sexuality, it is not surprising that his most common investigations into notions of self-definition involve male-female love relationships, and here too his work is well aligned with Cixous's theory since pleasure and love — often sexual love — are integral to her system of *écriture féminine*. It is only by means of love and sexual enjoyment (*jouissance*) that a reciprocity or openness to the other is possible; pleasurable activities stimulate love, she argues, which in turn stimulates generosity, thus countering appropriation and enslavement. This focus on love and pleasure leads feminist humanism to view sexual relations both as a metaphor for the differing economies of masculinity and femininity and as an arena for effecting social change. In other words, sexual excitement shows how men and women are different, but, by bringing them together, it also offers a clue to destroying the phallogocentric manipulation of their differences. This possibility exists partly because feminism views male sexuality and female sexuality as inherently opposed phenomena: while the male principle is based on partition, domination, and limitation, female sexuality emphasizes combination, equality, and unboundedness. Notions of abundance and excess, therefore, become key to a view of female sexuality for Cixous, as they do for most feminists. In a phallogocentric context, female sexuality is subjugated to male desire: women *offer* themselves to men or,

conversely, are *had* or *taken by* men.<sup>9</sup> Such a devaluing of the feminine must stop, Cixous and other feminists argue, if women are ever to gain autonomous control over their sexual identity.

Such an interplay between male-dominant and female-dominant sex and between the relative cultural acceptability of each is also at stake in Hemingway's inquiries into human sexuality. His career-long interest in experimenting both physically and fictionally with sexual position and role-playing suggests his own desire to rethink male-female sexual interaction. For one thing, the hard-to-follow sex scenes in his work often complicate a typically masculine approach to intercourse by making it difficult to know who is doing what to whom, while the importance he places on sex, as well as the interest he has in its revivifying and melding effects for lovers, indicates a further connection between his attitudes and Cixous's. Like his description of the reciprocal joy available to loving partners in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, the importance of female sexuality for Cixous lies in its generosity and openness to the other. This does not mean simply a woman's giving of herself to a man, but rather the generousness of her proportions. Unlike men, whose sexuality is based on, and whose pleasure is centered in, the penis, women are endowed, as far as most feminists (including Cixous) are concerned, with many erogenous zones. In addition to the multiple sites of pleasure open to them, women are capable of experiencing many pleasures at once through multiple orgasm. This means that, from a feminist viewpoint, woman's attitude to pleasure is different than man's, and so cannot be explained by male systems of pleasure. The often confusing descriptions Hemingway gives of sexual intercourse might be thought of as anachronistic version of such a feminine approach to love making, ignoring or refusing words and actions commonly associated with masculine

erotic discourse.

This sense of women's sexual boundlessness links to ideas of identity and writing for Cixous through the fact that feminine writing, like feminine sexuality, moves beyond masculine modes of meaning:

At the present time, *defining* a feminine practice of writing is impossible with an impossibility that will continue; for this practice will never be able to be *theorized*, enclosed, coded, which does not mean that it does not exist. But it will always exceed the discourse governing the phallogentric system; it takes place and will take place somewhere other than in the territories subordinated to philosophical-theoretical domination. It will not let itself think except through subjects that break automatic functions, border runners never subjugated to authority. (NBW 92)

The effort behind making a feminine writing lies in the fervent hope of countering an appropriative view of the world. The masculine tendency, Cixous observes, is to render the other controllable, to make it a piece of merchandise which is saleable, but which remains aware that it has been bought and is therefore a possession not an equal — the gender or sexual equivalent of slavery. According to Sellers: “willingness to enable and sing the other, rather than appropriate the other's difference in order to constrain it and glorify the self in accordance with masculine law, is the keynote of *écriture féminine*” (10). The author's mandate, then, is the allowance of multiple voices for the purpose of trying to find truth, and for Cixous the truth is to be found in a valorization of otherness, of “the ideal harmony, reached by few . . . , [of] assembling everything and being capable of generosity, of spending” (NBW 131). In his creation of believable and sympathetic female characters from the beginning to the end of his career, from Liz in “Up in Michigan” (written in 1922) to Catherine Bourne in *The Garden of Eden*, Hemingway might be viewed as having engaged in such a form of writing.<sup>10</sup> To be sure, the fact of a male author's writing from a female perspective was nothing new when Hemingway started. There are,

however, important implications about his career in the fact that he, a man, tried from the outset to understand what it meant to be female or feminine.

This has to do with the fact that Cixous adamantly maintains that biological sex has little — if anything — to do with the creation of feminine writing. Singer explains: “[g]iven that sexual difference is always a political determination, not a biological one, feminine writing differs not by virtue of the gender of the author, but on the basis of the textual strategies it employs” (147). According to Cixous’s theory, then, men are capable of writing in a feminine mode as well as women. Certainly they are less prone to do so given the social factors abetting the segregation of the genders: male feminine writers are fewer simply because in a phallogentric society femininity is only allowed or accepted in women, never in men. Given the relative unimportance of biology, however, this does not stop male authors from becoming scribes of *écriture féminine*. It is only necessary that men accept femininity, something Hemingway seems prepared to do in a number of texts. The possibility for such acceptance results from the fact that, as Cixous argues, all people contain both masculinity and femininity. The trick lies in allowing both facets to communicate. What she proposes, therefore, is “a reconsideration of *bisexuality*. To reassert the value of bisexuality,” which involves “the location within oneself of both sexes, evident and insistent in different ways according to the individual, the nonexclusion of difference or of a sex” (NBW 85).<sup>11</sup> If we recall Catherine Bourne’s gender-bending experiments, Catherine Barkley’s insistence that she and Frederic Henry are really the same person, or Robert Jordan’s insistence that Maria will carry him inside her wherever she goes, it is not difficult to imagine that Hemingway thought along much the same lines as Cixous concerning the combination of gender identities in men and women.

Despite bisexuality's being open to both sexes, however, Cixous does admit that men are less likely to adopt such a stance and embrace their femininity:

[f]or historical reasons, at the present time it is woman who benefits from and opens up within this bisexuality, . . . man having been trained to aim for glorious phallic monosexuality. . . . It is much harder for man to let the other come through him. . . . [Therefore,] rare are the men able to venture onto the brink where writing, freed from law, unencumbered by moderation, exceeds phallic authority, and where the subjectivity inscribing its effects becomes feminine. (*NBW* 85-86)

Yet there are to be found certain cases of the male feminine writer, Cixous insists — men such as Shakespeare, Genet, and German dramatist Heinrich von Kleist, for example. And perhaps a case can be made that Hemingway, too, struggles with human identity much in the way Cixous explains and that he comes to many similar conclusions about the nature of human sexuality and gender formation. Indeed throughout his fictional explorations, Hemingway seems to maintain quite a fidelity to principles Cixous would later establish for the creation of a bisexual writing, from his anxiousness always to make his stories ring true to his explorations of gender-meshing, from his severance of art and politics to his very writing style. The writer's craft was, for Hemingway, an attempt to come to terms with who he was in a complicated psychosexual sense, and his fluctuating attitudes towards masculinity and femininity, as well as his search for a method by which to live in the complex social structure of the twentieth century, bespeak a certain kinship with Cixous's feminist humanism.

As an artist, Hemingway was consumed with the need to make his writing live, to make it as true as possible. "It is certainly hell to try and write" (*SL* 275), he once wrote to his second wife, Pauline. In part, the hell of it surely lay in trying to create a truth in his work, something Cixous also sought. The key to writing, she explains, is the evasion of

falsehoods and lies.<sup>12</sup> Only by avoiding falsity may a writer “bring forth life,” as she quotes Cézanne. The desire centers around “the need not to lie, not to veil in writing.” She continues:

“It’s so difficult not to lie when one writes. And maybe even in the need to write in order to lie less, to scrape the scales away, the too-rich words, to undecorate, unveil. In the need not to submit the subject of writing, of painting, to the laws of cultural cowardice and habit.

In the need, which doesn’t mean its execution, not to make things pretty, not to make things clean, when they are not; not to do the right thing. But, whatever the price, to do the true thing. (“The Last Painting” 113)

Just such a fidelity to the true thing does Hemingway try to find. As he explains in “Soldier’s Home,” lying has the effect of falsifying experience even for the liar. In trying to tell his war stories to people, Harold Krebs finds “that to be listened to at all he [has] to lie, and after he [has] done this twice, he, too, [has] a reaction against the war and against talking about it. A distaste for everything that . . . happened to him in the war set[s] in because of the lies he [has] told” (*Complete Short Stories* 111). The truth is the only thing that will not cause personal anguish, Hemingway is implying, even if that truth is hard to stomach, and, as Cixous suggests writers should do, he refuses to sugar-coat rough scenes. This is made clear on the opening page of *Death in the Afternoon*, where he defends his bullfighting treatise against potential detractors:

I suppose, from a modern moral point of view, that is, a Christian point of view, the whole bullfight is indefensible; there is certainly much cruelty, there is always danger, either sought or unlooked for, and there is always death, and I should not try to defend it now, only to tell honestly the things I have found true about it. To do this I must be frank, or try to be, and if those who read this decide with disgust that it is written by some one who lacks their, the readers’, fineness of feeling I can only plead that this may be true. (1)

Potentially disgusting topics cannot be left out of writing for the sake of a weak societal

stomach, both Hemingway and Cixous believe. Writing must move beyond the constraints of the cultural norm to depict what the world is really like. This is not to imply that writing must be transgressive or that it has to shock, only that if it is transgressive or shocking this is not a detraction from its artistry but a fidelity to reality.

For both authors, then, the moral outlook of society weighs heavily in a writer's creation of art. Cixous discusses the bisexual artist's relationship to the phallogocentric law as being one not of transgression, however, but of evasion altogether. The feminine approach, she argues, is not a flouting of the laws of male society but a refusal to appear before them; only in a masculine economy of confrontation can the transgression of law occur. To an extent, such an attitude might be visible in certain of Hemingway's reactions to twentieth-century cultural practice as well. The very choice to publish *Death in the Afternoon*, for example, could be considered one instance of his ignoring laws (namely the rule of market value that favors fiction over encyclopedic non-fiction) in order to maintain a fidelity to his art. For that matter, the writing of a book like *The Garden of Eden* might be viewed more as a rewriting of the laws of gender and sexuality than a disobeying of them, though Hemingway was finally unable to overcome his own doubts about the work and publish it in his lifetime. The important idea in each case is the need for rebellion. The only way that the stifling phallic law can be changed is through an openness to otherness: "[t]here is something of the other that cannot be transmitted unless there is a political revolution such that a masculine man will let go of his phallic position and accept, *without even understanding*, the possibility of something else" (Cixous, *Readings* 27 [my italics]). It is necessary to emphasize, of course, that Hemingway was not self-consciously rewriting his culture's definitions of sexuality and gender; yet, as Cixous points out, the unconscious

attempt cannot be discounted in favor of the conscious. Thus Hemingway's fumbling towards a discovery of his sexuality and gender identity is no less valid than, say, the more overt experiments of other artists with whom he spent time in the heyday of expatriate Paris in the 1920s.

The trouble, Cixous notes, is that femininity has been stymied by the patriarchy: "[t]here always has been femininity from time immemorial but it has been repressed. It has never been unnamed, only suppressed. But it constantly reappears everywhere" (*Readings* 3). While Hemingway would never have admitted publicly that it perhaps reappeared in him, he would have no choice but to concur that it was certainly always appearing around him, and exposure to it clearly had a strong effect on him, as is evident from *The Sun Also Rises*, the book that developed out of his early Paris experience with men and women engaged more actively in Cixousian sorts of pursuits. This is perhaps not overly surprising since Cixous explains that first novels often offer the best indication of a writer's femininity:

one finds more femininity in texts that are written 'close to the savage heart' [a reference to Brazilian novelist Clarice Lispector's first book], in texts that are still close to sources, springs, to myth and to the beginnings of literary movements before they become institutionalized. Literature is like history. It is organized so as to repress and hide its own origin which always deals with some kind of femininity. (*Readings* 3)

Cixous's contention that beginnings are of great importance in exposing a writer's relationship to the feminine meshes nicely with Hemingway's own literary history, given that, as he grew in status and fame, it became more and more difficult for him to admit his femininity. Looking at *Sun* is important because it offers a view of Hemingway before he became institutionalized and before his doubts about the social definitions of gender and sexuality made him feel forced to bury publicly embarrassing manuscripts like *The Garden*

of *Eden*. Since Cixous argues that, in order to uncover why an author writes, it is necessary to investigate what she calls “texts that are as close as possible to an inscription — conscious or unconscious — of the origin of the gesture of writing and not writing itself” (*Readings* 1), the investigation into Hemingway’s genders in his first major work seems justified.

While first impressions can be lasting ones, they do not always disclose objects in their entirety. So though it may be valid to start with Hemingway’s earliest novel, it is not enough to end there. Cixous tells us that last works are just as important as first ones. In “Extreme Fidelity,” she imagines the final days of an author who, knowing of his or her imminent death, speculates on life and the universe:

Sitting on the edge of the earth the author is already almost no one. The phrases which come from the heart to the lips are released from the book. They are beautiful like the work, but they will never be published, and before the imminence of the starred silence, they hasten, assemble, and say the essential. They are a sublime farewell to life; not mourning, but acknowledgement. (9)

That last writings can “say the essential” means a great deal for Hemingway studies, given the complexity of the final narratives on which he worked, though he did not live to see any of them published except for the rambling articles in *Life* magazine that would be developed after his death into *The Dangerous Summer* (1985). The manuscripts that would eventually be published as *A Moveable Feast* (1964), *Islands in the Stream* (1970), *True at First Light* (1999), and, most significantly, *The Garden of Eden*, all convey to varying degrees the mark of a man vainly trying to define himself and his world, especially in terms of gender, sexual, and artistic identity.

Of course, in addressing the literary development of the questions Hemingway had about masculinity and femininity, from first novel to last, we must not overlook the

complexity of his personal life. Indeed, it is that very complexity which appears responsible for making him think along Cixousian lines in the first place. As a man, Hemingway was deeply ambivalent about questions of gender, and that uncertainty is reflected in the hyper-masculine persona he adopted in public to hide the doubts that are so apparent in his writing. In the public exterior he created for himself, we can see a good example of the masculine attitude Cixous says *écriture féminine* tries so hard to eradicate. As deftly and painstakingly created as any of his best works of fiction, the myth that Hemingway made himself into starting in the 1930s, and that followed — or dogged — him to his death, portrayed him as the absolute man's man, a man who knew all the right things and had all the right experiences, a man with just the right amount of machismo and nonchalance to be considered a hero of phallogentric society. The legend of the womanizing, thrill-craving, death-defying yet death-seeking misogynist is a familiar portrait for casual readers. People who know little else about Hemingway believe that he scorned all things unmanly — cowardice, homosexuality, effeminacy — all those concepts inimical to masculinity's view of itself.

Yet evidence of Hemingway's dilemma over personal identity can be found in the very stories he told in the molding of his personal mythos. A great many of the tales that circulated, and in some cases continue to circulate, about his exploits and conquests have little more than a shred of truth to them, if that. Such claims as being one-eighth Cherokee Indian or having served with the Italian Arditi shock troops during World War I point to the concern he had over what it meant to be a gendered human being in the twentieth century. Even in these two minor and quite disparate examples, a common thread may be found. That Hemingway should lay claim to Native American heritage may seem strange,

but the fact that he fetishized race — and all its corollary importance to notions of masculinity and femininity — leads the reader to imagine that invoking himself as an Indian warrior was one method of trying to establish a firm gender.<sup>13</sup> The lie about his military service also exposes his crisis of identity in that the Arditi were the most battle-hardened and toughest of Italy's fighting force, and calling himself an adopted brother of strong, brave, *masculine* men was a way of showing people that he was such a man himself. Needless to say, these and other tall tales smack of protesting too much, and the more private, inner Hemingway who is revealed in the writing proves that this pose of macho breast-beating exposed only half of his reaction to the quandary of self-identity in which he found himself.

Despite his bravado and braggadocio, Hemingway seems never to have been completely at ease with who he was. His adoption, for instance, of the mentor role over almost all of the people he befriended (regardless of whether they might, in fact, be older than he) bespeaks the need he felt to be in command of his identity. He wanted to fashion himself as he believed he should be. Yet even in saying this, there is the risk of implying that he had a true understanding of what he wanted to be. The dual life he led, not just in the battle between his public and private personae but even between the facets of his outward appearance, speaks to the incongruities of his character. Throughout his adult life he maintained an identity as both an intellectual and an anti-intellectual, portraying himself as the sportsman's thinker as well as the thinking man's sportsman. In the complex modern world, he could at once be the hero of the academic and of the adventurer because he maintained a simultaneous affiliation with both worlds — a dual possibility that surely emphasized for him the dichotomous nature of society.

Actually, the stage for such a marriage had been set long before Hemingway emerged from the wings and into the spotlight; physical fitness and intellectual vigor were the watchwords of early-twentieth-century America during Hemingway's formative years. The figure of Teddy Roosevelt, for example, who undertook a number of adventures from safaris to wars but who also made sure to turn them into art by writing about them, loomed large in the first years of the 1900s. In fact, Hemingway was greatly enamoured of Roosevelt (something not at all uncommon for young boys of the time) and even had a miniature version of the President's safari costume (Lynn 15).<sup>14</sup> Combined with this hero-worship was a general avocation of physical fitness in the United States at the time. In their study of American white masculinity, for instance, Joseph and Elizabeth Pleck identify the period of 1861-1919 as a time of anti-intellectualism, male dominance of the business world, and an emphasis on fitness (21-28). The importance of this trend to the formation of Hemingway's ideas on gender is clear if we remember both his and his parents' birth dates: Dr. Clarence "Ed" Hemingway was born in 1871, the future Mrs. Hemingway, Grace Hall, in 1872, and Ernest in 1899. Of further significance is the place of their births, the affluent and, more importantly, ultra-conservative Chicago suburb of Oak Park.<sup>15</sup>

Like America generally during these years, Oak Park was a place of contradictions, and the incongruities he observed could hardly have been lost on the maturing Hemingway. On the one hand, the town was notorious for its strictness concerning social rules and moralities, its very founding having been a form of rebellion against the dissolution Chicago seemed to be suffering in the nineteenth century. Considering themselves morally superior to their Chicagoan neighbors, Oak Parkers prided themselves on disallowing saloons and other morally dubious places. In fact, the community was full of churches

almost to the point where no bar could have found building space to set up shop; as the pastor of the Hemingways' church, Dr. William Barton, once bragged, Oak Park is where "the saloon stops and the church steeples begin" (quoted in Meyers, *Biography* 4). On the other hand, though, the townspeople were strangely permissive and socially far ahead of the rest of the country in numerous ways. For instance, tradition forbade the vote to women in national elections until 1919, but Oak Park allowed local votes to its female citizens eight years before national suffrage came about (Reynolds, *YH* 12-13). Furthermore, unlike newspapers in other cities, which refused female autonomy, *Oak Leaves* referred to certain women by their own names instead of their husbands'.<sup>16</sup> Hemingway's growing up in an environment such as this surely had an effect on how he came to understand society and the complexity of social existence, an effect compounded by the fact of his family's emulation of the town's incongruities, particularly in terms of the roles, restrictions, and privileges available to its men and women. To be sure, both his paternal and maternal families maintained certain traditions with a rigorous tenacity. For example, Dr. Hemingway refused to allow his children to dance, whether in the home or at organized balls, and Grace's father, Ernest Hall (after whom Hemingway was named), demanded prayer before every meal. In many ways, though, the home in which Ernest grew up inverted the usual patriarchal power structure.<sup>17</sup>

To an extent, it was his mother who was head of the family, at least in financial terms, for during many of the early years of the Hemingway-Hall marriage Grace's income was significantly higher than her husband's, without taking into account her inheritance from her father (Lynn 33). In attitude, as well, Grace dominated. Though Ed could be stubborn and forceful, it was she who had ultimate control. On numerous occasions, such

as her decision to build a separate cabin for herself at the family's summer retreat at Walloon Lake in Michigan (a suggestion with which Ed loudly disagreed), Grace would not brook his interference and went ahead with her plans despite his concerns. Conversely, while she acted as the breadwinner and decision-maker, it was Dr. Hemingway who carried out many of the household chores, most notably the shopping and cooking. Ed was quite a good cook, and took up the duty as much out of enjoyment as necessity. Cooking had, in fact, long been a favorite hobby of his, and he often told his children nostalgically about a geological trek through North Carolina with friends, during which he had been camp cook (Sanford 36).<sup>18</sup>

At the same time as these tendencies countered traditional male duties, though, much of what Hemingway witnessed in his father reinforced masculine social traditions. As might be expected of a man living on a frontier of sorts (Oak Park still bordered on fields and forests in the last quarter of the nineteenth century), Dr. Hemingway was an avid outdoorsman, a student of fishing, hiking, and general backwoods knowledge. It was from him that Ernest learned most of his lessons about the natural world, many of them during Sunday trips through the wilderness outside town when the doctor took a group of neighborhood children on sightseeing tours, telling them the names and habits of numerous birds and pointing out the edible and poisonous plants (Lynn 34-35). Like Ernest's other heroes such as Roosevelt and the characters of Rudyard Kipling (whose books Hemingway enjoyed),<sup>19</sup> Ed conformed to the Victorian model of masculinity and became an attractive figure for Ernest to model himself after, despite his later bitterness at the doctor's suicide.

The artistic side of Hemingway's personality derived more from his mother, herself a failed operatic star (or so she claimed) and a local voice teacher in Oak Park who

commanded high prices and held many students. In fact, when she and Ed were building a house for themselves after the death of her father and their moving out of his house — albeit only to settle across the street — she had a large music room constructed in which to hold her lessons and give private concerts. Encourage him though she did, however, Grace's musical talents did not transmit to her son; nor did her enthusiasm — while he was made to take cello lessons and perform in the school band, Ernest apparently did not take to music as his mother did.<sup>20</sup> Indeed, music would always play second (or third) fiddle to literature and art for Hemingway. When searching for metaphors with which to describe his fiction or his approach to writing, he usually relied on art, and frequently on Cézanne.<sup>21</sup> Whatever his relationship to music versus the other fine arts, the fact that Grace often took him with his siblings to various concerts and galleries in Chicago and Oak Park was to have the effect of engendering in Hemingway a sensitivity to the *beaux arts* that would remain as strong in him as his love of the outdoors.

In addition to the curiously mixed messages that he received from his family situation and from American society at large, and in a far more profound way, Hemingway was thrust into a world of gender confusion by his mother's habit of dressing him as a little girl for the first few years of his life. Admittedly male infants were typically clothed in dresses for their first two or so years; however, Grace carried on the practice longer than was usual. Her desire for twin children (or possibly for a second daughter) moved her to treat baby Ernest and Marcelline (born a year and a half before him) as same-sex twins, dressing them in identical girls' dresses and giving them matching girls' haircuts through Hemingway's fourth year, though she did sometimes force Marcelline to match Ernest in little boy's attire and coiffure (Lynn 38-43). The extent to which these changes had a

psychological impact on either child is difficult to determine, yet it is undeniable that Hemingway grew up noticeably to dislike his older sister, a feeling she reciprocated with intensity. It is not too much to suggest that a possible reason for this shared scorn might lie in their both being forced to adopt the other's gender in early life.<sup>22</sup> Regardless of the rift or its ostensible cause, Grace's actions hinted at (if not provoked) the fascination with sexuality and gender that her son would later manifest, both in life and art.

In many ways, then, Hemingway's boyhood sparked many of the quandaries about men and women he was to wrestle with all his life. From the general social tenor of the times, he learned a love of physical activity and was inclined away from overly intellectual (read, effeminate) pastimes, while in such men as Roosevelt, he witnessed the coming together of these ideals. By way of his upbringing in forward-thinking yet tradition-bound Oak Park, he saw how restrictive gender identity could be, even as he witnessed evidence to the contrary. From his own family history, especially the examples provided by his parents, he came to feel, consciously or otherwise, that one's gender was at once dictated by and, paradoxically, seemingly uninfluenced by one's sex. Finally, through his childhood ordeals of conflicted gender identities, he experienced the difficult reality that gender can be both externally and internally created.<sup>23</sup> All of this was soon to become grist to his literary mill when he left America for France and the further gender confusion of the artistic circles in which he was soon manoeuvring.

The fluidity of gender Hemingway had witnessed and indeed had been made to take part in early in life — even if he did not consciously understand it — must have been brought home to him again with his move to Paris in 1921, shortly after his marriage to Hadley Richardson. And, fittingly, it was now that questions of gender identity and

sexuality became intimately involved with questions of art and artistry. Ideas must certainly have begun to percolate in Hemingway's mind as he watched the activities and took in the appearances of some of the more flamboyant members of Paris's artistic community on the Left Bank, some of whom he knew slightly and others with whom he kept more intimate company. Many of these men and women were openly homosexual and, perhaps consequently, openly questioning of cultural definitions of personal identity. Part of their fascination for Hemingway was surely based on these facts, and on their refusal to abide by the nineteenth-century social norms surrounding sexuality and gender identity. When he arrived in post-war France, where the sight of such unconventional figures as Djuna Barnes or Gertrude Stein was an everyday occurrence, Hemingway again found himself in the midst of a great upheaval as, in Paris, he relived the confusion of tradition and progressiveness he had observed as a child growing up in Oak Park. For instance, though he envied the lifestyle of the artists and hangers-on of the Latin Quarter, he initially sided with the strict morality of his home town in disparaging them.<sup>24</sup> Yet the longer he lived in that atmosphere of bohemianism, the more fully he adopted it as his own, and it was not long before he too was to be found shabbily dressed, writing in Left Bank cafés, with empty saucers piled around him.

During those early years in France, a battle was being waged within Hemingway as to the proper roles men and women were meant to occupy in society. It was a battle instigated long before, when the goings-on around him in Oak Park brought to him conflicting reports as to the proper attitudes and behaviors appropriate for each sex. The troubling inconsistencies he witnessed concerning the true definitions of masculinity and femininity were beginning to have the effect of making him question whether the identity

available to him as a man was adequate to explain him fully to himself. The doubts that he began to register about the absolute nature of gender identity, the battle that he saw being waged around him — and that was surely being waged inside him — merely needed an outlet. The decision to write his first serious novel, in 1925, eventually offered that outlet, and *The Sun Also Rises* would become his first sustained examination of the available definitions of gender offered to men and women in the modern world. It would also mark his first sustained dissatisfaction with those definitions and search for a less oppressive alternatives.

## Chapter II

### *The Sun Also Rises:* Beginning the Search for Self

By the time Hemingway came to write *The Sun Also Rises*, the stories that had appeared previously in *In Our Time* had, of course, already offered a clue as to the fascination he had with questions of human identity. But *Sun* was to concentrate more sharply the confluence of sexuality, gender and social convention found in embryo in such stories as “Indian Camp,” “The End of Something,” and “The Three-Day Blow.”<sup>1</sup> As most readers will recognize, the novel deals overtly with the ramifications of changing attitudes towards gender and male-female sexual relationships. Like the real world Hemingway was watching change around him, “the world [of the novel] is out of sexual order” (Nagel, “Other Women” 94), its disorder epitomized by the turbulent relationships that the characters attempt to forge. In fact, he goes to some lengths to examine the problematic intersection of cultural rules and personal needs and desires in the book, showing a sensitivity towards the individual’s need for self-expression that offers a hint of his personal stake in the matter. As the twentieth century waxed, people began to challenge the forced conformity to Victorian gender and sexual codes, and Hemingway’s playing with the

categories of masculinity and femininity in *Sun* denotes a deeply felt need on his part to understand what the effect of these challenges would be.

For many critics, myself included, *Sun* remains ultimately just the sort of story Hemingway said it was: not “a hollow or bitter satire, but a damn tragedy” (quoted in Baker, *Writer as Artist* 81).<sup>2</sup> The downbeat ending which has Jake and Brett lamenting their failed lives (together, if not separately), not to mention the ominous epigraph from Gertrude Stein, leads some readers to imagine that in his first novel Hemingway was simply encapsulating the social angst of his post-war generation.<sup>3</sup> The book is more than a mere elegy, though, for the lost generation; it is also a record of the social change taking hold during Hemingway’s Paris years, an investigation into the various ways in which modern men and women were being molded by masculine culture and the various ways in which they tried to evade that molding. The tragedy of the book lies in the lack of options available to Jake and Brett, in the inevitability of their failure to maintain a relationship because it does not conform to societal expectations of men and women. Despite the macho image that would begin to crystallize around him within a few years of the book’s publication and his subsequent catapulting into the public eye, and despite some critics’ contention that in *The Sun Also Rises* Hemingway “launches his sharpest attack against the modern confusion of male and female roles” (Benson, *Writer’s Art* 30), he shows himself to be particularly sensitive to the problems of gender identity, though he was still at the rudimentary stages of trying to express it in his writing. And, in his responses to those problems, Hemingway created a book that deals with some startlingly Cixousian themes.

It becomes clear as the novel progresses that the ideal of gender relation Hemingway searches for, particularly in terms of Brett’s and Jake’s attitudes towards

themselves and each other, is a nascent form of the type of relationship Cixous believes is created in feminine writing. Through the main characters' coming to understand their positions in society and their desire not to let social strictures define them, *Sun* offers a preliminary example of the quandaries Hemingway faced and provides an inkling of how he would go on to address those concerns for the remainder of his career. Jake and Brett's apparent recognition of the cultural restrictions on gender and sexuality and their attempts to evade those restrictions by refusing male-enforced identity emphasize Hemingway's link to a feminist humanist theory of self-definition. The focus he brings to bear on Jake and Brett's mediation of masculinity and femininity (she by being a sexually free yet economically dependent woman, he by being a sexually incapable yet emotionally generous man) implies Hemingway's awareness of the trouble with trying to construct a unilateral gender identity.

Neither character is satisfied with the options available under a patriarchal system and both try to create their own sense of personal identity not based on cultural models of male and female behavior. Jake does this by becoming more feminine as the novel develops, becoming an example of Cixous's generous bisexual man capable of looking beyond himself. For Brett the problem and solution are rather different. As a woman in a man's world, she has been forced to adopt a masculine approximation of femininity. The task before her, if she is to become truly self-aware, is to evade that subjugation and think for herself. Ultimately, *Sun* offers a vision of the stultification of human relationships that occurs under a masculine system of identity, and, by showing Brett and Jake's acceptance of another system of relating to each other, Hemingway inadvertently provides a view of men and women consistent with Cixous's.<sup>4</sup> While it is not itself obviously a piece of

*écriture féminine*, then, *Sun* acts as an introduction to Hemingway's difficulty with the prescribed identities that a nineteenth-century male-dominated culture forced on men and women, showing how they must change if they are to relate to each other honestly and lovingly.

Hemingway's susceptibility to a fictional investigation of this sort was surely heightened by the romantic situation in which he found himself in 1925-26, around the time of the book's composition and revision, and these factors led *Sun* to deal far more directly with matters of sexuality and gender than the previous stories ever had. Of particular interest is the growing distance that seemed to be developing between Hadley and Ernest. Although he had never been the faithful husband she might have wanted, at least in the first years of their marriage Hemingway did not throw his affairs in her face. By 1925, though, his sense of decorum was slipping somewhat, especially after his introduction to two women who would begin to dominate his time and attention in the months to come: Pauline Pfeiffer, a *Vogue* correspondent from Arkansas living in Paris, and Lady Duff Twysden, a flirtatious and bibulous Englishwoman married to nobility. His and Hadley's meeting them that fateful spring was to have two important and divergent results. First, it led to the creation of *The Sun Also Rises*. Second, and unfortunately, it also spelled the death of his marriage.<sup>5</sup>

The effect Duff had on him was restricted mostly to a flirtation they shared during the Hemingway entourage's annual trip to the San Fermin bullfights at Pamplona in summer, 1925. While she was willing to trifle with Hemingway, Duff would not allow the affair to be carried any further, due both to her sense of propriety and to Hadley's presence. This did not stop Ernest from trying to consummate the affair, however, and his

infatuation with her was a poorly kept secret among the vacationing group, a fact that has often led to the supposition that Duff was the inspiration for Brett in the novel.<sup>6</sup> Certainly many of the incidents that found their way into the book were only thinly disguised versions of events Hemingway witnessed or took part in that season in Spain, and the publication of the novel, rumored to be a gossipy book about the Left Bank artistic community, was eagerly anticipated. However, it would be wrong to think of *Sun* as being simply a *roman à clef* with a list of notable personalities and a litany of minor scandals. To do so would be to ignore the important impact Pauline Pfeiffer had on Ernest's creation of the story and especially on its heroine.

In many ways, Pauline's contribution to the book was actually greater than Duff Twysden's, mainly because of the larger role she was soon to play in Hemingway's life. After having to watch her husband strut and preen himself before Duff in Pamplona, it must have been almost unbearable for Hadley to have to stand by as she saw Ernest become more and more attracted to Pauline as the fall of 1925 turned to winter. The attention he lavished on her that year in Paris and Schruns was surely irksome and disheartening for Hadley to endure. It must also have been difficult to ignore the fact that such occurrences were not isolated incidents but rather the symptom of a major problem with the marriage itself.<sup>7</sup> Yet true to his always mercurial temper, Hemingway maintained (to himself, as well as to Hadley) that he loved her still, in spite of or in addition to the other women who came in and out of his life. This certainly seems true of the triangulation of emotions passing among Hadley, Pauline and himself throughout late 1925 and early 1926; despite his now divided allegiances, it is very likely that he did "get . . . to love them both," as he later claimed in *A Moveable Feast*, despite the terrible "bad luck" this was soon to bring him

(210).<sup>8</sup>

All of this was critical to the mood in which Hemingway found himself when he began to write *The Sun Also Rises* after returning from Pamplona in July, 1925, and during the ensuing months of revision and proofing. However, it is not enough to know the directions of Hemingway's shifting affections; we must also understand the whys and wherefores if we are to understand his growing consciousness about matters of self-definition and gender identity. To that end, it is imperative to realize the differing types of women in whom Hemingway found himself interested that year. It is not too much to say, in fact, that the differences between the examples of femininity he saw projected by Duff and (especially) Pauline, on the one hand, and Hadley, on the other, contributed more than any other single factor to the sort of novel *Sun* became. In almost every way Pauline and Duff countered the sort of femininity Hadley cultivated during her years with Ernest. Though quite an attractive woman, Hadley was — with her large bosom, stoutish figure, and propensity for practical rather than stylish clothes — modeled on a more old-fashioned ideal of physical female beauty than either Duff or Pauline. With their slender builds, narrow hips and small breasts, they both epitomized the New Woman coming into vogue during the years after the First World War. They also favored the short bobbed hair that was one of the distinguishing features of the Age of the Flappers and was soon to be an earmark of Hemingway's first major heroine.<sup>9</sup> These physical attributes, coupled with Duff and Pauline's more fashionable attire, would surely have proven intriguing to Hemingway, married to their antithesis; the fact that Brett should be modeled on this ideal of modern womanhood thus comes as little shock.

Of course, Brett is a New Woman in more than appearance, and it is important to

recognize that the lure for Hemingway of women like Duff and Pauline was more than a mere aesthetic one. As a corollary to his sexual interest in them, Hemingway's attraction was also an indication of his growing interest in questions of gender and identity generally. After four years of living in Paris among some of the most flamboyant activists for a modern redefinition of masculine and feminine identities and social roles, Hemingway was himself becoming actively involved now in the politics of gender, even if he refused to see it or admit it, and that involvement is felt in the themes that dominate *Sun*. Its overt discussion of men's and women's attitudes towards gender, self-definition, and society lend credibility to a view of the novel as Hemingway's first real attempt to answer the question of how people can define themselves in non-repressive terms. The explorations Jake and Brett make, and their ultimate recognition of the dangers of adopting or being coerced by a masculine sense of gender and sexual identity, make it possible to view them as bisexual in the sense Cixous advocates. In the end, the attempts both make to relate to themselves, to each other, and to the world around them on terms not dictated by patriarchal models of behavior indicate not just Hemingway's dissatisfaction with then-current definitions of human identity but also his desire to redefine them.

In large measure, his sympathetic characterization of Brett Ashley demonstrates the importance of the search to Hemingway. His situating of her at the crossroads between a socially and personally created identity, and especially his understanding of the delicacy of her position, suggests his realization of the dilemma of the modern woman.<sup>10</sup> Brett's habits of keeping company with men, drinking freely, and affecting male attire and language all mark her as a New Woman who refuses to be bound by convention. Like the New Woman, though, she is a series of contradictions: self-possessed, yet financially dependent;

attractive to men, yet feared by them; femininely sexual, yet masculinely assertive. As with many women in the modern world, she is forced to live a life of mediated gender, caught by traditional male attitudes towards women even as she tries to evade them. This conundrum is summed up in Jake's initial description of her: "Brett was damn good-looking. She wore a slipover jersey sweater and a tweed skirt, and her hair was brushed back like a boy's. She started all that. She was built with curves like the hull of a racing yacht, and you missed none of it with that wool jersey" (22).<sup>11</sup> The idea that she is responsible for starting the trend of wearing her hair in a mannish style makes for an interesting conjecture as to what Hemingway distinguishes as the dividing points between men and women. While Eby argues that Hemingway's fascination with hair, especially women's hair, denotes his fetishistic attachments, it is possible to see Hemingway's interest as being guided equally by his unconscious difficulties with notions of gender identity.<sup>12</sup> That is to say, it is not necessarily the case that Brett has short hair (the descriptions of which Hemingway admittedly takes pains to detail) merely because he is sexually attracted to it. It might be, instead, that her appearance quantifies for Hemingway the sort of difficult changes that were occurring during the first decades of the century when men and women were trying to come to grips with notions of sexual and gender identity. Brett's short and combed-back style could be said to act as an external mediator of her femininity to allow her to resist the definitions that male society wanted to force on women — much as it did for women of Hemingway's acquaintance like Gertrude Stein.

It is not really surprising that Hemingway should notice this trend among many of the artists around him in Paris and that he should include it in his writing — if nothing else, he was an extremely observant man when it came to such matters. The shock comes,

rather, from his so willingly according Brett a feminine dignity by allowing her this type of experimentation. "In many respects," Wendy Martin suggests, "Brett represents Hemingway's idealized rendering of the woman free of sexual repression[,] . . . the principle of female eros unbounded by patriarchal control" ("Brett" 70). However, Lady Ashley's attempt to avoid that control is what really registers Hemingway's sympathy, a sentiment he will feel for many of his later heroines as well, from Catherine Barkley to Catherine Bourne. Much like the leading lady in *A Farewell to Arms*, in fact, Brett suffers quite a bit in her life, and the response she makes to that suffering is carefully catalogued by her creator. As we find out from Jake, who relates the details to a curious and smitten Robert Cohn, Brett was a V. A. D. during the war when she met Jake after his wounding. At the time, she was grieving over the loss of "[h]er own true love [who] had just kicked off with the dysentery" (39). That loss, coupled with her difficult marriage to Lord Ashley and her inability to forge a relationship with Jake, has brought her to the low point at which we find her when the novel opens. The description of her in the excised first chapter of the manuscript, which F. Scott Fitzgerald recommended Hemingway remove before publication, sums up the tragedies of Brett's life to this point:

Lady Ashley was born Elizabeth Brett Murray. Her title came from her second husband. She had divorced one husband for something or other, mutual consent; not until after he had put one of those notices in the papers stating that after this date he would not be responsible for any debt, etc. He was a Scotchman and found Brett much too expensive, especially as she had only married him to get rid of him and to get away from home. At present she had a legal separation from her second husband, who had the title, because he was a dipsomaniac, he having learned it in the North Sea commanding a mine-sweeper, Brett said. When he had gotten to be a proper thoroughgoing dipsomaniac and found Brett did not love him he tried to kill her, and between times slept on the floor and was never sober and had great spells of crying. Brett always declared that it had been one of the really great mistakes of her life to have married a sailor. She should have known better, she said, but she had sent the one man she had wanted to marry off

to Mesopotamia so he would last out the war, and he had died of some very unromantic sort of dysentery and she certainly could not marry Jake Barnes, so when she had to marry she had married Lord Robert Ashley, who proceeded to become a dipsomaniac as before stated. (Quoted in Svoboda 131)<sup>13</sup>

Not surprisingly, the effect of this hard life has been to make Brett cynical about herself and the world around her; it is because of these circumstances that she blames herself for her failed affairs and sees her troubled relationship with Jake as some sort of divine retribution for a life misspent.

Yet Brett's individual hardships do not account fully for the position in which she finds herself. It is imperative also that we recognize the power society wields over Brett's view of herself as a woman. Martin explains that in *Sun* Hemingway is exploring "the shift in the perception of gender following World War I, . . . [the] gradual shifting of the ground on which the edifice of Victorian sexual identity was built" ("Brett" 65), and it is precisely this change in cultural attitudes that forces Brett into her position as a restricted woman. Changing social systems mean that gender roles are less clearly defined, making the place Brett occupies harder for her and others to determine. To a large extent, in fact, she is not even responsible for her own identity. She is, as Linda Patterson Miller argues, "trapped within a superficial and misleading image determined for her by others [and therefore] feels increasingly isolated" ("Brett Ashley" 171). Miller's further argument that Brett is desired by men mainly (or perhaps only) for her beauty and not for her other qualities conveniently sums up the dilemma in which Hemingway's heroine finds herself, a dilemma plaguing women generally in a patriarchal society.

As Cixous and other feminists point out, male desire has the tendency to erase femininity by making women nothing more than objects of male sexual fantasy. If women

are to come to a female definition of femininity, then, one not tainted by masculine sexual and political subjugation, gender difference needs to be redefined along more egalitarian lines. Yet this is something Cixous recognizes as impossible while the patriarchal order is ascendant. It is fitting, therefore, that in the world of the novel Brett is unable to change the way men see her. This is not to say, however, that she does not take steps to mitigate her sexual objectification (even as she relies on it for material purposes), nor to suggest that Hemingway is blind to the need women feel to evade male conscription. In some sense, Brett's affectation of a man's haircut and hat can be viewed as an attempt to opt out of the system of sexual subjugation in which the masculine attitude to femininity places her. By cutting her hair like a man, wearing men's clothes and courting the company of homosexual men, Brett is removing herself from the context of normative heterosexuality and gender definition. By not looking or acting like a woman, she is trying to make them see her as something other as well, not merely as the object of their desire. Even as she is made to see herself from their point of view, then, Brett tries to alter how the men around her perceive her, just as she wants to alter her perception of herself, in order to escape their objectification of her completely.

In response to this idea, Delbert Wylder rightly suggests that Brett is "breaking from the strictures of Victorianism as much as most of the expatriated males in the novel" ("Two Faces" 91). Yet his emphasis on the men's struggles rather downplays the forcefulness of Brett's attempts, and that forcefulness is significant given its implications about Hemingway's understanding of the danger of her predicament. While readers often assume Hemingway's misogyny, *The Sun Also Rises* expresses his sensitivity to the plight of women to a surprisingly large degree. It is that sensitivity for Brett's position, and his

awareness of its cause, that evidences his recognition of the difficulty of self-definition by the means available to women at the beginning of the twentieth century and that implies his desire to explore what alternate options might be available to them. Hemingway exposes this difficulty as early as chapter four through Jake's description of Brett's eyes. As the two sit together in the taxi discussing their future, Jake has the feeling that though she is looking at him she nevertheless has a way "of looking that ma[kes] you wonder whether she really saw out of her own eyes" (26). It is notable that Jake should imagine her as looking at the world through someone else's eyes given that women in a male-dominated society are allowed only minimal (if any) unmediated personal identity.<sup>14</sup> In keeping with Cixous's view of the tremendous difficulty of overcoming male habituation, Brett succeeds very little in her struggle. She remains "caught between two modes of gender representation: that of the idealized woman on the pedestal and that of the self-reliant modern woman. She is both the idealized other whom men seek as a prize for their prowess and the autonomous woman who tries to make her own decisions" (Martin, "Brett" 71). It is this dilemma of being both independent from and inadvertently enslaved to a masculine view of femininity that creates Brett's unenviable situation. Even as she tries to escape, she "allows herself to be molded by the [male] crowd, becoming what the crowd desires" (Miller, "Brett Ashley" 173), something Hemingway points toward through her serial relationships and inability to live on her own.<sup>15</sup>

Yet Brett's feverish movement from man to man could also be symptomatic of her desire to find a companion who will not treat her, as most men have to this point, as sexual chattel:

She knows that her appearance draws men to her, and she defines herself in relation to this. Yet, as she molds herself to what the crowd wants her to be,

she also shatters this image. Her skittishness, her incomplete sentences, her carelessness, her restlessness — moving from place to place and people to people, all reflect her increasing sense of unrealized relationships and of her unrealized self. (Miller, "In Love" 23)

Surrounding herself with gay men who do not have ulterior motives allows Brett the opportunity to define herself by something other than her sexuality. Similarly, her necessarily non-sexual relationship with Jake, even if it causes other difficulties for her, does offer a sanctuary away from men like Cohn and her current fiancé, Mike Campbell, who are generally interested in her only for her body. Hemingway offers a glimpse of why Brett is eager to remove herself from a masculine context by making so painfully clear her sex-object status in chapter eight. Mike drunkenly admires her figure, repeatedly telling everyone that Brett "is a lovely piece," and suggests that the two of them leave the bar to "turn in early" (79). By including these comments, Hemingway seems to call attention to the importance of her sexuality for the men around her. The bracketing of this conversation by Mike's comments about her hat also offers interesting implications about the author's knowledge of how men treat women like Brett; Mike's shock at her wearing a man's hat ("[w]here did you get that hat?" [79]) and his wish that she would wear more feminine headgear surely reflect Hemingway's recognition of men's general need to view women as nothing more or other than objects of sensuality. That is, it seems plausible to assume that Mike's disdain for her choice of head covering is based on his following of cultural codes of dress that deem men's clothing off-limits to women — the hackneyed adage that men must be men and women, women — and that Hemingway is aware of what this means for Brett. Her response of "pull[ing] the felt hat down far over one eye and smil[ing] out from under it" (79) thus suggests his recognition of the necessity of upsetting cultural definitions of gender, even as it suggests Brett's refusal to play by Mike's rules.

Similarly, her response, later in the novel, to the bullfighter Pedro Romero's wish that she let her hair grow indicates both her wish to fight gender conscription and Hemingway's recognition of the necessity of such an act for her. After her affair with the young Spaniard has ended in Book Three and Jake has come to Madrid to rescue her at the behest of her telegram, Brett explains what doomed her relationship with Romero:

It was rather a shock his being ashamed of me. He was ashamed of me for a while, you know. . . . Oh, yes. They ragged him about me in the café, I guess. He wanted me to grow my hair out. Me, with long hair. I'd look so like hell. . . . He said it would make me more womanly. I'd look a fright.  
(242)

Romero's demand is the demand of masculine privilege which wants to enforce a strict separation of the sexes on gendered terms. While his desire to feminize Brett is indicative of the overall need for masculine culture to maintain rigid and definable barriers between men and women, Brett's comment to Jake that she would look terrible with long hair implies her refusal to accept the rules Romero and male society set out for her. Part of the novel's tragedy, of course, lies in the fact that this refusal comes at great personal expense for her. Her relatively emotionally impoverished relationships and apparent lack of any female companionship mark the marginalization that women face if they attempt to revolt against their male-created position. Given that situation, it rather stands to reason that the only real love she feels is for Jake and that she must turn to him, another unfortunate caught in a similar position of cultural marginalization, to come to her rescue.

Like Brett, Jake lives a life of mediated gender, "neither affirm[ing] nor den[ying] femininity or masculinity" (Grace 102). In fact, thanks to the wound Hemingway gives him, Jake is an almost more obvious product of the tensions in modern society than Brett, and his missing penis arguably becomes *Sun's* most overt method of exploring the

difficulties of self-identification in a world that defines people primarily by their sex. Lacking the equipment to be considered a true man by phallogentric culture, Jake suffers throughout the book for his attempts to come to terms with his marginalized position and to create for himself an identity not based on the possession or lack of sexual/gender demarcations.<sup>16</sup> Knowing as we do that Hemingway and psychoanalysis are contemporaries, it is fitting that *Sun*, which appeared during the furore over Freud's theories, should concentrate much of its attention on the importance of the penis and, by extension, on the importance of the phallic social control symbolized by it. In "The Infantile Genital Organization," Freud explains that childhood sexuality, which governs an individual's future sexual existence, is centered in the phallus, regardless of the sex of the child. "For both sexes," he claims, "only one genital, namely the male one, comes into account" (142). And while the symbolic phallus should not be confused with the physical penis, we must bear in mind that the male genital becomes for Freud (and psychoanalysis generally) the most obvious symbol of masculinity and masculine control. This means that having or not having a penis contributes significantly to a person's relationship to power in society, something Cixous, among others, also recognizes. Such an equation leads Freud to conclude that "[w]hat is present, therefore, [in childhood genital organization] is not a primacy of the genitals, but the primacy of the phallus." The effect of such phallogentrism, which dominates not just Freudian psychology but also most other facets of Western culture, is to normalize male experience. That *Sun*, a novel attempting to unpack notions of identity, should use as one of its primary methods of investigation the possession and/or lack of a penis is intriguing to say the least.

Though Hemingway was never really caught up in the Freudian excitement, the fact

that he would write, in his first novel, the story of a genitally wounded hero suggests a similar interest to Freud's in examining notions of gender. Actually the possibility of writing such a narrative came to him long before he began work on the manuscript that would become *Sun*. It "was not a new idea for Hemingway" in 1925, according to Reynolds; "[i]n Chicago right after the war, he had discussed the maimed soldier story with a high-school friend, and he and [another friend] talked it over in the summer of 1924, remembering war wounds they'd seen and joking about others" (PY 308). Hemingway himself often boasted that during the war he had been "shot twice through the scrotum" (SL 694), and at least one biographer has speculated that, while he did not suffer anything near the horrific injury he boasted of, he did endure a bout of impotence following an infection of the scrotum during his convalescence in Milan (Montgomery 117).<sup>17</sup> Whether this is accurate or not, and whether Hemingway really did visit the sexual mutilations ward at the Milan hospital as he asserted, is ultimately of little consequence. The very fact alone that he focused such attention on this sort of wounding and tried in *Sun* to work out its social and personal repercussions goes far to proving the tensions that questions of sexual and gender identity were beginning to cause in him.

His own comments about Jake's wound and his desire always to clarify just what had happened to his hero during the war speak also to the notion that Hemingway wanted to explore sexuality and gender in the novel. Any time the question was asked as to the exact nature of Jake's injury, Hemingway made a point of giving a detailed answer; and the details are important in understanding what *Sun* is investigating. In a 1951 letter to an editor at Rinehart Publishers, for instance, Hemingway claimed that he "had known a boy that had happened to" — "his penis had been lost and his testicles and spermatic cord remained

intact" (SL 745). He was equally adamant about his protagonist's lost member but still-active libido when questioned about Jake by George Plimpton in the famous *Paris Review* interview in 1958, over thirty years after the book's publication. When Plimpton mentioned that at least one member of the magazine's staff believed Jake to have been "emasculated precisely as is a steer [*i.e.* impotent]," Hemingway replied sharply about the nature of Jake's loss:

It sounds as though the advisory staff editor was a little bit screwy. Who ever said Jake was "emasculated precisely as is a steer?" Actually he had been wounded in quite a different way and his testicles were intact and not damaged. Thus he was capable of all normal feelings as a *man* but incapable of consummating them. The important distinction is that his wound was physical and not psychological and that he was not emasculated. (Plimpton 120)

The clues to be gleaned from these two similar assertions are important ones. That Jake should have lost his equipment but not his desire emphasizes that in *The Sun Also Rises* Hemingway wants to explore male and female relationships sexually, as well as in terms of gender. Were Jake not capable of sexual interest in Brett, obviously the irony of the story would be lost, but so too would Hemingway's opportunity to play with the Victorian sex-role conventions that remained largely in place in the 1920s. By making his hero a man who still has the feelings and needs of a man but can no longer satisfy them, Hemingway is able to write a novel that will explore the very notion of modern manhood, just as focusing on Brett's difficulty with male-based definitions of femininity allows the book to explore modern womanhood.

Of course, in paying heed to his comments about Jake's wound and speculating upon its consequent importance to the ideas of gender that Hemingway was developing in the book, we must not lose sight of the fact that his words cannot be trusted as accurate

indications of the motives or thoughts he had at the time he was writing *Sun*. Even this wariness, though, might help us to understand the depth of concern Hemingway felt, not for the wound as such, but for its ramifications for Jake as a twentieth-century male. To suggest, as Hemingway does, that Jake's injury is merely a physical and not a psychological one seems wrong. It is not difficult to imagine that the mental and emotional weight of the mutilation are as oppressive for Jake as the pure bodily loss. The torment he suffers is so deep precisely because it *is* psychological. In fact, the physical trauma he has experienced seems less relevant to the story than the emotional pain he presently endures; although he must obviously still bear the physical scar of his lost penis, it is likely that, by the time of the events in the novel, the pain of the amputation has dissipated. Nowhere does Jake mention that his old injury still hurts him, for one thing, and, for another, the possibility that he and Brett perform some sort of sexual activity together in his apartment after Count Mippipopolous has left to fetch more champagne in chapter seven appears to further the conclusion that his physical pain has ended.<sup>18</sup> By this point, it is the mental wound his amputation has caused that continues to haunt Jake: the anguish he feels over his inability to consummate his relationship with Brett, and his fear that his status as a dysfunctional man mitigates his masculinity. Despite Hemingway's assertions to the contrary, then, concerning Jake's psychological emasculation and ensuing doubt about his manhood, it seems safe to imagine that, since an emasculated man cannot fulfill the patriarchal category of lover so integral to a masculine sense of self, Hemingway is using Jake's wound as a method of exploring the difficulties associated with an adherence to societal descriptions of gender identity.

For the most part, Jake is cryptic about his injury, and perhaps understandably so.

What we do learn, though, is important for its implications about his mental state. When Brett laments during their taxi ride that their tormented relationship is her punishment for all of the “hell [she has] put chaps through,” for example, Jake chastises her for her selfishness even as he tries to downplay the significance of his wound (26). He explains that “what happened to [him] is supposed to be funny. [He] never think[s] about it” (26). As we find out shortly, though, this is not entirely true; actually Jake has difficulty *not* thinking about his injury, especially when he is around Brett. She becomes the focus of his regret in that she represents all that he has apparently lost through the loss of his penis — love, sexual intimacy, even normalcy. The means by which he attempts to overcome, or at least to mask, his anguish is to make light of the situation whenever possible, as when he lies in bed later, after leaving Brett, and reminisces about the circumstances surrounding his injury and recuperation:

it was a rotten way to be wounded and flying on a joke front like the Italian. In the Italian hospital we were going to form a society. It had a funny name in Italian. . . . That was in the Ospedale Maggiore in Milano, Padiglione Ponte. . . . That was where the liaison colonel came to visit me. That was funny. That was about the first funny thing. I was all bandaged up. But they told him about it. Then he made a wonderful speech: “You, a foreigner, an Englishman” (any foreigner was an Englishman) “have given more than your life.” What a speech! I would like to have it illuminated to hang in the office. He never laughed. He was putting himself in my place, I guess. “Che mala fortuna! Che mala fortuna!” (31)

From the laughability of his wound to the ludicrousness of the Italian officer’s speech, Jake focuses on the absurdity of his situation. In large part, that absurdity revolves around the fact that so much importance is placed on such a seemingly small part of the anatomy. While the amputation of any part of the body is certainly no laughing matter and is deeply traumatic for the amputee, the loss of the penis in physical terms could almost be equated with the loss of some other limb. However, in a culture which makes the penis the stand-in

for the phallus (and therefore the indicator of phallic power), the loss of the penis is far graver than mere physical amputation. It becomes politically important as well, a reality that leaves Jake and his society to ask the question: if penises are tokens of power, what becomes of the man who no longer has the token?

In large part, this is the question with which Hemingway is wrestling through Jake's wound. For Jake, the problem is a concrete one of figuring out how to approach life as a disempowered male, and particularly of how to face his relationship with Brett. For the author, things are slightly more complex. Himself not the victim of his protagonist's personal tragedy, Hemingway is less concerned with the physical ramifications of penile loss than he is with the social problem of gender-identity creation. Since Western society has effectively founded itself on the totemic phallus, markers of human identity are generally derived either by relation to or by alienation from it; men are generally viewed as strong, hard, and resilient because they possess a penis, women as passive, soft, and vulnerable because they lack one. If these characteristics can, in a general sense, be applied to patriarchal definitions of male-female difference, Hemingway's inversion and subversion of them in this novel, by making Brett in many ways the stronger and Jake the weaker character, offers an important clue to his suspicion of categorical definitions of gender and his belief in the need for new ways of gendering people.

Jake's realization that his wound is "supposed to be funny" proves his knowledge of the politics of the modern world: men without penises are not real men — nor, however, are they women. Instead, they occupy a middle ground that is truly indefinable by phallogocentric standards, except as objects of scornful humor. Such mockery is the defense mechanism of a culture uncomfortable with things it does not understand and cannot easily

define. The further fact that Jake knows that such “injuries or imperfections [as his] . . . remain . . . quite serious for the person possessing them” (26) points to Hemingway’s realization about masculine society’s narrow ways of thinking of gender and sexuality. Jake’s wound has made him not only vulnerable to the ridicule of his society for no longer being a man, Hemingway seems to observe, but also prone to an insight about just how detrimental such strict gender definitions can be.<sup>19</sup> While the Catholic church may be able to preach to him “not to think about it” (31), Jake realizes that such an answer is impossible, that some other action needs to be taken.

Not eager to be the butt of derisive jokes and keen to reaffirm his status in society, early in the novel Jake does attempt to maintain an untroubled allegiance to a cultural standard of masculinity. As he himself indicates, he is content to be what people want him to be: “I try to play it along and just not make trouble for people” (31). This is partly indicated by his picking up of Georgette in chapter three and taking her to dinner. By escorting an obvious prostitute, Jake is attempting to confirm (both for himself and others) his intact sexuality. She acts, as women are usually made to act in phallogentric society, as his means of masculine self-confirmation. Hemingway emphasizes this through Jake’s comment about her smile as they sit across from one another: “[s]he grinned and I saw why she made a point of not laughing. With her mouth closed she was a rather pretty girl” (15). His focus on her beauty (or lack thereof in certain instances) suggests his superficial attitude toward women, his concentration on them mainly for sexual purposes, even if he himself is incapable of using them for such things. In turn, his later mockery of her by introducing her to the Braddockses as Georgette Leblanc suggests how uncaring Jake is about her feelings.<sup>20</sup>

More than his involvement with prostitution (even if it is an asexual one), the circumstances surrounding Brett's introduction into the novel confirm the allegiance Jake has at the outset to the restrictive views of gender difference. Her entry into the Café Select, in chapter three, in the company of a group of flamboyantly homosexual men establishes the fact that, despite his own physically mediated identity, Jake still sides at this point with traditional definitions of masculinity and femininity. The seemingly irrational anger he feels towards Brett's companions proves Jake's masculine sexual perspective. For one thing, he is immediately aware of their physical appearance, much as he was of Brett's: "A crowd of young men, some in jerseys and some in their shirt sleeves, got out. I could see their hands and newly washed, wavy hair in the light from the door. . . . As they went in, under the light I saw white hands, wavy hair, white faces" (20). To some extent, his annoyance focuses on their cleanliness and nattiness because he sees their mimicry of feminine aestheticism as an affront to masculinity. Yet, it is not so much their appearance that causes Jake's irritation with them as it is their inclusion of Brett in their circle — not to mention their swift adoption of Georgette. Hemingway makes this clear by the apposition of Brett's introduction and Jake's admission of anger: "And with them was Brett. I was very angry" (20). Within the space of one paragraph break, Jake has bound together the object of his desire and the anger he feels at homosexuals, and the reason is not far to seek for such a connection. For Jake, homosexual men are something to be annoyed at because of their voluntary opting out of the heterosexual game of desire. Unlike Jake, who has been sidelined without his consent, these men actively do not want women and are thus free to interact with Brett in a way unavailable to him, whose motives will always be tinged with sexual interest in her.

This surely accounts for the increasing vehemence of Jake's bitterness towards the men as he continues watching them: "Somehow they always made me angry. I know they are supposed to be amusing, and you should be tolerant, but I wanted to swing on one, any one, anything to shatter that superior, simpering composure. . . . [Georgette] had been taken up by them. I knew then that they would all dance with her. They are like that" (20). Jake registers such heartfelt disgust because he still believes enough in the societal prescriptions of gender difference to be angered by their rearrangement. Homosexual men are a danger because they throw into question all of the comfortable notions the patriarchy has about the differences between men and woman and their respective attitudes towards masculinity and femininity. Gay men, like genital wounds, are supposed to be amusing so that the danger they represent to heterosexist and phallogocentric ideology can be kept in check. However, just as he has difficulty laughing at his injury, Jake finds it hard to be lighthearted about the men who do not desire Brett (or women generally), and who are thus able to maintain the trouble-free relationship with her that is denied to him. "This whole show makes [Jake] sick" (21), then, because it makes him critically aware of his failure to conform to the parameters of sexuality and gender identity that are demanded of him.<sup>21</sup>

At this stage, Jake has difficulty figuring out a method of evading the dilemma that confronts him, and the fact that he is rather maudlin throughout Book One and into Book Two underscores this. Given his dilemma, it is not surprising that the opening of the novel deals so much with questions of sickness, of both the physical and (more pointedly) the psychological variety. For instance, after Jake pushes Georgette's hand from his lap to keep her from discovering his lost penis and claims that he is sick, she commiserates with him, suggesting that "[e]verybody's sick" (16). While Jake means sick in an overtly bodily

sense, Georgette extrapolates on his definition to include spiritual illness as well. Of course, part of the dis-ease might simply be a sort of restlessness. Something of that certainly lies behind Georgette's meaning, just as it does behind the desire Cohn expresses in chapter two to leave France for South America and to have Jake accompany him. In both cases, the root of the discomfort is a sense of personal dissatisfaction and overall malaise. However, as Jake goes on to explain to Cohn, running from oneself is not the answer: "going to another country doesn't make any difference. I've tried all that. You can't get away from yourself by moving from one place to another. There's nothing to that" (11). Instead, one must face problems head on. It is impossible to hide in another place hoping the trouble will not follow, just as it is impossible to try not thinking about it. The key to coming to terms with oneself is not changing one's scenery, Jake and Hemingway seem to be arguing, but changing one's attitude, and it is precisely this attitudinal adjustment that Brett and Jake must both make. If they are to find some way to deal with their difficulties of self-definition, and thus with their relationship to each other, they need to redefine their relationships to masculine culture.

Just as Cixous encourages men and women to ignore the precepts of phallogocentric society and determine a new method of interpersonal interaction, Jake and Brett must also reconfigure their relationships, and they accomplish this by adopting attitudes remarkably similar to Cixous's ideal male and female dispositions. Generally speaking, Cixous bases her philosophy of gender difference on the notion of gift-giving and acquisition: "what I call 'feminine' and 'masculine' is the relationship to pleasure, the relationship to spending" ("Extreme Fidelity" 15). An attitude of openness towards the other depends heavily on the self's ability to be generous, she suggests, and typically it is femininity that is willing to go

beyond itself, to spend itself in and for the other, while the masculine principle remains acquisitive and self-involved, interacting with others only as a result of inward not outward love. Cixous argues that, if society is to change, men must begin to look beyond themselves and have a more caring and open attitude toward others. Women, on the other hand, must be prepared to deny any externally enforced identity. As we have seen, both Jake and Brett remain trapped initially in their respective roles in masculine culture; however, as the novel progresses each begins to adopt a more open attitude toward gender identity, and this general movement offers a clue to the proto-Cixousian ideas that emerge in *The Sun Also Rises*.<sup>22</sup>

Cixous's economics of masculinity and femininity become important, particularly in terms of Jake's growing feeling of responsibility for those around him. As Scott Donaldson has pointed out, the novel is greatly concerned with a monetary metaphor throughout in that "[f]inancial soundness mirrors moral strength" ("Morality" 77), and this focus on giving and receiving can be fitted into a Cixousian context without much difficulty.<sup>23</sup> Throughout the book, for instance, Hemingway sets up a dialectic between Jake's magnanimity and the profligacy of many of the other characters, and this generosity offers a clue as to how Jake might eventually shrug off the patriarchal attitudes that bind him early on. In fact, the advice he gives to Cohn not to think that he can flee from himself merely by fleeing France begins to expose Jake's adoption of feminine generosity and implies Hemingway's recognition of the need for a temperance of social masculinity. While Jake will cycle back and forth between feelings of camaraderie and bitterness towards Cohn for much of the novel, he is nonetheless willing to offer his thoughts on life to his some-time friend.<sup>24</sup>

Jake's discussion of personal contentment with Cohn in chapter two after the latter's

return to Paris from the United States is particularly important in understanding Jake's potential for femininity. As he informs us, "when [Cohn] came back he was quite changed . . . , and he was not so nice" (8). Part of the transformation has to do with Cohn's earlier revelation that "he was an attractive quantity to women." After this, Jake says, he "was not so pleasant to have around" (9). Two possible reasons could account for Jake's antagonism. For one, we might argue that Cohn's new-found confidence makes Jake jealous and that this sparks his disdain: as a man who cannot offer the standard sort of physical relationship to a woman, Jake might be inclined to envy another who can and be understandably embittered at seeing his failure thrown into relief by keeping that man's company. Yet we could also suggest that Jake's distaste stems not from wanting to be more like Cohn but from the fact that Cohn is no longer like him. That is, Jake might be at least partly angry with Cohn and uncomfortable in Cohn's presence because he knows that Cohn's attitude towards women — his knowledge of his attractiveness to them — is based on his faulty masculine confidence about gender relations. While Cohn used to believe "that the fact of a woman caring for him and wanting to live with him was . . . simply a divine miracle" (9), he has come to imagine that it is proper that women should be attracted to him. For Jake, attraction is still miraculous, in a way that it cannot be for Cohn. Immersed as he is in patriarchal notions of female duty to, or bedazzlement by, masculinity, Cohn now takes for granted both his attractiveness and his manhood, something impossible for Jake, and it is possibly this reality that instigates Jake's contempt. In any event, the fact that Jake is still willing to give Cohn the benefit of his experience after witnessing Cohn's backslide into phallogocentric thinking is impressive. It is also telling as to his propensity towards giving of himself.

Hemingway revisits this issue of generosity in a far more detailed fashion with the introduction of Count Mippipolous to the story. The view the count imparts to Jake during their three-way conversation with Brett in chapter seven establishes a strikingly Cixousian sense of the economics of existence and of relations between men and women. While Jake and Brett thrash out the problems of their relationship in his bedroom, the count rushes off to buy champagne for the three of them. This generosity, this desire to indulge his friends, is a large part of the value system by which the count lives. As Brett informs Jake, the count is “extraordinary about buying champagne. It means any amount to him” (56). The importance of buying it, we can assume, is imparted by the pleasure of giving it and not simply by the pleasure it will provide the count himself. Unlike Jake, who is still trying to make some sense of life and of his place in a social system that cannot account for his marginal position, the count has figured life out. ““That is the secret,”” he tells Jake. ““You must get to know the values’” (60). In other words, one must understand the things that are important in life and follow them; that, as he informs his two companions, is how he has been able to enjoy life.<sup>25</sup> He is content to watch how his wealth can make others happy and to fulfil the obligations he feels he has towards them. This explains his treating Jake and Brett to a bottle of 1812 brandy after the three have dinner (probably paid for by the count as well). It also accounts for Mippipolous’ support of the painter, Zizi, despite the fact that, as he confesses to Brett and Jake, he “do[es]n’t want him around” (63). The matter is as simple as familial duty. “His father was a great friend of my father,” Mippipolous states, implying that the camaraderie between their parents necessitates his own continued good will.

By the time he and the count part company later in the evening, Jake has thus been

offered an example of how to relate to the world in a feminine mode. And it is a lesson he appears to have begun to heed, if we remember his desire to reimburse Mippipopolous by paying for a certain portion of the night's expenses himself: "It was a wonderful time. . . . I wish you would let me get this" (64). Admittedly, Jake does not hold fully to the count's teaching from this point on. For one thing, his late-night brawl with Cohn during the fiesta over Cohn's continual hassling of Brett suggests his inability to shrug off a masculine attitude completely; however, the example the count provides does offer Jake a new way of approaching life, one he will ultimately accept after his time alone in San Sebastian.

The same is not true of Brett. She does not recognize the potential salvation in the count's insistence on values because, for her, the system is reversed. Unlike a man, who must outgrow his selfishness to achieve bisexuality, a woman must deny the appropriation of her self by men — a necessity of which Brett appears aware, if her attitude toward her title is any indication. For Mippipopolous, nobility means spending money, whether by being asked for it by friends and acquaintances or by lavishing gifts upon them. Brett, on the other hand, is selfish about her peerage, using it to her own advantage. In fact, she scolds Mippipopolous, telling him "[he] ha[s]n't used it properly" (57), and goes on to explain the real value of such a distinction: "I've had hell's own amount of credit on mine." The fact that she uses her social status for personal gain says quite a bit about Brett's knowledge of a woman's primary responsibility to herself. Even if, at this stage, she remains unable fully to break from other people's views of her, Lady Ashley appears to have the sense that she must create an identity for herself if she is to be happy.<sup>26</sup>

The most obvious example of this determination not to be defined by a male culture comes in the form of her almost manic need to bathe. While many critics explain her

washing herself throughout the book as merely an indication of her shame over her horrid treatment of men, it may instead be the case that she bathes to symbolically wash away the culturally defined identity that has been forced on her.<sup>27</sup> This would further suggest Hemingway's own tacit understanding of the unenviable position in which modern women find themselves in that it is only through the difficult task of ridding herself of the persona she has been forced to adopt that Brett might find a positive femininity. If we can view her, as Miller does, as "undergo[ing] a . . . quest for freedom from 'agonizing self-consciousness' toward self-discovery" ("Brett Ashley" 183, n. 8), it is not beyond believability to imagine Brett's ablutions as an unconscious attempt to get below her male-created identity and discover a self that she alone defines.

In fact, the first mention of bathing in the text sets the tone for Brett's relationship to cleaning herself. When she and Count Mippipopolous call on Jake late at night in chapter seven, he tells them he has just been showering, and Brett's response is evidence of her own wish to get clean: "Aren't you a fortunate man. Bathing" (53). Though seemingly a throw-away line, her words take on importance as we progress through the book and realize the significance she places on washing herself. It is notable, for instance, in terms of her desire to define herself for herself, that the next mention of her obsession coincides with a conversation in chapter eight about Mike's imminent arrival in Paris. As Jake tries to convince her to dine with him and Bill Gorton while waiting for Mike, Brett repeats three times that before he comes she "must bathe" (74). It is surely not coincidental that her fixation should follow closely on the heels of her return from San Sebastian where she had an affair with Robert Cohn, nor that it should precede her reunion with Mike.<sup>28</sup> Knowing that both Cohn and Mike treat her as a sexual object, we should not be surprised that her

response to both of them is to feel in need of washing herself.

Actually, Hemingway makes the metaphor of psychological ablution important to the book generally, not simply to its heroine in that his suspicion of the need for social gender reevaluation is also confirmed by Jake's baptismal swim at San Sebastian in Book Three.<sup>29</sup> After the conclusion of the fiesta and, more significantly, after Brett's departure with Romero, Jake leaves Pamplona empty and alone. Following a short excursion into France with Bill and Mike, he returns to Spain — a trip that, despite his twice feeling himself "a fool for going back" (233), seems to have a cathartic effect on him. The swimming he does while relaxing at the ocean-side town provides him with a ritual cleansing much like Brett's own, and the implication of both is a need for rejuvenation. While it may appear likeliest that Jake's swims are a metaphorical leave-taking of the festival and a washing away of the troubling relationship he shares with Brett, such is not necessarily the case. Instead, it could be argued that, rather than helping Jake to forget his difficulties, his diving experience makes him re-evaluate his circumstances altogether, for after his immersion in the Atlantic he is able to take better stock of his situation.

Having left Pamplona feeling guilty over his pandering for Brett and Romero and its negative consequences for all concerned, Jake feels uncertain about his future with her. His swim at San Sebastian serves to clear his mind, not making him reject the relationship with Brett but rather making him realize how closely bound together they are regardless of their frustrated sexual desires. It is because of that recognition, for instance, that he immediately responds to her cry for help when he receives her cable from Madrid. Knodt explains that "[o]n the first day [of swimming] Jake has an experience that produces an 'epiphany' or a moment of truth, and on the second day the 'echo scene' reveals the change that has taken

place in his character” (28). That change is a renewed commitment to caring that had worn off during the chaos of the festival of San Fermin.

Hemingway’s description of the swim indicates the world of confusion Jake is living in as he tries to come to grips with his sense of self and his affair with Brett: “I tried several dives. I dove deep once, swimming down to the bottom. I swam with my eyes open and it was green and dark. The raft [above] made a dark shadow“ (235). It is logical, after his experiences in Pamplona and given the difficult relationship he has with Brett (and with himself, for that matter), that Jake should first be seen swimming around in the dark water. For much of the novel, he has indeed had trouble seeing properly. However, his diving deep also has the appearance of a desire to get below superficialities in the same way Brett’s bathing does. This is clarified by his second swim the next day, by which time it appears that he has been able to find some sort of answers:

I sat in the sun [on the raft] and watched the bathers on the beach. . . . After a while I stood up, gripped with my toes on the edge of the raft as it tipped with my weight, and dove cleanly and deeply, to come up through the lightening water, blew the salt water out of my head, and swam slowly and steadily in to shore. (238)

Through his careful choice of words, Hemingway offers a fairly clear picture of the rebirth Jake undergoes while swimming this final time. The cleanness and depth of the dive, reminiscent of Brett’s baths, indicate the washing away of his old attitude, while the emphasis on swimming up towards the light rather than on the darkness of the deep water, as in the first day’s swim, suggests a new perspective on Jake’s part — a removal of the blinders or a penetration of the previous moral murkiness of his behavior. Finally, his steady strokes as he returns to shore offer evidence that perhaps he has come to a more balanced view than before.

After his baptismal swim, Jake at last seems able to accept responsibility and become a caring, compassionate man, as if he now truly grasps Count Mippipopolous' lesson about values. Of course, it is important to recognize that there are still certain problems Jake has difficulty overcoming, which explains why he thinks initially that Brett's telegram requesting his help "mean[s] San Sebastian all shot to hell" (239). However, it is also notable that he "suppose[s], vaguely, [that he] ha[s] expected something of the sort," seeming to imply that he has come to see what his real place is opposite Brett. His bitterness, too, at his prior actions is another indication that he has begun to reject his earlier masculine attitude. After signing his return message to Brett "Love Jake," he cynically evaluates his behavior to this point: "That seemed to handle it. That was it. Send a girl off with one man. Introduce her to another to go off with him. Now go and bring her back. And sign the wire with love. That was it all right" (239). The abuse Jake piles on himself here is admittedly self-pitying, an expression of regret at being the pander and rescuer but not the lover. Yet his magnanimity in journeying to help Brett is important for its implication of his renewed commitment to the values of Count Mippipopolous, which are themselves more than reminiscent of Cixous's suggestion of the feminine commitment to generosity. While Brett's most pressing problem may appear to be her insolvency and resulting inability to pay her hotel bill (though, unknown to her and Jake, Romero settled it before he left), Jake's decision is more than simply a determination to be financially responsible for Brett. And his immediate reaction upon entering her room of going "over to the bed and [putting his] arms around her" (241) offers evidence of his recognition of both her deeper need for him and his willingness to fill that need despite the difficulty with their relationship.<sup>30</sup>

By the time she has ended her affair with Romero, Brett, too, seems to have come to a conclusion about how she must act. Hers, though, is more focused on a need to care for herself, to determine her own identity, conforming to a feminist understanding of the need for women to exercise their right to self-direction. The time she spends with Romero serves a positive purpose for her in making her realize the pain she has suffered by virtue of her mediated gender identity. Recognizing that Brett has been trying for the length of the novel to create herself in an image of her own choosing, we can view her decision to give up Romero as a final means of evading male dominion. A large part of this has also to do with the fear men have of sexually strong women. Though Brett is often cast as a predatory woman, particularly by Cohn, who describes her as a modern-day Circe luring men to their doom with her sensual charms, her decision about Romero “not . . . to be one of those bitches that ruins children” (243) need not necessarily be viewed as self-abuse for sexual predation. If we recognize that on some level she has been aware of her marginalization by men throughout the novel, her decision could be symbolic of a new-found or re-energized determination not to settle for a state of alienation from herself.

In a way, her leaving Romero thus acts as a sort of feminine declaration of independence; she escapes him because he wants to force her to become “more womanly,” to match his definition of womanhood at the expense of her selfhood. As she declares to Jake, Romero “really wanted to marry [her] . . . [so she] couldn’t get away from him” (242), and that obviously proprietary sentiment frightens her enough to make her leave him. As we know, it has always been her habit in the past to try to avoid being controlled or dominated, and her need to leave Romero becomes another such instance of her refusal to give in to male desire. It makes sense, in the end, that Brett should “feel rather damned

good” (245) about leaving her young bull-fighter, not because it indicates her desire not to corrupt him, but rather because “deciding not to be a bitch” means she is not playing by the rules of a male society that sees women as dangerous. Thus, “[t]he realization of her sexual identity,” as Kumar insists, “yields to her a happiness for which Hemingway protagonists struggle all through their lives” (106) because she finally recognizes that her wishes must come first. In a very real way, Brett’s opting out of the system of female subservience to male-created roles is really “what [women like her] have instead of God” — perhaps not in the narrowly religious sense that Jake imagines, but definitely in the sense that the only thing a woman can do in a practical manner about male co-option is to refuse it, to worship instead at the altar of her own femininity.

By the end of the novel, then, Jake and Brett begin to adopt the attitudes Cixous believes men and women must respectively achieve if the phallogocentric enterprise is to be stopped. The key for men is to recognize their femininity, to realize the dangers that a continued selfish, masculine attitude poses. In conjunction with this recognition by men of their femininity, Cixous urges women to reject patriarchal definitions of themselves and ensure that their femininity has a voice. Jake’s and Brett’s personal revelations and attempts to modify their behavior by the end of the novel can thus be seen as Hemingway’s foreshadowing of a vision of the bisexual human being who is able to recognize the troubles with personal identity and, especially, of gender interaction in a society that effectively silences the feminine. Jake’s initial introduction to a feminine economy of generosity and caring by Count Mippipopolous, though he loses sight of it during the fiesta, is not in vain. By *Sun*’s conclusion, after he has made his rejuvenating dive into the baptismal waters of the Bay of Biscay, he has come to see the importance of a renewed commitment to others,

and it is this realization that prompts his trip to Madrid and his return to Brett. Similarly, Brett's ultimate decision not to have her life dictated for her by the edicts of Romero's conservative Spanish upbringing mirrors Cixous's call for women to celebrate their femininity. While she has, for the majority of the book, recognized the position society has forced her into, at the end she makes a concerted effort to re-establish her understanding of femininity. And, while neither of them can be said to benefit overly from their perspective revaluations, both Jake and Brett do come to recognize what it is that keeps them apart: their initial allegiance to a male view of gender and, more unfortunately, the impossibility of wholly evading that view.<sup>31</sup>

In the final analysis, if we are willing to believe, as I think we should, that *The Sun Also Rises* is indeed the tragedy Hemingway claimed it to be, it surely is so because of the hopelessness of Brett and Jake's making their relationship work in a society that forces specific and confining identities on them, roles they both have difficulty playing but also have difficulty ignoring. Though many readers assume that the tragedy inheres in the fact of their distance from one another at the end of the novel — Brett eternally hopeful of a union, Jake ruefully pragmatic in recognizing its futility — a Cixousian response to the book can bring us to a different conclusion, not one that negates their tragedy, but one that shifts the focus as to what the tragedy really is. As with any tragic story, the problem for Jake and Brett lies more in the circumstances in which they find themselves than in their inability to overcome those circumstances. It is less Hamlet's indecisiveness, for example, than the fact of his being "the son of a dear father murdered" and his duty to avenge the king's death that brings about the terrible chain of events in Elsinore. Similarly, in this novel, it should not be Jake's and Brett's individual disappointments that we take as the

indication of the novel's tragic end. Rather, we need to look at what has caused their misfortune. This does not mean registering the simple reality that Jake's missing penis negates the possibility of a sexual relationship between the two, but registering that it is the inability of society to accept either of them for who they are (and not how they should be) that ultimately refuses Brett and Jake the opportunity for an easy relationship with one another.

Hemingway clarifies this in the last pages as the two silently ponder what keeps them apart. Jake's reaction to their situation is to drink himself into oblivion, knowing that he and Brett can never be together.<sup>32</sup> She, on the other hand, still has hopes for their relationship, even if only faint ones. However, she also recognizes that the opportunity for them to create a different sort of relationship is only a dream since the creation of a relationship outside "normal" heterosexual parameters in a male-dominated culture that disallows the reconciliation of masculine and feminine is an impossibility. Her famous last line picks up the thread of her wistfulness even as it acknowledges the impossibility of their dream: "Oh Jake . . . we could have had such a damned good time together" (247). If the world operated under any other system than that in which women are grist to the mill of the male sexual ego and in which men are expected to be selfish and domineering, Brett and Jake might indeed have been able to work out their relationship. As it stands, though, and as Jake succinctly points out, the possibility does not exist. It is "pretty to think" it does (247), but ultimately the restrictions on male and female behaviors and social roles deny the chance for any other kind of relationship than those Brett has with the other men in the novel and that she cannot have with Jake because of his wound.

Yet Jake is, in most senses, decidedly unlike the other male characters. While he

does adopt the masculine social position early on, as the novel progresses, it becomes clear that Hemingway is as interested in exploring the male reaction to cultural norms through Jake as he is to explore the female through Brett. By the end, in fact, both characters have come to similar conclusions about the individual's place in the social system, and Hemingway has catalogued the difficulty of trying to maintain personal integrity in a world that rejects all attempts at self-definition which run counter to accepted ideals of masculinity and femininity. Admittedly, Brett and Jake's relationship does appear to have failed. However, it is important to recognize the wisdom each of them gains as the novel progresses. Showing them sitting together in the taxi on the book's final page, with Jake's "arm around [Brett,] and she rest[ing] against him comfortably" (247), Hemingway is showing the level of peace they have attained and the level of commitment they have made to each other as "emotional equals" (Martin, "Brett" 80).<sup>33</sup> Even if the love between them cannot flourish in a sexual manner as both would like, Jake and Brett remain tied to each other because of their simultaneous marginalization — a marginalization they have begun to deal with.

By the end of *The Sun Also Rises*, Hemingway has certainly not been able to come to any easy conclusions about why the world treats so badly people who do not (or cannot) conform to social models of behavior. He has, though, seemed to recognize the problem that such people face. His exploration of an attempted relationship outside the bounds of normal male-female interaction suggests a desire to understand how individuals define themselves when they refuse culturally sanctioned gender or sex roles, and, while he dooms Jake and Brett's affair to failure, he appears to have begun to recognize the need for personally rather than socially determined identity. In the end, the move Jake and Brett

make toward a Cixousian approximation of gender relation suggests Hemingway's need to create open and honest male-female relationships. Admittedly, such a relationship does not flourish in *Sun*. However, the groundwork laid in this novel by his investigations into alternative gender and sexual identities would stand Hemingway in good stead to create a more positive feminine relationship in his future fiction. What *Sun* ultimately accomplishes is a focusing of the author's energies upon the questions surrounding male and female self-definition in the twentieth century, with the possibility of a successful relationship to come. In his next novel, with the growing love between Frederic Henry and Catherine Barkley, he would begin to identify just what such a successful relationship would look like.

## Chapter III

### *A Farewell to Arms:* Rejecting Patriarchal Models

If we take *The Sun Also Rises* as Hemingway's first extended look at how male-female relationships are jeopardized — perhaps even denied — by restrictive social models of gender, *A Farewell to Arms* can be viewed as his first novelistic attempt to create a relationship that cannot be easily broken — a loving sexual relationship, freed from the bonds of politicized definitions of masculinity and femininity. His bringing together of Frederic Henry and Catherine Barkley offers interesting clues as to the author's foreshadowing of Cixousian bisexuality in part by extending his look at gender and sexual identity into the arena of sexual compatibility. Though he certainly would never have explained their relationship as a conscious effort to undermine political differences through a committed sexual union, Hemingway does indeed offer the couple's burgeoning love as a new kind of relating not predicated on masculine hierarchy.

Given the problems that strict gender identities impose on people, it is actually rather fitting that Hemingway chose to set his first real examination of sexual love in the modern world during the First World War. If relations between the sexes in a patriarchal

society are antagonistic, as most feminists would suggest, the fact that Hemingway offers a love story in war-time makes for interesting speculation; for while the affair may germinate during the war, Frederic and Catherine's relationship eventually outgrows it, to the extent that by Book Five mention of battle has ceased almost entirely. Instead of the usual story of love in war, or even love *as* war (as might be expected from a phallogocentrically trained man), Hemingway gives us a tale documenting the very breakdown of patriarchal constructs such as war. The attempts Frederic and Catherine make to define themselves and foster their relationship during World War I offer an example of "the 'truth' learned on the frontlines [that] gender, desire, and sex cannot be defined by oppositional binarisms" (Elliott 292).<sup>1</sup> Thus we witness Frederic's growing distaste for the military operation of which he is a part and a concomitant growth in his emotionality as a result of his relationship with Catherine, who, as Hays explains, is the "embodiment of admirable qualities and Henry's tutor in committing to life and love" (12).<sup>2</sup> Similarly, though she is, at the beginning, as much a product of cultural indoctrination as Frederic, Catherine also overcomes this impediment to individual identity by way of their affair. This dual move away from a phallogocentric conception of self-definition suggests the interest Hemingway had in exploring the extent to which sexual relationships are often determined by cultural definitions of masculinity and femininity.

Such an interest may surprise some readers, particularly those inclined to view *Farewell* as another modernist work written to help reclaim masculinity for literature and to return men to their rightful position atop the gender hierarchy.<sup>3</sup> Such an interpretation of the book, though, has been tempered recently by the work of a number of other scholars hoping to show that Hemingway was not as opposed to female concerns as some critics

would have us believe. Joyce Wexler's ground-breaking essay, for instance, offers "A Feminist Defense of *A Farewell to Arms*" that stresses Catherine's importance as a "forerunner of the kind of person Frederic has become by the time he narrates the story" (112) by suggesting that she "teaches him the value of love" (121).<sup>4</sup> More recently, criticism of the novel has attempted to topple the book's assumed heterosexism by declaring that Hemingway was playing with ideas of sexuality at the same time as he was experimenting with notions of gender. This has led Miriam Mandel to uncover the lesbian aspect of Catherine's relationship with Helen Ferguson, while Peter Cohen has explored the latent homoeroticism between Frederic and Rinaldi. Both of these studies have, in Mandel's words, "increase[d] our understanding of the two main characters and allow[ed] us to glimpse the sexual politics and prejudices at work in the novel" ("Ferguson" 18) — politics and prejudices suggestive of Hemingway's desire to question and perhaps reformulate the cultural models available to him.

The novel's concern with matters of sexuality, gender, and identity construction stems partially from the fluctuations occurring in relations between the sexes during the first decades of the twentieth century. Social historians and feminist critics alike have made it clear that the period during and following World War I was a crucial time of change for male and female social roles around the world, particularly in the United States. In summing up the important social trends of the period, Joe Dubbert explains that the end of the war saw also the end of the traditional belief "that military training protected and helped maintain the nation's manhood" (193). He further details how manhood now came to be defined after 1920: "there was a subtle but noticeable shift in the perception of the hero. His masculinity was no longer evaluated quite as much on the basis of his ability to control

situations and life generally, as it was now measured by his ability to withstand experiences and events that happened to him" (198).<sup>5</sup> In other words, masculinity now meant a man's ability to react rather than act; and in part it was this change, along with women's own reactions to it, that sparked a redefinition of gender roles.

Setting his story during the war thus acts as a metaphor for what Hemingway watched around him, validating Spilka's claim that he is "a critic of cultural codes who offers some sense of alternative possibilities and directions" ("Repossessing Papa" 41). However, the decision to use the war as a backdrop also created one of the most pervasive and enduring troubles about the reception of *A Farewell to Arms*. Many readers were unprepared for the sort of novel Hemingway offered — a love story set in a war which is quickly jettisoned from the book almost entirely.<sup>6</sup> In fact, even before its publication, Max Perkins was confused and apprehensive about the disjunction between the war story and the love story:

[t]hey combine, to my mind, perfectly up to the point where Catherine and Lieutenant Henry get to Switzerland;- thereafter, the war is almost forgotten by them and by the reader. . . . I can't shake off the feeling that the War, which has deeply conditioned this love story — and does so still passively — should still do so actively and decisively. (Brucoli, *Only Thing* 98)

What worried Perkins, aside from some of the rough language and innuendo in the soldiering scenes, was how a novel of wartime lovers could excise the war that threw them together. To an extent his fear was justified, at least in terms of reader response, as many of the first reviewers focused their attention on the division between the battle sequences and the lovers' rendezvous.<sup>7</sup>

Yet the gap Hemingway creates between the war and love plots is rather fitting for the larger project at hand in *A Farewell to Arms*, if we regard the book as a step closer to a

feminine mode of writing. Far from being a clumsy handling of such a story, the novel could instead be viewed as Hemingway's attempt to engage meaningfully with questions of identity creation and gender role-playing. What he does, in essence, by separating his spheres of influence so conspicuously is to draw attention to the problems arising from such a division. The separation allows him not only to expose the overly codified model of gender difference as it existed during the first decades of the twentieth century but also to provide a forum for improving the situation by melding masculine and feminine principles in his protagonists.<sup>8</sup> Coming as it did ten years after the end of the war, *A Farewell to Arms* was Hemingway's response to the transformations he witnessed, as well as his imaginative attempt to bridge the gap he saw widening between men and women of his generation.

The novel therefore stands as an attempt to reconcile opposites, a fact Robert Gajdusek demonstrates in language close to that which Cixous might be expected to employ: "[the] reader discovers quickly that the novel is based on a profound intellectual and mystical study of the inseparability of ultimate and antithetical dimensions and experiences of life" ("Oxymoronic Compound" 44). Gajdusek's argument may be clarified to explain that, in *A Farewell to Arms*, Hemingway takes great interest in demonstrating the fact that gender differences actually draw men and women together in more than merely sexual ways. This makes the book decidedly unmasculine, from a Cixousian perspective, given the cultural tendency to use difference to segregate people by gender and sex (among other criteria). As Gajdusek quite rightly implies here, the love Frederic and Catherine share combats the deadening effect of gender separation enforced by the Victorian social model and exacerbated by the war. Hemingway's setting his love story during the war thus has the effect of emphasizing the inseparability of masculinity and femininity in people,

even as it exposes the political disparity between masculine and feminine perspectives.

In fact, his juxtaposition of love and war, and his favoring of love, meshes quite well with late-twentieth-century feminist ideas on the dilemma facing modern society. Luce Irigaray, for example, asserts that “patriarchal culture is a culture founded on sacrifice, crime, [and] war” (quoted in Whitford 11) — the sacrifice of female subjectivity, the crime of marginalizing the feminine, and the war of masculinity against otherness. Cixous extrapolates on this, suggesting that matters of manhood and gender are “always clearly a question of war, of battle” (“Castration” 47). The implication of such arguments is that men must prove themselves militarily in order to claim their masculine birthright. True to his public battle against his own femininity, Hemingway was no less prone to such behavior, as is surely indicated by his continued wearing of his non-standard-issue Red Cross uniform after his return to Oak Park in 1919, not to mention his embellished stories about his war service. Given this tendency, it makes sense that the hero of his first war novel would similarly try to use his military status to define himself.<sup>9</sup> Yet the ultimate effect of Frederic’s allegiance to the military is not to aid him in creating a solid masculine identity, but rather to cast doubt on the possibility of uni-gendered self-definition. At the beginning of the novel, Hemingway sets up his protagonist as a man hoping to identify himself solely in masculine terms but unable finally to do so. While Frederic’s initial desire is to deny his femininity, it soon becomes clear that he is unable to fit completely into a masculine model, and his growing doubt about his place in the military enterprise and eventual rejection of a phallogentric sexual dynamic demonstrate Hemingway’s developing sense of the need for men to accept their inherent femininity.

To begin with, Frederic is eager to identify himself with the all-male ambulance

corps of which he is a member and thus link himself to the masculine war machine.<sup>10</sup> What he does is to “create a battlefield family” (Elliott 293) which offers him the sense of being part of a male community. This is integral to the way Frederic defines himself in the book’s opening pages. When we meet him in the first sentence, for instance, we do not learn anything about him personally. Rather, his identity is subsumed within a larger group: “In the late summer of that year *we* lived in a house in a village that looked across the river and the plain to the mountain” (3 [my italics]). The first-person-plural pronoun Frederic uses here is somewhat problematic as an introductory device, given that readers are not alerted to who this “we” is anywhere in the first chapter; it is only as the cast of characters grows in chapter two that Frederic hints that it refers to his military unit.

As Brenner points out, the remainder of the first chapter is equally baffling, given that Hemingway uses his typical technique of dropping readers into the story *in medias res* and forcing them to make sense of what is going on with a minimum of clues or assistance:

For all of its poetry, the much-praised opening paragraph to *Farewell* is confusing — as any new reader of Hemingway and the novel will affirm. The first sentence alone generates no fewer than seven unanswered questions. And the following paragraphs fail to answer the questions of who the narrator is, where he is, why[,] and what he is doing there, and when the events are taking place. (*Concealments* 35)<sup>11</sup>

These questions, though difficult for even the most scrupulous reader to answer, can help us immensely in deciphering what is going on early in the narrative. One of the effects of Hemingway’s confusing style is to make us read extremely carefully, which inadvertently focuses our attention on Frederic’s pronoun manipulation. Conscientious readers will be struck by Frederic’s reference to himself in the singular only after he has established his military identity (though admittedly in veiled terms) in the first chapter. In addition, even when he does start using “I” in chapter two, the effect is to further clarify his attachment to

a martial outfit. For example, the mere fact that we find him sitting in the officers' brothel indicates that he is closely connected to the military enterprise he has been describing.<sup>12</sup> The importance of this linguistic manipulation cannot be overemphasized since it constrains us to think of Frederic first and foremost as a military man. Indeed, we see him as an individual only in the sense of being part of a larger, masculine society.

This early patriarchal self-definition is heightened by the notable lack of personal detail Frederic offers to us in the novel. We learn very little, for instance, about his family, and even less about his personal history and so must see him only as a member of the ambulance corps. Much of the nebulosity surrounding his identity is directly attributable to his problematic name — a significant fact, considering the importance of the patronymic and male ancestry in a patriarchal society.<sup>13</sup> As Robert Finnegan points out, Frederic “remains anonymous through all of Book 1. He is not named until . . . the first chapter of Book 2, in an exchange with Nurse Gage” (259). Before this point, only cryptic clues about his name are available; he is twice referred to as “Mr. Henry” (25, 29), but this could be either a first or last name. That fact, along with the inversion of his name by a drinking buddy (“He said was my name Frederico Enrico or Enrico Federico?” [40]), suggests to Finnegan that Frederic’s “identity is curiously reversible and perhaps confused” (259). The partial result of this fluid identity is a necessary doubt about Frederic’s family history since, without certainty about his name, certainty about his past is difficult. In fact, aside from the monetary assistance he receives from his grandfather (76, 135), we don’t have any evidence of his continued interaction with his family at all. The only time Frederic does discuss them is to dismiss them out of hand: in response to Catherine’s question as to whether he has a father, he answers, “[n]o, . . . a step-father” (154), and assures her she

will never have to meet him. This split from the father — any father — casts him adrift, leaving him without the critical patriarchal sense of self or past necessary for men to identify themselves in masculine society, and suggests the reason for his attachment to the military as a stand-in for the male lineage he lacks. At the same time, though, such a freedom from paternal influence would seem precisely the recipe for a Cixousian revelation, a point Elliott tangentially endorses: “that he lacks a patronymic indicates that Frederic’s link to the father has been severed. His two first names suggest the American myth of the self-made man and underscore the degree to which personal identity is largely a matter of self-invention” (293).

Something of this possibility is further realized by his growing doubt about Frederic’s usefulness to the war effort in Book One. That is to say, if he is rejected by a masculine military system (which he, in turn, will later reject), the possibility for a different means of identifying himself arises; and events conspire to destabilize the availability of military self-definition as Frederic becomes increasingly aware of his essential unimportance to the ambulance corps. After returning from leave early in the novel, he realizes that he is not as indispensable as he had previously believed:

It evidently made no difference whether I was there to look after things or not. I had imagined that the condition of the cars, whether or not things were obtainable, the smooth functioning of the business of removing wounded and sick from the dressing stations, hauling them back from the mountains to the clearing station and then distributing them to the hospitals named on their papers, depended to a considerable extent on myself. Evidently it did not matter whether I was there or not. (16)

More than thinking himself unneeded, Frederic even begins to imagine that he is a detriment to the smooth running of the operation: “the whole thing seemed to run better while [he] was away” (17). This spark of doubt about his necessity to the system renders

him vulnerable to other potentially devastating questions about himself and is at least partially responsible for his ultimate desertion in Book Three. It is also indicative of the jaundiced view that Hemingway had come to have regarding military life and the military mentality, a view exemplified by Frederic's famous condemnation of the obscenity of "[a]bstract words such as glory, honor, courage, or hallow" (185).<sup>14</sup>

Frederic and Hemingway both appear to disparage the use of these words in a military context because war so often precludes the very notions they signify. Furthermore, both men's willingness to reject masculine systems suggests a connection to feminine ideas. The twisting of terms and concepts for military purposes looks remarkably similar to the warping of gender definitions to accommodate male superiority, a fact that inadvertently defends Cixous's and Irigaray's claims that phallogentric culture is war-like. Through Frederic's disgust at military posturing, Hemingway is unconsciously advertizing his own distrust of political machination and thus aligning himself with a feminist humanist view of society. In the political language of battle, terms like courage or glory gloss over the truth about war, focusing on the end of winning rather than on the morally dubious means by which victory is achieved. Frederic and Hemingway both seem to have reached a point, though, at which they can no longer support this sort of machiavellian approach. Neither can stomach the lies of military campaigning because each knows what the rhetoric of war is meant to disguise: the truly horrific nature of actions taken in the names of glory, honor and courage. Instead, Frederic — and presumably Hemingway, as well — finds dignity in the names of places, "the concrete names of villages, the numbers of roads, the names of rivers, the numbers of regiments and the dates" (185) which do not have, or need not necessarily have, the political/military ramifications of ideals like sacredness and sacrifice.

These are the words of masculine culture attempting to validate itself, a validation that Frederic and Hemingway seem hesitant to offer since it would necessarily force them to accept evils such as dispossession, brutality, and murder, as well.<sup>15</sup> This lays the groundwork for the novel's later emphasis on the importance of openness, an emphasis heralded also by the negative view of male sexuality Hemingway offers in the opening pages.

It is clear from the first chapters of *Farewell* that, as far as Hemingway was concerned, male desire dominates cultural views of sexuality, a fact feminism also argues:

[i]n patriarchy, male privilege is both marked and exercised, at least in part, by control over the production, circulation, and representation of pleasure. Such control is operative . . . at the level of cultural representations, which are designed to accommodate and normalize masculine preferences and patterns of gratification. (Singer 139)

At first glance, the beginning of the novel seems to contradict this in that sex matters to Frederic and the other soldiers only as a distraction, some fun in the midst of battle; however, even this underscores the male domination of sexuality. Sex is a male pursuit and must be available when men want it, Hemingway is tacitly suggesting — something demonstrated by the fact that the men see all women, not just the prostitutes in the brothels, as a sexual commodity. This is most succinctly represented in the discussion between Frederic and Rinaldi about the changes that have occurred in the town during Frederic's leave. After Frederic has hinted at the amount of time he spent chasing women and frequenting bordellos, Rinaldi fills him in on the news of their village in similarly sexual terms: “Here now we have beautiful girls. New girls never been to the front before. . . . You don't believe me? We will go now this afternoon and see. And in the town we have beautiful English girls. I am now in love with Miss Barkley. I will take you to call. I will

probably marry Miss Barkley'" (12). Readers are of course meant to laugh at Rinaldi's brazen predictions about his and Catherine's future together, spoken as they are half in jest. However, the sentiment behind his words belies the light tone that conveys them. His off-handedness only partially disguises his belief in the typical patriarchal assumption that, as the man, he will control the affair. By forecasting his future with Catherine, as well as assuming that her decision will favor his best interests, Rinaldi is acting out the pattern of dominance that allows woman a place in society only as chattel or sex object. As far as he is concerned, women are really only useful for one thing, and hence are interchangeable — which explains why he turns his attention to Helen Ferguson without a second thought when it becomes clear that Catherine favors Frederic.<sup>16</sup>

For his part, Frederic might similarly be accused of refusing female autonomy during his first encounter with Catherine and of manipulating her to achieve his own goal of sexual satisfaction. When he is introduced to her, he thinks of their meeting as nothing but another possibility for sex, no different from the affairs with the women he met on leave or the evenings spent with prostitutes in the officers' brothel. In fact, he explicitly views his dalliance with her merely as a distraction, a game the moves of which he must master if he is to win the prize of physical gratification:

I did not love Catherine Barkley nor had any idea of loving her. This was a game, like bridge, in which you said things instead of playing cards. Like bridge you had to pretend you were playing for money or playing for some stakes. Nobody had mentioned what the stakes were. It was all right with me. (30-31)

At this point, before he discovers any feelings for her, Frederic treats Catherine, as he has treated all of the women before her, as a means to an end. That he does so is, of course, quite in line with culturally sanctioned views of sexuality. Discussing the masculine

tendency towards dominance at all costs, Cixous explains that when men are not actively engaged in battle their everyday relationships become martial and/or proprietary ones: “If there is no battle, it’s replaced by the stake of battle: strategy. Man is strategy, is reckoning . . . ‘How to win’ with the least possible loss, at the lowest possible cost” (“Castration” 47 [ellipsis in original]). Frederic demonstrates just such a tendency in chapter five when he calculates the superiority he has over Catherine after she slaps him for trying to kiss her: “I felt I had a certain advantage. . . . She was looking at me in the dark. I was angry and yet certain, seeing it all ahead like the moves in a chess game” (26). Part of his certainty rests on the fact that the sexual roles men and women are expected to fulfil are clearly and deeply etched. Frederic can attempt to kiss Catherine, whether or not she is receptive or consenting, because of male privilege. Similarly, she is expected to put up little resistance to his advances; she is, in Cixous’s words, “matter to be subjected to the desire he wishes to impart” (*NBW* 65).

Catherine’s smacking of Frederic can be seen, though, as an indication of Hemingway’s awareness of the impropriety of such liberties as Frederic takes and of his condemnation of them. As was the case with Brett Ashley, Catherine seems painfully conscious of men’s commodification of her femininity, and it is clear from the slap she administers that she dislikes being thus degraded. More than the smack, though, it is her defense of it that demonstrates her knowledge of the truth of the situation: “I’m dreadfully sorry. . . . I just couldn’t stand the nurse’s-night-off aspect of it” (26). Her rather unwieldy adjective illustrates the commonality of the occurrence; it also demonstrates her disgust at male appropriation of female sexuality, as well as her refusal to view love as the game Frederic takes it to be. Her smacking him might thus suggest Hemingway’s

discomfort with cultural manipulation of the feminine, as her hesitancy is not based merely on social propriety (good girls don't) but rather on personal choice.<sup>17</sup> She, like Brett before her, has suffered the trauma of having lost her true love to the war, and is consequently fearful of beginning a relationship with another soldier; losing one is enough to make her wary of falling for another so close to the front, particularly given the tendency of men to objectify women in her position. What is really at stake, then, in Catherine's relationship with Frederic is her sense of her sexuality since she most assuredly does not want to become another notch in his bedpost, his nurse-by-day and his prostitute-by-night(-off). She was similarly cautious with her previous man, denying him sex presumably on the grounds that they were not married. Yet she is still indoctrinated enough to feel guilty for that first refusal: "he could have had anything he wanted if I would have known. . . . But then he wanted to go to war and I didn't know" (19). Wexler points out that "[t]he war has shattered [Catherine's] identity no less than her fiancé's body" (115), and Catherine's explanation that it was social conditioning that dictated her sexual response to him and her ensuing guilt might help to explain why she appears so skittish and nervous in the opening chapters. As Frederic himself rather quickly realizes, Catherine has not come through her war experience without scars: "I thought she was probably a little crazy" (30).

Typical of the dilemma we saw plaguing the New Woman in *The Sun Also Rises*, Catherine finds herself caught between her desire to lift herself out of a male-defined gender role and her tendency still to accept that role. Much like Brett, she has been pushed to the brink of insanity by "a cultural history which gives her no other choice" but to accept her subjugation (Barlowe-Kayes 32) — a state Cixous recognizes as all too common: "we might say that the Absolute Woman, in culture, the woman who really represents femininity

most effectively . . . who is closest to femininity as *prey* to masculinity, is actually the hysteric. . . . He makes her image for her!" ("Castration" 47 [ellipses in original]). An unbalanced woman is a prime target for male desire, in other words, because she has been denied any control over her gender or sexual identity and is thus vulnerable to male suggestion. Without the ability to determine for herself what is right, she must rely on men to think for her.<sup>18</sup> Catherine's hysteria in the opening pages of the novel suggests that she has been thus manipulated, and her refusal of sex to her now-dead lover is obviously at the root of her feelings of guilt in Book One. She is angry at not having offered herself to him and worried that he might have died less happy because of it — even if she refused because of a logical fear of becoming pregnant and of the attendant disastrous consequences to her reputation. Without question, Catherine is not right in blaming herself; on the contrary, the notion that she is responsible for his happiness or disappointment is clearly wrongheaded. However, her position of subservience in male culture conditions her to accept the blame, and Frederic, inadvertently or otherwise, reinforces this feeling by thrusting his attentions on her regardless of her own desires. Even the fact that she eventually accedes to Frederic's wish to kiss her in chapter five may be blamed on her inability to think of herself outside of a patriarchal context, to think of herself as a woman who has the right to say no and be believed and obeyed.

From a biographical standpoint, Catherine's and Frederic's actions can be used to explain just how troubled Hemingway was by his competing desires to be a loving and caring man and to get his own way with women. If we want to emphasize his desire to change, we could view the love affair between Frederic and Catherine as a clue to Hemingway's guilt over the break up of his and Hadley's marriage, which had ended less

than a year before he began work on *Farewell*. The exchange that Catherine and Frederic share in the garden in chapter five, and more particularly her disgust at his callous behavior, may indicate the conscious and/or unconscious remorse Hemingway felt over ruining his life with Hadley by involving himself with Pauline. One interpretation of the relationship that blossoms between Catherine and Frederic, then, would be to consider it Hemingway's rewriting of his first marriage, this time with a husband who remains a faithful and committed partner to his wife; if we see Frederic, in his manipulation of Catherine for sexual purposes, as a stand-in for the sort of man Hemingway subconsciously took himself to be at this point of his life, we can perhaps consider Catherine as a manifestation of what he longed to be instead. The entirety of *A Farewell to Arms* might thus be read almost as an alternative present, Hemingway's soothing his shame over his adultery by his fictive recreation of a loving relationship in which the man does not betray his love or his lover. Such a view would make it plausible to take the novel as Hemingway's unconscious recalibration of his previous understanding of love by trying to omit the manipulative and acquisitive behavior that society usually demands of male partners.

If, on the other hand, we are to see his narcissistic and vindictive side, we can take his killing off of Catherine as Hemingway's punishment of Hadley for not fighting harder to keep their marriage together and, even more, for not being more unhappy after they separated. Catherine's continued self-effacement in favor of Frederic's desires could thus stand in as Hemingway's desire for Hadley to be more concerned about his needs than her own. All through her relationship with Frederic, for example, Catherine willingly represses her needs in favor of his, first during her long nights on duty in the Milan hospital ward

and then in Switzerland, despite being at the height of her pregnancy. It is even plausible that with Frederic and Catherine's relationship Hemingway was moving further back into his romantic past to create an idealized version of the abortive affair he briefly enjoyed with Agnes von Kurowsky during his own convalescence in Italy in 1918. Instead of being jilted by his beloved, Hemingway rewrites the affair, making Agnes's double hang on her lover's every word and ultimately punishing Agnes for leaving him by killing her fictional counterpart.<sup>19</sup> This kind of unconscious ego-stroking to sooth his wounded pride and broken heart, whether at the expense of Agnes or Hadley, clearly problematizes an argument for the book's movement towards a feminine ideal.

Yet Hemingway's dissatisfaction early in *Farewell* with typically masculine responses to life sets the stage for Frederic and Catherine's conversion to bisexuality as their relationship progresses beyond a male conception of love once she has joined him in Milan. It is rather fitting that their love should develop only after they have been removed from a military setting because, in order for Cixousian love to exist, "neither person can wage war. Arms, including those of rhetoric, have to be set down. The space of love is situated outside combat" (Conley, *Hélène Cixous* 43). It makes further sense that they begin to develop these feelings in a hospital, given that notions of health and love intertwine for Cixous: "[a]s a constant in all her work, Cixous insists on displacing *séparation*, based on the metaphor of death, with *réparation* and healing. This sets her apart from the main trend, emphasizing death, in contemporary letters" (Conley, *Writing* 100). The fact that *A Farewell to Arms* consistently moves away from a focus on the war in favor of a focus on Frederic and Catherine's love and that the relationship begins in a setting devoted to healing suggests an increasing similarity between Cixous's and Hemingway's understanding of the

capabilities of love.

That similarity is primarily established by Hemingway's description of love in the exchange between Frederic and his friend, the Abruzzi priest, who visits the hospital after Frederic's wounding. During their discussion in chapter eleven, the priest makes the comment that "when you love you wish to do things for. You wish to sacrifice for. You wish to serve" (72). Cixous similarly explains that a feminine attitude towards others necessitates keeping their feelings and interests at heart: "Bisexuality on an unconscious level is the possibility of extending into the other, of being in such a relation with the other that I move into the other without destroying the other, that I will look for the other where s/he is without trying to bring everything back to myself" ("Castration" 54 [n.5]). In other words, a feminine ideal of love looks out for the other's best interests at the expense of the self. It does not forget the self's own wishes, but it does refuse to privilege them over those of the loved one. For the priest, as for Cixous, love is a spiritual thing, and it is because of his initial learning of this doctrine that Frederic is able to view Catherine as something more than a means to sexual pleasure when he sees her for the first time after his transfer to the Milan hospital: "[w]hen I saw her I was in love with her. Everything turned over inside of me. . . . God knows I had not wanted to fall in love with her. I had not wanted to fall in love with any one. But God knows I had and I lay on the bed . . . and all sorts of things went through my head" (91-93). Of course, his joy at seeing Catherine upon her arrival may seem to be based on his old attitude that women are meant to serve men sexually; however, he really has no need for her since all but his physical needs are being met by Miss Gage. There is even an indication that she could satisfy those desires if he were to cultivate the relationship. While he is being dressed in clean pajamas and put to bed

after his arrival, Frederic compliments Miss Gage: “‘You’re awfully nice to me,’ I said. The nurse called Miss Gage giggled” (86). Though it is impossible to be certain, there is at least the possibility that she is being coy with her patient and that her coyness might develop into something more were it allowed to flourish.<sup>20</sup>

As if in response to the emotional alteration in him, the general tenor of the story changes after Frederic realizes his love for Catherine. This is borne out by the shift in language that marks his removal from the world of men and war to the world of women and love. A comparison of the introductory sentence of chapter one with that of chapter eighteen, for instance, after Frederic has had his revelation about loving Catherine, yields some interesting evidence as to the increased emotional attachment he makes to life because of his and Catherine’s relationship. While the justifiably famous opening chapter of the novel does evoke in readers a sense of death and mourning, Frederic himself remains relatively unattached to the events he narrates. That is to say, it is the descriptions of the weather and the images of battle, birth, and death, and not Frederic’s sentiments about these, that create the atmosphere of chapter one. The same is not true of the description of his time in Milan. By Book Two, when he enjoys his sick leave with Catherine, Frederic is emotionally involved in the goings-on around him, reporting not simply the details but also his reactions to them: “We had a lovely time that summer. . . . It was lovely in the nights and if we could only touch each other we were happy. . . . We said to each other that we were married the first day she had come to the hospital and we counted months from our wedding day. . . . The summer went that way” (112-17). This transformation in Frederic is important, particularly in light of the fact that he narrates the story years after it happened.<sup>21</sup> That he modulates the tone of his writing to be more committed and emotional

when he describes the affair with Catherine should lead us to imagine the importance he places on her over his military service. As Hays enthuses, “we [can] see how successful Catherine has been. She does cause Frederic to sacrifice for others, to serve others, and [especially] to feel for others” (16). By now, rather than feeling wistful for the male camaraderie that he may have lost, Frederic appears happy to have left it behind in favor of a relationship with Catherine.

The time before her now means relatively little to him, as is indicated from Book Two onward by his habit of keeping himself aware of the ongoing war only when he has spare time away from her. In fact, Frederic spends most of the time between their nights together simply whiling away the hours until their next meeting:

I do not remember much about the days, except that they were hot and that there were many victories in the papers. . . . I went over to [the Ospedale Maggiore] afternoons and afterward stopped at the café and had a drink and read the papers. I did not roam around the town; but wanted to get home to the hospital from the café. All I wanted was to see Catherine. The rest of the time I was glad to kill. (117)

He is content to waste the day reading war news because it is only at night with Catherine that he truly feels happy. Actually he reads the newspapers as a time-killer numerous times in the novel (95, 117, 136, 139, 320, 329), prompting one critic to suggest that Frederic wants to reconnect with his old military life by remaining abreast of developments at the front.<sup>22</sup> It should not be automatically assumed, however, that his interest in reading about the war necessarily indicates Frederic’s need to reunite with it. Since news of the front dominated most of the papers at the time, it would be surprising if he did *not* read about it. Furthermore, the bare fact that he once had a vested interest in the war’s outcome cannot by itself prove that he informs himself about the war to compensate for his regret at deserting.

Frederic's concentration on his love for Catherine, to the exclusion of the war, is also indicated by his consideration of the hospital as his and Catherine's "home" (117). Though he expresses admiration for the house he and his unit shared in Gorizia ("the town was very nice and our house was very fine" [5]), he does not value it in the same emotional way. Unlike the bombed-out town so close to the front, the hospital is a safe and peaceful place, a demilitarized zone in the most literal sense, if we remember Cixous's description of love as being beyond war.<sup>23</sup> And it is a sanctuary made all the safer by his being there with Catherine, who now "functions to shelter [him] from the world's demands" (Solotaroff 10). Their love acts to relieve the stress of his earlier life as he lies hiding behind the curtain of her hair when she bends down to kiss him during their evenings together. Indeed, her hair acts almost as a feminine shield behind which Frederic can retreat from the patriarchal world that wants him to recuperate and rejoin the war.<sup>24</sup>

Given the idyllic life the couple leads during his sick leave after his initial doubts about his importance to the war and his subsequent emotional revelation of loving Catherine, Frederic's desertion at the end of Book Three is fitting. It may also demonstrate Hemingway's increasing proximity to Cixousian themes. The fears and dangers Frederic lives through during the fighting in Book One and, even more acutely, during the Caporetto retreat culminate when he sees the Italian army killing its own officers for dereliction of duty and desertion of their commands in chapter thirty. The irony of Aymo's being shot on the railway outside Udine by snipers from his own army, as well as Bonello's ensuing desertion to the German lines to plead for mercy and thus escape a similar (and similarly pointless) death, has underscored for Frederic the haphazardness and violence of the patriarchal world. Thus when he is finally faced with his own death at the hands of the

nameless and faceless “they” who have been dogging him and Catherine from the outset, he refuses to continue endorsing the masculine system that has repeatedly tried to harm him.

The decision Frederic makes to flout military authority and face damnation by his fellow soldiers is rapidly made. Though Hemingway does not elaborate on the reasons for Frederic’s choice, and though it is surely based for the most part on a fear of dying, it becomes increasingly clear that on one level the decision is a consequence of his feeling of alienation from the entire military enterprise. Like Huckleberry Finn’s belief that he has done the right thing by not turning Jim in as a runaway slave, Frederic feels he has made the right choice in deserting, and his resulting swim in the Tagliamento acts as a sort of baptism: “Anger was washed away in the river along with any obligation. . . . I would like to have had the uniform off although I did not care much about the outward forms. . . . I was through. . . . [I]t was not my show any more” (232). As was the case with Jake’s cathartic swims in *The Sun Also Rises*, Frederic’s leap into the river washes away his commitment to the restrictive masculine principle and focuses his attention instead on love:

I was not made to think. I was made to eat. My God, yes. Eat and drink and sleep with Catherine. To-night maybe. No that was impossible. But to-morrow night, and a good meal and sheets and never going away again except together. Probably have to go damned quickly. She would go. I knew she would go. When would we go? That was something to think about. (233)<sup>25</sup>

By the time he has left the war behind, then, Frederic is ready to forego his earlier attitude almost entirely to focus his attention on loving Catherine in such a manner as Cixous would advocate.

This conviction is clarified by Frederic’s comments in Book Four that, while in Stresa, he and Catherine become almost inseparable. Admittedly, Hemingway’s

descriptions are extremely romanticized, and the notion of young lovers having eyes only for one another was a cliché long before he wrote about it. However, there are important indicators of the author's true understanding of love and identity to be found in the passages in which Frederic recounts his time alone with Catherine:

We slept when we were tired and if we woke the other woke too so one was not alone. Often a man wishes to be alone and a girl wishes to be alone too and if they love each other they are jealous of that in each other, but I can truly say we never felt that. We could feel alone when we were together, alone against the others. It has only happened to me like that once. I have been alone while I was with many girls and that is the way you can be most lonely. But we were never lonely and never afraid when we were together.  
(249)

In conformity with Cixous's idea of love, Frederic and Hemingway inadvertently endorse the fact that only reciprocal love, based on sharing rather than subordination, offers lovers true happiness.<sup>26</sup> By living in and for one another, they can see themselves reflected in each other. Thus they are truly alone when together because the fusing of their identities makes ordinarily political divisions such as self/other or masculine/feminine obsolete.

It is important to recognize, however, that Frederic and Catherine only really begin to understand the potential for a committed sexual relationship after they have escaped from Italy to safety in Switzerland. In terms of the novel's approximation of feminine writing, Switzerland geographically symbolizes the space of openness Cixous posits as the breeding ground for bisexuality. In fact, her description of the bisexual and fulfilling relationship between the title lovers in Shakespeare's *Anthony and Cleopatra* might equally fit Frederic and Catherine's situation in Switzerland:

They have . . . abandoned the minuscule world. . . . And with a leap, it is toward the new land they go to look for an entirely different life. There, all powers are employed, not in diplomacy, or in politics (with which they have no other relation than that which is tragically imposed upon them, because they begin their eternal story right in the middle of an old history that does

not let itself just be forgotten like that) but employed to struggle against all the forces of death and to change all the ancient and reductive means of thinking life that would threaten to enclose it, slow it down, deaden it. (NBW 128)

Contrary to Finnegan's claims that it "is the land behind the looking glass, fundamentally deadening" and that "to go there is to be trapped" (162), Switzerland, with its four official languages, population of varied ethnic backgrounds, and political neutrality, serves well as a metaphor for a feminine zone of free play. "We live in country where nothing makes any difference," Frederic remarks (303); and this view of Switzerland as an area removed from constrictive moral codes surely exposes Hemingway's need to imagine a way out of a system forcing the repression of certain of his own gender and sexual tendencies. Given the freedom afforded by their escape from Italy, is it hardly surprising, therefore, that Frederic and Catherine should begin to experiment with their gender and sexual identities after settling in the Alps above Montreux. As he did in *The Sun Also Rises*, Hemingway again explores the social and personal significance of cross-gendered dress and hairstyle; however, the experiments in his second novel mark a new stage in his interest, in that they now evolve through a sexual relationship.

In terms of the early decades of the century when many women were attempting to rethink the social configuration of gender difference by such means as transvestism and mannish hairstyles, the long hair Catherine has worn throughout the novel indicates her acceptance of standard views of femininity. This fact is underscored by her admission to Frederic early in Book One that, after the death of her pilot, she "was going to cut it all off" (19). At this point, she sees her hair as the repository of her femininity, thinking that its length makes her womanly. Her desire to crop it following her fiancé's death is based, then, on the misguided assumption that she has failed her lover as a woman by not allowing

sexual intimacy between them; cutting it off would atone for her mistake.<sup>27</sup> By the time she and Frederic have escaped Italy, though, Catherine has overcome her guilty feelings and begun to reject a masculine construction of femininity, and she now proposes that she and Frederic grow matching hairstyles as if in response to their new gender freedom. Her experiments thus constitute a desire to refuse a male construction of her femininity and to complicate a masculine sense of the division between men and women. Catherine's proposal thus evidences Hemingway's progression from *The Sun Also Rises* in his exploration of identity creation. That is, if Brett's haircut offers a clue to his recognition of the need for women to defy masculine/cultural definitions of femininity, Catherine's desire for shorter hair to match Frederic's as a part of a more general sexual game between them uncovers the author's interest in the idea that gender is not static but fluid, that men and women are not gendered merely on biological grounds any more than on strictly cultural grounds; sexuality also plays a part.

This helps to explain why, for instance, Catherine first mentions her wish for a hairstyle like Frederic's while the two of them are discussing Frederic's past love life. Gender and sexuality clearly merge in Catherine's concomitant desires to look like Frederic and to have slept with his previous lovers ("I wish I'd stayed with all your girls so I could make fun of them to you" [299]). Superficially, her desire seems a jealousy over the fact that Frederic has had lovers while she has not, or that he has had lovers other than her. However, the importance of this conversation runs deeper than a desire to possess Frederic totally; or, rather, it is precisely that desire which hints at the true depth of Catherine's comment. In other words, by emulating the male, as she imagines doing in her dream, Catherine is complicating the masculine definitions of men's and women's sexual roles by

taking control. Moreover, the hint of lesbianism implied by Catherine's wish, as well as its political implications of women's avoiding the conscription of female sexuality, acts as a logical lead-in to her proposition that she and Frederic try new hairstyles, since these experiments will offer a real-world method of exploring gender outside typical masculine definitions that refuse female power and autonomy.

Of course, looked at from the standpoint of typical interpretations of androgyny, Catherine's dream of matching coiffures appears to be a simple rejection of gender difference altogether. By approximating a middle ground between masculinity and femininity, she seems to be denying the importance of gender distinction altogether. Upon closer examination, though, what Catherine is suggesting here looks more like a form of Cixousian bisexuality than a total loss of gender distinction. The haircuts will exacerbate the gender difference that already exists in herself and Frederic, in that a more female appearance will potentially cultivate Frederic's femininity while the more mannish cut she proposes for herself will release her latent masculinity. Such a stirring up of gender categories is further heightened by Catherine's desire for Frederic to continue simultaneously to grow the beard he has started which represents the standard facial demarcation of masculinity. The combination of a feminine hairstyle and masculine facial hair would thus be an example of the combination of genders which, according to Cixous, resides within all of us. That is to say, having a beard and long hair "doesn't annul differences but stirs them up" ("Laugh" 1096).<sup>28</sup>

While Catherine is willing and eager to explore a world of gender not based on the conventional methods of differentiation, Frederic appears at first to be rather hesitant to join in such experiments; a fact that indicates the difficulty Hemingway had in expressing

his feminine tendencies — even in such a latent form as fiction. To an extent, both Hemingway and Frederic “fearfully regard . . . *total* surrender to Catherine’s femininity as engulfment: as a regression to the helplessness of an infant before the threats of the world; as so complete a withdrawal from the world of functioning as to constitute a kind of psychic death” (Solotaroff 11). For instance, in answer to her suggestion that she cut her hair, Frederic says flatly, “I wouldn’t let you” (299), and, while he seems equally unwilling to grow his hair to match her proposed shortening of her own, he does accept her suggestion to continue growing his beard, as if in defense of the masculinity she is apparently threatening.

Yet when Catherine asks whether he would prevent her from trying a new shorter style, Frederic responds: “No. I think it would be exciting” (305). Furthermore, his beard hardly acts as an uncomplicated indication of his masculinity. In fact, after he has grown it he comes quickly to dislike it, or so seems to be the implication of his two comments about it after catching sight of the offending hair in a mirror. The first mention of his discomfort comes during his discussion of boxing in Lausanne: “I could not shadow-box in front of the narrow long mirror at first because it looked so strange to see a man with a beard boxing. But finally I just thought it was funny. I wanted to take off the beard as soon as I started boxing but Catherine did not want me to” (311). The other instance occurs as he is dressing to enter Catherine’s hospital room after she has begun labor: “I looked in the glass and saw myself looking like a fake doctor with a beard” (319). The implication of both passages is similar, and similarly detrimental to an argument in favor of Frederic’s unswerving allegiance to masculinity and its cultural markers. By this point in the novel, he has mostly given up on cultural definitions of gender identity, so it makes sense that he should feel

awkward with a facial manifestation of masculinity. The fact that he is engaged in occupations traditionally reserved for men (boxer and doctor) each time he catches sight of the beard, and is startled by it, suggests his wariness of external or biological definitions of gender. He may feel like a fake doctor, that is, because he now feels himself a fake man in terms of the methods of gender identification he used to operate under. The beard, and its symbolic status as an indicator of masculinity, is merely “funny” now because he has grown beyond the limited perception he had earlier in the novel when he might have believed such things.<sup>29</sup>

What we find, then, in Book Five, is Hemingway’s idealized version of the love he did not yet feel comfortable enough with in 1926 to offer to Jake and Brett. In some sense, their tragedy is partially overcome by the relationship Frederic and Catherine share in Switzerland where the rules of male culture seem not to apply. Yet as Frederic’s hesitation over a matching appearance with Catherine indicates, Hemingway’s difficulty with a bisexual model of gender existence governs the outcome of *Farewell* just as it did that of his previous novel. In the end, he was still too uneasy with his femininity to offer a happy ending, making Catherine’s death symbolic of his discomfort with himself and of his inability to let his feminine side show. Despite its unhappy outcome, however, or perhaps even because of its very unhappiness, *Farewell* can be recognized as marking a further alignment of Hemingway’s work with Cixousian themes, in that Cixous herself admits that a complete evasion of patriarchal law is impossible:

we must make no mistake: men and women are caught up in a web of age-old cultural determinations that are almost unanalyzable in their complexity. One can no more speak of “woman” than of “man” without being trapped within an ideological theater where the proliferation of representations, images, reflections, myths, identifications, transform, deform, constantly change everyone’s Imaginary and invalidate in advance any

conceptualization. . . . [W]e are still floundering — with few exceptions — in Ancient History. (NBW 83)

While certain people do try to rethink the way the world understands gender difference, she implies, the attempt to create a new order generally fails. That difficulty of reconceptualizing the world by means of recalculating gender identity along nonpolitical lines is underscored by a look at some of the male authors whom Cixous advocates as writers of *écriture féminine*. Men such as Genet and Kleist, for example, lived particularly troubled lives, unsure of their place in the world, and Hemingway's equally difficult existence suggests that he, too, paid dearly for his inner desire to be something other than was expected of him. Perhaps necessarily, then, this is true also of the idyllic world Hemingway allows Catherine and Frederic to inhabit for a brief time in Switzerland.

It is telling of his inability fully to understand or accept his own femininity that he refused to offer a happy ending to his lovers in this novel. If, indeed, we can see something of Agnes and/or Hadley in Catherine, it is not surprising that the affair ends badly. Looking beyond such a correspondence, though, we might imagine that the novel's conclusion is fitting in terms of the difficulty that anyone, not just Hemingway, faces in conceiving of an alternative to the highly politicized and hierarchized system of identity creation now in place in our society. The tragedy of *A Farewell to Arms*, as Hemingway makes clear (and as Cixous might be imagined to endorse), is that virtue is no protection against cruelty:

If people bring so much courage to this world the world has to kill them to break them, so of course it kills them. The world breaks every one and afterward many are strong at the broken places. But those that will not break it kills. It kills the very good and the very gentle and the very brave impartially. If you are none of these you can be sure it will kill you too but there will be no special hurry. (249)

The connection between this sentiment and Cixous's comment that "the world is too jealous

not to put love to death" (*NBW* 120) should alert us to an affinity between the two writers; in both, we can detect a lament for the present condition of the world in which rigid cultural definitions of gender and sexuality obliterate a feminine approach to male-female relationships. The courage Catherine and Frederic might be said to exhibit in their questioning of current gender constructions is also the courage of Hemingway in exploring, albeit obliquely, his own difficulties with personal identity. The fact that the novel ends without the satisfaction of their continued love does not mean that Hemingway did not make the attempt to document what such a love could be or what sort of power it could have; rather, it suggests his continuing inability to conceive of how it could be lived in a real-world context. Tellingly, the despair that marks the final pages of the novel, after the elation of Frederic and Catherine's love together, matches very closely the despair Cixous feels over the law of phallogocentric society, which sees difference only as a danger. Yet Cixous refuses to allow this to bury the happiness offered by love of a bisexual and non-confrontational kind. The hope she holds for humanity is that men might be able to betray their patriarchal roots and embrace femininity, a hope that explains how she is able to take tragedies and extract from them their positive aspects. It is also a hope that might forge a final bond between her theories and *A Farewell to Arms*. One play in particular, Kleist's 1808 tragedy *Penthesilea*, can be called upon to make that bond explicit.<sup>30</sup>

In its mythical form, the story of Penthesileia tells of the death of the eponymous Amazon queen during the Greek siege of Troy. Kleist, though, inverts the myth, portraying Penthesileia's murder of Achilles rather than his killing of her as the traditional story maintains. In his version, Mars predicts that Penthesileia will fall in love with Achilles, best him in single combat during the Trojan War, and then take him as a captive to her

homeland of Themiscyra where he will father her children. The prophecy comes partially true when the two great warriors meet in battle and are instantly attracted to one another. During the contest, Penthesileia is beaten by Achilles, who demands that she accompany him back to Greece, despite her request that he go with her. When she refuses, Achilles abandons her and rejoins his troops attacking Troy. So smitten is he, though, that he determines to engage her once more, pitch the battle, and allow her to take him triumphantly home. Unfortunately, the queen has been deeply wounded by Achilles' initial insistence that they return to Greece and vows revenge. Tragedy ensues when, after he allows the physically weaker Penthesileia to beat him, she is not content simply to take him prisoner but instead attacks and kills him in a blind rage, almost rending him limb from limb. Having satisfied her vengeance, she returns to her army, but her victory is short lived. She soon recovers her senses and realizes what she has done, whereupon she dies of grief and guilt, her body falling across Achilles' brutalized corpse (Kleist 165-268).

Needless to say, aside from the coincidence of lovers trapped by war and death, this story seems, at first glance, rather far removed from *A Farewell to Arms*. However, by invoking Cixous's view of Kleist's play as an example of *écriture féminine*, we can begin to discern thematic comparisons with Hemingway's novel. As Cixous notes, *Penthesilea* pits love against death, the masculine attempt to dominate against the feminine attempt to fuse, and there is surely something similar at work in Hemingway's novel. In addition, the interchange between self and other that Frederic and Catherine undertake is set against the backdrop of war, much like Kleist's play. Moreover, the problem that Hemingway's unfortunate lovers must face — namely, a culture that does not want their love to succeed — reflects the impediments of gender division and hierarchy that Cixous finds in

*Penthesileia*, impediments she claims always interfere with open love:

In history, the first obstacle, always already there, is in the existence, the production and reproduction of images, types, coded and suitable ways of behaving, and in society's identification with a scene in which roles are fixed so that lovers are always initially trapped by the puppets with which they are assumed to merge. You are not a man, you are not a woman, you are first of all son of, daughter of, you are from such-and-such a class, such-and-such a family, such-and-such a tribe. You are first the anonymous element of a given category, and your fate is set in advance. If you are woman, you will resemble ideal woman; and you will obey the imperatives that mark your line. You will channel your desires, you will address them where, how, and to whom it is proper. You will honor the laws. (*NBW* 113)

Given this inevitability, it is no surprise that Hemingway's novel, like Kleist's play, begins as an example of masculine writing. In both cases, the main characters start out by identifying themselves in terms of opposition: Penthesileia and Achilles serve opposing armies, Catherine and Frederic have distinctly different sexual value systems. Cixous thus explains that in Kleist's play the "Greeks and Amazons are defining their relation to sexuality and love in terms of exclusion/inclusion" (*NBW* 115), and, because of this, Kleist's characters cannot forego their ingrained hatred of each other — Penthesileia wants only to have Mars' prediction come true, Achilles wants only that his masculine authority be respected. This quarrel for sexual supremacy balances Frederic's and Catherine's similar attempts to force each other to act out preordained roles. His initial desire for a casual sexual experience with an attractive nurse epitomizes the typically masculine view of women only as sexual objects, while her preliminary wish for Frederic to replace her dead fiancé exposes her refusal to relate to Frederic as an individual.<sup>31</sup>

What is surprising, in the case of both works, is that such inauspicious beginnings evolve into tolerance and then into love, intimating that for both authors the ultimate goal is not to depict misery and discord (the inevitable results of exclusionary and hierarchical

thinking), but rather to underscore the importance of love based on shared experience and an acceptance of difference. In both pieces, phallogocentric dominance — the refusal of openness and difference — is quickly overshadowed by the growing love between the main characters. The competition for supremacy in *Penthesilea* fades before the feelings that develop between Kleist's protagonists, just as the importance of the war in *A Farewell to Arms* loses significance to Frederic and Catherine's relationship. Instead of developing into typical war stories, then, "everything is turned upside down" by the heroes' reciprocal love (Cixous, *NBW* 115); at the point of their emotional attachment, the importance of the conflict fades before the passion they have begun to feel. Now "[the territorial] war is no longer *the* war. This battle to the death is no longer a battle" (Cixous, *NBW* 115). As Cixous notes, the stakes change over the course of Kleist's play; and the same is true of Hemingway's novel. In both, the private loves of the couples grow out of, but eventually outgrow, the wars that spark them.

Though both lovers die in Kleist's drama, they have learned that love must be based on an openness to the other. Achilles understands his excessiveness in demanding Penthesileia accompany him to Greece, and Penthesileia learns that her suspicion of him has been equally excessive. From these revelations comes a new foundation of commitment, according to Cixous, laid out by the couple's understanding of love as an exploration of each lover's selfhood through the other. Such a discovery seems also to occur in *A Farewell to Arms*. Like the "transgressive form of desire" Kleist's lovers enjoy after their move away from a restrictive "economy of opposition and war" (Shiach 29, 16), Catherine and Frederic's time in Switzerland is the beginning of a truly Cixousian love. Though Catherine's death negates the possibility of the continuation of that love, the very fact that

Frederic has not forgotten the lessons of love she taught to him — and has even gone so far as to memorialize them by writing the novel — lends strength to an interpretation of the novel not as moralizing on the dangers of allowing women power, as some critics would have it do, but rather on the dangers of politicizing and hierarchizing gender.

In his second novel, Hemingway has developed upon the feminist humanist ideas that were embryonic in *The Sun Also Rises*, so that, by the conclusion, he has given readers a glimpse of the ability of bisexual love to overthrow restrictive gender parameters. The love that was denied to Brett and Jake three years earlier is now conceded to Frederic and Catherine, at least for a time. Their movement from an opposition to each other's sexual identity to a communion involving shared gender experience offers an example of the need Hemingway felt to attempt to reconcile the battle between masculinity and femininity being waged inside him. That he should have made that attempt through a reciprocal sexual relationship further develops our understanding of the increasing similarity between Hemingway's views of love, gender, and sexuality and those Cixous espouses as the foundation of *écriture féminine*. At this point in his life, he was admittedly still unable to make such a love work for any length of time, both in his fiction and in his personal life; however, Hemingway was now beginning to define what such a love and tolerance would look like. In his next major novel, though it would not arrive for another eleven years, he would do more to make that love successful, to the point that even the death of one partner could not destroy it.

## Chapter IV

### *For Whom the Bell Tolls:* Loving in a Feminine Mode

By way of the love story of Jordan and Maria, Hemingway develops his sensitivity to sexuality and gender identity in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* even further than in *A Farewell to Arms*. By examining the complex relationships that evolve in this book we can understand just how much effect his life experiences and increasing personal insight were having on his writing by 1940 and just how far Hemingway had come in the ten years since his last successful attempt at extended fiction.<sup>1</sup> If Catherine and Frederic had been offered a glimpse of feminine love in Switzerland, Robert Jordan and Maria's relationship in the Spanish mountains would be even more intensified, despite being much shorter, and would demonstrate the development Hemingway was making in his attempts to sort out his doubts and desires. The couple's three days together evidence Hemingway's growing interest in loving and sexual commitment; Jordan's refusal to dwell on the impending doom forecast for the bridge-blowing mission in favor of loving Maria implicates his creator in a typically Cixousian refusal of death in favor of life. That championing of love even extends to homosexuality in *Bell*, as Pilar and Maria's apparently mutual attraction in the manuscript

marks a movement beyond Hemingway's earlier investigations of same-sex desire. Though, in the end, he toned down the hints of lesbianism in revising the manuscript for publication, Pilar's sexual preference can fit into a feminist humanist view of *Bell* as an indication of the author's recognition of and openness to a variety of sexual (and therefore gender) identities. Of even more importance to Pilar's role as the indicator of Hemingway's growing accession to his femininity is her ability as a story-teller. The linguistic power Hemingway accords to her is suggestive, perhaps, of the sort of power Cixous encourages women to explore by writing their bodies and their experiences. In fact, Pilar looks remarkably like the strong independent woman Cixous envisions as the writer of *écriture féminine*, much as she resembles the strong independent women Hemingway had known through his life. It is arguable, even, that through his characterization of her he was trying to reassess those relationships as he approached middle age. Finally, it seems, by 1940 Hemingway was beginning to deal more openly with the doubts he harbored about many aspects of his identity, from his search for a sustainable relationship with a woman to a confrontation with his father's suicide and his own suicidal tendencies.

Of course, to suggest that *For Whom the Bell Tolls* marks the next step in Hemingway's evolution as a feminine writer is not to ignore the work that appeared between 1929 and 1940. Stories such as "The Sea Change," "A Way You'll Never Be," and "The Mother of a Queen" in *Winner Take Nothing* (1933) had already addressed his questions about sexuality and sexual preference, and *To Have and Have Not* offered an increased interest in female attitudes towards sexual pleasure.<sup>2</sup> While these works do offer tangential proof of Hemingway's increasing tendency to a Cixousian type of gender and sexual awareness, the writing he did in the 1930s may be better considered a practice run

than anything else, a foreshortened and preliminary working out of themes that would flourish at the close of the decade in *Bell*, a novel that, perhaps not coincidentally, would prove to be his longest published fictional manuscript.

It is almost as if Hemingway had to live through those harrowing eleven years — the “expensive decade,” as Reynolds calls it — and write those shorter pieces before he was ready to tackle such a massive project:

To create his characters [in *Bell*] he needed all those Spanish days of *Death in the Afternoon*, studying the bullring and the faces surrounding it. He needed the African book to learn about people moving through terrain. He needed all those experiments with structure before he could write this story which has within it several other stories, each in a separate voice. He needed his affair with Martha before he could write of his fictional Maria. He needed the strength and purpose of Pauline to create the older woman, Pilar. . . . He needed to watch the Italian bombers on the Tortosa road before he could describe the bombing of the lonely hilltop. (*The 1930s* 304-05)

The years between *A Farewell to Arms* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, it is safe to say, could be looked upon as a decade of apprenticeship, teaching Hemingway about his world, his writing, and himself. As John Raeburn has explained, “in the early 1930s [Hemingway began] to cultivate a large public reputation” (*Fame* 33) which grew to the extent that by the mid-point of the decade “his fame was more than literary. . . . By 1936 he was truly a celebrity — a public figure more renowned for his personality than for his accomplishments, however substantial those might be” (*Fame* 37). Hemingway’s inability to complete a major manuscript during this time might owe something to the fact that he had “begun to publicize himself as someone more than a writer — indeed, it often seemed, as someone only incidentally a writer” (Raeburn, *Fame* 31).

With his attention turned more toward adventuring than writing, it stands to reason that the major works of the early 1930s were less imaginatively based than his previous

books. Though both *Death in the Afternoon* and *Green Hills of Africa* do have their fictional elements, they were occasioned more, perhaps, by Hemingway's interest in documenting his love of bullfighting and big-game hunting and by his journalistic sensibility than by his need to write fiction. However, it is significant that both books, like his other writing of the 1930s, do address sexual and gender issues. Firstly, they extend the project he had begun in *The Sun Also Rises* and *A Farewell to Arms*. Secondly, and more importantly, they were to become catalysts in his creation of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. The fact that the decade culminated in the writing of that book, which develops even further his anticipation of "change in the world of men and women" (Lewis, "Warrior-Writer" 67), suggests how extensive Hemingway's search had become by this point for answers to his questions about gender and sexuality.

Arguing for *Bell* as a new high-point of introspection for Hemingway might seem a dubious claim, at first, because of the point of view he used to tell the story of Jordan's ill-fated demolition assignment. Though he originally began the manuscript in the first person, Hemingway quickly altered it, "deciding almost from the start to write this story in the detached third person" (Reynolds, *The 1930s* 301). On the surface, this appears to demonstrate a wish on the part of the author to distance himself from his protagonist — if it can be assumed that many readers would more automatically equate a first-person narrator with the author's own voice. Yet in certain ways, the omniscient narrator he eventually chose is actually more self-revealing than the first-person narrator he had used previously in *A Farewell to Arms*. The detachment of not seeing solely through one character's perspective allowed a certain honesty about himself to creep into Hemingway's story, an honesty that writing from a first-person point of view might not have permitted.<sup>3</sup> It also fits

with a feminine sense of writing that he should deal with his private struggles and personal demons in a book that allows for multiple voices to speak. The possibility of getting inside the hearts and thoughts of many characters offered Hemingway the opportunity to explore new attitudes toward the themes he had been rehearsing for so long, without necessarily accepting them as his own.

Point of view aside, the amount of time it took Hemingway to prepare himself to write a totally new novel after *Farewell* is ironically appropriate given that *Bell* deals so directly with the very question of time's passage, the most obvious indication being the book's taking over four hundred pages to detail a seventy-two-hour period. Whether it succeeds or not as Joycean epic, the novel's telescoping of time does make for some intriguing speculations as to Hemingway's seemingly Cixousian attitudes toward life and death. In an intriguing essay linking *Bell* and Proust's *à la recherche du temps perdu* with Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity, Ben Stoltzfus examines Hemingway's connection of time and love, concluding that Jordan and Maria's love and lovemaking are "concretizations of feeling and emotion . . . that . . . resist the erosion of time and the corrosive forces of death" (20). Conley offers a similar equation of love and life in her discussion of how feminine writing, based on a bisexual acceptance of otherness, acts as a rejuvenating force: "Cixous's endeavor . . . has been to push back the limits of death in and through writing. She . . . rearticulates life and death in such a way as to privilege life and love . . . , continuously urging a discourse of deliverance with resonances of coming onto life and love" ("Saying 'Yes'" 93). Linking these two ideas together, we can begin to recognize that, through the love affair that lies at the center of *Bell* and through its focus on life over death, Hemingway is allowing his femininity more latitude than he had ever done

in the past.<sup>4</sup>

If we acknowledge that for Cixous the “act of . . . writing as a female represents a fundamental birth drive which will destroy the old order of death” (Stanton 78), the possibility that Hemingway uses his third novel to work out — or at least come to terms with — his own feelings about dying becomes all the more intriguing. From his fascination with bullfighting and his passion for hunting to his interest in war, it is clear that death was an overwhelmingly important matter to Hemingway. All of his death-dealing hobbies to the contrary, though, perhaps it is not specifically death, but the human attitude toward it, that held such an allure for him. For example, the majority of his work that centers on death has less to do with the acts of dying or killing than with the various methods of accepting death or murder. While “The Snows of Kilimanjaro” is probably the best example, *Bell*, too, is bound up with the question of whether to treat death as a tragic necessity, a sought-after release, or a natural inevitability.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, most of the novel’s subplots are ruminations on how people accept death, from Jordan’s thoughts about his father’s suicide to Anselmo’s resigned distaste at having to kill. And in each case, the author favors a view that refuses to privilege death over life.

It is significant, first of all, that Hemingway should take time to address the issue of self-inflicted death in his first lengthy fictional manuscript since his father’s suicide. When Dr. Hemingway shot himself in 1928, he suffered from diabetes, hypertension, hemochromatosis, and almost certainly from manic depression, many of which illnesses would also plague his son thirty-three years later.<sup>6</sup> The fact that most of Ed’s more serious ailments went undiagnosed meant that the family had little idea of the real reasons for his suicide; and, in the absence of any medical knowledge that might have helped to explain his

father's actions, Ernest reached for the nearest scapegoat: his parents' often strained relationship. Having grown up seeing Grace and Ed invert typical gender-role behaviors, not to mention seeing her rule the house (and her husband), Hemingway began, not surprisingly perhaps, to lay the blame for his father's death on a combination of the doctor's innate weakness and Grace's dominance. In fact, from the time of his father's death, Hemingway began to imagine that "Ed [was] a castrated weakling dominated by the monstrous Grace" (Meyers, *Biography* 212).

While this view is a rather unfair assessment of the situation and of Hemingway's parents and might be imagined to have added to Hemingway's sense of gender division, the effect of dealing with his father's suicide in *Bell* would, oddly enough, be to bring his writing closer to a Cixousian focusing on life rather than death. That emphasis is partly demonstrated by the author's transformation of his resentment, anger, and sadness — and maybe even fear — over his father's suicide into Jordan's shame over his own father's death: "as he thought, he realized that if there was any such thing as ever meeting [his father in the afterlife], both he and his grandfather would be acutely embarrassed by the presence of his father. Any one has the right to do it, he thought. But it isn't a good thing to do. I understand it, but I do not approve of it" (338). The disdain both author and character feel could be seen as Jordan's and Hemingway's preliminary move away from a masculine focus on death. Though Jordan realizes why his father did what he did, he cannot endorse it, and that conclusion, with its potential meaning for his own life, implies the desire Hemingway felt to come to terms with Ed's death and to reject suicide.

Something of this refusal to dwell on death also plays out in Anselmo's distaste for what is required of him at the bridge when he must kill the sentry to protect Jordan and is a

sign of what Romesburg calls “the traditionally feminine aspect of Anselmo’s character: Of all the men in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, he expresses the only real compassion for the victims of his actions” (146). Anselmo is, as Jordan remarks to himself, “against all killing” (63), and participates only because it is his duty, knowing that he will eventually have to repent the murder:

I hated the shooting of the guard and it made me an emotion but that is passed now. How could the *Inglés* say that the shooting of a man is like the shooting of an animal? In all hunting I have had an elation and no feeling of wrong. But to shoot a man gives a feeling as though one had struck one’s own brother when you are grown men. And to shoot him various times to kill him. Nay, do not think of that. . . . That is over, he told himself, and thou canst try to atone for it as for the others. (442-43)<sup>7</sup>

Certainly, Anselmo feels guilty over the death he has caused and hopes later to expiate that guilt through prayer. His refusal to let himself dwell on what he has done, though, suggests an attempt not to let death interfere with his responsibilities during the mission. With thoughts of death come thoughts of despair, and it is in an attempt to stave off desperation that Anselmo counsels himself to ignore the death he has inflicted, for the time being, in order to carry out his orders.<sup>8</sup>

A similar sense of being bound by his responsibilities conditions almost all of Robert Jordan’s decisions. For the most part, he ignores anything that might take his attention away from his mission. Yet even as he forces himself to focus on the objective of blowing the bridge and thus repeatedly returns to a contemplation of the death he believes will accompany it, Jordan chides himself for this habit, reminding himself time and again not to let these morbid thoughts interfere with his relationship with Maria. Though he is destined to die and though Hemingway was working the novel toward a tragic conclusion from the outset, we must recognize that both the author and his protagonist want to

emphasize life even in the face of death. That, certainly, is the implication of Jordan's thoughts about the importance of enjoying his time with Maria while it is still possible. Lying with her after their first experience of mutual orgasm in chapter thirteen, Jordan realizes that his feelings for her differ from any he felt for a woman before. He further understands that the depth of that emotion necessitates his concentration on it and his commitment to it: "if your life trades its seventy years for seventy hours I have that value now and I am lucky enough to know it. And if there is not any such thing as a long time, nor the rest of your lives, nor from now on, but there is only now, why then now is the thing to praise and I am very happy with it" (166).

Jordan believes that he and Maria are "making an alliance against death" (264) through their love for each other. Thus whenever his thoughts wander from his love for Maria morbidly back to the likely deadly result of his mission, he reproaches himself for focusing on the wrong thing: "Til death do us part. In two nights. Much more than likely. Much more than likely and now lay off that sort of thinking. You can stop that now. That's not good for you. Do nothing that is not good for you. Sure that's it" (168). Instead, he determines that he will "take what [he has], and do [his] work," with the result that he "will have a long life and a merry one" (169). It is important that Hemingway should emphasize the length of Jordan's life here since it returns the novel to the question of time and also to a feminist humanist attitude towards time's passage. While it defies temporal logic that two nights or seventy hours might represent a long life, Jordan's determination explains that he is thinking not in terms of chronological time but of psychological time; his life will be a long and merry one because he will spend his remaining hours confirming the meaningfulness of his existence.<sup>9</sup>

While this emphasis on a qualitative rather than a quantitative view of life moves Jordan away from a pessimistic masculine attitude toward a feminine attitude of optimism, we must remember that he only makes the change as a result of Maria's and Pilar's assistance.<sup>10</sup> That partly explains why the opening pages of the book, when Jordan meets Maria and is instantly drawn to her, appear to offer us merely another instance of the Frederic-Henry-like masculine hero lusting after the prettiest, most available woman, without any desire to form a relationship with her. It also explains some critics' discomfort at the seeming immediate emotional connection between Jordan and Maria. As Eby sums up the situation, "there is something a little perverse about love at first sight. The lover . . . *recognizes* some quality that speaks to him, . . . but this quality isn't *in* the object so much as it is projected onto the object and then 'discovered' there" (111).<sup>11</sup> It may indeed be misreading the signs to suggest that the feelings passing between Jordan and Maria are, in the first place, loving ones; we should probably consider the "thickness in his throat" (22) that Jordan feels when he first sees Maria simply as an indication (perhaps a too-heavy-handed one by Hemingway) of his sexual desire for her, not as an indication of love. This view of his sexual opportunism is furthered by Jordan's primary focus on her physical features: "he noticed her handsome brown hands. . . . She had high cheekbones, merry eyes and a straight mouth with full lips. . . . [H]e could see the shape of her small, uptilted breasts under the gray shirt" (22). As Hemingway heroes have done in the past when they first meet or introduce us to their heroines, Jordan views her in sexually objectified ways — a treatment Maria is sadly all too used to.

Given the fascists' rape of her, it almost goes without saying that the nature of sexuality for Maria prior to Jordan's entry into her life is modeled on a masculine

debasement of the feminine. Even worse, the description of their assault of her in chapter thirty-one exposes the fact that it is not just her sexual degradation that they desire but a defilement of her very identity as a woman. As we have seen him do in past novels, and as he would go on to do even more purposefully in *The Garden of Eden*, Hemingway once again uses hair length to explore issues of gender identity, this time through the fascists' attempt to humiliate Maria by shaving her head. As we learned in *The Sun Also Rises*, short hair tends to negate a woman's female identity in Spain since Spanish culture equates long hair with femininity. The fascists' cutting off of Maria's hair is thus a rape of her feminine gender identity, as much as their physical violation of her is a rape of her female sexual identity. Hemingway makes this clear in Maria's description of the scene, during which the equation between her hair and her identity is forcefully made:

“[the leader of the group] stood in front of me and struck me across the face with the braids [he had cut off] while the other two held me and he said, ‘This is how we make Red nuns. This will show thee how to unite with thy proletarian brothers. Bride of the Red Christ.’

“And he struck me again and again across the face with the braids which had been mine and then he put the two of them in my mouth and tied them tight around my neck, knotting them in the back to make a gag and the two holding me laughed.” (352)

The conjunction here of religion, political affiliation, sexuality and gender is important in recognizing how Maria's hair functions for the fascists as a metaphor for her entire existence, as if all facets of her identity were bound up in her braids and as if she could be destroyed by losing them. Hemingway underscores this when Maria's best friend, Concepción García, is brought into the shop to suffer the same treatment and does not recognise her. “[W]hen she saw me she did not recognize me,” Maria tells Jordan, “and then she recognized me, and she screamed, and I could hear her screaming all the time they were shoving me across the square, and into the doorway, and up the stairs of the city hall

and into the office of my father where they laid me onto the couch” (353). The fact that Concepción fails to identify the now-bald Maria suggests society’s equation of gender identity with external appearance.

Maria’s own embarrassment at her slowly growing hair when she begins to flirt with Jordan only a couple of months after her rape, as well as his qualified assessment of her beauty when he first sees her (“she’d be beautiful if they hadn’t cropped her hair” [22]), also implies Hemingway’s sense that gender and sexual identity are often tied to externals. Yet as she begins to fall in love with Jordan and to rely more on a personal sense of sexuality, Maria becomes less conscious of her short hair; in fact, rather than see it as an impediment to her beauty, she begins to regard it as part of her sexual attractiveness.<sup>12</sup> This explains why she begins increasingly to use her hair as an element of excitement in the relationship, nuzzling her head against Jordan’s hands, chin and shoulders at numerous points in the book. The embarrassment she initially feels ceases as their relationship develops because theirs is a feminine love that refuses to be bound by the male need to subjugate female sexuality, something Hemingway demonstrates by way of his detailed and positive depiction of their emotional and physical compatibility — a compatibility that approximates a feminine sexual economy.<sup>13</sup>

From some angles, of course, Hemingway’s attitude towards Maria does appear proprietary, particularly in her sexual relationship with Jordan. His repeated urging of her to slip into the sleeping bag during their first night together and his almost impatient attempt to help her strip off her clothes make it obvious that he is eager to begin a sexual encounter with her. This has led at least one critic to accuse Jordan of being “patronizingly male-chauvinistic” and to suggest that he wants to use Maria’s sexuality solely for the purposes

of his own “sexual self-aggrandizement” (Rudat, “Hemingway’s Rabbit” 40). Such a charge may be levelled in part because of the unfortunate nickname Hemingway chooses for his heroine. As was made clear as early as 1941, the Spanish word *conejo*, the English translation of which — rabbit — becomes Jordan’s most common nickname for Maria, is “one of the more frequent and vulgar euphemisms for the female sexual organ” (Barea 207), equivalent to the English “pussy” or “beaver.” Needless to say, a male author’s use of such a term for his heroine seriously undermines a connection with feminine writing. However, it seems plausible to imagine that Hemingway’s mistake was just that, an unfortunate blunder by a man not well versed in the language. Allen Josephs, the contemporary scholar whose examination of Hemingway’s use and misuse of Spanish in *Bell* introduced many new readers to Hemingway’s or Jordan’s slip of the tongue concerning Maria’s nickname, presents a fairly convincing case that the unfortunate term is merely one in a litany of linguistic errors Hemingway made in the novel. Josephs’s assessment of Jordan’s true love for Maria by book’s end suggests to him that Maria “is not meant to be the object of a lewd or puerile play on words” (214), a contention that seems more than likely if we examine the unironical and deeply moving manner in which Hemingway depicts the love that blossoms between the two characters.<sup>14</sup>

In the same manner as her possibly derogatory nickname, Maria’s ignorance in the ways of love, implied by her desire for Jordan to teach her how to kiss, may also seem at first to be an indicator of Hemingway’s phallocentrism. Making his male character a knowledgeable lover, while his heroine remains ignorant, appears to suggest their creator’s desire for male supremacy over the feminine. However, the overwhelming sense when Jordan and Maria first make love is one of tenderness and communion, not of divisiveness

and male dominance.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, the very phrasing Hemingway employs to describe Jordan's feelings at lying naked beside her might intimate a feminine attitude in the author:

Now as they lay all that before had been shielded was unshielded. Where there had been roughness of fabric all was smooth with a smoothness and firm rounded pressing and a long warm coolness, cool outside and warm within, long and light and closely holding, closely held, lonely, hollow-making with contours, happy-making, young and loving and now all warmly smooth. . . . (70-71)

It is important, first of all, to note the similarities here to Cixous's description of female love. The correlation between the lovers' divestment of clothes and simultaneous dropping of emotional restraints — the unshielding of all that has previously been shielded — suggests the openness of non-politicized love available to bisexual lovers. Furthermore, the lack of overt sexuality in the passage suggests a deepening of feeling on Jordan's part, as if he has moved past the stage where Maria's only effect on him is to swell his throat or his other parts.

The unshielding that occurs here may even be indicative of a desire on Hemingway's part to be equally open and committed in his own relationships. It is a desire all the more understandable when we recall that, during the course of writing *Bell*, his personal life was at a particularly turbulent point; while he lived openly with Martha Gellhorn in Cuba, he was still married to Pauline. Jordan and Maria's affair might possibly be viewed as an imaginative forecasting of how his relationship with Martha would play out after his divorce, as if Hemingway were trying to find the right way to approach this new love affair in order to keep it from crumbling as his first two marriages had. It might not be too much to suggest, even, that it was due to a lack of any such connection at this stage of his real life that Hemingway was encouraged to explore the possibility in his fiction. The fictional relationship could plausibly be examined, then, as a sort of wish-fulfillment for the

author, much as Catherine and Frederic's affair was meant to soothe him during the earlier stormy time of his break up with Hadley. Unfortunately, the possibility for this kind of unencumbered relationship was destined to fail in his marriage to Martha, due mostly to his inability consciously to let go of his masculine ideas about writing and female sexuality. Yet his attention to the positive energy passing between Jordan and Maria as a result of their sexual compatibility surely suggests Hemingway's hope of finding a different approach to his own interaction with women.

The earth-moving joy that the couple twice experiences aligns closely with Cixous's sense of feminine love, certainly, and may be evidence of Hemingway's unconscious wish to change his masculine attitudes. If nothing else, this would make sense of Pilar's comment to the two lovers, after they first experience mutual ecstasy in chapter thirteen, that the earth "never moves more than three times in a lifetime" (174), a comment that implies Hemingway's interest in underlining the importance, even the sacredness, of what Maria and Jordan have just shared. Though Jordan is sceptical about Pilar's gypsy "wizardry" (175), Hemingway's attitude towards the efficacy of the union is far less cynical. The description he offers of their lovemaking itself, though typically perplexing, indicates his belief in the positive nature of Maria and Jordan's experience. Indeed, before they even begin to make love, a force seems to bind the two together:

in his hand, he felt the girl's hand firm and strong, the fingers locked in his. From it, from the palm of her hand against the palm of his, from their fingers locked together, and from her wrist across his wrist something came from her hand, her fingers and her wrist to his that was as fresh as the first light air that moving toward you over the sea barely wrinkles the glassy surface of a calm, as light as a feather moved across one's lip, or a leaf falling when there is no breeze; so light that it could be felt with the touch of their fingers alone, but that was so strengthened, so intensified, and made so urgent, so aching and so strong by the hard pressure of their fingers and the close pressed palm and wrist, that it was as though a current moved up his

arm and filled his whole body with an aching hollowness of wanting. (158)

The almost electric energy passing between Jordan and Maria argues in favor of Hemingway's non-ironical approach to their relationship and intimates his wish to explore the positive power of human sexual desire and love. That he will shortly go on to depict their lovemaking in terms that call to mind Cixous's rules of *écriture féminine* further supports the contention that, at least in this novel, Hemingway was doing his best to offer a view of sexuality that differed substantially from the masculine model he followed in his real-life relationships.

In discussing the treatment of sexuality in Cixous's novel *le livre de Promethea*, Emma Wilson claims that Cixous "almost exclusively narrates and creates a text of the interior and of metaphor, only loosely related to social reality . . . , an interior realm of consciousness, perception and imaginary scenarios" ("Erotics" 129). A similar argument could be made in connection with the methods Hemingway employs to express Jordan and Maria's simultaneous sexual pleasure in chapter thirteen. In fact, the distinction he makes between their respective attitudes toward sexual pleasure is important. Since he characterizes Maria's and Jordan's responses in terms that Cixous herself might be expected to use in differentiating masculine enjoyment from feminine, it is intriguing, to say the least, that it is the depiction of Maria's *jouissance* that, in the end, Hemingway appears to favor. As she lies beneath Jordan, Maria first feels a sensuous attachment to the world around her: "there was the smell of heather crushed and the roughness of the bent stalks under her head and the sun bright on her closed eyes. . . . [F]or her everything was red, orange, gold-red from the sun on the closed eyes, and it was all that color, all of it, the filling, the possessing, the having, all of that color, all in a blindness of color" (159). The

attempt Hemingway makes to describe Maria's feelings — indeed his very entry into her consciousness — offers an important clue to his developing desire to explore femininity and to bring female sexuality to life. It is significant, for example, that she appears actively involved in the couple's lovemaking, rather than being passive as a masculine system of sexuality would require; she is not possessed, but is a part of the possessing and the having, an equal in sexual power.

This positivity in Maria's sexual response is markedly different from the way Jordan first feels during intercourse:

For him it was a dark passage which led to nowhere, then to nowhere, then again to nowhere, once again to nowhere, always and forever to nowhere, heavy on the elbows in the earth to nowhere, dark, never any ending to nowhere, hung on all time always to unknowing nowhere, this time and again for always to nowhere, now not to be borne once again always and to nowhere, now beyond all bearing up, up, up and into nowhere. (159)

The terms Hemingway chooses to express Jordan's response are obviously negative and make the typical phallogentric equation of femininity with nothingness and the threat of male absorption. Yet by the end of the scene, it is the female response that reigns supreme, as Jordan's feelings of fear during the lovemaking are soon alleviated by the burst of pleasure he and Maria share during their simultaneous climax. As the world moves for both of them, Hemingway shows that the experience changes Jordan's way of thinking: "suddenly, scaldingly, holdingly all nowhere [was] gone and time [was] absolutely still and they were both there, time having stopped and he felt the earth move out and away from under them" (159). At the moment of orgasm, Jordan's senses once more come into play. The feeling of holding Maria, the sensation of warmth from their bodies, and, particularly, the metaphorical notion of being transported off the earth, refocus the scene on sensory perception instead of sensory deprivation. Through their combined *jouissance*, Hemingway

implies, Jordan has arrived at a response similar to Maria's — aware of the togetherness in lovemaking rather than being fearful of it.<sup>16</sup> The fact that time and place also regain importance suggests Hemingway's movement away from a negative sense of female sexuality. Nowhere vanishes and time stops, indicating perhaps a symbolic staying of death through the concentration on being that occurs for Jordan at the height of ecstasy and implying, however inadvertently, that Hemingway was moving towards a feminine model of sexual relations.<sup>17</sup>

The same is true of the couple's second and final earth-moving paroxysm, late in their third night together. In fact, by this point, Hemingway has developed the relationship further. While Jordan may have first seen Maria only in sexual terms, it now seems clear that their creator wants to demonstrate more insistently the importance of their psychological togetherness. That is surely one of the main ideas involved in the decidedly feminine terms he uses to describe the couple's lovemaking in chapter thirty-seven:

Then they were together now so that as the hand on the watch moved, unseen now, they knew that nothing could ever happen to one that did not happen to the other, that no other thing could ever happen more than this; that this was all and always; this was what had been and now and whatever was to come. This, that they were not to have, they were having. They were having it now and before and always and now and now and now. Oh, now, now, now, the only now, and above all now, and there is no other now but thou now and now is thy prophet. Now and forever now. Come now, now, for there is no now but now. Yes, now. Now, please now, only now, not anything else only this now, and where are you and where am I and where is the other one, and not why, not ever why, only this now; and on and always please then always now, always now, for now always one now; one only one, there is no other one but one now, one, going now, rising now, sailing now, leaving now, wheeling now, soaring now, away now, all the way now, all of all the way now; one and one is one, is one, is one, is one, is still one, is still one. . . . (379)

Given what she considers to be the novel's focus on the changing of human perceptions of time during love and war and her explanation of Gertrude Stein's use of such a subject

years before, Jacqueline Vaught Brogan makes the interesting supposition that this passage might possibly be Hemingway's attempt at matching and surpassing the stylistic proclivities of his one-time mentor. Whether or not we accept Brogan's argument that the "passage achieves not mere parody, but at the very least parity with his authorial precursor" (89), Hemingway's emulation of Stein's style here is important in recognizing his movement beyond the sort of writing and thinking he had earlier employed in creating his love scenes.

One of the overwhelming difficulties in reading Stein is her frequent refusal to abide by common literary and grammatical conventions, a tendency that, according to Irigaray, often marks woman's position in male society:

she is called . . . incomprehensible, perturbed, capricious — not to mention her language in which 'she' goes off in all directions and in which 'he' is unable to discern the coherence of any meaning. Contradictory words seem a little crazy to the logic of reason, and inaudible to him who listens with ready-made grids, a code prepared in advance. ("This Sex" 103)

Stein's style can obviously be equated with the Irigarayan ideal of feminine language, and perhaps something similar is possible in Hemingway's case, at least in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Of course, Irigaray's concentration on the auto-erotic aspect of feminine writing and female sexuality makes a close comparison difficult. However, Cixous's notions of sexual pleasure, which entail the importance of union and mutual gratification for sexual partners, might demonstrate just how far Hemingway is here from a masculine sense of sexuality. Barbara Freeman explains that for Cixous "[s]exual and inscriptional expenditure . . . function in tandem" (65), meaning that writing of the body and of sexual pleasure allows women a freedom from male oppression. Of course, this is generally understood in the context of women writers. However, it is perhaps possible to adapt the idea to explain how the lovemaking passage in chapter thirty-seven evidences Hemingway's developing

feminine approach to sexuality.

For one thing, we should note the expansiveness of Hemingway's description of Maria and Jordan's mutual *jouissance*. The clearly effusive nature of the language — the extension he makes beyond a rational explanation of their pleasure by means of the repetition of key words and phrases — might possibly be seen as a man's attempt to move beyond masculinity. We must also acknowledge that the possessiveness and divisiveness that characterized the couple's lovemaking in chapter thirteen has disappeared. While Hemingway earlier emphasized the individual responses of his characters, here he is careful to declare their unity ("they knew that nothing could happen to the one that did not happen to the other, that no other thing could happen more than this;" "one and one is one"). This extension of each lover into the other, in addition to the lack of any overtly phallic sexuality, and thus the lack of any negatively possessive sexuality, looks forward to the ideal of Cixousian bisexuality that embraces difference but champions unity.

Unlike a masculine approach to sexuality, with its attendant fears about expenditure, feminine sexuality is based on sharing such as Maria and Jordan appear by now to have reached. Between the time he and Maria lie in his sleeping bag on their third night together in chapter thirty-one and the moment of their last shared orgasm six chapters later, Jordan makes a final conversion from masculine retentiveness to a feminine belief in mutual expenditure. Maria's complaint of pain, after two successive evenings of lovemaking and his attempt to initiate a third, apparently denies the possibility of further sex for Jordan before the bridge-blowing the following morning. Feeling guilty about depriving him, Maria offers to masturbate him instead. He refuses, though, on the grounds that he will need all of himself for the attack the next day. The clear connection Hemingway makes

here between Jordan's sexual and physical potential would seem to indicate that the author himself understands sexuality in terms of retention. The fact, too, that this would be wasted vitality cannot be overlooked. Squandering the sexual-physical manifestation of his manhood worries Jordan:

I'll keep any oversupply of that for tomorrow. I'll need all of that there is tomorrow. There are no pine needles that need that now as I will need it tomorrow. Who was it cast his seed upon the ground in the Bible? Onan. How did Onan turn out? He thought. I don't remember ever hearing any more about Onan. He smiled in the dark. (342)

Interestingly, though, Jordan's fear over the depletion of himself only colors his thoughts about masturbation. When Maria later suggests that they make love, his anxiety quickly disappears. The reason for this may not appear readily visible; however, it is perhaps not too far-fetched to suggest that Jordan's conversion has something to do with his creator's understanding of the importance of sexual union in the discovery of personal identity. If woman's difference from man is indicated in her more liberated and liberating approach to sexuality, as Cixous suggests, it might be plausible that, for Hemingway, only interaction with the feminine sexual principle could allow for potential masculine liberation. Maria thus becomes, as Earl Rovit explains, "the vessel of Jordan's complete self-realization; in his merger with her, he has achieved the immortality of becoming 'other'" (134).<sup>18</sup> Thus while Jordan does not want to waste his vitality in the solipsism of personal pleasure, he is more than willing to expend himself in union with Maria.

In one sense, Jordan's musings about ecstasy after their final lovemaking, once Maria has confided that she has again experienced orgasm, might be thought of as Hemingway's own pondering of the question of sexual union and what it means:

[h]ow little we know of what there is to know. I wish that I was going to live a long time instead of going to die today because I have learned much

about life in these four days; more, I think, than in all the other time. I'd like to be an old man and to really know. I wonder if you keep on learning or if there is only a certain amount each man can understand. I thought I knew about so many things that I know nothing of. (380)

If we agree that Hemingway's usual interpretation of sexuality is a masculine one (as would appear to be indicated by his treatment of his wives and mistresses), we might view this passage as his veiled or unconscious admission of doubt as to the validity of patriarchal sexual identities. Furthermore, it could indicate a desire to explore other avenues of sexual self-expression than those he had previously walked. The implication, therefore, of Jordan's final sexual encounter with Maria, especially its oddly feminine mathematical equation of "one and one is one" (379), might be that Hemingway was experimenting not simply with how to express sexual pleasure but with how to define it.

It is reductive of the novel, however, and of Hemingway's complex themes to imply that Jordan and Maria's relationship is simply the author's modulation of sexual response. While their sexual compatibility does lead to an almost symbiotic connection between the two lovers, it is important to recognize that Hemingway does not limit this closeness to the time of their mutual orgasms. Rather, the attachment they feel, though it begins in sexual contact, develops beyond physicality. This is integral to viewing the novel as something more than Hemingway's description of good sex. He is at pains to demonstrate that sexual enjoyment reaches beyond the confines of physical togetherness, that it can foster other, non-sexual, connections between partners. That is why, when Jordan is to be left behind at the end of the novel because of his broken leg, Hemingway indicates the extent to which Jordan's and Maria's lives have become intertwined beyond the mere fact of mutual physical enjoyment. While the inevitable death that has been in the air since the opening pages of the book is almost upon him, Jordan chooses again to focus on the life that will

continue in Maria.<sup>19</sup> He assures her that he will remain alive in her, despite his physical death: "We will not go to Madrid now but I go always with thee wherever thou goest. Understand? . . . Thou wilt go now, rabbit. But I go with thee. As long as there is one of us there is both of us. Do you understand? . . . If thou goest then I go, too. . . . I am thee also now" (463). In attributing these words to the male protagonist rather than his female partner, Hemingway has begun to move beyond the type of male stoicism that marked his earlier heroes. While Frederic Henry was eager to join Catherine and live his life with her as its focal point, Catherine's declaration to Frederic that she has no existence outside of him evidences Hemingway's conformity to masculine modes of behavior in *A Farewell to Arms*. By *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, though, that fantasy of the subsumed woman has taken a radical course change.

Admittedly, Maria does at times appear the submissive and passive woman critics have charged her as being. The links, for instance, to such patriarchally constructed women as Mary Magdalene or the Virgin Mary, with both of whom she shares a name, are not to be denied. Her drying of Jordan's shoes and fetching him clean socks, for example, implicate Hemingway in a re-establishment of typically hierarchized male-female relationships, as does her ignoring her pain to offer her lover a final sexual experience. In this sense, Maria can be regarded as a logical extension of loyal help-mate partners such as Catherine Barkley, a conclusion further prompted by her determination to become a perfect wife for Jordan if they escape the war: "I will make thee as good a wife as I can. . . . Clearly I am not well trained but I will try to make up for that. . . . I will make mistakes but you will tell me and I will never make them twice, or maybe only twice. . . . I will go to a school to learn to be a wife, if there is such a school, and study at it" (348). The fact

that Maria should lay such importance on these things surely suggests that her creator placed importance on them, too. Indeed, for most of his adult life Hemingway manoeuvred himself into relationships that look conspicuously similar to the sort Maria imagines for herself and Jordan. Most of his wives, for instance, were coerced, whether passively or aggressively, to conform to the standards he set out and to become the type of woman he wanted them to be. Whether it was his forcing of Hadley to join him at the bullfights, his migrations with Pauline from Key West to Sun Valley for hunting, or his turning Mary into a competent deep-sea fisherwoman, Hemingway's demand that his wives adopt his hobbies and cater to his needs makes his narcissism abundantly clear. In many ways, each wife was no more than a means for Hemingway to catch a reflection of himself, an external indicator of his stature as a masculine man.<sup>20</sup>

Martha, however, does not fit this mold as the other wives did, and, perhaps appropriately, that difference may help to explain why Maria appears to be one of the most facile and dominated woman Hemingway created. The relationship with Martha was undoubtedly the bitterest Ernest shared with any of his wives, and also the shortest, due mainly to the fact that she refused to give in to him as Hadley and Pauline had done in the past and as Mary would do in years to come. Having a successful writing career that she was loath to give up and being a woman who always stood up for herself, Martha represented a threat to Ernest (at least in his own mind). The fact that she did not conform to the pattern of quick submission to his needs that he had come to expect from his partners surely riled Hemingway, and his creation of Maria might be viewed, in part, as a wish-fulfilment fantasy of the sort of wife he could not find in Martha, or, since at this early stage in their life together he may not have been aware of the impossibility of his plan to

shape her in his image, Maria might be considered an example of the sort of woman he wanted Martha to become.

It is too categorical an approach, however, to cast Maria aside completely as a shallow, patriarchal creation; and it is wrong to suggest that her submissiveness to Jordan marks the totality of Hemingway's ideas in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. We must also acknowledge that Jordan is against Maria's becoming a subservient and dutiful "good wife" (348), just as he is against her servicing of his sexual needs in forms other than intercourse: "[w]hat we have we have together and we will keep it and guard it. . . . We will have our necessities together. I have no necessities apart from thee" (349). Jordan's refusal of Maria's offer of masturbation and his understanding of their relationship as something more than mere sexual compatibility seems to offer some evidence that Hemingway, too, desired a relationship based on reciprocity and not on subjugation. Thus by the time Jordan convinces Maria to leave him to die on the Spanish hillside, he has come to see that love can move beyond mutual sexual gratification and that he and she are not joined merely by lust but by love.

Needless to say, such a revelation for a Hemingway hero is just short of miraculous. It can help, though, to evidence how far Hemingway had come toward a feminist humanist sensibility by the end of the 1930s, if we think of Jordan's regret in the novel's final pages as a determination by the author not to leave his own revelations unspoken: "[y]ou've had just as good a life as grandfather's though not as long. You've had as good a life as any one because of these last days. You do not want to complain when you have been so lucky. I wish there was some way to pass on what I've learned, though. Christ, I was learning fast there at the end" (467). Reminiscing about the three days he has

lived with Maria makes Jordan want to teach his new-found knowledge to others, something Hemingway is arguably doing by presenting the novel to the reading public. And this overt focus on learning and teaching might logically lead us to a contemplation of Pilar, the other major influence on Jordan.

Given Pilar's place in the novel as a source of narrative skill and sexual wisdom, perhaps the best way to explore her importance to a bisexual view of *Bell* is to examine how she links together the important Cixousian categories of writing and loving. Typically, Hemingway's sages are men — and even in this novel he imbues his male protagonist with what Rudat calls “an Olympian range of experience and knowledge” (“Hemingway's Rabbit” 39), from foreign-language skills to bridge-blowing, from guerilla warfare to lovemaking.<sup>21</sup> Yet Pilar's knowledge cannot be overlooked in examining the sources of instructive power in the book. Indeed, without her assistance, the rejuvenating, death-denying love between Jordan and Maria could not have occurred. For one thing, Pilar's belief in the psychological benefit for Maria of an affair with Jordan indicates the importance Hemingway placed on the power of loving sexual union to fend off solitude and depression.<sup>22</sup> For another, it suggests his belief in the possibility of female wisdom.

In her introduction to *The Newly Born Woman*, Sandra Gilbert describes *écriture féminine* as “a fundamentally political strategy, designed to redress the wrongs of culture through a revalidation of the rights of nature” (xv). A similar definition might be used to explain Pilar's encouragement of Maria and Jordan's affair. As Maria explains to Jordan, Pilar believes that through a healthy sexual experience Maria's rape will be undone: “If we do everything together, the other maybe never will have happened. . . . [Pilar] told me that nothing is done that one does not accept and that if I loved some one it would take it all

away" (72-73). The essence of loving, sexual contact is to erase negativity as far as Pilar and Maria are concerned, or, to put it in feminist humanist terms, relationships like Jordan and Maria's create "a kind of desire that wouldn't be in collusion with the old story of death. This desire would invent Love, it alone would not use the word love to cover up its opposite: one would not land right back in a dialectical destiny, still unsatisfied by the debasement of one by the other" (Cixous, *NBW* 78). The fact that this love is the product of a woman's action might alert readers as to how far Hemingway had come by this point in his career, and underline how different Pilar is from the female characters he had previously created.

It is not too much to argue that Pilar's characterization demands a revisiting of Hemingway's depictions of women altogether, given how far she is from past Hemingway females. This is emphasized most clearly by the power of language Hemingway accords her, particularly through Jordan's awe at her narrative ability. After Pilar has told of Pablo's running of the fascists in chapter ten, Jordan thinks to himself how well she captures the scene so completely: "Pilar had made him *see* the fascists die in that story she told by the stream" (134 [my italics]). The impressiveness lies in Pilar's ability to draw him into the tale and to make the story come alive for her listeners, a capacity that Cixous argues as one of the cornerstones of *écriture féminine*. Of course, it must be acknowledged that Jordan's awe remains firmly rooted in a phallogentric conception of language by its favoring of writing over speaking; though he commends her story-telling, he laments that Pilar is unable to transcribe it: "[i]f that woman could only write" (134). The essence of this comment is to praise her tale as an example of oral history, but in so doing Jordan also privileges written history over the kind of skill he attributes to Pilar. This does make it

more difficult to argue for a Cixousian interpretation of Hemingway's depiction of Pilar. Yet if we recognize Jordan's wish for her literacy as a wish that the story could reach a wider audience, his ruefulness might indeed be interpreted as a feminine approach to writing, since this would put him in line with Cixous's idea that writing can bring people together.

Admittedly, there are problems with such a reading, one of them being the fact that Cixous believes masculine attitudes toward language automatically favor written acts over spoken ones. From this perspective, Hemingway's refusal of writing power to Pilar looks like the work of a male author anxious about the possibility of female competition. Brogan, for instance, asserts that "having Robert Jordan praise Pilar's oral language when she tells of the atrocities of war and wish later that he will be able to write as well is, of course, a not-so-subtle tribute to Hemingway himself — as author who is actually writing both the 'oral' tale and the desire to write it better later (making him superior as author to both his main character and to the female Pilar . . .)" (95 [n. 8]). In fact, Jordan's hope that he could possibly use Pilar's spoken story as the basis for his own written account of the experience might be explained as Hemingway's wish to take writing out of the hands of "incapable" women and return it to its rightful male owners. This would certainly prove to be the case biographically in the years following *Bell's* publication when his professional jealousy over Martha's continuing literary career became an increasingly bothersome thorn in his side. For example, he once demanded in a cable to her while she was on an extended trip to cover the war for *Colliers*: "ARE YOU A WAR CORRESPONDENT OR WIFE IN MY BED?" (quoted in Kert 391). If we further recall his interference with Martha's career, we can begin to recognize how fearful Hemingway was of female writers. Since both of

them were in the Scribner's stables, he often took it upon himself to run interference for her with her editors and publisher — usually without her permission or knowledge. Actually this “assistance” (as he labeled it) amounted to little more than manoeuvring to gain some kind of control over her work (Kert 338). From these examples, Hemingway's fear and jealousy of women writers, at least one so close to him, is obvious and does indeed mitigate the view that he is entirely positive in his depiction of Pilar, but biography alone does not make the case.

Hemingway further betrays a desire to establish a masculine dominance over words by offering Jordan a positive linguistic ability of his own through his command of Spanish (though, as we've already seen, Hemingway's own inadequacies ironically make Jordan's talent humorous). We are reminded at various points of Jordan's former career as a Spanish professor in Montana, and, even though the book he wrote about Spain has not sold well, we are asked to take for granted his intimate knowledge of the country and its language. Musing to himself about how good an education the war has become for him, for instance, Jordan counts himself lucky to have been welcomed by the Spanish people, believing his acceptance hinges on his familiarity and ease with their language: “they trusted you on the language, principally. They trusted you on understanding the language completely and speaking it idiomatically and having a knowledge of the different places. . . . He never felt like a foreigner in Spanish and they did not really treat him like a foreigner most of the time” (135). Without question, Jordan's acceptance by the guerillas has allowed him the learning experience at Pilar's and Maria's hands for which he is so thankful in the book's final pages. It is important to realize, however, that his feeling of being lucky is quickly superseded by a belief that his acceptance was fated because of his linguistic ability.<sup>23</sup>

In terms of what some feminist theorists view as the main difference between men's and women's relationships to words, Hemingway's bestowing of linguistic ability on Jordan is provocative. It also offers a possible explanation as to why Pilar is allowed a vocal ability but denied a written one — and why Jordan's own skill quickly eclipses hers. Margaret Whitford explains that Irigaray's research into the confluence of sex and language has resulted in the supposition that "men are more likely to take up a subject position in language, to designate themselves as the subjects of discourse or action; women are more likely to efface themselves, to give precedence to men or to the world" (4). This has ramifications for *Bell* since it would appear that by crediting Jordan with a command of Spanish and by privileging his own writing abilities through a negation of Pilar's, Hemingway re-enacts the masculine domination of language uncovered by Irigaray. Within the confines of the novel, Hemingway forces an effacement of Pilar by way of Jordan's wish to appropriate her story and write it himself, taking the subject position from her by becoming the conduit through which her story comes to light. Hemingway then steps in front of both of them and, by his very creation of their story, proves his ability both to tell and to write the tale.

That he should do so undoubtedly problematizes a discussion of possible feminine tendencies in the novel. Yet despite his unresolved difficulties with issues of gender, Hemingway offers an escape from the apparent phallicization of language threatened by Jordan's (and his own) usurpation of Pilar's tale by way of Jordan's thoughts about his future work. "[T]he study of women" which he determines to begin "[w]hen [he] get[s] through with this war" (176) moderates his apparently masculine attitude, even as it tempers a similar tendency on Hemingway's part. It makes sense, too, that Jordan should

envision this future project only moments after Pilar's explanation of the limited number of truly perfect sexual experiences available in one's life and, more significantly, after his own admission that there are some mysteries in life that it seems impossible fully to understand. If we keep in mind the fact that traditional psychoanalysis determines female sexuality to be inscrutable and recall also that feminism believes this happens because of men's fear of the feminine, it is perhaps not going too far to suggest that the study Jordan imagines might be an attempt to move beyond the usual male definitions of woman as foreign and dangerous. Indeed, the examination of womanhood he proposes for himself could even be thought of as a future fictional version of the study Hemingway himself appears to make in most of his writing, both early and late. This is not to say that there was any conscious intention on Hemingway's part to learn about women in a non-patriarchal way. However, if nothing else, the study of femininity to be found in *Bell* and other of his works surely indicates his interest in exploring what gender identity is.

The fact that Jordan seems to open himself to the possibility of another way of thinking and living because of his thoughts about Pilar thus adds to a view of the novel as Hemingway's questioning of the suppositions that are culturally held — and that he held himself — about the differences between men and women. The general movement in the book toward an approximation of a female response to life calls into question the argument that Hemingway was only ever interested in underlining his masculine status in a masculine culture. The dignity he gives to Pilar may indicate that, in fact, Hemingway tempered his earlier views about women, and about relationships with women, as he aged. Certainly the positive depiction of her as a strong and capable woman intimates a modification of the author's typical response to such figures in his own life. While he had for years harbored a

deep resentment towards his mother (partly because of his mistaken assumption that her bullying relationship with Dr. Hemingway had caused his suicide), and had openly and painfully broken from his one-time mentor, Gertrude Stein, some time before, Hemingway appears to revisit these relationships in his portrayal of Pilar. It may even be the case that her characterization was a way for Hemingway to try to come to an understanding what sort of people Grace and Gertrude really were.

That Pilar physically resembles both of the important maternal figures in Hemingway's life is surely not coincidental. Actually, Grace's physiological and psychological similarities to Gertrude Stein might even account, at least in some small part, for Ernest's attachment to Stein during his early years in Paris. Like Grace, Gertrude was stout of figure, extremely strong-willed, and bore a similar love for the arts; and the fact that Hemingway had a very close early childhood relationship with his mother, despite the growing antagonism between them as he reached puberty, may have left him primed for a relationship with another such woman. This is not to suggest that he sought out and cultivated a friendship with Stein in any way consciously to make up for or repeat his relationship with his mother. However, it seems likely that a man might be susceptible to female figures who closely resemble his mother, especially a man like Hemingway who, though he so adamantly denied them, had deep-rooted feelings of love for Grace.<sup>24</sup> There may even be a connection in terms of Grace's and Gertrude's sexuality, if rumors are to be believed that Grace manifested lesbian attraction for one of her close friends (certainly Ernest himself suspected as much). In fact, Hemingway's more balanced treatment of Grace and Gertrude in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* through his characterization of Pilar could be suggested by a more even-handed attitude toward lesbianism in this novel than in his past

fiction. Admittedly, the hints of a sexual attraction between Pilar and Maria at various points in the published novel are quite toned down from the suggestions in the manuscript version of the story.<sup>25</sup> However, while he may have felt compelled to scale back the more obvious indications of Pilar's attraction for Maria and, more pointedly, to excise almost totally any suggestion that it was reciprocated, the very fact that this facet of the story remains in the published novel is important in uncovering the possibility that Hemingway was now dealing with female sexuality and sexual preference — perhaps even with his mother and former mentor — differently than he had before.

If we accept Mandel's contention that "[Helen] Ferguson's relationship to Catherine [in *A Farewell to Arms*] is complicated by a strong sexual component" ("Ferguson" 19), surely Pilar's relationship to Maria is no less complex, and once we acknowledge that Catherine accepts but does not appear to reciprocate these lesbian feelings, we can view the desires that pass between Maria and Pilar in the manuscript as a new direction for Hemingway in dealing with sexual relations between women. As Comley and Scholes suggest, "Pilar's strength is a function of her bisexuality" (46), a supposition that argues for Hemingway as viewing women and sexuality in a totally new light. While neither *Farewell* nor *Bell* can be said really to endorse bisexuality, the latter does offer the suggestion that feelings of this kind are not uncommon, an admission Pilar makes in the manuscript version of chapter eleven: "There is always something like that [lesbian tendencies]. . . . There is always something like something that should not be, and for me to find it in me now" (quoted in Gould 74). As Gould argues, Hemingway probably cut this overt indication of attraction because "the American public [was not] ready to read about lesbianism" in 1939 (75). However, Gould's theory that Hemingway intended to include the

scene to highlight “the idea of bisexuality inherent in all of us” surely indicates the author’s growing realization that questions of sexuality and sexual preference are not as neatly answered as divisive male systems would have us believe.

Suggestively, Cixous models her theories about sexuality on just such grounds as Hemingway was exploring in the manuscript relationship between Maria and Pilar. While her focus does not aim itself specifically at homosexual versus heterosexual object choice, she does articulate the desire for humanity to move beyond the present structures of sexual identity that enforce a marginalization of certain sexualities:

let us imagine a real liberation of sexuality, that is to say, a transformation of each one’s relationship to his or her body (and to the other body), an approximation to the vast, material, organic sensuous universe that we are. . . . What today appears to be “feminine” or “masculine” would no longer amount to the same thing. No longer would the common logic of difference be organized with the opposition that remains dominant. Difference would be a bunch of new differences. (*NBW* 83)<sup>26</sup>

The fact that Hemingway felt compelled to de-emphasize the sexual aspect of the relationship between Pilar and Maria suggests that he was still ruled by the cultural and political codes of his time. However, the alternate fact that by the time of *Bell* he was working with such different and culturally opposed sexualities as lesbianism in a more conscious way, not to mention the importance he had begun to place on sexual compatibility as a means of personal identity construction, indicates that his attitudes towards questions of gender and sexuality were being modified as he aged, and that those modifications took Hemingway further away from narrowly masculine views and closer to the more permissive understandings promoted by feminist humanism.

If we look at the importance he places in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* on human sexuality — whether of the same-sex or opposite-sex variety — we can begin to recognize

how far Hemingway had come from his more guarded understanding of love's potential in *The Sun Also Rises*. Firstly, the relationship that develops between Jordan and Maria acts as a catalyst for their growth toward a more feminine outlook on life — for her it offers an escape from the restrictive sexual identity forced upon her by male society; for him it provides a means of pushing back the fear of death that might otherwise dominate his final days. The further fact that the relationship occurs as a result of Pilar's intervention implies Hemingway's more feminine approach to love than in past books. Her understanding of love's efficacy and her desire to see it repair Maria's damaged psyche allow us to witness Hemingway's growing belief in the power of a female attitude toward life, even if it could only manifest itself by way of his fiction. That Pilar herself should have sexual feelings for Maria also strengthens the supposition that by 1939 Hemingway had a more complicated view of personal identity construction than before. Finally, if we think of Pilar as a possible stand-in for Grace Hall Hemingway or Gertrude Stein, it is plausible to suggest that Hemingway was taking time in this text to look back on his life and on his relationships with women in a more equitable light than he had previously.

It is rather appropriate, then, that *Bell* was, in the end, a novel ten years in the making. Its retrospective feel and apparently more balanced approach to questions of gender and sexual identity offer a sense of Hemingway's increased desire to question his previous attitudes toward masculinity and femininity, not to mention his increasing proximity to a feminist humanist conclusion. Most importantly, the ruminative nature of the novel offers a preliminary glimpse of the sort of altered attitudes Hemingway would display in the manuscripts he would work on next, after his return from World War II. The writing that would occupy him for the last two decades of his life, particularly *The Garden of Eden*,

would act as an extension of the themes he had begun in *The Sun Also Rises*, themes he had fleshed out in *A Farewell to Arms* and gone on to question further in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. It is to *Garden* that we should turn, therefore, as a final and crucial piece in the puzzle of Hemingway's ideas about gender and sexuality.

## Chapter V

### *The Garden of Eden:* Exploring Feminine Writing

While *For Whom the Bell Tolls* forges a stronger link between Hemingway's private dilemmas and fictional inspirations, it is with *The Garden of Eden* that we can most clearly see how close he was coming, late in his career, to a confessional and feminine sort of writing. From the standpoint of gender fusion, as well as the creative artist's sense of self, *Garden* best evidences what he had been working on since he had first begun writing roughly twenty-five years earlier.<sup>1</sup> In a complex novel that "concerns itself with the nature and evolution of authentic selfhood in its examination of Catherine's and David Bourne's [sic] individual crises of gender identity" (Jones, "Mimesis" 2), Hemingway offers a final reflection on the possibility of personally defined standards of masculinity and femininity by way of an overt experimentalism in both style and substance.<sup>2</sup> The characters' conflicting ideas over sexuality and their attendant problems of gender definition act as a metaphor for the inner battle the author himself was suffering through, not merely during the ten or more fruitless years he worked on *Garden*, when many of his manuscripts were stagnating, but for much of his life.<sup>3</sup> The fierceness of the battle is evident from the fact

that, though the themes in this book are similar in kind to his past writing, they are quite different in degree. Earlier novels had indeed dealt with questions of gender and sexual inversion, but these were to become the very foundation of *Garden*, as Hemingway's increasing desire to explore the formation of a psychosexual sense of self would play itself out in the transformations made by Catherine, David, and Marita, and by Nick and Barbara in the manuscript.

If, as Cixous argues, it is through writing that men and women come in contact with patriarchally silenced or sublimated femininity, we can perhaps see this novel as Hemingway's clearest vocalization of the feminine for, in his characterization of Catherine, David, and Marita and of their struggles to live happily together, as well as in the mirroring subplot of Nick, Barbara, and Andy, he was writing the story of his conflicted sense of gender with an almost unprecedented honesty.<sup>4</sup> Catherine's search, in particular, implies the need Hemingway felt to use his writing as a method of self-discovery, even if he was unaware of it or consciously opposed to it. The experiments she uses to explore her sexuality, from her fluctuations between boy and girl during her and David's lovemaking to her wish for him to memorialize the transformations in the honeymoon narrative, become the summation of Hemingway's lifelong interaction with his own feminine impulses, impulses that seem to be at the core of his creativity. The fact, too, that Catherine is unable to reach David through artistic endeavor and must rely instead on physical creativity also suggests a link to Cixous's understanding of *écriture féminine* as the means for women to explore their bodies. Catherine's fear that she and David will be alienated from one another by his allegiance to his writing suggests that Hemingway had begun to worry about the effect his work was having on his personal life, even as David's fear of Catherine's games

indicates his wish to remain true to his art. Furthermore, David's suspicion of the immorality of her changes implicates Hemingway in the phallogentric refusal of gender and sexual heterogeneity. His anxiety over the transformations speaks directly to Hemingway's own anguish over the possibility that his engagement in activities like Catherine and David's exposes his own tenuous link to masculine heterosexuality. David, like Hemingway, is suspicious of femininity as a destructive force. However, while he tries to reclaim his manhood through writing, it is evident that Hemingway's feminine side could not be totally silenced, for the stories David creates as an escape from Catherine's gender-confused world, particularly the important tale of the elephant which chronicles David's alienation from his father, expose the extent to which Hemingway's femininity was integral to his art.

This is also evident from the book's deliberate focus on sexuality and sexual preference. Catherine's flirtation with lesbianism and David's unvoiced fear that her change from boy to girl implicates him in homosexual activity provide interesting evidence of Hemingway's concern over how men and women define, acknowledge and accept their sexuality. And the fact that sexual identity is bound up for both characters in their respective needs to create art suggests a similar equation for their creator. Though Catherine recognizes that her impulses go against society's strict rules concerning sexual self-expression, she knows that only by being true to her desires can she begin to understand herself. The lesbian affair she begins with Marita thus becomes a sign of her recognition that personal concerns must outweigh social ones; it is a necessity that she explore her sexuality fully — as Hemingway himself was doing at the time — because her identity hinges on this as much as on her gender role. Even David, who vocally disparages

the sexual transformations in which she makes him take part, comes grudgingly to accept that they have positive effects on his art — especially after Marita takes them up and offers him equal power in carrying them out. All of this ties his identity, no less than Catherine's, or Nick's, Barbara's, and Andy's in the manuscript, to the triumvirate of sexuality, gender identity and artistry, and the repetition of these connections in multiple characters emphasizes the importance of such ideas to Hemingway himself.

The fact that he should focus so determinedly and repeatedly on this connection in *Garden* uncovers the depth of Hemingway's need to explain his innermost desires, despite his very real worry that the answers to his questions were not ones to which he could ever admit. If nothing else, this might explain his inability to leave the novel behind even if he could not complete it: though he wanted consciously to reject his femininity, it refused to be totally sublimated.<sup>5</sup> Thus while Marita quickly gives up her lesbian affair with Catherine for a return to heterosexuality with David and while Catherine descends into madness as a result of her inability to reconcile her desires with society's rules, Hemingway does not simply return to a normative view of sexuality by the conclusion of the book. The very fact that he was not able to finish the book suggests that a patriarchally happy ending was not possible for him, that, to the very end, he felt constrained to address his gender concerns repeatedly in his art, as Cixous encourages. We might consequently credit *The Garden of Eden* with being the most honest engagement with his fears and desires that Hemingway had ever attempted, and as an example of feminine writing that extends far beyond his earlier work.

Viewed from afar, of course, this novel seems quite in line with the fiction Hemingway had produced before the war — a tale of marital woe involving two young

expatriate Americans in Europe. Upon closer examination, however, it “is importantly and *honorably* different from Hemingway’s other novels” (Varsava 115), mainly because of its much deeper, more personally involved, musings on his life-long themes. Part of the reason *Garden* differs so much from the pre-war writing has to do with Hemingway’s growing need to interrogate himself and his culture after his experiences in World War II.<sup>6</sup> As Rose Marie Burwell has shown, almost all of the (mostly abortive) manuscripts he worked on between 1946 and his death are a variation on one particular theme: “the search for a form and a style that would express his reflexive vision of the artist” (*Postwar Years* 1). It now seems clear, through the efforts of Burwell’s excellent study, that *Garden* and its siblings evidence Hemingway as a man and artist desperate to define himself, to find answers to the questions about sexuality, gender, and personal identity with which he had grappled almost from the beginning. The consequence of the personal and cultural reevaluation Hemingway performs in these texts is to make them some of the most autobiographical of his career.

Real-life incidents like Pauline’s near-death in childbirth were no longer the fodder for fictional extrapolation as they had been when he worked on *A Farewell to Arms*. Now Hemingway’s life experience was transported wholesale into his work; for instance, the sexual games David and Catherine play in *Garden* have their genesis in the activities Hemingway was carrying out with Mary throughout his work on the manuscript.<sup>7</sup> A telling entry he made in Mary’s journal suggests that the Hemingways were taking part in sexual inversions that are quite similar to the Bournes’:

Mary is an espece (sort of) prince of devils . . . and almost any place you touch her it can kill both you and her. She has always wanted to be a boy and thinks as a boy without ever losing any femininity. If you should become confused on this you should retire. She loves me to be her girls, which I love to be not being absolutely stupid . . . In return she makes me awards and at night we do every sort of thing which pleases her and which

pleases me. . . . Mary has never had one lesbian impulse but has always wanted to be a boy. Since I never cared for any man and dislike any tactile contact with men except the normal Spanish abrazo or embrace which precedes a departure or welcomes a return from a voyage or a more or less dangerous mission or attack, I loved feeling the embrace of Mary which came to me as something quite new and outside all tribal law. On the night of December 19<sup>th</sup> we worked out these things and I have never been happier. EH 20/12/53 (quoted in Mary Hemingway 369-70 [ellipses in original])

The wording of Hemingway's entry is remarkably similar to the phrasing he uses to describe Catherine and David's experiments and makes clear the combination of creative imagination and documentation of real life that comprises the novel. The fact that he and Mary were engaging in such sexual activities implies the greater need he felt to express his sexuality and to determine his attitude toward gender. The complex mixture of sexual preference and relative expressions of masculinity and femininity that is indicated by his experiments helps us to understand how confused Hemingway was about who he was by this time in his life, and his use of his art to attempt to work it out is suggestive of his nearness to a Cixousian model of literary creativity. The similarity between the fictional and factual experiments proves just how important it had become for him to try to reconcile the opposing parts of his psyche, the side that yearned to explore his desires further and the side that was embarrassed by their very existence. The fact, for example, that he should defend himself and Mary from the supposed taint of homosexuality in even so private a confession as this underscores the difficulty Hemingway had in admitting his feelings to himself, even as his admission of enjoyment demonstrates his refusal or inability to deny his true feelings.

Indeed, if his ongoing experimentation with his and Mary's hairstyles throughout the 1940s and 1950s is any indication, even his deepest fears about his desires could not

keep him from continued — albeit secretive — investigation of his gender and sexual orientation. The experiments with cutting and bleaching her hair that Catherine performs and later encourages on David are direct imports of the games Hemingway was playing and urging on Mary while he wrote the book. For instance, he one time asked her to silver her hair, another time to redden it, requests with which she readily complied at the same time as she made similar requests of him. The result of this experimentation, not surprisingly, was a blurring of the lines between Hemingway's life and work:

Soon these games would become part of his fiction, which in turn would enrich the games. In the beginning he could move easily back and forth between the fictional world of his characters and the less fictional world outside his writing room. Later the dividing line became so porous that it was difficult to say on which side he stood. (Reynolds, *FY* 156)

The loss of distinctiveness he increasingly felt between his two lives as man and author makes *Garden* a fascinating piece of the Hemingway puzzle by exposing just how ambivalent he was toward his feminine identity.

If the book is a fictional working out of his dilemmas to the degree it seems to be, Hemingway's prediction that it could never be published in his lifetime implies a wish not to divulge his secret desires similar to the conscious rejection of homosexuality in Mary's journal. In both cases, he appears morbidly fearful of admitting himself to be anything less than a quintessentially masculine man. Yet the need to work out his questions in both the fictional and real worlds tellingly suggests his refusal to ignore his feminine side altogether and offers convincing evidence that he used his art as a feminine confessional in much the sense that Cixous imagines male writers should, both of which points "mark Hemingway as an evolving writer" (Peters 17). In one sense, it seems fair to consider that, in the late

manuscripts, Hemingway was investigating the scope of his life, looking at how he had lived and how he had written so as to get the measure of himself as man and writer, much as Joyce had done in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*.<sup>8</sup>

This is perhaps difficult for the majority of readers to recognize, not just because of Hemingway's understandable secrecy about the details of his sex life but also because of the severe editing that was done by Scribner's to derive the published novel from Hemingway's manuscripts. Editor Tom Jenks's decisions make the commercial *Garden* a far different book from what Hemingway appears to have intended, though a misleading Publisher's Note downplays the copious editing: "we have made some cuts in the manuscript and some routine copy-editing corrections. Beyond a very small number of minor interpolations for clarity and consistency, nothing has been added. In every significant aspect the work is all the author's" (n.p.). While it is accurate that Jenks did not add to the text in order to cobble it together, the publisher's proclamation belies the extensive amount of excision that was involved — while the work may be all Hemingway's, certainly not all of Hemingway's work was used for the manuscript was winnowed away by over 80%. It almost goes without saying, therefore, that "the sanitized version" of *Garden* (Comley and Scholes 89) differs radically from the manuscript housed in the Hemingway Collection at the John F. Kennedy Library in Boston, and the two most drastic and influential changes, the excision of the Sheldon subplot and the arbitrary conclusion of the novel with David's rejuvenated writing career by way of his seeming return to heterosexuality with Marita (an ending nowhere indicated as one Hemingway was contemplating), both have significant consequences as to how the public perceives the ideas at work in this text.

On the stylistic side, Jenks's omissions have the effect of giving *Garden* a rather

superficial feel. Certainly the published version makes for some uninteresting reading given that we are not offered enough insight into the characters or the situations to understand exactly why the continual cycle of eating, tanning, and lovemaking should be imbued by the characters or their author with such significance. According to Peters, “[t]he result [of Jenks’s editing] is a tale of self-abuse, betrayal, and guilt without any real motive, explanation, or justification” (18), which has the detrimental effect of problematizing our view of the novel as the culmination of Hemingway’s interaction with femininity. The mirroring scenes, allusive conversations, doubled characters and duplicated story-lines in the manuscript suggest the importance the author laid on the sexual and gender investigations urged by Catherine and resented by David; and, by omitting this counterpoint, Jenks has created problems, if not of logic, at least of motivation. This is not to suggest that the manuscript version is not without its own problems. Some of the overwritten scenes and sometimes wooden dialogue — not to mention an arguable over-indulgence by Hemingway of his obsessions — do make the twelve-hundred-plus-page holograph hard to wade through, and even he would probably have admitted the need for careful editing prior to publication. In the end, though, we must acknowledge that the version redacted by Jenks surely omits more than the author would have removed, had he been able to see the project through.

Interestingly enough, however, the enormous distance between Hemingway’s novel and the Scribner’s version of it can, in fact, be explained by recourse to Cixous’s beliefs about the political biases inherent in cultural representations of masculinity and femininity. It is rather fitting, for example, that at least one Hemingway scholar believes the Jenks edition to have been politically more than literarily motivated. Due in large part to its re-

inscription of male literary power in the final pages, Debra Modellmog sees the available version of the text as evidence of the publisher's desire (conscious or otherwise) to present a canonically Hemingwayesque novel, a text in the tradition of the muscular, masculine Hemingway. "Jenks's *Garden*," she argues, "is a reading of Hemingway's *Garden* . . . based on the popular, commodified Hemingway and his work" (*Reading Desire* 59). By removing the passages that emphasize the author's doubts about the ascendancy of masculinity, Scribner's was, according to Modellmog, silently endorsing the typical image of Hemingway, making the work fit the legend rather than the other way around.<sup>9</sup> And, as most readers of the manuscript will concur, his publishers did Hemingway a disservice by not allowing the full breadth of his ideas to come through for while the published novel presents a solidly masculine Hemingway, the manuscript uncovers a suspicion of masculine models and even seems, in places, to opt for feminine ones in their place.

What is necessary, therefore, is a re-politicization of the novel in order to explore the ways in which it marked a departure for Hemingway — a departure distinguished, appropriately enough, by his arrival at a sort of *écriture féminine*. If, as Cixous suggests, feminine writing is an attempt to upset the hierarchies of phallogocentric thinking by "put[ting] politics on trial," perhaps *The Garden of Eden* might be looked at as evidence of Hemingway's desire to create what she calls "a universe of becoming where power and its snares can never be calmly inscribed" (*NBW* 99). While it is true that books of a politically open nature are usually created by female authors, Cixous declares that men can indeed write such texts if they are able to create strongly feminine characters.<sup>10</sup> By writing of Catherine's attempts to define herself by her own rules rather than by external ones, Hemingway indeed begins to approach a feminist humanist sort of political understanding.

Her perception “that women’s lives are constrained by rigid cultural definitions of appropriate behavior and that men are freer to construct their identities” and her “anger at the limitations [that] biology and culture impose on women” (Raeburn, “Sex and Art” 114, 115) surely point to Hemingway’s potential as one of Cixous’s biologically male but subconsciously feminine writers.<sup>11</sup>

Catherine’s bodily and sexual transformations become integral to an exploration of the bisexual aspect of *Garden* because Cixous is eager, like Catherine, to bring about a revolution that would culminate in a freeing of gender from cultural restriction. It is intriguing, too, given Hemingway’s focus on language and writing in this novel, that Cixous should figure her call for rebellion along linguistic lines. “[W]oman,” she explains, “has always functioned ‘within’ the discourse of man, a signifier that has always referred back to the opposite signifier which annihilates its specific energy and diminishes or stifles its very different sounds, it is time for her to dislocate this ‘within,’ to explode it, turn it around, and seize it; to make it hers” (“Laugh” 1098). What women must do in order to make that seizure, Linda Singer explains, is to begin writing their own lives:

Because women’s silence has been produced politically, it can also be contested, most powerfully by women’s refusal of that position in writing. Writing is a particularly forceful gesture because it is public and because it has the potential to incite and provoke more writing. Unlike speaking, which is restricted in its effects to the situation that occasions it, writing allows for a wider sphere of circulation, and thus offers the potential for a far broader, and more enduring sphere of influence. (145)

Through his very writing of a book like *Garden*, which revolves around access to and denial of writing, Hemingway is apparently working toward such a goal by making Catherine hope for autonomy through artistic means. In the manuscript, for instance, while talking to David and Andy about painting and writing, Catherine comes to a conclusion

similar to Singer's about woman's need to create herself by way of artistic — if not literary — expression, even as she laments the seeming impossibility of doing so herself: "I never wanted to be a painter until I came to [France], now it's just like being hungry all the time, and there's nothing you can ever do about it" (422.1-6 p. 10).<sup>12</sup> As if to emphasize Hemingway's recognition of the female need for freedom, Catherine goes on to explain the need to define herself on her own terms when David suggests that Andy could paint in her place: "[t]here's nothing except through yourself." "She knows," McCampbell Grace explains, "that since she is biologically female she has been assigned specific roles that she must assume, almost as if they were natural. But . . . she does not want *to be made*; she wants to create herself and others" (242). The fact of another female Hemingway character's determining not to let other people run her life for her should not come as a shock after having seen similar sentiments expressed by Catherine Barkley and Brett Ashley. Yet Catherine's desperate wish for self-sufficiency differs significantly from those of Hemingway's earlier women by way of her conscious linking of personal freedom with artistic expression.

Unfortunately, as Cixous and other feminists have explained, women are often exiled from the masculine world of art and literature, "in which publishing houses are the crafty, obsequious relayers of [masculine] imperatives handed down by an economy that works against [women] and off [their] backs" ("Laugh" 1091). Not surprisingly, then, freedom through art is denied to Catherine, and, as she later confides to Andy and David in the manuscript, she feels she has no talent, no way to communicate other than talking (422.1-11 p. 11). It might seem, of course, that Hemingway's refusal of literary ability to Catherine, like his refusal of it to Pilar in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, uncovers his jealousy of

female talent and his desire to preserve the world of writing for male authors. However, we could also argue for Catherine's lack of talent as an honest depiction of the real world in which men continually attempt to silence women, and as an honest admission by Hemingway of his self-stifled femininity.

If, as Singer states, the restrictions imposed by a merely verbal talent tend to deny women real power, Catherine seems destined to remain mute, unable to proclaim her femininity and so unable to claim any true artistic talent. Yet the very nature of her experiments with her and David's hair and with their sexual repertoire might be considered in itself a version of Cixous's feminine writing. Cixous explains that, for women, writing is always a writing of the body: "by writing herself, woman will return to the body which has been . . . taken from her" ("Laugh" 1093), and this takes on concrete form in *The Garden of Eden* through Catherine's use of her body as the medium through which she creates herself. She needs neither pen nor paper, neither canvas nor brush, because her body acts as both — a living declaration of her cry for freedom from male oppression. Her ventures into bleaching and cropping her hair, as well as her transformations from girl to boy, act as primary methods for her self-expression, and appear fundamental to Hemingway's conception of identity, if we follow Varsava's argument that Catherine is "the only genuine artist in the novel, though her medium is existence itself, and not *merely* language or canvas" (123).

While she is not involved in the explicitly artistic world that David and Hemingway inhabit, the novel's continual reference to Catherine's experiments as creative activities suggests her affinity with artistry, as does her desire to see those experiments memorialized in David's transcription of them in the honeymoon narrative she asks him to begin. And

Hemingway takes pains throughout the book to underscore for us that Catherine's physical transformations are every bit as important and artistic as David's literary production.<sup>13</sup> As she undertakes to manoeuvre David into a space of sexual togetherness and tolerance, she consciously figures herself as the creator of their life together by saying that she has "invent[ed]" it (48), just as she will later see herself as the inventor of David and Marita's relationship (422.1-29 p. 49). Even David casts her experiments in terms of artistry when, at one point in the manuscript, he looks at her newly cut hair and imagines that "[s]he's like the sculptor with her lovely head" (422.1-8 p. 7). And it is precisely in her being an artist who creates herself that Catherine might be deemed a *femme écrivain*, and that *Garden* might thus be considered Hemingway's most Cixousian work. In fact, in the only Cixousian analysis of *The Garden of Eden* so far published, Kathy Willingham asserts that the book is explicitly concerned with "the debilitating anxieties which the woman artist experiences" (46) as Catherine tries to force David to accept her experiments and help her to understand herself and their relationship better.<sup>14</sup>

The fact that Catherine begins the Bournes' sexual adventure after she has visited David's barber and had her hair cut to a style resembling David's is also important in that it indicates the extent to which Hemingway knew that human sexual identity is inextricably linked with gender and with the artist's creativity. Catherine as much as says that her new coiffure is meant to remove her from a patriarchal context, at the same time as it is meant to stand in for a female sense of artistry, and she hopes David will make a move with her away from the confining male standards of art and life. This becomes clear quite early in her experimentation when she returns from the salon and wants David to agree that her haircut was necessary for both of them: "I thought about it. I've thought all about it. Why

do we have to go by everyone else's rules? We're us'" (15). Though Catherine believes that her changes will be frowned upon socially, she still imagines that they are imperative if the couple is to continue a loving, committed and open relationship. In essence, she wants to reinvent herself and David in roles that do not necessitate a combative or hierarchical relationship between them, and the transformations she encourages are thus meant to make each see his or her own innate connection to the other by emphasizing their inherent sameness.<sup>15</sup>

Just as Hemingway was doubting his ability to free his femininity in a conscious way, however, Catherine worries that she will not be able to define herself in any but masculine terms for, as Frank Scafella notes, "writing is already David's master when he marries [her] and she knows it" (21). Her fear at being abandoned in favor of his work is manifested in her disgust at and hatred of David's absorption in the clippings about his novel during the couple's lunch together in the first chapter. Given that art is usually the purview of men, she worries that his writing will carry him where she cannot reach him, effectively destroying the relationship she is trying to cultivate between them and negating the possibility of the experiments she plans. Her bitterness comes partially clear in her response to their waiter's question as to her profession when he sees the couple perusing the mail from David's publisher: "Is Madame also a writer?' 'No,' the girl said not looking up from the clippings. 'Madame is a housewife'" (24). The juxtaposition between David's occupation as writer and Catherine's as housewife exposes the plight of her situation. The waiter's query implies the possibility that she could be (literarily) creative like David, but Catherine knows she is not, and this angers her because it underscores the possible destruction of their marriage by way of his loss of interest in her. Her description

of herself as a housewife, by extension, is important not for its domestic implication but for its indication of the importance to her of their relationship.

This is underscored by Catherine's direct questioning of David about his work and her feeling that her desire for togetherness will not be enough if he continues to drift further into his writing and further away from her: "How can we be us and have the things we have and do what we do and you be this that's in the clippings?" (24). Stephen Roe declares that "Catherine is asking David to exchange collective narcissism for genuine interaction and intimacy" (55), which helps us clarify the feminist humanist objective behind her actions. It makes sense, from a Cixousian perspective, that she should focus her attention on her and David's life together as a means of avoiding the danger of his becoming a self-absorbed artist, as if in fictional response to Hemingway's own desire to balance his artistic needs with his human ones. This is not to suggest that Catherine's ideas are inimical to art; rather, we must view her artistic understanding as an example of the life-giving creativity Cixous believes women can offer. However, Catherine fears that the more time David spends absorbed in his work the less time (and use) he will have for her even if she defends the artistic/creative validity of what she does.<sup>16</sup>

Such a fear of separation is surely at the heart, too, of Hemingway's worry about the literary life: the possibility, examined at length in many of the post-war manuscripts, that art and personal relationships are diametrically opposed concerns and that a slavish adherence to art alienates the artist from society. His own life-long habit of writing at a remove from his wives, friends and children — whether in a separate apartment as he used in Paris during the early years, before his divorce from Hadley, or in the tower at the Finca Vigía in Cuba that Mary commissioned to be built especially as a writing room for him —

surely re-enforced his view of the writer as a solitary figure needing peace and quiet to compose. And Catherine's fear that David might fall into this trap and leave her by herself suggests that Hemingway was worried he might be guilty of having fallen into it himself.

Conversely, the concern David has about the effect of Catherine's transformations on his writing demonstrates Hemingway's fear that personal activities interfere with a writer's calling. Even before Catherine has made her first transformation, for instance, David laments that he is not working while they tour the Mediterranean coast, and wonders whether she will understand his desire to begin again:

It would be good to work again but that would come soon enough as he well knew and he must remember to be unselfish about it and make it as clear as he could that the enforced loneliness was regrettable and that he was not proud of it. He was sure she would be fine about it and she had her own resources but he hated to think of it, the work, starting when they were as they were now. It could never start of course without the clarity and he wondered if she knew that and if that was why she drove beyond what they had for something new that could not break. But what could it be? They could not be held any tighter together than they were now and there was no badness afterwards. (14)

The nebulous anxiety he has bespeaks his belief that art is a solitary (and masculine) pursuit that suffers when introduced to femininity. Because of this fear, as Robert Fleming rightly points out, David's musings appear not to be "true expressions of his own feelings but a rehearsal of the defenses he will use to justify what Catherine might be expected to view as his selfish withdrawal" (*Face* 149). There is indeed an indication that David is suspicious of Catherine's motives in beginning the transformations and that he hopes to make a preemptive strike that will force her to accept his writerly solitude.<sup>17</sup>

An early scene in which Catherine encourages David to continue his writing can help to expose just how conscious David is of the possibility of being drawn from his work by his life with Catherine. "You didn't say you wouldn't write," she reminds him.

“Nobody said anything about worrying if you wrote” (27). An omitted manuscript sentence, in which Catherine assures David that his being with her did not mean selling his soul to the devil (422.1-2 p. 7), begins to explain just how he does view her experiments: as a mortgaging of his masculinity. Soon enough, this argument between David’s need for categorical masculinity and Catherine’s need for fluid bisexuality will become the major stumbling block of their marriage and will offer an indication of the trouble Hemingway had in reconciling his feminine and masculine sides and of how dearly he hoped a reconciliation possible.

The very title of the novel, in fact, can help to explain how difficult it was for the author to allow a connection between his two warring selves. In a 1948 letter to Col. Buck Lanham, a close friend since their time together in WW II, Hemingway explained that he was working, at the time, on a novel dealing with “the happiness of the Garden that a man must lose” (quoted in Baker, *A Life Story* 460). With this metaphor as a guide, we can see that the Bournes’ initial happiness, before Catherine’s exploration into and experimentation with her sexuality, represents for Hemingway the paradise of a heterosexual and socially acceptable union. Unfortunately (inevitably, Hemingway is suggesting), her flouting of convention by way of her games and transformations will force the couple out of the garden and into the world of sin and wickedness.<sup>18</sup> This sense of the conflict between masculine and feminine values is established in the novel even before Catherine begins the experiments that will ruin the Bournes’ marriage. As they eat breakfast at the opening of the published novel, David describes their love of food in language laced with moral (and later sexual) implications. While he and Catherine imagine the delectable lunch they will order that day, David suggests in the manuscript that they pretend it is sinful to eat,

imagining that maybe this pretense will make the experience more fun (422.1-1, p.3). Perhaps realizing David's fascination with sin, despite his later protests to the contrary, Catherine tantalizes him by invoking the same air of immorality and danger when she changes the subject to their sex life. Her description of what she intends to do to him sexually that evening sets the tone for the novel — even as it unwittingly implies the likely outcome of their sexual life together: “I’m the destructive type. . . . And I’m going to destroy you. They’ll put a plaque up on the wall of the building outside the room. I’m going to wake up in the night and do something to you that you’ve never even heard of or imagined” (5). The gender and sex-role reversal that she envisions — but does not yet explain to David — will surely be destructive, at least to his sense of masculinity, since it will entail her physical penetration of him and his concomitant feminization.<sup>19</sup>

Yet the truth as to “[w]hether her destructiveness might have positive or negative consequences is open to question” (Varsava 119). In terms of their effect on David, Catherine's actions run the risk of destroying him because they run counter to a cultural sexual system that protects male sovereignty by appropriating female sexuality. That is to say, her taking over the dominant role in their lovemaking threatens his supremacy. As she goes on to emphasize, though, the result of her change might in fact be a heightening of his sexual pleasure: “It’s fun without sin. . . . But sin does give it a certain quality” (422.1-1, p. 4). There is perhaps a hint of the positive involved in this if we view increased sexual stimulation as a constructive outcome of their activities. More importantly, a positive consequence can be imagined for Catherine if we see her experiments, as she does, as a means of evading a subjection to masculine/heterosexual rules that want to deny her authority over her sexuality. While the nominal reason for her changes may be to pique

David's sexual curiosity, then, there is far more at stake for her than mere titillation; she is attempting to create for herself a sexual freedom by nullifying the hierarchy usually inherent in male-female relationships and by refusing to allow her sexuality to be used solely for David's masculine self-aggrandizement.

Fittingly, this is precisely how Joy Simpson-Zinn describes Cixous's ideal of female sexuality — as a move beyond the codifying of masculine practice toward a more fluid interaction, one which does not restrict but frees people: “In the feminine libidinal economy there is no self and other, no appropriation of difference. Two entities are inextricably linked in an exchange which has no beginning and no ending” (84). The result of Catherine's transformation into a boy during the couple's lovemaking the night after her first haircut is to offer her and David a similar kind of endless, non-politicized possibility. In a description that looks quite like the confused love scenes in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, both Catherine and David lose physical distinctiveness, to the point, even, that she remarks that they are indistinguishable from one another:

He had shut his eyes and he could feel the long light weight of her on him and her breasts pressing against him and her lips on his. He lay there and felt something and then her hand holding him and searching «lower» and he helped with his hands and then lay back in the dark and did not think at all and only felt the weight and the strangeness «inside» and she said, “Now you can't tell who is who can you?” (17)<sup>20</sup>

Through their sexual merging, Catherine is trying to restructure the cultural codes by which she and David have been forced to live, and, at least for her, the potential efficacy of the attempt is proven almost immediately. Living in the mediated gender world of being both a boy and a girl, Catherine now has choices previously closed off to her: “I can do anything and anything and anything” (15). This is not to suggest that she is blind to the fact that what she is attempting runs counter to accepted practice. It is simply that she refuses to be bound

by the cultural mores threatening her. Only “[s]tupid people will think it is strange” she assures David; the two of them “must [instead] be proud” of the changes she initiates (16). At one level, Catherine’s words seem to echo the statements a more confident Ernest Hemingway might have made about his own experiments with gender and sexual role-inversion. As we know, he often played with the styling and shaping of his and Mary’s hair as Catherine and David do and engaged in sexual practices remarkably similar to theirs, all of which amounts to the supposition that, in creating a character like Catherine who proudly rejects convention by disobeying cultural rules about the respective hair lengths of men and women and about sexuality, Hemingway was hinting at his own (often-hidden) desire to make similar statements about his gender and/or sexual identity.

True to his conscious ambivalence toward the feminine, though, it is fitting that Hemingway’s protagonist should be wary of such transformations. While David is intrigued, and not a little excited, by Catherine’s change to a boyish style, he also fears what that excitement might say about his own sexual preference. His response to her arrival at the restaurant after her first haircut in chapter one of the published novel intimates his sexual interest in Catherine’s transformation in that he initially plays along with her game of being a boy — when she displays herself to him and exclaims, “‘You see. . . . That’s the surprise. I’m a girl. But now I’m a boy too’” (15), David responds by sitting her at the table beside him and quipping, “‘What do you want, brother.’”<sup>21</sup> Yet the longer Catherine carries on her games, the more doubtful David becomes about the sexual implications of his participation in them. Even at this early stage, he is apprehensive of the changes Catherine has initiated because he believes that her new haircut has broken the rules of a heterosexual and hetero-gendered society. Thus when she first hints at the change she is going to make,

he complains that he “like[s] everything the way it is just now at this minute” (12), thereby preparing us for the fact that, after she returns with her surprise (and surprising) new look, his primary emotion will be concern mixed with a masculine sense of resentment at being overshadowed by his wife:

ordinarily there would have been much talk about [the fish he had caught] but this other was a big thing in the village too. No decent girls had ever had their hair cut short like that in this part of the country and even in Paris it was rare and strange and could be very bad. It could mean too much or it could only mean showing the beautiful shape of a head that could never be shown as well. (16)

David’s attitude accurately explains his feelings about the need for social/sexual conformity. The fact that he recognizes the potential harm to their reputations indicates his discomfort at appearing abnormal, appearing, that is, as anything other than a masculine, heterosexual man. Similarly, his petulance at having his fishing prowess eclipsed by Catherine evidences his phallogocentric need to be the center of attention. On both fronts, he is demonstrating the male need for definitive gender identity, the need to be assured of a grounded and definable masculinity whose desires define the rules of society.

It is because of his need to maintain this façade and his fear that it will shatter as a result of his participation in Catherine’s transformations that David feels remorse over their sex life after the change. That ruefulness, exposed by the book’s title, is clarified by his regret and sadness after their first sexual inversion:

The young man put his arms around the girl and held her very tight to him and felt her lovely breasts against his chest and kissed her on her dear mouth. He held her close and hard and inside himself he said goodbye and then goodbye and goodbye.

“Let’s lie very still and quiet and hold each other and not think at all,” he said and his heart said goodbye Catherine goodbye my lovely girl goodbye and good luck and goodbye. (18)

In some senses, David is saying goodbye more to his masculinity than to Catherine. Yet

even as he laments what is going to happen, he cannot forget that on some level he is intrigued by her changes as has been indicated by, among other things, his nonchalant response to her first haircut. Throughout the novel, in fact, David and Hemingway wage a battle inside themselves as to whether to condemn Catherine for her forced feminization of David or to accept that he (and by extension Hemingway) is as interested as she. At one point in the manuscript, for example, while David is ruminating on their transformations, he goes so far as to imagine that perhaps their experiments are not wrong at all but are actually normal. He imagines that maybe all people are born bisexual and/or bi-gendered but that society refuses to acknowledge this truth (422.1-8 p. 7). That concession is important if we are to recognize that Hemingway could not let go of the chance of coming to terms with his femininity, despite his ongoing conscious attempts to bar that possibility.

From his need for sexual privacy to his wish for public acceptance, from his pride in work to his fear that it affected his performance as a person, and from his insistence on masculinity to his artistic expression of femininity, the almost schizoid separation of Hemingway's conscious and unconscious desires reveals itself as *Garden* progresses. His growing inability, late in his career, to reconcile the essentially irreconcilable facts of a writer's need for solitude and a man's need for human relationships began to pull him apart, a fact that the nexus of art, sexuality, and personal identity in this novel makes clear. The sort of wavering we see in David, between his desire to write and his need to attend to his personal life with Catherine, signals that Hemingway was perhaps not entirely comfortable with the sort of literary life he had made for himself at the expense of the other facets of his existence. Since the drive towards a committed relationship with others and an avoidance of, or discomfort with, the solipsistic life of the writer matches closely with

Cixousian ideas about gender differences, it might be appropriate to view *The Garden of Eden*, as Gajdusek does, as “an attempt to remodel the soul and technique of the modern man and artist into that of a sharer” (“Elephant Hunt” 17). That Hemingway should use his writing at this stage to debate the correctness of his past actions surely demonstrates that he was at least aware of the quandary that a writer must be enough with humanity to gain insight into it but at the same time be enough removed from it to analyze it, that he must use people and not be used by them. In fact, the manuscript admission David makes as to each person’s bisexuality can help us to explain how Hemingway’s writing functions for him as a reminder of his masculinity but also, subversively, as an agent of his feminine side.

Almost from the beginning, David exhibits enormous disdain for the story he is writing in the honeymoon narrative of his and Catherine’s life, mainly because he is angry that she not he is the story’s creator. “Symbolically,” Robert Jones attests, “the honeymoon narrative is Catherine’s text” (11) by way of the fact that, through her inversions, she creates the story while David merely transcribes it. His being forced into the role only of scribe and resulting loss of creative masculine power culminate in his refusal to work any longer on the text. And, to compensate for the loss, he begins to write about the Africa of his adolescence, as if a renewed kinship with youth — a youth significantly devoid of female contact — can shore up his self-doubt and allow him to see himself in a positive and dominant role again. That he should attempt such a repair job by means of writing is hardly surprising given Hemingway’s belief in the power of art to determine identity. Yet unlike Catherine’s feminine writing with her body, which seeks to create something new, David’s search for his father through his remembrance of times past in the African stories is

actively a turning back to the old, an attempt to maintain ties to his masculine roots by way of “a kind of combative enterprise, demanding the violent exertion of creative power” (Roe 59). His approach to writing is thus specifically anti-Cixousian because of its desire to recapture the writer’s former identity rather than help him achieve a new one. Counter to theories declaring the relative unimportance of the author in the process of meaning making in literature — and counter, therefore, to a feminine vision of art — David and Hemingway emphasize, in the African stories, the writer’s narcissistic importance.<sup>22</sup>

This tendency to focus on the narcissistic value of writing for the writer shows David’s and Hemingway’s suspicion of, and worry over, a more feminine practice of writing that does not exist only in and for itself or its writer. As Plate explains, for Cixous, the author’s identity (as author, or even as man or woman) is not crucial to feminine texts. In fact, “Cixous deflects the subject of writing away from the question of the name of the author [entirely,] . . . so as to locate, within writing, a feminine subjectivity which is not tied to fixed identities” (167). David’s very subject matter in the African stories, particularly his use of them to re-evaluate and then, later, to reformulate his relationship with his father, suggests his inability or his lack of desire to use writing as a means of communication with anyone other than himself. That resistance to any outside response to his work exposes David’s masculine, exclusionary attitude towards writing. Part of the problem with this view of art, and part of the tendency Hemingway may have been trying to fight while writing *Garden*, has to do with the male author’s possessiveness and belief in the value of writing as cultural and financial capital. It is important, for example, that just prior to his exchange with Catherine over his press clippings in chapter two David has been working out the monetary rewards his book has already brought him. In fact, Hemingway

takes great care to describe David's working out of the figures, delineating the finer points of the publishing deal to the extent of noting, down to the penny, how much money David has coming to him from the novel's first and second printings.<sup>23</sup>

This should hardly surprise us, though, if we recall Cixous's understanding of masculinity as being based on an economy of acquisitiveness. She suggests that, in order to maintain their position of cultural superiority, many men feel the need to cash in on their masculinity:

At first what [the masculine man] wants, whether on the level of cultural or personal exchanges, whether it is a question of capital or of affectivity (or of love, of *jouissance*) — is that he gain more masculinity: plus-value of virility, authority, power, money, or pleasure, all of which re-enforce his phallogentric narcissism at the same time. Moreover, that is what society is made for — how it is made; and men can hardly get out of it. An unenviable fate they've made for themselves. A man is always proving something; he has to "show off," to show up the others. Masculine profit is almost always mixed up with a success that is socially defined. (*NBW* 87)

In terms of *Garden*, this translates, in part, into David's locking away his manuscripts in his work room and keeping the key from Catherine. Additionally, and far more significantly, it accounts for his reluctance to continue writing the honeymoon narrative, a work which does not — indeed cannot — heighten his masculine profile either within himself or in the public sphere were it to be published as Catherine wants (and even threatens). His chastisement to himself to start working on his stories and forget the complexities of his marital life demonstrates just how threatened David feels by Catherine's machinations and their implications as to his masculine identity: "You better get to work. You have to make sense there. You don't make any in this other" (146). He does not make sense in the world of Catherine's transformations because her experiments automatically call into question, if not nullify, the masculine model of gender distinction by which he

lives, and it is only by maintaining an iron grip on his profession that he believes he can weather the storm and regain a unified sense of himself.<sup>24</sup>

It is fitting, therefore, that the material to which David turns for self-defense should involve his curiously female-free childhood. If, as Marita later suggests, David has been forced into his new role as “a feminized male” (Grace 234) by her own and Catherine’s actions, it is by writing about exclusively masculine rites that David believes he will regain his masculinity.<sup>25</sup> Searching for a proper method of repelling what he feels to be Catherine’s assault on him, he thus regresses, through his writing, to his womanless days in Africa:

To *master* Catherine finally, David resorts to learned technical skills. To escape her withering attack on his values, he withdraws into the safety of his past. Through his writing, he engages in an act of double self-mythification, making of himself a traditional “code hero”: vicariously, through the moral praxis of his puerile alter ego, young David, and[,] in deed, through the very act of disciplined engagement that his writing constitutes from *his* point of view. (Varsava 126)

It seems likely that David does indeed want his writing, particularly the story of the elephant hunt, to act as some form of therapy given that he begins the elephant narrative after Catherine has condemned his writing as awful and torn up another of the African stories.

Yet even in his creation of the hunt story, there is an apparent indication that David — and presumably Hemingway — recognizes how narrow his view of art is in its denial of the efficacy and importance of Catherine’s transformations. He himself admits at one point in the manuscript that their games have re-energized him creatively, even if he is still worried about their implications about his sexuality: “[a]ll that is left entire in you is your ability to write and that gets better. You would think it would be destroyed. By everything

you have been taught it should. But so far as you corrupt or change, that grows and strengthens" (422.1-17 p. 9). Significantly, it is after this revelation and other similar admissions of his increased creative ability thanks to Catherine's transformations that he becomes able to write the African stories, particularly the elephant-hunt story. Moreover, his writing about the elephant's death and its result of turning him against his father tend to suggest Hemingway's awareness of the danger of overly masculine behavior. In fact, David's growing disgust at Juma's and Mr. Bourne's actions, or, more specifically, his recollection of that disgust while writing the story, might lead us to see *Garden* as Hemingway's training ground for a new conception of the artist's approach to his art. Thus while David begins the story with the semi-conscious intent of breaking Catherine's hold over him and ending his exile from masculinity, the overall outcome of his childhood reminiscence is a confrontation with, and temporary alienation from, the male identity which he hopes to regain by writing the story in the first place.<sup>26</sup> Superficially, of course, the tale of the elephant hunt does appear to have all the markings of a male search for self. To gain favor with his violently masculine father, young Davey proudly relates his tracking of the elephant and joins Juma and Mr. Bourne on their trip to kill it (ostensibly because of its previous rampages through local native villages, but really to plunder its ivory). On the way, he tries to please his father further when he provides food by killing a few partridges with his sling. Finally, after what seems an endless trek for the tired boy, the trio runs across the elephant, and, in a scene that ritualistically enacts the destruction/rape of the feminine world of nature by the masculine world of technology, Juma murders the elephant by jamming his phallic shotgun into the beast's ear and repeatedly pulling the trigger.<sup>27</sup>

This synopsis, though, leaves out the important detail of David's growing disdain

for his father and simultaneously increasing emotional sympathy for the soon-to-be-annihilated elephant. As he continues to track the animal with the two men, David comes to realize the immorality of killing such a majestic beast for the sake of its tusks. He cynically realizes that the money they might bring would be wasted: "My father doesn't need to kill elephants to live. . . . If they kill him Juma will drink his share of the ivory or just buy himself another god damn wife" (181). There is an interesting correlation in David's thoughts here between the men's commodification of the elephant and their (at least Juma's) commodification of women, one that suggests his growing understanding of wrong. Though he is naive enough not to comprehend fully the political motivations behind Juma's and his father's attitudes, it is clear that by the time the three catch up to the elephant David wants to distance himself from the men emotionally. Even if he is too young still to grasp the true source of his anxiety, his description of them as "god damned friend killers" (198) and his decision that he will "never tell [his father] or anybody anything again never anything again" (182) betoken his discomfort with the patriarchal social codes of behavior that accept and even endorse ivory hunting and all its attendant evils. What David learns during the elephant hunt in his youth, and the attitude which is revitalized by his writing and reliving of it years later, is a sense of the brutality and emotional poverty attached to a masculine attitude toward life — much like Frederic Henry's similar realization in *A Farewell to Arms* decades earlier.

Admittedly Hemingway and David's writing of the elephant story is by no means the conscious reworking or de-politicizing of gender roles and social identities that Cixous demands. It does serve, though, to demonstrate Hemingway's growing unease with the moralities to which people are forced to conform. Cixous suggests that for men a

reminiscence of childhood is, generally speaking, an attempt to co-opt history for their own purposes. That is, men revisit and rewrite their youth in order to annul the debt of life that

Freud claims children automatically owe their parents:

Freud, in deciphering the latent antagonisms between parents and children, shows very well the extent to which the family is founded, as far as the little boy is concerned, on a fearful debt. The child *owes* his parents his life and his problem is exactly to *repay* them: nothing is more dangerous than obligation. Obligation is submission to the enormous weight of the other's generosity, is being threatened by a blessing . . . and a blessing is always an evil when it comes from someone else. For the moment you receive something you are effectively "open" to the other, and if you are a man you have only one wish, and that is hastily to return the gift, to break the circuit of an exchange that could have no end . . . to be nobody's child, to owe no one a thing. ("Castration" 48 [ellipses in original]).<sup>28</sup>

This would seem to make the elephant-hunt story a case of David's discharging old debts and reinventing himself without the cumbersome memory of obligation. And, in certain ways, he does accomplish this, dismissing his father as a murderer and annulling any maternal influence by omitting his mother from the story altogether.

However, the division of the male child from his familial obligation, and his concomitant movement into the adult world by rejection of his father's values, does not, as Lacanian theory would like, function in this story to assure David of his adherence to cultural masculinity. Rather, his childhood revelation forces him first to doubt his patrimony of a masculine gender identity and all it encompasses (anger, violence, lack of emotion), and then — for a time, anyway — to reject it. A combination of the elephant's metaphorical femininity and David's renunciation of the men who kill it is indicated in the death scene in which, as David remembers it, Juma "had taken the rifle from [him] without speaking and pushed the muzzle almost into the ear hole and fired twice jerking the bolt and driving it forward angrily" (199). The violent sexual parody here is not far to seek, and the

impact on David is immediate. The image of the animal's life-blood pouring out of its ear remains fixed in his memory: "It was a different colored blood and David had thought I must remember that and he had but it had never been of any use to him" (199). It might be possible, though, to speculate that David has, in fact, made use of the memory by his very writing of the story and remembrance of his (at least temporary) division from his father. The dried piece of blood he scrapes from the elephant's tusk shortly after Juma kills it could thus symbolize his adherence to a principle of friendship rather than one of antagonism, just as his writing of the story years later surely indicates his continuing need for kinship with the creature and all that it stands in for.

David's rejection of his father and adherence to a new set of behaviors are just the sort of rethinking of personal identity and cultural allegiance that Cixous advocates. She believes that generally "a boy's journey is the return to the native land . . . , the nostalgia that makes man a being who tends to come back to the point of departure to appropriate it for himself and to die there" (*NBW* 93).<sup>29</sup> However, David and Hemingway both buck this trend in *Garden*, for David's return to his initial break from his father acts not as an appropriation of masculinity but instead casts doubt on the viability of a masculine ideal in itself. Similar to Catherine's urging his completion of the honeymoon narrative, David's creation of the hunt story and its important recapturing of his doubts about his father and his father's behavior offer proof of Cixous's belief that "writing *is the possibility of change itself* . . . the movement which precedes the transformation of social and cultural structures" (quoted in Makward 25 [ellipsis in original]). David's willingness and need to return to that time when he began to doubt the wisdom of the existing socio-political structures — which he sums up in his declaration to his father "fuck elephant hunting"

(181) — are suggestive of Hemingway's own suspicions about gender roles and identities. David's writing the stories of his youth and rediscovering his father (and, more importantly, revisiting the distance he feels between the two of them) gives him an example of how not to view life, one similar to that which Robert Jordan found in his father's suicide or that which Hemingway perceived as the message of his own father's death.

The fact that David's sense of the indecency of his father's and Juma's actions in the elephant-hunt story is remarkably similar to Catherine's own disgust with Mr. Bourne lends further credibility to a view of *The Garden of Eden* as silently endorsing the feminine principle. Her tearing up the story of the Maji-Maji rebellion upon reading it because of her revulsion at the actions of David's father (which even David himself admits are "rather awful" [148]) matches his anger at the killing of the elephant, and her complaints against it, and specifically against David's father, help us to interpret *Garden* as the protest of Hemingway's feminine side. By rejecting the father figure (as David does, at least for a while), Catherine is at the same time rejecting all that the law of the father stands for. Her further anger at David for perpetuating this law by writing the story expresses the depth of her need to counteract it. Tearing up the stories is not enough; some other, more powerful action must be taken. It is necessary, instead, to rewrite such stories, to create a narrative that will not bow to the cultural precedent. This method would allow for "the emergence of a new social subject who would write from a socially and historically inscribed body which is not that of the unitary, narcissistic self" (Plate 164). It is at this point in the manuscript, therefore, that Catherine redoubles her efforts to convince David to complete and publish the honeymoon narrative, and her renewed enthusiasm would seem also to suggest Hemingway's desire to create an art which is not dictated by the cultural forces at work on

the artist but which remains true to his or her inner needs and desires.<sup>30</sup>

If we take this as part of the evidence of Hemingway's true — if never openly admitted — belief about the importance of self-defined identity, we can also begin to recognize how important Catherine's sexual experimentation and her later move to lesbianism become for the author in recognizing how sexual preference functions for the artist as a means of self-understanding. Almost undoubtedly, Catherine and Marita's affair, as well as the sexual tension that exists in the manuscript between Catherine and Barbara Sheldon, addresses the need Hemingway felt to explore alternative sexualities and to investigate the situations that result from conflicting or non-standard sexual preferences and identities. Indeed, lesbianism becomes a major sub-theme of the novel.<sup>31</sup> Early in the manuscript, for instance, when Catherine and David run into Barbara and Nick in Hendaye three months after their first meeting in Paris prior to the opening of the novel, the latent lesbian attraction between the two women, which had initially been fostered by seeing a statue of female lovers — *The Metamorphoses of Ovid* — at the Rodin museum, becomes manifest as Barbara actively seeks out a relationship with Catherine (422.1-4, 1-5).<sup>32</sup> For her part, Catherine is fascinated by Nick and Barbara's similar appearance, a twinning constituted mainly by Nick's long hair.<sup>33</sup> However, she is worried over the feelings she earlier had for Barbara and attempts to deny her growing interest in a lesbian relationship by setting up "an elaborate system of defense mechanisms" to shield herself from the possibility (Moddelmog 74). She strenuously denies that she is interested in Barbara, or any other woman, stating flatly that she does not like girls (422.1-4, p. 4). Yet her fascination with Barbara, and seeming understanding of Barbara's fascination with her, might lead us to speculate that Catherine is not altogether honest in her protestations against her lesbian

desires. The fact that she registers feeling strange when looking at Nick's long hair (422.1-4 p. 2) surely indicates at least a curiosity about bisexuality.

Readers of the manuscript are thus somewhat better prepared for the fact that Catherine later experiments with lesbianism in the published novel, after she and David have met and befriended Marita in a French café, upon their return from a trip to Madrid during which she has again made the change from boy to girl. Her active pursuance of an affair with Marita hints at the necessity she feels to explore her homosexual inclinations, despite her earlier denials to Barbara. When Marita first openly addresses the subject of an affair with her, Catherine responds again that she "do[es]n't go in for girls" (105), but her conviction is faltering, as she and David both recognize: "her voice did not sound right either to herself or to David." The thrill with which she relates to David her first kisses with Marita a chapter later exposes her need to see the affair through in a way she could not do earlier with Barbara, in spite of her veiled interest:

"I kissed her and she kissed me and we sat in the car and I felt very strange and then we drove into Nice and I don't know whether people could tell it or not. I didn't care by then and we went everywhere and bought everything. She loves to buy things. Someone made a rude remark but it was nothing really. Then we stopped on the way home and she said it was better if I was her girl and I said I didn't care either way and really I was glad because I am a girl now anyway and I didn't know what to do. I never felt so not knowing ever. But she's nice and she wanted to help me I think. I don't know. Anyway she was nice and I was driving and she was so pretty and happy and she was just gentle the way we are sometimes or me to you or either of us and I said I couldn't drive if she did that so we stopped. I only kissed her but I know it happened with me. So we were there for a while and then I drove straight home. I kissed her before we came in and we were happy and I liked it and I still like it." (113)<sup>34</sup>

In addition to its description of lesbian desire, this passage is particularly important in terms of determining how well Hemingway is able to capture a feminine sensibility.

In fact, his description of Catherine's excitement after kissing Marita looks

remarkably like the sort of sexual desire to be found in Cixous, whose “language of eroticism . . . seeks an immediacy of feeling, a performance of desire which destroys divisions between text and sex act, entirely involving the reader in a scenario which s/he must enter, denying any possible position of voyeurism or exteriority” (Wilson, “Erotics” 131). The immediacy of Catherine’s language, the palpable desire she feels for Marita, is carried to the reader by the way Hemingway emulates the rushed speech of an excited person. The repetitive nature of her phrasing — the inability to describe adequately what has occurred and the attempt to convey emotion by emphasis rather than description, as well as the fact that Hemingway does not show us the embrace but instead has Catherine describe it, lends credibility to our interpreting this passage as a scenario such as Wilson describes. Cixous herself explains that a “feminine textual body is recognized by the fact that it is always endless, without ending: there’s no closure, it doesn’t stop, and it’s this that very often makes the feminine text difficult to read. . . . A woman-text gets across . . . a real capacity to lose hold and let go” (“Castration” 53). Catherine’s excited speech here might be said to approach this kind of letting go, of being carried away both by the power of her desire for Marita and (maybe more importantly) by her “hopes of answering questions about her own sexuality” (Powell 83).

Thus while Hemingway’s conscious explanation of the novel in the letter to Lanham as a lament for the ruination of love through female wickedness apparently aligns *Garden* with a masculine biblical tradition that fears and wants to subjugate the feminine, there is clearly far more going on beneath the surface. Even as Hemingway pondered man’s ejection from the uncomplicated paradise of heterosexuality at the hands of women, *The Garden of Eden* demonstrates “a sexuality that transgresses the norms of the culture that

[he] kept trying to outgrow” (Comley and Scholes 89), hinting at his ever-present and only barely submerged doubt about the phallogocentric denial of difference. In fact, as Barbara’s manuscript description of her lesbian feelings seems to imply, Hemingway felt it imperative to register one’s desires without moralizing on them: “I know I’m strange. But I’m not a queer or I never was. Crazy if you like and with special things or one thing that I wanted and got it or have it or had it. It was just a simple delight or ecstasy. It was private but I made it public. That’s the danger. The necessary danger” (422.1-5 p. 8bis). It is arguable, of course, that Barbara’s rejection of the label of homosexuality is a defensive gesture on Hemingway’s part. However, it could equally be suggested that such a refusal to abide by conventional definitions is evidence of his wish that sexuality could be dissociated from morality. If desire were not labeled, the remorse David and Hemingway feel over their sexual transgressions would not exist.

Such a utopian hope, as Cixous herself has observed, is impossible, of course. Yet as seems to be indicated by Barbara’s further manuscript comment that obsessions must be articulated, Hemingway imagined that the exploration of one’s sexuality should not be halted merely because of society’s rules (422.1-5 p. 8<sup>b</sup>). Indeed, this might be seen in part as Hemingway’s very reason for writing *Garden* in the first place (even if he still had doubts about talking of his obsessions with anyone other than his typewriter), a claim that helps to validate Spilka’s argument that this is “the most strikingly reflexive and easily the most ambitious novel Hemingway had ever attempted” (*Quarrel* 12).<sup>35</sup> That same hope of Hemingway’s to deal openly with his desires is evident in Catherine’s comments to David early on about her need to express herself honestly. After she has made the switch from girl to boy for her first attempt at sexual inversion with David, she begs him to realize what the

change means to her: “Please understand. Please know and understand” (17). The working out of their complex relationship is easily seen as Hemingway’s means of working out his own tendencies, and seems to make Catherine’s appeal for understanding an entreaty from Hemingway to his reading public and to himself.

While the inner Hemingway could create a strongly independent and feminine woman, though, the public/conscious Hemingway remained firmly caught by his patriarchal tendencies. The obvious result is a bifurcation of his views of women, which plays out in this novel in the marked contrast between Catherine and Barbara’s freedom and Marita’s re-inscription of phallogentric values for if we see the former women’s approaches to sexuality as the epitome of Hemingway’s silent femininity we must register Marita’s as being the vocalization of his masculine side, a figure Comley and Scholes pejoratively but rightly call “a lesbian sex-kitten” far less interesting than Catherine (66). Even if, through her lesbianism, she can be seen as a positive figure by allowing Catherine to explore a new attitude towards sexuality, Marita ultimately functions more as a means for Hemingway to re-instate a masculine dominance over female sexuality. In a way, she is both the yin and yang of Hemingway’s sexual conundrum in that her affair with Catherine stands in for his growing dissatisfaction with strict rules about sexual feminine subjugation while her affair with David suggests his contradictory need to maintain masculine superiority.

In the end, however, though she initially serves to help both David and Catherine explore their sexualities, Marita’s true use seems to be to shore up David and Hemingway’s faltering sense of masculinity. That certainly seems to be the implication of her rejecting lesbianism in favor of a return with David to a heterosexual existence. It is even possible to argue that she uses Catherine’s desire for her in order to get close to David and lure him

away, which would hold with her later assertion that, though she is willing to carry on Catherine's inversions with David, he need not fear that they are meant to convert him from heterosexuality.<sup>36</sup> Whether we view Marita as being sincere in her initial love for Catherine or merely as manipulative, the effect of her abandonment of the relationship is the same in terms of Hemingway's inner debate over gender and sexual identity, in that she acts as a strengthening agent for David's masculinity, and for a masculine sense of male-female relationships generally, by quickly taking over responsibility for him.<sup>37</sup>

This is marked most obviously by David and Catherine's nickname for her: Heiress. Though on one level the name is meant to be symbolic of her wealth and her ability to keep David in the style to which Catherine has made him accustomed, it also indicates the function she plays within the threesome. Marita inherits David because, with Catherine's move into lesbianism, it is left to her to satiate his masculine and heterosexual desires. Not surprisingly, therefore, our impression of her for a large part of the story (at least in the published version) is as another of Hemingway's servant-girl lovers. In fact, only a day after she and Catherine make love for the first time, Marita begins to focus on her future role as David's dutiful wife. When Catherine tells her that they must both watch out for David and take care of him, Marita responds in a way similar to Maria's wish to become a good wife for Robert Jordan in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*: "I'm trying to study his needs" (122). Perhaps even her name is suggestive of a connection in Hemingway's mind between the two women's submissive obedience in that "Marita" is the Spanish diminutive of "Maria." And it becomes abundantly clear, as the story progresses, that Marita is a quick and eager study who earns her highest marks in male sexual satisfaction.

Graphic testimony of Marita's frantic desire to please David sexually can be found

in chapter twenty-two after the two have begun their affair and are lying in bed together. Before he falls asleep (after having just completed the elephant-hunt story), she discusses their sex life, intimating that she is open to any sort of activity he desires — a notable difference from Catherine who usually played the dominant role in deciding the Bournes' lovemaking. She even goes so far as to suggest that, if he would like, she could emulate the things Catherine did. Admitting that she has read the honeymoon narrative's description of his and Catherine's sexual experiments, Marita enticingly tells him that she enjoys similar activities: "she looked up at him and then moistened her lips and did not look away and she said very carefully, 'I knew all about that because I'm just the way you are'" (185). In the manuscript, she then fellates him as he drifts off to sleep, thinking to herself that she is a better partner for him than Catherine because she is willing to give him any sort of sexual pleasure he desires, including the games Catherine had initiated, which she believes she can perform better (422.1-27 p. 33). One implication of Marita's internal declaration is that Hemingway uses her explicitly to reject and denigrate the open approach to sexuality implied by Catherine's experimentalism, a point with which Steven Roe concurs: "Marita's imitative endeavors lead away from the intersubjective, androgynous intimacy that excites Catherine, toward one-sided and cruelly exploitative sexual relations, based on privileged usership and hierarchical mastery" (58). Indeed, her performance of oral sex seems almost a shorthand method of re-enforcing the idea that female sexuality only means something as it relates to male pleasure, while her further desire to please David by emulating — but also improving on — Catherine's transformations might suggest an attempt to invalidate Catherine's experiments altogether.

It becomes clear, as David and Marita's heterosexual relationship grows, that

neither one of them wants to continue the alternative sexual experiences that Catherine earlier offered, and their rejection of Catherine and all that she stands for — otherness, openness, experimentation — indicates the degree of anxiety Hemingway felt concerning sexual orientation and gender modulation. The presumed normalization of Marita by David and his all-powerful phallic love apparently indicates a desire on the part of the author to maintain such a power for himself, even as his creation of Catherine casts doubt on his belief in it. That is to say, if Catherine represents the desire for the alternate sexual or gender identity which Hemingway manifested at times and hoped to come to grips with in his fiction, Marita's heterosexualization by David — and David's re-established masculinity and creativity as a result — indicates Hemingway's belief that such a tendency could and/or should be overcome. From this perspective, we might view Catherine's downward spiral into madness in the face of David and Marita's developing relationship as Hemingway's punishment of her for attempting to create her own definitions of sexual and gender identity and as his punishment of himself for encouraging them. Modellmog suggests, for example, that "it is no accident that references to her 'madness' increase after [her] admitting her desire for Marita" and then being quickly spurned (77).<sup>38</sup> Indeed, we might even be inclined to view Catherine's imbalance as Hemingway's attempted rejection of transgressive sexuality altogether.

That, at least, is the sentiment that comes through in the published novel, thanks to Jenks's decision to conclude the story with "a fairytale, or better, Hollywood ending" (Raeburn, "Sex and Art" 120), after David's successful rewriting of the work that Catherine has burned in a fit of madness and jealousy. His recovery of the stories of his youth, and particularly his renewed sense of kinship with his father, intimate that

Hemingway had reached the conclusion that a man's unalloyed masculinity is crucial to his identity as a man. And so, as David works on recapturing the essence of his lost stories on the last page of the published novel, he begins to feel a new closeness to his father and to his previously stolen/rejected masculinity: "He found that he knew much more about his father than when he had first written this story. . . . He was fortunate, just now, that his father was not a simple man" (247). The implication of this new-found understanding, particularly as the book's final sentiment, is that David has recovered not simply his father and his stories but also his male identity. Jenks's choice to conclude *Garden* with the optimistic notion that "there was no sign that any of [David's memories] would ever cease returning to him intact" suggests that Hemingway's wrestling match with his feminine tendencies ended in their defeat. The fact, too, that David is able to rediscover his creative ability and rewrite the stories of his childhood as a result of his renewed heterosexuality with Marita implies Hemingway's sense of the futility of attempting to redefine oneself outside cultural boundaries as Catherine had wanted to do. By the conclusion of the published novel, then, when David and Marita are beyond Catherine's range of influence, there is every indication that Hemingway has also moved the book away from the idea that love of a bisexual nature might offer sexual and/or gender and/or artistic freedom.

Yet Jenks's concluding with David's multiple recovery, which so clearly undermines a view of *Garden* as the sign of Hemingway's wish to side with a feminine model, was obviously *not* the author's final decision on where to end the manuscript. In truth, Hemingway was never sure how he wanted to conclude the book for though he brought the Sheldon plot to a close with Nick's accidental death and Barbara's suicide a few months later he left David, Catherine and Marita's story unfinished. From manuscript

evidence, however, it is possible to divine two separate probable endings to their narrative, and it is important that, though they differ radically from each other, both expose the depth of Hemingway's ambivalence towards a masculine view of gender and sexual identity. The first of these conclusions — which Hemingway himself titled "Provisional Ending—written when thought something might happen before book could be finished [sic]" (422.2-1 p. 1) — fits into the story around chapter twenty-one, shortly after Catherine and Marita have decided to share David, each being his wife for two days before giving way to the other. The short, eleven-page insert chronicles a conversation between David and Catherine on the beach as they reminisce about the good times they had before their alienation from each other. It becomes clear, as they talk, that Catherine has returned from a stay in a Swiss sanatorium, where she sought treatment for her erratic behavior toward David and Marita, but that she fears another bout of madness might overtake her sometime in the future. She proposes that if this happens she will take her own life and asks David to join her in a suicide pact, a request to which he agrees.<sup>39</sup>

The fact that David appears to concede to her plan for suicide has some intriguing implications concerning Hemingway's feelings about the investigations that the Bournes have been making into gender and sexuality. That they should both be unable to find a way out of their confusion other than death would seem to imply an equal inability on Hemingway's part to work out his own ideas on these matters. This clearly complicates the too-easy conclusion about his gender identity that Jenks inadvertently offers in the published book. In fact, the very manner in which Catherine describes her previous sexual experiments suggests that in the provisional ending Hemingway still felt a hint of their possible efficacy. It also returns the novel to a discussion of Catherine's belief in her

creativity: “Remember when I used to talk about anything and everything and we owned the world. All we had to do was see it and we owned it. And I was so proud and made everything in my image. I could change everything. Remember? Change me change you change us both. Change the seasons change everything for my delight.” (422.2-1 p. 7). It is important, in terms of the book’s relationship to *écriture féminine*, that Hemingway still sees Catherine’s experiments as positive ones, even if the suicide pact reveals their impracticability.

The strength she manifests at the end and the manner in which she manifests it are remarkably similar to the strength that Cixous believes women possess and the way they can use that potential to change the world:

Women have it in them to organize [the] regeneration, [the] vitalization of the other, of otherness in its entirety. They have it in them to affirm the difference, *their* difference, such that nothing can destroy that difference, rather that it might be affirmed, affirmed to the point of strangeness. . . . But first she would have to *speak*, start speaking, stop saying that she has nothing to say! . . . Dare to speak her piece about giving, the possibility of giving that doesn’t take away, but *gives*. (“Castration” 50-51)

In the provisional ending, Hemingway makes clear Catherine’s own realization of such a possibility and even offers her a small measure of success along the lines Cixous imagines. Admittedly, her madness — a madness induced by the attempts of male culture to foil her plans (in the form of David and Marita’s rejection of her and return to exclusive heterosexuality) — does keep Catherine from being fully able to change herself or David. Yet the fact that she has made the attempt says much about Hemingway’s increasing need to come to terms with gender and sexuality in ways outside normal parameters.<sup>40</sup> Moreover, the suicide Catherine proposes as the only way to avoid a return of her madness indicates Hemingway’s realization that such transgression does not come without a price, that the

demands of society always override the wishes of the individual — and there is a sense of sadness in the provisional ending that this should be so, as if Hemingway lamented that society would not allow him to express himself freely.

Such a feeling does not come out so clearly in the other possible ending which Jenks refused. Nevertheless, there is still a mitigation of his conclusion. Actually, the second manuscript ending is rather less of a conclusion to the novel than a new beginning, in that it develops David and Marita's affair beyond the morning of the recovery of his creative talent. In any event, the chapters of the holograph that follow Jenks's arbitrary stopping point reflect a rather altered relationship between Marita and David than comes through in the published novel, a fact that may temper the masculine victory implied by David's renewed career. Instead, their affair begins to look similar to the sort of relationship in which Catherine had earlier tried to engage David. In a manuscript scene that takes place soon after Catherine departs in chapter twenty-eight of the published novel, Marita explains her plan to cut her hair in the style of the African girls of David's childhood — a style close to that which Catherine had also worn — and confides that she knows about Catherine's transformation and so knows how to excite him (422.1-35 p. 31). Marita recognizes that, in spite of his protests, David was not completely against the experiments Catherine carried out. She recognizes, too, that his hesitation was due not to a dislike of the activities but to a fear of Catherine's aggressiveness in carrying them out. Marita explains that Catherine forced the changes on him for her own sake but that she, Marita, will be doing it for David's enjoyment as much as her own because she knows how she and he are (422.1-35 p. 32). How they are, in fact, is quite like how Catherine herself was — interested in the non-traditional aspects of sexuality and gender identity. And this similar desire prompts Marita

to admit that she wants to be both a girl and a boy in the same manner as Catherine.

There is, of course, some difference between Marita's version of the experiments and Catherine's, namely, a desire to do them for David's sake and not her own. This means that he will not feel pressured now as he did with Catherine and will not suffer the remorse he felt when she instituted the changes earlier. Marita tells him she can be a boy and girl at once but that David should not worry about this fact: "You'll never have remorse because I'm your girl really and it never happened. It's not perversion. It's variety" (422.1-36 p. 6). Her placating of David displays Marita's understanding of his worry over his sexual preferences even as it caters to them. This leads Modellmog to suggest that in place of Catherine's dangerous changes Marita offers a re-inscription of hetero-normativity by focusing David's attention on the fact that, regardless of the nature of their sexual activity, they will both remain constant in their sexual identities — he the masculine man, she the feminine woman — and that both of them will still be engaged in strictly heterosexual relations: "What David does in bed [with Marita] does not make him homosexual and perverse; it makes him experimental, quite unlike the feelings he felt when Catherine offered similar changes" (*Reading Desire* 82). The fact, though, that Hemingway reintroduces Catherine's experiments through Marita, albeit in a form more palatable to the heterosexual male psyche, hints at his need to work out a sense of his own sexuality and gender identity in a different form than was commonly accepted, even as he was coerced by societal pressure to conform publicly to accepted models of behavior. Indeed, if we accept McCampbell Grace's contention that Marita "resurrects" Catherine (266), we may realize that, at the end of the second variant ending, Hemingway was still working out the same dilemmas that had prompted him to start the book over a decade before.

Ultimately, because of the hard choices Hemingway was trying to make, the lack of a definite conclusion in the manuscript should not be seen as a detriment. Instead, we might argue that its open-endedness marks the culmination of Hemingway's interaction with the sort of ideas Cixous would later incorporate into her theory precisely *because* he did not fall back into an easy phallogentrism. In the end, Catherine, David and Marita's story, like Nick, Barbara and Andy's story in the manuscript, is also Hemingway's — the story of a man attempting to give voice to his feminine side while being lured into the trap of gender division that society demanded of him. Earlier novels like *The Sun Also Rises*, *A Farewell to Arms*, and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* indeed flirt with feminist humanism and offer some evidence of Hemingway's interest in exploring the difficult area of gender relations. However, the focus on artistic and sexual identity to the exclusion of almost all other themes in *The Garden of Eden* makes Hemingway's last major novel his most Cixousian, his clearest "study in male relinquishment of power and in a new male posture" (Gajdusek, "Elephant Hunt" 15).

Obviously, his inability to come to terms with his problems, which prevented him from completing the novel, has implications for an endorsement of *Garden* as feminine writing. However, the very fact of his penning such a book — and perhaps the more important fact of his returning to it for more than a decade — suggests the deep need Hemingway felt to attempt to come to terms with the femininity he must have known was inside him. The further fact that he himself was engaging in activities much like Catherine, David and Marita's for almost the entirety of his work on the novel also proves the desire he had to work out his complex psychosexual dilemmas, making this book not just the "most compelling work of his final twenty years of life" (Raeburn "Sex and Art" 113) but

the truest rendering of his innermost secrets. Admittedly, Hemingway never made the leap from unconscious recognition of his femininity to conscious acceptance of it, a fact all too clear in the divisive nature of this last fictional manuscript with which he was never satisfied. Yet his writing of such a novel leads us to see how deep his ambivalence ran as far as societal definitions of identity were concerned. While it stands, then, as his most indecisive book, in some ways *The Garden of Eden* also stands as Hemingway's legacy of sexual, artistic and gender possibilities and as the culmination of a career fueled by a deep-seated need for self-understanding.

## Conclusion:

### Reconstructing Hemingway

At his death, Hemingway left us a history of machismo, both in literature and legend, that stood almost unchallenged for a quarter-century. In the fifteen years or so since the publication of *The Garden of Eden*, though, that history has started to be contested. As more and more scholars begin to reassess their beliefs about literature, and as the old-boys club of dead white males has been forced to open its doors to authors once marginalized or ignored entirely, our critical opinion of the canonical authors in American Literature has been forcibly altered. In terms of Hemingway, this has meant an increased interest in the previously untold (or untruthfully told) story of his sexual and gender identity. Finally, Gertrude Stein's prediction of fifty years ago that a different Hemingway awaited readers in his work has come true as we have begun to realize just how vast the divergence is between the public Hemingway and the private Hemingway. The determined attempts he made, for example, to appear masculine by way of drinking, womanizing, and hunting are starting to be recognized by a growing majority of Hemingway scholars as defenses against a fear that his masculinity was tempered by a feminine side.

The degree to which he himself was aware of his strategy of self-deception is, of course, difficult to gauge. However, the fact that he offered clues to the feminine aspect of his personality in his work is suggestive that, at some level, he yearned to expose his true self. Through the writing, we can start to see that Hemingway did not believe the world to be simply divided into feminine women and masculine men, as earlier theories of his fiction suggested. Titles like *Men Without Women* (1927) to the contrary, he appears to have been expressly interested in exploring a world where men and women must interact. More importantly, his work exposes a man eager to understand how masculinity and femininity intersect — not just between people but within individuals. The complexities of human gender and sexual identity surely fascinated him from the beginning of his career, probably from nearly the beginning of his life, and that fascination played itself out in detail in the fiction. The plethora of texts that revolve around issues of sexual preference and mediated gender argue convincingly for a view of Hemingway as a man deeply concerned about his relative masculinity and femininity. Canvassing his oeuvre, it is possible to suggest that many of the stories and all of the novels are bound up with the question of determining personal and social identity in a world that wishes to differentiate and segregate male and female characteristics.

It is the long fiction, though, with its offer of greater depth and breadth, that allowed Hemingway the requisite space to explore his interests with the care and attention he felt obligated to give them. The novels thus become an arena in which is waged the difficult battle between his heartfelt desires and his bleakest doubts, a place where he attempted to argue out his problems in full. Through plots such as Jake's and Brett's attempts to understand themselves, Hemingway was registering, from the very beginning of

his career, an interest in the construction of masculinity and femininity. With stories like *Frederic and Catherine's*, he extended his examination, beginning to look more closely at how gender affects and is affected by sexuality. In his telling of Jordan and Maria's relationship, he later proved his desire to make love work, to use it as a safe port in the storm of gender indecision forced on individuals by a restrictive patriarchal society. Finally, through the narrative of David and Catherine's troubled marriage, he offered a parable of the feminine and its difficult search for a voice. In each of these books, Hemingway was probing the desires that lay just beneath the surface of his consciousness and indulging his feminine side in a way impossible for him to do anywhere but in his most private fantasies.

Looking at the development of these novelistic inquiries over the length of his career, it becomes clear that, as he aged, Hemingway felt an increasing need to come to a definition of himself that was true to his inner feelings as well as to the system of identities made available by society. Moreover, in tracing this evolution, it appears that, by the later years of his writing life, he came close to adopting an attitude towards the feminine that looks remarkably like Cixous's understanding of *écriture féminine*. Admittedly, suggesting that Hemingway was consciously aware of his increasing desire to interact honestly with his femininity might be overstating the case. However, it would be doing the literature a wrong turn not to concede that the struggle between his needs and worries was being played out on the stage of his unconscious and that his art was honestly dramatizing the conflict. In fact, if we believe Cixous's claim that femininity is always trying to show itself despite the best efforts of phallogocentric culture to stifle it, we can perhaps see in Hemingway an admirable example of this phenomenon. Though he felt constrained to protest his masculinity in

public, in the inner world of his fiction his feminine side took stronger hold, causing him enough doubt about his identity to make him create narratives that explore the importance of honest self-definition. The fact that he returned almost ceaselessly to texts that question — sometimes actively challenge — patriarchal ideas about sex and gender suggests that writing was not the unalloyed masculine pursuit for Hemingway that earlier critics took it to be. Rather, we can see his writing as a sign that Hemingway was particularly *unsatisfied* with the masculine identity forced upon him from the outside. If he was finally unable to proclaim his femininity vocally, it was due mainly to his inability to overcome his patriarchal training that saw mediated gender and sexuality as perverse and deviant. In his writing, where the strictures of society were less a hindrance to his desires, Hemingway could revel in imagined scenarios of gender-blurred characters who, if not homosexual, were often intrigued by bisexuality.

The battle between his needs and his fears was, of course, not won or lost in the realm of his creative imagination. So while the writing does manifest a different Hemingway than the legend allows, the myth cannot be discarded out of hand. If we are to gain greater insight into the story of the real Ernest Hemingway, though, we must admit that the public image we have had of him for over half a century is not comprehensive. And recourse to Cixous can help delineate the side of his psyche that remained mostly hidden during that time. For one thing, her understanding of the difficult cultural history of the feminine can help to clarify the reason for Hemingway's reluctance to accept or admit his gender bisexuality. For another, her image of femininity as a creatively subversive force that continues to show itself against all odds can help to prove that his writing became for him the site where his publicly muzzled femininity was allowed a voice. The writing thus

becomes a struggle between conscious and unconscious impulses, as one side begs for the freedom which the other continuously denies. This sense of the conflicted nature of his work fits well with Cixous's understanding about reading and writing. "I see my work both as a constant battle and as a source of infinite pleasure," she explains. "I see it as a battle against all the prohibitions I recognize within myself as well as those imposed by society" ("Conversations" 142). For Hemingway, the battle was surely drawn along the same lines, though perhaps his self-awareness was never as clear as Cixous's. It may even be the case that his writing about questions of gender and sexual identity provided him the pleasure he was unable to find in life because of his inability to admit publicly to his desires.

As Cixous constantly reminds us, masculinity and femininity coexist in each of us and we must be ready to open ourselves to that otherness inside us if the political hierarchies of phallogentrism are to be destroyed. Through a practice of feminine writing that refuses to rank gender difference, she suggests, the revolution can be made whereby men will give up their cultural link to masculinity. "[T]he fact that a piece of writing is signed with a man's name," she claims "does not in itself exclude itself from femininity. It's rare, but you can sometimes find femininity in writings signed by men: it does happen" ("Castration" 52). The rarity of such a writer cannot be overlooked; yet we must not dismiss out of hand those writers who do not appear initially to fit the mold of *écriture féminine*. Thus while Hemingway seems at first an unlikely candidate for feminist humanist revaluation, it makes sense, after examining the complex ideas in his writing, that we might see him as developing, in embryo, sensibilities quite close to Cixous's own. Through an application of her ideas, the difficulty of comprehending his relationship to femininity is somewhat lessened as we are offered insight into his unconscious. Though "Hemingway

never succeeded in coming to terms with his feminine self” consciously (Grace 105), the picture that comes out in the writing shows a man curious to understand the many possible identities available to men and women.

Thus, if we still see Hemingway, the man/legend, as the endorser of “red-blooded masculinity” that he was accused of trying to be fifty years ago, our perception of Hemingway, the author, as writing in “a literary style . . . of wearing false hair on the chest” (Eastman 96) has surely altered in the interim. Cracks have indeed begun to appear in the macho pose of his work, and this fact is particularly fitting for a Cixousian evaluation of his writing, given her explanation of how femininity makes its presence known in the masculine world:

From the very moment that anything connected to desire begins to speak up, and begins to speak against established forms, against what closes, what codifies, from the moment an anti-code arises, it necessarily indicates that there is an open channel. It’s a narrow channel, to be sure; it is perhaps, for the time being, only a crack, perhaps only a fissure. Nonetheless, it has always existed. (“Rethinking Differences” 72)

Cixous’s insistence that the feminine continually peeks out from behind the veil of masculinity through writing works well in Hemingway’s case, since she insists that men’s acceptance of femininity is most prevalent among writers: “in writing — particularly in writing more so than in any other domains where they can be found — there are men who transmit femininity” (quoted in Makward 22). To be sure, such transmissions from Hemingway, like “the Sinai-like voice” (Burwell, *Postwar Years* 92) that Thomas Hudson receives on his radio in *Islands in the Stream*, were always faint and cryptic, necessitating a decoder to be understood; and, for many years, it looked as though decryption would not be possible. However, through the increased academic interest in non-canonical themes and writers and through scholars’ and readers’ access to a widening variety of sources detailing

Hemingway's personal and professional predilections, the task of "decoding Papa" (Comley and Scholes 3) has become less arduous. It has also become imperative, if we are to understand as well as possible how his art functioned for him at conscious and unconscious levels.

The landscape of Hemingway studies has altered drastically over the last few decades, and, from the look of current scholarship, the changes are not about to end soon. However, by putting a name and a theory to the previous *terra incognita* of his attitudes toward gender identity and human sexuality, we can start to recognize how profoundly contemporary his ideas were in terms of men's and women's relationships to themselves and to each other. If Hemingway is not the macho breast-beating writer that, for decades, we took him to be, and if we are to give some further shape to the sometimes theoretically nebulous terms by which the *nuevo Hemingway* is measured, we could do worse than to adopt Cixousian parameters. By charting a feminist humanist course through his major novels, we can see that he recognized society's tendency to subjugate and silence the feminine and registered his sincere, if not loud, protestation against this unfortunate reality. We can also see that, in his movement from *The Sun Also Rises* and *A Farewell to Arms* through *For Whom the Bell Tolls* to *The Garden of Eden*, Hemingway left us quite a different legacy than we previously thought — the legacy of a male writer who, even if unconsciously, often wrote the feminine.

## NOTES

### Introduction

<sup>1</sup> Though Cixous nowhere acknowledges the potential femininity of Hemingway's texts, during the early years of her career, Hemingway had not yet undergone the recuperation and tempering which has happened in the past decade or so. Thus, her omission is not at all surprising.

<sup>2</sup> As far as my research has been able to determine, the only published work to be done so far on the connection between Cixous's theories and Hemingway is Willingham's 1993 article. While Brenner does mention Cixous's name in connection with *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, he goes no further in his analysis than this ("Interview" 137). The current propensity for complicating Hemingway's ideas about gender, though, will surely spark a move toward further cross-over between the two writers.

<sup>3</sup> This is not to suggest that Hemingway was not suspected of having greater psychological complexity prior to *Garden*. As early as the 1930s, critics like Max Eastman were hypothesizing that Hemingway's machismo was designed to hide a nature far more feminine than he wanted the public (or himself) to realize. Eastman's review of *Death in the Afternoon*, entitled "Bull in the Afternoon," implied that Hemingway was using his love of bloodsports as a cover-up:

It is of course a commonplace that Hemingway lacks the serene confidence that he is a full-sized man. Most of us too delicately organized babies who grow up to be artists suffer at times from that small inward doubt. But some circumstance seems to have laid upon Hemingway a continual sense of the obligation to put forth evidences of a red-blooded masculinity. It must be made obvious not only in the swing of the big shoulders and the clothes he puts on, but in the stride of his prose style and the emotions he permits to come to the

surface there. (176)

Not surprisingly, Hemingway took exception — particularly to Eastman's jibe that he wrote in "a literary style . . . of wearing false hair on the chest" — and, years later, when he ran into Eastman the offices Maxwell Perkins, his editor at Scribner's, he opened his and Eastman's shirts and compared his own hairy chest to Eastman's hairless one. He then proceeded to cuff Eastman in the head, and a fight broke out.

Even in the 1970s, when select scholars were given a glimpse of the manuscript of *The Garden of Eden*, predictions were made that it would revolutionize the public's perception of Hemingway. For instance, Aaron Lapham prophesied in 1977 that it would mark the end of one Hemingway and the beginning of another.

<sup>4</sup> In fact, to a certain degree, the wound-defense theory continues into the present arena of analysis. See, for instance, Spilka (*Quarrel*) and Benson (*Writer's Art*).

<sup>5</sup> Actually, investigations into sexuality in Hemingway's fiction have always been somewhat troublesome. While it seems clear now that he was interested in questions of sexual orientation, a definitive answer as to his conception of and relationship to homosexuality — both male and female — has been difficult to find. And that difficulty has had the corollary effect of complicating our understanding of his view of heterosexuality. Modellmog provocatively explains that the problem is often the result of scholars' own sexual and gender preferences, arguing quite properly that our own desires automatically color how we interpret Hemingway's. She further contends that the many texts tackling the question of Hemingway's gender identity usually do so at the expense of his discussions of sexuality. In Hemingway studies, if not everywhere, she summarizes, "gender [might] be a smoke screen that blocks the more incendiary topic of sexuality" (*Reading Desire* 3). The attempt she makes to position Hemingway's life and fiction within a discussion of his sense of personal sexual orientation, as well as gender identity, is thus a positive and necessary step forward in coming to grips with Hemingway in a psychosexual way and exploring how his fiction offered him a venue to explore sexuality on unconscious as well as conscious levels.

<sup>6</sup> Although *The Torrents of Spring* was technically the first piece of long fiction Hemingway published (it appeared some months prior to the 1926 publication of *The Sun Also Rises*), and while it is a better book than has often been admitted by critics, it was essentially an avenue by which to dodge his contract with Boni and Liveright in order to sign with Scribner's and did not receive from its author the attention he lavished on subsequent works of long fiction, making *Sun* Hemingway's first serious literary novel.

<sup>7</sup> In discussing the arc of Cixous's career, Sellers emphasizes "that although Cixous remains loyal to women's causes her more general interest is in the constructions and motivations of the *human* subject" (3). Conley echoes this sentiment:

The woman's cause for which [Cixous] is primarily known, though perhaps central to her enterprise, is but one of many worth fighting for. . . . The major thrust of her work appears to come back to the question of the female and the fleeting adequation of woman, theory and writing. But in turn, the woman's question that she posed almost two decades ago, must now be considered in broader political contexts. (*Hélène Cixous* xix)

Cixous's pan-cultural and cross-gender approach is evident in her choice of studies; she includes in her work references to male and female authors and popular figures from such varied cultures as Ireland, Brazil, Russia, Germany, South Africa and India, and to literary periods ranging from ancient times to the present.

## Chapter I

<sup>1</sup> See also *SL* (736, 781). For a review of the early years of the Hemingway-Stein relationship, see Wagner-Martin ("*Favored Strangers*" [168-78]). In terms of the validity of Hemingway's claim in *Feast*, it is interesting to note Souhami's observations about Stein and Toklas's relationship: "Alice was fiercely possessive and jealous and wanted absolute fidelity" (153). Souhami further relates that "Alice was the brusque and uncompromising manager of Gertrude's life. She guarded, promoted and protected Gertrude. . . . [However,] Gertrude was not the victim. It suited her to be managed, shielded and freed" from the everyday hassles of life (146). It is not unbelievable, then, that Hemingway was privy to a scene something like the one he describes.

<sup>2</sup> For more on Hemingway's adoption of the "Papa" persona, see Comley and Scholes (3-19). Though Mellow suggests that Hemingway's life-long habit of inventing nicknames for himself and others indicates "a teasing streak in his character" (22), most of the names are arguably much more significant. For instance, Mellow's explanation that Kitty became "the affectionate nickname Hemingway later used for some of his wives"(6) is intriguing in the light of Eby's discussion of the importance of cats in Hemingway's psychosexuality (121-25, 130-33).

<sup>3</sup> For more about Hemingway's penchant for keeping secrets, see Eby (22-25).

<sup>4</sup> Interestingly, as the editor's introduction to volume four of the Pelican Freud Library reveals, Freud's first work, "*Die Traumdeutung* [*The Interpretation of Dreams*,] was actually first published in November, 1899, though its title-page was post-dated into the new century" (Richards 34). This makes psychoanalysis and Hemingway almost exact contemporaries — an important point considering Hemingway's interest in psychosexual matters.

<sup>5</sup> Rudat argues to the contrary that Hemingway "was familiar with and fascinated by Freudian theory" ("*Wounds*" 231).

<sup>6</sup> Introduced to Ellis in 1920, Hemingway was greatly intrigued by the English sexologist's work for much of his life; Reynolds estimates that Hemingway was still reading Ellis as late as 1939 (*YH* 124), a point that has intriguing significance considering the careful attention Hemingway paid to sex and sexuality in *Bell*, which he was writing and editing throughout that year.

<sup>7</sup> Ellis's books contain examinations of a number of sexual positions and fetishes, along with studies of various "perversions" such as homosexuality and cross-dressing. Of

particular interest, especially in the wake of Eby's study, is the fact that Ellis's book *Erotic Symbolism* (the first Ellis Hemingway read) contains a discussion of hair fetishes. See Eby (81, 241). In addition, as Reynolds notes, Ellis's description of the quintessentially attractive woman matches quite closely certain of Hemingway's own preferences: "short stature, small breasts, wide hips, dark hair, brilliant eyes" (YH 121).

<sup>8</sup> Two important concepts inhere in this refusal to rank difference, though both are tightly bound together and cannot really be viewed separately. They are social and political respectively. On the social front, Cixous's explorations have the result of calling for a generosity towards others, an economy of sharing and giving. Indeed, economy is a word much used in her writings. The importance of the monetary metaphor lies in the corollary facts that the patriarchy has traditionally been acquisitive and proprietary, and that any attempt to displace it must focus on reciprocation. At the same time, this becomes a highly politicized action for Cixous since it effectively means that socio-political relations of any number of kinds come under fire; her hypothesizing endangers the traditional ranking of gender experience and the application of masculine and feminine traits (whether for positive or negative reasons) to a variety of actions, things and thoughts.

<sup>9</sup> Much of this is predicated, of course, on the importation of the physical realities of sexual intercourse, by seeing the male as the active thruster and the female as the passive receptor. Yet this argument relies more on the male need for superiority than on biological fact — while the man may be physically superior in the classically patriarchal "missionary position," it is important to recognize that many other sexual scenarios do not automatically grant masculine dominance (bodily or otherwise). In fact, a counter-argument could be made about the relative power of each sex during intercourse (in whatever position) by suggesting that it is the woman who plays the active role by engulfing the penis.

<sup>10</sup> The first really mature piece of fiction Hemingway wrote, "Up in Michigan" exposes the fact that he was quite interested in gender and sexual identity from the start. Apart from the developing terse Hemingway style and the risqué subject matter (Stein called the story *inaccrochable* [unhangable], presumably meaning unpublishable for moral reasons), it is noteworthy because of its indication of Hemingway's curiosity about female responses to life in a man's world as he embarked on his life of writing.

<sup>11</sup> Gwin succinctly defines this bisexuality as "an exacerbation of both male and female elements in the self and in writing" (10). She also emphasizes the importance of plurality, generosity, and openness to Cixous's project: "[b]isexual writing is in a permanent state of tension; it is generated and regenerated by an interaction between the feminine and masculine, between self and other."

The bisexuality of feminine writing allows Cixous to refuse a ranking of gender experience and to advocate instead a fluid interplay between masculinity and femininity. This commingling should not, however, be thought of as in any way a concession on the part of either masculine or feminine traits. She refuses the notion of androgyny, the sort of bisexuality evinced by "Ovid's Hermaphrodite, less bisexual than asexual, not made up of two genders but of two halves. Hence a fantasy of unity. Two within one, and not even two wholes" (NBW 84). The reason for eschewing this definition of bisexuality is that such an androgynous ideal

“melts together and effaces” genders, rather than bringing them together whole. A similar desire appears in Hemingway’s writing also. Catherine Bourne’s declaration in *The Garden of Eden*, “I’m a girl. But I’m a boy too” (15), emphasizes precisely the need for both gender identities to be brought forward rather than for all sense of gender to be lost.

For ease of differentiation, throughout this study I shall use the term “bisexuality” to refer to the positive efficacious combination of masculine and feminine traits that Cixous champions, rather than a clumsy neologism like “bi-gendered” or the theoretically more slippery “androgyny.” My reasoning is based on the most commonly held definition of androgyny as being of indeterminate sex as well as gender, much like a definition of hermaphroditism. Since Cixous wants to maintain that masculinity and femininity are to be found in both men and women, the use of a word that often implies genital uncertainty seems inappropriate to her theories. For further discussion of the definition of androgyny, see Cook (19-20, 32-33).

<sup>12</sup> Conley describes the search for truth as Cixous’s ultimate goal in writing: “Cixous wills writing to be a quest for truth, a way of facing ourselves and of affronting our own lies” (*Writing 2*).

<sup>13</sup> Burwell (*Postwar Years* 129-49) provides an solid examination of Hemingway’s fascination with tribal practice in his later years. See also Morrison (69-90), Comley and Scholes (88-103), and Eby (155-84).

<sup>14</sup> Several photographs of young Ernest in his Great White Hunter outfit are still extant; Meyers reproduces one (*Biography* photo 2). He also makes an interesting comparison of the careers of the two men (3-4). Reynolds, too, examines Roosevelt’s effect on Hemingway in some detail (*YH* 23-30). Of particular interest, given our focus on Hemingway’s gender problems, is Bederman’s account of how gender, as well as race, was at the root of Roosevelt’s plan to revivify American masculinity (170-215).

<sup>15</sup> This fact had quite an effect on Hemingway’s upbringing by fostering in him a vein of traditionalism that surfaced, at various times, for most of his life. For instance, Ernest’s first wife, Hadley, once remarked that his being born in Oak Park forever damned him to a Victorian sense of morality: “If Ernest had not been brought up in that damned stuffy Oak Park environment, . . . he would not have thought that when you fall in love extramaritally you have to get a divorce and marry the girl” (Kert 226). Certainly the pattern of his marriages bears this observation out, since the succeeding wife was always the mistress with whom he cheated on the wife before. Such a notion — that adulterous sex, or even sex out of wedlock, was morally reprehensible — would have been planted in his head by his weekly trips to the First Congregationalist Church with his family or by the Oak Park newspaper which sharply criticized any mildly immoral practice. See Meyers (*Biography* 178) and Reynolds (*YH* 7-9).

<sup>16</sup> Hemingway’s mother was one notable example. References to her in the Oak Park paper appeared as “Mrs. Grace Hall Hemingway” and not “Mrs. Clarence Hemingway,” making her one of the few women so honored (Reynolds, *YH* 106-107).

<sup>17</sup> See Barlowe (“Gender History”) for a more in-depth look at Hemingway’s family

history and its influence on his views of gender.

<sup>18.</sup> Mellow also describes Dr. Hemingway's expedition, calling it "one of the significant events in [Ed's] life" (8).

<sup>19.</sup> Spilka offers a detailed examination of the effects of Kipling's work on Hemingway (*Quarrel* 99-124).

<sup>20.</sup> Meyers suggests that Hemingway's scorn for the cello was mostly an act concocted in later life as his disgust with Oak Park grew and implies that music was a greater influence on Hemingway than he let on. However, in paraphrasing Ernest's older sister, Marcelline, Meyers mitigates against his own argument by stating that Ernest "was eager to succeed, reached a *modicum* of competence and liked music well enough to play the cello in the high school orchestra until his senior year" (*Biography* 11 [my italics]). It is possible that it was Hemingway's need to compete and not, as Meyers believes, his innate love of music that was the impetus behind his continuing to play the cello, much as he continued to box and play tennis years later in Paris, despite having little aptitude for either.

<sup>21.</sup> One exception was his claim that the repetitive style of the opening of *A Farewell to Arms* was intentionally imitative of Bach's style of composition: "in the first paragraphs of *Farewell*, I used the word 'and' consciously over and over the way Mr. Johann Sebastian Bach used a note in music when he was emitting counterpoint" (quoted in Ross 60). Whether this was really the case or not is, of course, open to conjecture. For a defense of Hemingway's musical talent and musical interest, see Justice, who offers an intriguing, though quite technical, study of the musicality of Hemingway's early work. Interestingly, she suggests that one of Grace's gifts to Ernest was a musical sense, and that, for his first years as an artist at least, music "was [an] inescapably feminine and maternal" influence (294).

<sup>22.</sup> Reynolds believes that Ernest and Marcelline's mutual distaste for each other stemmed from her being the Hemingway daughter who most emulated her mother (*YH* 220-21) — and Ernest's hatred of Grace, the "all time, All-American Bitch" as he called her (*Baker, Life Story* 465), is legendary. Lynn takes a more Freudian tack, suggesting that Hemingway's dislike was the result of his sister's greater abilities, both athletically and intellectually, while the two were in school (53-54). He further speculates that Marcelline's malice was a sham, designed to mask the crush she had on her brother (97).

<sup>23.</sup> Rotundo gives a generalized account of boyhood in the nineteenth century (31-55). Admittedly Hemingway's own youth came a little later; however, the description can still be applied to the first decade of the twentieth century. For a discussion of the sort of life Hemingway's parents would have lived in the last half of the nineteenth century, specifically as it concerns gender relations, see Stearns (108-155).

<sup>24.</sup> Hemingway's March 22, 1925, dispatch to *The Toronto Star* exposes his initial distaste for the hedonistic lifestyle that flourished in the Latin Quarter of Paris in the 1920s, particularly among the expatriate American population. "The scummiest of scum," he called them (*Dateline* 114).

## Chapter II

<sup>1</sup> For a good gender analysis of the opening story of *In Our Time*, see Wainwright. Ferrerro deals with both “The End of Something” and “The Three-Day Blow” in terms of Hemingway’s interest in masculinity, and Strychacz offers a particularly interesting, and more general, study of gender in *In Our Time* and *Sun*, concluding that, for their male protagonists, audience is the primary factor in the creation of self-image.

<sup>2</sup> Hemingway was adamant that the novel be viewed as a tragic tale, as he expressed in numerous letters around the time of the book’s completion and publication. See *SL* (211, 276).

<sup>3</sup> For more on Stein’s epigraph, see Baker (*Life Story* [155]) and Eby (289, n. 20). Stein’s comment, “You are all a lost generation,” has become a short-hand method of referring to the group of young men and women who came of age during the war and whose experiences were so responsible for the changes that followed it. In actuality, though, the phrase is not Stein’s at all, but rather the words of a French mechanic who once repaired her car. Commenting on the worthlessness of one of his young assistants who had been in the war, the mechanic lamented to Stein that the youth, like the rest of his peers who had fought, was a poor worker. They were all, he said, “une génération perdue.” The importance of knowing the origin of the comment lies in the fact that originally the term was meant to indicate that the younger generation had been lost to the ways of the older, not that they were in and of themselves lost. The statement has political significance, then, in that it suggests the bitterness of the Victorian world at its inability to foist itself on the twentieth century. In terms of the gender study I am attempting here, rather than assuming that they felt “lost,” we could argue that lost-generation members would be proud of having left the past behind.

<sup>4</sup> In a 1952 letter, Hemingway serio-comically referred to *Sun* as “a treatise on basic loneliness and the inadequacy of promiscuity” (*SL* 767-68). While this does not capture the whole of the novel, it does offer interesting insight into Hemingway’s understanding of it, particularly in terms of a Cixousian analysis since both ideas (loneliness and promiscuity) could be said to lie at the foundation of her charge against phallogocentric society — its tendency to alienate and its emphasis on a non-committal male sexual dynamic. Hemingway’s view of the novel was the same three years later when he provocatively told an interviewer “that [*Sun*] was the most moral book he had ever written, a sort of ‘tract against promiscuity’” (Drew 113). This focus on the castigation of adultery is intriguing, to say the least, given that he was committing it himself even as he was finishing the book.

<sup>5</sup> In a 1928 letter to Max Perkins, Hemingway reflected on how he had spent his time during the composition of *Sun*, showing surprising insight by registering what those months had wrought: “I wrote *Sun Also Rises* in 6 weeks but did not look at it for 3 months — and then rewrote it for another three months. How much time I wasted in drinking around before I wrote it and how badly I busted up my life in one way or another I can’t exactly fit in time” (*SL* 273). The implication of Hemingway’s guilt over what he had done to Hadley (and to himself) might be a recognition of the error of his masculine ways, making the novel perhaps partially an attempt to atone for his actions.

and the characters in *The Sun Also Rises* and goes into some detail about Duff and Brett (228-40).

<sup>7</sup> In a fascinating article, Mandel links the Hemingways' trip to Chamby-sur-Montreux with Ernest's recurrent use of a floral motif in the works that derive from the journey, suggesting that his excision of Hadley from each version of the story indicates that "Ernest and Hadley's marriage was in desperate trouble as early as May, 1922," only eight months after their wedding ("Lifetime" 321).

<sup>8</sup> Ernest and Hadley's divorce was finalized on April 14th, 1927, and less than a month later he and Pauline were married in Paris. The degree to which Hemingway felt guilt over leaving Hadley and their three-year-old son, "Bumby," is evidenced by his dedication of *The Sun Also Rises* to them both and his decree that all royalties from its sales would be deeded to Hadley. See Reynolds (PY 259-344) for a detailed description of Hemingway's life during 1925. In the next volume of his excellent biography, Reynolds relates the settlements Ernest and Hadley reached concerning their divorce (*Homecoming* 81, 100).

<sup>9</sup> It should be noted that Hadley also cut her hair in shorter and shorter styles to please Ernest, a trend that Pauline and Mary, Hemingway's fourth and last wife, would follow in later years. Eby gives a brief overview of the hairstyles worn by all four of Hemingway's wives (35-37).

<sup>10</sup> Wylder agrees that "one of the things which makes this novel an exceptionally fine one is the subtlety with which Hemingway treats some of the deeper aspects of Jake's and Brett's rather complicated relationship, and particularly the characterization of Lady Brett Ashley" ("Two Faces" 90).

<sup>11</sup> Jake's comparison of Brett to a sail boat obviously violates the standards of generosity and openness Cixous conceives of as the tenets of a truly bisexual person, and his gaze is an objectifying (and thus patriarchal) one. This is only one of the indications of the difficulty Hemingway had in according selfhood to women.

<sup>12</sup> See Eby (26-40). He concludes that examining Hemingway's fixation on hair as an example of his "entire field of fetishistic fantasy" can explain everything from "the lesbian love implied by Catherine Bourne's relationship with Marita" and "the erotic fusion of identities" in so many of the stories and novels to his "ongoing interest in nurse-figures, 'first loves,' sisters, and incest" (37, 39). While we cannot discount the idea that Hemingway was sexually fascinated by hair and its many cognates (fur, wool, etc.), leaving the discussion at the level of fetishism can have the unfortunate result of trivializing other, not specifically sexual, implications of his continued interest in women's hair.

<sup>13</sup> For a detailed look at Fitzgerald's contribution to the editing of *The Sun Also Rises*, see Bruccoli (*Fitzgerald and Hemingway* 56-80).

<sup>14</sup> In describing Brett's mediated gender, Comley and Scholes contend that "[w]hat makes [her] interesting as a character is the way that Hemingway has assigned her qualities

from both sides of his gendered repertory of typical figures" (45).

<sup>15</sup>. Taking a more sexually oriented view of Brett's dilemma, Rudat makes the interesting, but ultimately unsatisfactory, claim that "Brett has difficulty reaching orgasm, which causes her to drift from one man to the next" ("Masculinity" 43).

<sup>16</sup>. Buckley makes a compelling case that Jake's attitude toward his mediated role involves the separation of his conscious impulse for masculinity and his unconscious desire to be transgressive of phallogentric gender limitations, "privately idolizing normative behavior [in his narration of the story] but voicing the antisocial in dialogue" (80). This, of course, fits well with a view of Hemingway as being resistant of his femininity in a real-life context while engaging thoughtfully with it in his writing.

<sup>17</sup>. See also Meyers (*Biography* 33).

<sup>18</sup>. Whether or not there is anything going on in this scene between the two erstwhile lovers is certainly difficult to prove, though Hemingway's tendency to use the cinematic technique of fading to black prior to sexual contact and refocusing afterwards seems to indicate that some form of interplay happens between Jake and Brett at this point. At first they are on his bed, he lying down and she "stroking his head" (55). In answer to Jake's question about the Count's whereabouts Brett informs him that she "sent him for champagne." The scene cuts away, "then later: 'Do you feel better, darling?'" Brett asks. "'Is the head any better?'" It is certainly plausible that the lapse in narrative time covers a sort of sexual union between the two. Nahal agrees with such a supposition, though he passes a moral judgement on the couple — with which I would argue — by suggesting that the action Brett performs for Jake gives him "a perverted sexual satisfaction" (44).

<sup>19</sup>. For a contrary reading that views Jake's wound as a means of confirming his masculinity by showing that, though he has lost his penis, he was indeed once a man, see Schwartz (49-56).

<sup>20</sup>. Hemingway's own tendency to castigate women comes out in this scene as well. The joke he puts in Jake's mouth about Georgette's last name is a jab at the real-life Georgette Leblanc, a well-known figure in Left-Bank Paris and a woman of Hemingway's acquaintance who was by all accounts strikingly beautiful. She was also the lesbian lover of Margaret Anderson, editor of *The Little Review* (Wagner-Miller, "Racial and Sexual Coding" 40). Hemingway's breaking with a literary acquaintance and mocking her sexuality by making fun of her lover follows the pattern we have already seen in his snubbing of Gertrude Stein. It also emphasizes the difficulty he had defying the male cultural identity he felt so desperate to maintain publicly. For more on Georgette's thematic importance to the novel, see Nagel ("Other Women" 103-105).

<sup>21</sup>. There is also the possibility that Jake's anger is an elaborate self-deception meant to hide his sexual interest in the men escorting Brett. This complicates the importance of his wound beyond a mere heterosexual inability, suggesting that Hemingway might also be investigating the phallogentric equation of loss of phallic power with the loss of heterosexual

identity. For more on Jake's interaction with homosexuality, see Blackmore, who describes Jake's and Hemingway's attitudes as evidence of "repressed homosexual desire" (49), and Davidson.

Comley and Scholes deal with this topic on a more general level, noting an "extraordinary interest in homoeroticism on Hemingway's part" (107). Their conclusion ("Have we been trying to show that Hemingway was gay? No. If anything, we have been trying to show that such a question is too simple" [143-44]) aligns well with a feminist humanist view of the author by their observation of the complexities involved in forming sexual and gender identity.

<sup>22</sup> Martin argues along similar lines that "the emotional challenges of Brett and Jake are antithetical: Jake must learn to accept the discomfort and uncertainty that come with his loss of authority, and Brett must learn to make choices for herself and to take responsibility for those choices" ("Brett" 75).

<sup>23</sup> See Cheatham for more on the issue of economy and morality in *Sun*.

<sup>24</sup> For more on Jake and Cohn's difficult relationship, see Grace (128-38).

<sup>25</sup> Kerrigan makes the interesting argument that "Count Mippipolous . . . shares the sexual debility of Jake Barnes" (87). While he does not specifically address gender-related links between the two characters and while his emphasis is more on the epicurean nature of the count's indulgence than on his selflessness, Kerrigan does suggest that his and Jake's mutual sexual wound "certainly underlines the significance of Count Mippipolous as a model for Jake" (89).

<sup>26</sup> The fact that Brett has come by her title by marriage rather complicates this argument and offers insight into the essentially conflicted view of women and femininity Hemingway had at this stage in his life. However, Brett's having entered her marital career to get rid of her husband and get away from her family and choosing Lord Ashley "when she had to marry" again, as the excised opening indicates, suggests that to a certain extent she uses men who fit into her plans.

<sup>27</sup> Miller also argues this notion, suggesting that Brett's compulsive bathing "predominantly reveals her need to get beneath surfaces, to wash away the outer image so as to get to who she really is" ("In Love" 23).

<sup>28</sup> Considering Brett's despair at being objectified, in a rather appropriate typographical error, San Sebastian is referred to as "Sad Sebastian" by Kumar in his description of her affair there with Cohn (103).

<sup>29</sup> Lewis also argues that Jake "makes almost a ritual, like baptism, out of bathing" (*Hemingway on Love* 32). For more on the religious significance of Jake's swim, see Stoneback.

<sup>30</sup>. Grace similarly suggests that “[c]ontrary to the argument that Jake’s heroism is marked by his ability to disengage himself from Brett, he actually becomes more human and whole — and thus heroic — by aligning himself with her” (139).

<sup>31</sup>. Jake’s continued allegiance to masculine ideals can be seen in his heavy drinking during the final chapter, as if he is drowning his sorrows over the reality of a continued sexless relationship with Brett. This implies that he is not totally ready to give up his old ways and try to create a relationship with her based on other things. His belief that men and women can only love one another sexually thus keeps him from being a truly bisexual man. Brett, too, has difficulty overcoming her cultural indoctrination. If women in a male society are expected to be dependant on men, then she continues to play this role by calling on Jake when she finds herself in trouble.

<sup>32</sup>. For more on alcoholism in *The Sun Also Rises*, see Djos and Crowley (43-64).

<sup>33</sup>. See also Grace (141). For a counter-argument that views Brett as manipulative and punitive toward Jake in the final scene and that regards Jake as attempting to “exorcise himself of Brett,” see Rudat (“Sexual Dilemmas” 5).

### Chapter III

<sup>1</sup>. Though he downplays the importance of Catherine and Frederic’s relationship in favor of Frederic’s military life, Beverslius also recognizes the importance of identity in the book: “[v]iewed within the context of his work as a whole, *A Farewell to Arms* is Hemingway’s most philosophical novel . . . because it contains his most sustained exploration of an explicitly philosophical problem, namely, the problem of self-knowledge” (18). Benson offers a similar sentiment, suggesting that “*A Farewell to Arms* is not a war story or a love story so much as it is a modern morality drama, the story of the developing consciousness of a young American within the characteristic twentieth-century context of war. *Consciousness* here has a somewhat special meaning in that the development of Henry’s character is not indicated so much by changes in the quality of thinking, as it is by changes in the quality of seeing” (83). In other words, it is Frederic’s perception of the world which is at stake, a perception, I would argue, that focuses quite sharply on issues of gender identity.

<sup>2</sup>. Apropos of a discussion of Frederic’s learning about emotion, it is interesting to note that one of Hemingway’s possible titles for the novel was *The Sentimental Education*, a literal translation of the title of Flaubert’s 1869 novel. As Reynolds notes in his transcription of a list of titles contained on a holograph page of the *Farewell* manuscript, Hemingway actually toyed with a number of variations on this theme, including “Education of the Flesh, The Carnal Education, [and] The Sentimental Education of Frederic Henry,” as well as the English version of *L’Education Sentimentale* (*First War* 296). While Reynolds does caution “that readers should not place undue emphasis on the novel’s title, nor rely on the title’s source as any sort

of thematic key to its content" (*First War* 295), it would be difficult to deny that part of *A Farewell to Arms* is centered around the protagonist's developing sensibility as the story progresses.

<sup>3</sup> Fetterley's and Gilbert and Gubar's studies offer the clearest discussions of this view written by women. Gilbert and Gubar describe *Farewell* as one of Hemingway's "anxious meditations on sexuality . . . associated with the unmanning trauma of the Great War" (343). They call Catherine a "notorious heroine . . . set sexually free by the war" (287), speculating that she represents "something faintly sinister" for Hemingway because of this freedom. Similarly, Fetterley suggests that Frederic and Hemingway tell Catherine's story as a cautionary tale for men of the danger of women gaining too much cultural (and literary) power. She even proposes that Hemingway's moral is that "the only good woman is a dead one, and even then there are questions" (71). See also Bell, who calls Catherine "a sort of inflated rubber woman available at will to [Frederic,] the onanistic dreamer" ("Pseudobiography" 114).

<sup>4</sup> Actually Wexler's definition of love as it exists in *A Farewell to Arms* is remarkably similar to Cixous's own idea of what true love entails. For Wexler "the novel presents a conception of love that emphasizes the integrity a person capable of loving another achieves" (119). Cixous's comment that "love necessarily means opening up to another" implies just such an emphasis on love's integrity ("Rethinking" 81). See also Balbert, who explains that "a neglected crux of *A Farewell to Arms* is its ability to demonstrate, in a persuasive and moving fashion, how Fredric Henry's practical, soldierly, but delimiting brand of merely 'survivalist' ideology is broadened and enriched, under the influence of Catherine Barkley, to become a courageous commitment to love, life, and family responsibilities" (31).

<sup>5</sup> Though our understandings of Hemingway's psychology differ widely, Dubbert's study is particularly well-suited to a discussion of Hemingway's questions about gender identity in the early twentieth century as it uses him numerous times as a model of modern masculinity (183, 195, 199, 231 *passim*, 244 *passim*).

<sup>6</sup> For more on the connecting points between the worlds of love and war, see Haytock, who explores Hemingway's "use of domestic ritual in his writings about World War I" (57).

<sup>7</sup> See Meyers (*Critical Heritage* 121-59) for a compilation of reviews of *A Farewell to Arms*. T. S. Matthews complained in the *New Republic* that "the transition . . . from the comparative realism of the war scenes to the ideal reality of the idyll is not as effective as it might be. The meeting of the lovers after Henry's desertion from the army, and their escape into Switzerland, have not [sic] that ring of authenticity about them which from Hemingway we demand" (125). Arnold Bennett's review in the *Evening Standard* also targeted the poor linkage:

The weakness of the novel, if it has one, springs from the author being [sic] of two minds about his purpose in writing it. He seems to be undecided whether he is writing a description of the war as his hero saw it, or the love-story of his hero. . . . The love-story is quite as fine as the war-story, but a divided aim is bound to have some deleterious influence. In *A Farewell to Arms*, either the military background should have been less, or there should have been more of

the sexual passion, or the two should have been more cunningly intermingled.

(131)

In *New Masses*, Hemingway's long-time friend John Dos Passos seemed almost to forgive him for the disjunction in his suggestion that *Farewell* only "accidentally combines the selling points of having a love-story and being about the war" (133), as if it were not Hemingway's fault that both plots wove their way into the book. Finally, Lewis Galantière, also on friendly terms with Hemingway during the early Paris years, suggested in *Hound and Horn* that "the protagonists remain insignificant, a pair of silhouettes," while "the war story, which fills nearly two-thirds of the book, is very much more successful" (140).

<sup>8</sup> Gajdusek argues along a similar line that in this book Hemingway is undermining the convenient and restrictive definitions usually offered to men and women by society: "Forces everywhere in the novel labor to eradicate distinctions so that opposites are confused with one another" ("Oxymoronic Compound" 43).

<sup>9</sup> This is a noticeable trend in men's writing generally, particularly in the twentieth century. We might also include Henry Fleming, the protagonist of Stephen Crane's *The Red Badge of Courage* as another example of the patriarchally taught young man who tries to come to terms with himself on the battlefield. (Though Crane's book was published in 1894, it seems a viable inclusion here as a precursor to such anti-war novels as Erich Maria Remarque's *All Quiet on the Western Front* [1929], Charles Yale Harrison's *Generals Die in Bed* [1930] and *Farewell*.) For a review of other aspects of male self-definition in modern literature, including a view of Hemingway's place in it, see Schwenger. It must be noted that in the majority of these cases (both Schwenger's and those others mentioned here, including Frederic's) the solely masculine attempt at identity creation fails.

<sup>10</sup> Despite his minimal protests to the contrary that he enlisted simply because "[he] was in Italy . . . and [he] spoke Italian" (22), it is clear that there is more to Frederic's joining the Italian army than mere coincidence.

<sup>11</sup> The so-called "iceberg theory" of writing that Hemingway sketched out in *Death in the Afternoon* (192) and later expanded upon in the Plimpton interview (125-26) describes a type of fiction in which only about one-eighth of the situation is revealed to the reader in the words of the story; the rest is hidden between the lines. Needless to say, this makes reading Hemingway no easy task.

<sup>12</sup> That tendency is hardly surprising, of course, if we remember Cixous's claim that "the good love for man is his country, the fatherland. A masculine land to hand down from father to son" (*NBW* 77). For more on Hemingway's use of pronouns in *A Farewell to Arms*, see Gajdusek ("Psychodynamics" 27-28) and Stoltzfus ("Sliding Discourse").

<sup>13</sup> Some critics have difficulty knowing what to call Frederic, and those who do settle on his first name often misspell it to boot! The confusion over names is great enough, even, to compel one critic to refuse him a name altogether: Savage refers to him as the novel's "curiously nameless hero" (99). In a work that counterbalances military and psychosexual methods of self-definition and identity creation, however, the anonymity of the military man

before his removal from the military life seems proper. For a discussion of possible biographical sources for Frederic Henry's names, see Reynolds (*First War* 158-59).

<sup>14</sup> In his introduction to *Men at War*, a collection of excerpts from factual and fictional accounts of war through the ages, Hemingway stated flatly: "[t]he editor of this anthology, who took part and was wounded in the last war to end war, hates war and hates all politicians whose mismanagement, gullibility, cupidity, selfishness and ambition brought on the present war [World War II] and made it inevitable" (xi). For more on Hemingway's disgust with war, see Reynolds (*FY* 22-25). See also Kleinman, who discusses the existential humor in *Farwell* as "a weapon . . . against institutions' alienating system" (54).

<sup>15</sup> It is perhaps not coincidental that both Frederic and Hemingway do not actually belong to the military enterprise as soldiers but as ambulance drivers. Admittedly neither is directly responsible for giving medical aid; however, their jobs would seem to align them with the culturally feminine position of healer, rather than the masculine position of warrior. Of course, this is made somewhat problematic in Hemingway's case given that he joined the American Red Cross only because he was ineligible for military service due to his poor eyesight.

<sup>16</sup> For more on Helen Ferguson's place in the novel, see Mandel ("Ferguson") and Kory. In his examination of the homosexual overtones and undercurrents between Rinaldi Frederic, Cohen has a different view of Rinaldi's giving up on a relationship with Catherine, suggesting that Rinaldi "abandons his chances for a marriage with Catherine in order to cement his bonds with his American friend" (51). See also Elliott, who examines "the ways in which gender fluidity and sexual indeterminacy function in relation to the three central male figures in the novel, Frederic Henry, the surgeon Rinaldi, and the unnamed priest" (292).

<sup>17</sup> It is this insightfulness that brings Lockridge to claim that "Hemingway often does *not* portray Catherine as a submissive female, but as quite the opposite — an intelligent, insightful woman with an ear for empty posturing, and a sharp, economical way of putting [Frederic] in his place" (171).

<sup>18</sup> Martin suggests that hysteria was the female equivalent of the shell shock suffered by soldiers during the war:

a . . . parallel between the psychic cost of the redemptive role of Victorian women and the disequilibrium of the war-weary man of the lost generation can be seen in the extreme in their respective pathologies — hysteria and shell shock. Both are somatic responses to psychological conflicts; hysteria is a female response to the inability to reconcile the need for self-expression and the cultural imperative for self-denial, and shell shock is a parallel response of men who are terrified of combat and death on the battlefield. ("Brett" 67)

This assertion makes for interesting connections between Catherine's and Frederic's respective needs for escape from the pressures of a patriarchal society that forces these responses on them.

In the context of Cixous's theory of hysteria as a male-defined woman's only true

identity, it is intriguing to note also that at least one Hemingway scholar falls prey to this sort of thinking in his understanding of Catherine. In a letter to Carlos Baker, Malcolm Cowley once admitted: "to me . . . she is only a woman at the beginning of the book, in her near madness" (Baker, *Writer as Artist* 111).

<sup>19</sup>. For more on Hemingway and Agnes's affair, see Villard.

<sup>20</sup>. Mandel concurs with such a reading, suggesting that "[Miss Gage's] ministrations to him are tinged with the sexual flattery which Henry understands, enjoys, and can recall in accurate detail. . . . [She] obviously likes her handsome young patient" ("Ferguson" 22).

<sup>21</sup>. For more on the narrative technique in the novel, see Nagel ("Retrospective") and Phelan.

<sup>22</sup>. See Finnegan (265-67). While he agrees that before Catherine's pregnancy Frederic's reading of the news is symptomatic only of his desire to ignore the time when she is absent, Finnegan goes on to suggest that the pregnancy changes Frederic's view of life with her and that, consequently, the papers "become an avenue of escape from Catherine and the pregnancy by providing a vicarious re-connection with the war, and an imaginative reintegration with the military community which he has deserted" (265).

<sup>23</sup>. See Haytock for more on the idea of home in the novel (65-71).

<sup>24</sup>. The importance of this sense of safety is underscored by the way in which Frederic's description of the hair-curtain ("it was the feeling of inside a tent or behind a falls" [114]) echoes the natural images of safety which other Hemingway protagonists utilize to escape from war-time injury, often with female companions. These words call to mind the sleeping bag that becomes Maria and Robert Jordan's hideaway from war in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, as well as the sanctuary Nick and Little Adams find in the forest together in "The Last Good Country." They might even suggest the camp Nick sets up beside the stream in "Big Two-Hearted River" to collect himself after his return from World War I. Within the framework of *A Farewell to Arms* itself, the space Frederic and Catherine carve out in the hospital bed, hidden behind her hair, presages the large warm bed which they will snuggle into in the hotel above Montreux in chapter thirty-eight.

<sup>25</sup>. The faith Frederic has in Catherine after his desertion/baptism is not only an echo of Jake's renewed commitment to Brett after the San Sebastian trip, it is also a corollary to the commitment Catherine made to Frederic earlier: "[y]ou're my religion. You're all I've got" (116).

<sup>26</sup>. For a contrary view of the novel, see Beverslius, who argues that "it is not so much that Frederic and Catherine want more from each other, it is rather that each wants a kind of reciprocity of which the other is incapable" (24).

<sup>27</sup>. Eby agrees with this argument: "Her willingness to give up her hair, even if she didn't follow through on it, . . . atones for . . . her earlier unwillingness to give up her

virginity" (84). His rationalization, though, is quite opposite to mine, in that he views her unwillingness as Catherine's means of gaining phallic authority in a phallogocentric world.

<sup>28</sup>. Also important to a view of Catherine's hair experiments as opening rather than closing gender difference is her comment that, though she and Frederic would have similar styles, their hair color would not match (unlike the bleaching and dyeing that the Bournes undergo in *The Garden of Eden*): "we'd be just alike only one of us blond and one of us dark" (299). The fact that they would still maintain some marker of individuality concurrent with their emulation of each other holds with Cixous's notion that bisexuality requires simultaneous selfhood and extension beyond the self into the other, as Emma Wilson explains: "Cixous allows for no easy fusing between self and other; she seeks instead to undo divisions between exterior and interior" (132).

<sup>29</sup>. Contrary to my argument, Eby believes that "Frederic tries to shore up his masculinity by growing a beard to identify with his or Hemingway's father" (213). The beard, he says, "wards off cross-gender identification and reinforces the anatomical *difference* of the sexes" (215), making Frederic's unease at seeing his mirror image more a question of his inadequate portrayal of a masculine man than of his discomfort with culturally or physically defined gender identifiers. However, given that Frederic has become wary of most such markers by this point, it would seem more logical to view his beard as one of the secondary sex characteristics which he no longer regards as indicative of true gender identity.

In an interesting reversal of Eby's contention, Finnegan suggests that Catherine wants Frederic to grow a beard as a substitute for the pregnancy she is undergoing and that his uneasiness with his appearance is thus an uneasiness with the symbolic femininity she forces on him (268, n. 9). While this argument does imply the disruption of normal indicators of gender, it also necessitates a view of Frederic as incapable or afraid of mediating his masculine identity, which is perhaps too narrow an interpretation of his and Hemingway's views by Book Five.

<sup>30</sup>. Cixous discusses Kleist numerous times in her theoretical work. The most extended examinations appear in *NBW* (112-22) and *Readings* (28-73). In fact, Kleist's work and life offer a number of similarities to Hemingway's own. For example, describing Kleist's relationship with his fiancée, Helbling notes that "we can easily discern the struggle of a lonely young man for a full satisfying union with a woman" (5), something we might say was also true of Hemingway's life-long search. Furthermore, Kleist's aim in his relationship for "nothing less than the godliness of the 'I-Thou' relationship described by Martin Buber more than a century later" seems a plausible description also of Frederic and Catherine's affair in *A Farewell to Arms* — if not of male/female relationships in Hemingway's oeuvre generally. On medical grounds, too, both men share certain characteristics; Hemingway's bouts of depression are now fairly common knowledge, and Kleist also suffered from such violent attacks of anguish that he once destroyed the manuscript of what promised to be his best work. A final thread may be found in their both having committed suicide at least partly due to fears over a flagging literary career, not to mention nagging health problems.

<sup>31</sup>. Lockridge argues that Catherine never outgrows this desire to mold Frederic, that, in fact, "[i]t is [her] effort to resurrect her lost love, not the narrator's pursuit of a sexual

liaison which grows into love, that is the whole novel's primary mover" (177). For more on Catherine's use of David for the purposes of her own sexuality, see Comley and Scholes (35-36).

## Chapter IV

<sup>1</sup> Though *To Have and Have Not* (1937) appeared as a novel, it was based primarily on two previously published stories about Harry Morgan ("One Trip Across" [*Cosmopolitan*, 1934] and "The Tradesman's Return" [*Esquire*, 1936]) and a third story Hemingway worked into the mix. Since he did not originally conceive of the narrative as a novel, it seems fair to suggest that Hemingway really did not work on a unitary piece of long fiction between the completion of *A Farewell to Arms* in 1929 and his beginning of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* upon his return to Cuba from the Spanish Civil War in 1939.

<sup>2</sup> In chapter twenty-four of *To Have and Have Not*, in what Meyers calls a "lyrical-sexual interior monologue" (*Biography* 293), Dorothy Hollis lies awake after her lover, Eddie, has fallen asleep without satisfying her and masturbates to put herself to sleep: "Oh, you're so lovely, yes, lovely, and I didn't want to [masturbate], but I am, now I really am, [Eddie] is sweet, no he's not, he's not even here, I'm here, I'm always here and I'm the one that can't ever go away, no, never. You sweet you. You lovely. Yes you are. You lovely, lovely, lovely. Oh, yes, lovely. And you're me. So that's it. So that's the way it is" (246). In addition to its Joycean echoes, the passage is notable for its affirmation of a feminine approach to woman's sexuality, suggesting an interest on Hemingway's part in attempting to understand — or at least to capture — a female response to sexual satisfaction. How successful he is may, of course, be answerable only by women themselves; however, the very effort itself surely indicates a heightening of his curiosity about sexual differences between men and women and works well as a precursor to the more systematic investigation of sexuality in *Bell*. For more on Dorothy and the other women of *To Have*, see Tyler ("Gender") and Moreland.

<sup>3</sup> The move from first to third person in *Bell* has an interestingly opposite effect to Hemingway's decision in 1925 to distance himself from *The Sun Also Rises* by changing his narrator's name from Hem to Jake Barnes. Since the first-person narration maintains a suggestive closeness of author to narrator, the autobiographical distancing implied by the change might be seen as Hemingway's attempt to keep himself out of that novel. In *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, though, the inclination is reversed; by having an external narrator, he can inject himself more fully into the story without necessarily forcing a correspondence between himself and his main character. This authorial sleight of hand may indicate Hemingway's growing need to interrogate himself, even as he remained consciously hesitant to do so. That such a tendency grew for him as the 1930s advanced is proven, at least in part, by the similar narrative approach he took in "The Snows of Kilimanjaro" in 1936. The same omniscient narration occurs, along with the same introspection by the main character about his attitudes towards himself and others. The culmination of this would come a decade or so later with his work on *Garden* in which Hemingway maintains a seemingly detached narrative style, all the while injecting the book with more of himself than had ever appeared on paper before. See Raeburn,

whose suggestion that “[a]lthough the third-person narrator of *The Garden of Eden* is never specified, it almost certainly has to be David Bourne himself, at some later time, so closely does the novel adopt his point of view” (“Sex and Art” 118) helps to verify the closeness Hemingway increasingly felt to his narrators, even as he attempted narrative distance.

<sup>4</sup> Cixous’s comments on another conflicted twentieth-century author’s connection with death might also apply to Hemingway’s case: “Kafka . . . was an embattled man, . . . his battle was with death — in this sense he was a man greater than the rest” (“Castration” 47). Cixous further points out that Kafka’s fear of women drove him to distance himself from them even as he felt a need to draw them towards him. Obviously, such a contradictory set of tendencies also marks Hemingway’s dealings with women. Yet the attempts he makes in fiction to come to grips with this battle within himself (attempts Kafka cannot really be said to have made) might indicate his subconscious wish to fight his misogyny.

<sup>5</sup> For more on the sense of futility and inevitability in the novel, see Whitmore.

<sup>6</sup> Commenting about his father’s death in a letter to Pauline’s mother, Hemingway prophetically guessed “I’ll probably go the same way” (quoted in Meyers, *Biography* 210). The extent to which his father’s suicide affected him is open for debate; however, the complexity of his feelings over the manner of Dr. Hemingway’s death was heightened by the fact that Ernest favored his father and wanted to look up to him, as he wrote to Max Perkins: “[w]hat makes me feel the worst is my father is the one I cared about” (*SL* 291). Interestingly enough, it was not just depression but also a fear of financial woe that haunted Hemingway’s final years, much as his father’s failure as a Florida land speculator intensified his own feelings of hopelessness three decades earlier. For more on Dr. Hemingway’s illness, see Beegel, who laments that “at present we may never know for certain whether Ernest Hemingway had hemochromatosis” but offers compelling evidence to support the possibility that both Ed and his son suffered from it and that there appears to have been a “family history” of the disease in the Hemingways (“Hemochromatosis” 64, 63).

<sup>7</sup> It is seemingly incongruous that Hemingway should feel some moral difference between the killing of animals and the killing of men. Indeed, throughout the book he is careful to distinguish Anselmo’s hatred of murder from his enjoyment of hunting. This conundrum (perhaps all the more incomprehensible today in our “politically correct” times), that a man could lament the death of men while reveling in the killing of animals, helps to expose the difficulty Hemingway had within himself as to matters of morality involved with violence. If, as ideologies like eco-feminism suppose, there is a fundamentally feminine characteristic associated with conservation and a masculine one with destruction of the natural world, then it is clear that Hemingway was not yet ready for a complete conversion from masculine ways. For more on an eco-feminist approach to *Bell*, see Farr, Romesburg, and Tyler (“Dead Rabbits”).

<sup>8</sup> The same tendency to refuse death and to disparage killing appears to be a large part of the message behind Hemingway’s inclusion of Pilar’s lengthy tale of the fascist extermination in chapter ten. Pablo’s uncaring assassination of the *guardias civiles* and the bloodthirstiness of the crowd suggest an excessive violence to Hemingway. This passage is

clearly Hemingway's attempt to deal with war honestly, without bias or propaganda, by refusing to claim innocence for the Republican cause or to water down its brutality. Of itself, this could be said to be a commentary on death, given the sadness Pilar feels for the horrors she must witness as the fascists are forced to run between the ranks of angry Republicans to be beaten and hurled from the cliff at the edge of town. Viewing the novel from a perspective close to a feminist humanist approach, Gajdusek describes Pilar's story as a depiction of "the over[throw of a] patriarchal pattern" through "the shift of masculine powers into feminine hands" ("Pilar's Tale" 28, 27), suggesting that "[w]hat Hemingway is getting at is a theory of the restoration of absolutes through cycles, and of the masculine through the feminine, to create a both/and psychic base" (24). Though his wording is not exactly Cixousian, Gajdusek is essentially arguing for a bisexual interpretation of *Bell*.

<sup>9</sup> This was apparently a favorite theme for Hemingway in the thirties since stories like "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber" and "The Snows of Kilimanjaro" also explore the male attitude towards love, particularly as the hero's life is waning. That he should write a number of texts that address this point suggests that he was trying hard at this time to come to some conclusions as to how men (and artists) are expected to interact with women and with life. This would become an even more urgent need for him in coming years as the themes of the artist's duty to art and the man's duty to human relationships began to take over in such manuscripts as *Islands in the Stream* and *The Garden of Eden*. On *Islands*, see Burwell (*Postwar Years* 51-94).

<sup>10</sup> Rudat makes a similar argument that the novel "can be read as a *Bildungsroman* [as] Maria helps Jordan change from a sexually selfish male-chauvinist, from a sexual Fascist as it were, into a considerate human being" ("Other War" 17).

<sup>11</sup> In a fictive interview with Maria, Brenner has her suggest that she is "someone whose uncertain sex [because of her short hair] contributed to [Jordan's] prompt love for [her]" ("Interview" 136). If that is indeed part of the reason for his protagonist's immediate attraction, we can see Hemingway paving the way for the more overt examinations of alternative sexuality and gender coding in *The Garden of Eden*.

<sup>12</sup> Sinclair even argues that "[s]hearing her hair moves Maria to an androgynous position where she possesses more power, not less. She becomes less feminized, and therefore for Hemingway, a more potent and equal force with his male protagonists" (145).

<sup>13</sup> Brenner also argues for such a view: "I must confess that if I were to read one of the earth-moving passages out of context, I might well conclude its author was a woman. . . . Indeed, the lack of phallic regionalization in these love scenes suggests an antiphallocentric text that Hélène Cixous might well find deserving of comment" ("Interview" 137).

<sup>14</sup> Rudat offers another, though highly unlikely, possibility to explain the author's use of rabbit as Maria's nickname: "Hemingway is cracking a joke at the expense of . . . critics in general and, more directly, at the expense of one of those scholarship/criticism-dispensing university teachers who thought he knew it all: Hemingway presents his protagonist as an academician who has published a book on Spain but is inept at translating academic knowledge

into practical action" ("Hemingway's Rabbit" 35). Although Hemingway's disgust at scholars — whom he disparagingly referred to as manipulative thesis hunters — is legendary, the likelihood that he was taking potshots at them in *Bell* is minimal since this would imply an ironic portrayal of Jordan which is not really supported by the rest of the story.

<sup>15</sup> Actually the use of a word such as communion to describe Jordan and Maria's love is important since there is an almost palpable religious context to their feelings for each other. Teunissen similarly argues for a hierogamous view of their relationship: "the impulse to seek union with María [sic] in a sleeping bag under the stars is in Robert Jordan a . . . religious one" (233). Jordan's saving his sexual energy for the following day's mission by not accepting Maria's offer of masturbation and his subsequent reference to the biblical edict against Onanism also suggest the religious underpinnings of sexuality in the novel (see Rudat, "Jacob Barnes" 53-56).

<sup>16</sup> See also Farr, who explains that "Jordan's shift from an arrogant to loving perception . . . grows out of his awareness of difference from Maria and his (apparently new) willingness to acknowledge reciprocity in his relationship with her. After all, the earth moves for both of them, and he seems to need Maria's love just as she does his" (157).

<sup>17</sup> Again Wilson's descriptions of Cixous's *le livre de Promethea* might fit such a reading of Hemingway's ideas on sex in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*: "[i]t is a novel which seeks to enact the birth of a new eroticism which is . . . freed from . . . binary gender oppositions, yet also explores conflict and difference within identity" ("Erotics" 130).

<sup>18</sup> See also Gajdusek, who explains that "Hemingway's protagonist . . . argues for . . . self-transcendence and empathic projection into the 'other'" (Pilar's Tale" 19).

<sup>19</sup> For a counter-argument, see Boker: "[w]hat is fundamentally lacking in Hemingway's inner experience of love, as it is portrayed in his novels, is a sense of basic trust and object constancy which could allow his hero to retain the feeling of intense love even after the beloved object is lost. As it is, for Robert Jordan, as for so many of Hemingway's male lovers, 'oneness' can only be experienced at the precise moment of sexual union, which cannot be sustained over time, and so is destined to end in tragic loss, disappointment, and separation" (97-8).

<sup>20</sup> Under such a patriarchal power structure, Hadley, Pauline, Martha, and Mary functioned exactly as Irigaray says women are always made to function in phallogocentric relationships: "'[s]he' must be no more than the path, the method, the theory, the *mirror* for the 'subject' that leads back, via a process of repetition, to re-cognition of the unity of (his) origin" ("Volume" 65).

<sup>21</sup> Gajdusek suggests that this projection of expertise onto his protagonist suggests Hemingway's emphasizing of his own powers, particularly in a creative sphere, citing Jordan's interior monologue on the educative potential for others of the bridge-blowing he is soon to accomplish as evidence of "the author's, Hemingway's, pride in *his* accomplishment and in his

solution to problems of style. . . . It is no more Jordan's reflection than it is Hemingway's" ("Repossession" 46). For a contrary argument, see Rudat, who advises that "we as readers might do well to consider the possibility that Hemingway may actually have used *For Whom the Bell Tolls* to satirize, however, subtly, macho posturing — including the macho posturing that he himself had been guilty of in his writings" ("Macho Posturing" 30).

<sup>22</sup> Sinclair maintains a similar view, emphasizing not only Pilar's decisiveness but Maria's as well:

Maria makes a conscious decision, encouraged by Pilar's advice, to give herself sexually to erase choice having been so brutally seized from her before. She is not a submissive woman whose will is non-existent or twined around a man's, but instead acts positively to assert her own force and to free herself from others' intrusions upon her. (139-40)

The circumstances surrounding Maria's going to Jordan to seek sexual and emotional nourishment are also important because of the parallel with Catherine Barkley's situation before falling in love with Frederic Henry. Like Catherine, Maria "was in a very bad state" at first, "crazy" as a result of her assault (32, 33). Also like Catherine, it is as a result of her lover's ministrations that she comes out the other side of it "so that the other is all gone" (73).

<sup>23</sup> Knowledgeable readers will certainly not be surprised at Hemingway's crediting of linguistic ability to his hero — if there was one thing Hemingway prided himself on, it was his ability to pick up foreign languages quickly and converse with people in their native tongues. The irony, of course, is that he was never the linguist he took himself to be, much as he overestimated his skills as a connoisseur of wine and food. Stanton admits to Hemingway's having had a "nearly perfect ear" (*Hemingway and Spain* 157) as does Reynolds (*PY* 9), but Ernest's reach far exceeded his grasp of languages other than English. In terms of *Bell* and its importance to the arguments we are making here about Hemingway's views on language, it is significant that Josephs suggests that "an examination of [the book's] errors [in Spanish] reveals more than Hemingway's linguistic ignorance because it begins to expose a chauvinism which is not in keeping with . . . Hemingway's image of himself" (205). See Rogal for more on Hemingway and food.

<sup>24</sup> The exact nature of Hemingway's sentiments towards Grace were always conflicted; however, it is possible to assume that his protestations of hatred for her masked the love he equally felt. Reynolds, for one, cautions us: "[a]llowing for Hemingway's penchant for hyperbole, the judicious reader will remember that love and hate are sometimes indistinguishable" (*YH* 81).

<sup>25</sup> As Thomas E. Gould has demonstrated, "Hemingway made significant revisions to the manuscript when dealing with sexuality [,] . . . revisions . . . influenced by the purpose of the novel and the historical context of its writing" (68).

<sup>26</sup> Though Cixous is admittedly less interested in questions of sexuality than of gender, this does not mean that a combination of Cixousian ideas and theories of sexual preference is impossible. Knowing that the cultural production of gender affects the development of human sexuality, we should not be shocked to learn that critics often see a sexual component in

Cixous's writing. Wilson, for instance, explains that in much of her work "Cixous creates a poetics of the feminine which is intimately dependent on an elusive voicing of lesbian eroticism" ("Erotics" 121). She further argues that it is "through the performance of a sexuality which challenges the regulatory practice of heterosexuality . . . that Cixous pursues a multi-faceted project to destabilize identity in both desire and writing" (122) — a stance that might profitably be used to explore Hemingway's attitudes toward lesbianism in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*.

## Chapter V

<sup>1</sup> A precise measurement is difficult since it remains uncertain as to exactly when Hemingway began work on *Garden*. Burwell posits that four of the six major manuscripts on which Hemingway worked from 1946-1961 — *The Garden of Eden*, *Across the River and Into the Trees*, *Islands in the Stream* and *The Old Man and the Sea* — had their genesis in what she refers to as the "ur-text" he began writing in a burst of creativity after returning to Cuba from Europe in 1946 (*Postwar Years* 1, 51). While *A Moveable Feast* and *True at First Light* did not come from the so-called "Land, Sea, and Air Book," they do, according to Burwell, conform to the other four manuscripts in their examination of "the artist as writer and painter, and as son, husband and father" (*Postwar Years* 1). The date that *Garden* separated from the others cannot be undisputedly established; however, Burwell suggests spring, 1948 (*Postwar Years* 95-7). As far as the date when Hemingway finally broke off work on the manuscript, it is generally agreed that 1959 marked his last writing; see Burwell (*Postwar Years* 97) and Valerie Hemingway (110). The fact that he spent over a decade returning to work on the book is suggestive of his need to work out his questions about self-definition given that the manuscript's twinned stories of the Bournes and the Sheldons revolve around this issue.

Readers of the published novel are unfortunately disallowed access to the Sheldons. The excised plot describes them as an artistic couple much like the Bournes who undergo hair-growing experiments similar to Catherine and David's. While these changes are initially beneficial to their marriage, their artistic and marital bliss is cut short by Barbara's attraction to Catherine and later affair with Andy Murray, a painter friend of both couples. Almost immediately after she and Andy have become lovers, Barbara is shattered by the news that Nick has been killed in a hit-and-run accident even as she and Andy first make love. Her resulting neurasthenia gradually fades, but she does not regain her mental balance and ultimately drowns herself in the canals of Venice, leaving a note of apology for Andy who has been nursing her since Nick's death.

<sup>2</sup> Unlike his earlier books, Hemingway's post-war manuscripts are self-consciously different from their predecessors — or so he claimed. While at work on *Across the River and into the Trees* in the late 40s, he was fond of explaining that his method of writing, his very understanding of literary composition, had changed. Though in the past he had used admittedly complex methods to illustrate his conception of the writer's art (whether it was by means of the iceberg theory or the elusive fourth dimension [see *SL* 153]), his new explanations were even more difficult to understand. He described *River* as being presented to the reader through a series of "three-cushion shots," saying: "in writing I have moved through arithmetic, through

plane geometry and algebra, and now I am in calculus" (Breit 62). While it seems difficult, if not impossible, to explain what calculus literature might be, the fact that Hemingway himself saw his fiction differently after the Second World War says some important things about the late writing he did.

<sup>3</sup> The story of Hemingway's decreased productivity, or at least the slowing rate of his publication after *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is not new. It was ten years before *River* in 1950, and, after that, only *The Old Man and the Sea* (1952) was published in book form before his death. Early in his career such stretches of relative fictional silence seemed not to bother him; while major novels came sporadically, he was almost always busy on some project or collection of stories, or was out enjoying the experiences he would one day use in his fiction. As he grew older, however, Hemingway's discomfort with non-producing authors also grew, perhaps due to the ever more protracted periods it was taking him to bring manuscripts to what he considered a satisfactory end. In many of his later and more vituperative recollections of F. Scott Fitzgerald, for instance, his favorite — and most convenient — target was the lengthy interval between the publication of *The Great Gatsby* in 1926 and *Tender is the Night* eight years later, a circumstance Hemingway attributed in *A Moveable Feast* to Scott's belief in his failing abilities as a writer:

His talent was as natural as the pattern made by the dust on a butterfly's wings. At one time he understood it no more than the butterfly did and he did not know when it was brushed or marred. Later he became conscious of his damaged wings and of their construction and he learned to think and could not fly any more because the love of flight was gone and he could only remember when it had been effortless. (148)

What probably did not cross Hemingway's mind as he lamented Scott's downfall was the possible aptness of his description to himself as well. Whether Fitzgerald's inability to focus himself on his writing was caused by a combination of drunkenness and spousal interference, as Hemingway would always claim, or by a more general sense of self-doubt, the confluence of factors which kept him from completing his masterpiece as quickly as he desired could almost as easily be mapped onto Hemingway's years of work on *Garden*. The doubts and regrets Hemingway attributes to Fitzgerald were surely ones he felt acutely himself as he was working on *A Moveable Feast* in 1959. That he should be making such statements only shortly after being unable to bring *The Garden of Eden* to some sort of conclusion is important for two reasons. First, the preoccupation with non-writing (or at least non-publishing) authors suggests Hemingway's doubt about his own writing abilities. Furthermore, the subdued anger manifested towards Scott can be seen as anger at himself not just for not seeing *Garden* through to publication but also, possibly, for his inability adequately to work out the questions of gender and identity with which he had struggled for so long.

<sup>4</sup> Valerie Hemingway, Ernest's secretary in his final years (and later his son Gregory's wife), sees a direct correlation between David and his creator: "I did not realize it the first time I read *The Garden of Eden* but it became apparent to me over the subsequent months that David Bourne was Ernest Hemingway" (107-108). Conversely, Roe argues that "[o]n most occasions, [Catherine's] devilishly feminine voice is closest to Hemingway's own, and accurately articulates the moral concerns of *Eden*" (54). This seeming disparity is resolved by the fact that in this book, as in his earlier novels, two Hemingways manifest themselves at once

— the phallogcentrically oriented man (visible in David) and the man aware of the feminine (visible in Catherine).

<sup>5</sup> Cornell explains that “while society runs on an ‘apparent’ separation of the sexes, in poetics originary bisexuality is not necessarily repressed.” She goes on to acknowledge that “[t]he poetic management of this bisexuality in art can be conflictual” and that “[o]ne could find traces of both economies in a same writing, or in a same practice” (38). This suggestion that both masculine and feminine tendencies can be manifest in a single piece of writing clearly has implications for *The Garden of Eden*. It means that, though certain aspects of the book must be regarded as inimical to a feminine practice, the validity of Hemingway’s partial approximation of feminine writing in it cannot be denied.

<sup>6</sup> The Hemingway who returned to Cuba in March, 1944, from a harrowing tour of the European Theater was, in some fundamental way, not the same man who had shipped off to cover the Spanish Civil War less than a decade earlier. In the eleven or so months he was in France and Germany, Hemingway was part of many military offensives — he was among the journalists who witnessed the Normandy invasion; he helped in the liberation of Paris by personally liberating the Ritz Hotel (or at least its bar); and he witnessed unimaginably brutal fighting in the Hürtgen Forest. During combat, he exhibited all the signs of a man deeply suicidal. For example, the story of his refusal to take cover during a German machine-gun raid on the building he occupied, and his almost preternatural calmness in continuing to eat as bullets whizzed by, gives a clue to his increasing inner turmoil (Reynolds, *FY* 112-13). This feeling is also evident in the letters he sent to his new love (and soon-to-be fourth wife) Mary Welsh, an American journalist whose companionship helped speed the final break-up of his always stormy relationship with Martha:

[in war] you are so busy, and impermanent, and always moveing [sic] and tired and makeing [sic] decisions and sleep dead-tired when you can get it with a division that is fighting that you really have no other life. I have to do this now and for certain reasons can’t leave area or I would be there. . . . Mary, there is no being careful in this world we received as our inheritance, our gleaming aluminum, black and white striped, 700 MPH inheritance. (*SL* 559-60)

That Hemingway should return home to begin work on writing that was different from anything he had ever previously attempted seems almost inevitable given these circumstances.

<sup>7</sup> Similarly, David Hudson’s near shark attack in *Islands in the Stream* is a direct fictionalization of Gregory Hemingway’s own close call while swimming with his father and brothers in the Gulf Stream off Cuba in 1942. For more, see Gregory Hemingway (95) and Baker (*Writer* 379-408).

<sup>8</sup> Burwell (1, 187 n.2) and Reynolds (*FY* 137-38) both note the similarities between Hemingway’s post-war material and Joyce’s novel of artistic development. They also liken *Garden* and the other late writing to Proust’s detailed (and equally massive) project of reminiscence and introspection in *à la recherche du temps perdu*, a work that Hemingway had read by this time and to which he began referring more frequently. Reynolds suggests that Hemingway was attempting something similar to both Proust and Joyce in his creation of “a multivolume portrait of the artist/writer in the first half of the twentieth century” (138). For

more on the connections between Joyce and Hemingway, see Gajdusek (*Study*).

<sup>9</sup> If one has the privilege of reading the manuscript, the validity of Modellmog's claim can be verified. Yet even in looking at the editors' defenses of their work, we can find evidence as to the political nature of the changes. Jenks, for instance, claims that "in terms of subject matter, the strongest, clearest impulse evident in the manuscript was Hemingway's desire to take on his own myth without, however, destroying or relinquishing it" (33). In his Preface to the 1987 Collier's edition, Charles Scribner, Jr. provides some further clues:

This last work was filled with so many remarkable riches that, in spite of the fact that Hemingway never finished it, we were convinced that it should be published. Only the second part was incomplete, and the first half, taken with only a modest amount of pruning, provided a wholly harmonious and coherent narrative. (n.p.)

Obviously the two parts of the story to which Scribner refers are the matched triangles of David/Catherine/Marita and Nick/Barbara/Andy — the latter of which Jenks felt it necessary to cut out due to its sketchy plotting. However, the suggestion that the Bournes' story is either harmonious or coherent in the manuscript is a far cry from the truth, and the seeming harmony achieved by Jenks belies Hemingway's obvious ambivalence as to how gender and sexual identity may be created.

Intriguingly, though, Scribner's decision to side-step political issues fits, in a way, with the general frame of Hemingway's career. Cooper asserts that "literature was more important than politics for Hemingway" (21), and for most of his writing life — especially in the politically charged 1930s — Hemingway was often accused of evading politics. In fact, it may have been due to this pressure that he cobbled together *To Have and Have Not* as a defense of his art. Nolan, for one, calls it Hemingway's "protest novel" (20). The protest, though, is perhaps two-fold; it marks his displeasure with the American government's slow reaction to the hurricane that ravaged Matecumbe Key in 1935, and it proclaims his own political activism. Admittedly, the sort of politics Hemingway superficially grafted onto that wayward novel were never his true literary focus, and part of the reason for the poor critical and popular reception of the book might lie in readers' realization of this. In any event, the fact that he rarely manifested an overtly political conscience in his work should not suggest that political matters did not concern him. And perhaps by examining its Cixousian appearance, it is not too much to argue for *The Garden of Eden* as the political novel Hemingway apparently never wrote. Claiming such status for the manuscript may seem a dubious prospect, but, while it is improbable, this contention is at once compelling, given Cixous's idea of the political basis of feminine writing. For more on Hemingway's political leanings, see Baldwin and Kastely.

<sup>10</sup> Cixous thus urges male writers to create "the woman who would resist destruction and constitute herself as a superb, equal, 'impossible' subject" (*NBW* 98). Such a female character is "impossible," Cixous goes on to explain, because she would be "intolerable in the real social context" of our phallogocentric society. The fact that "Catherine struggles [so] heroically to legitimize her creativity" (48), as Willingham argues, might lead us to surmise that Hemingway did, in fact, understand women's battles for autonomy and that he was capable of writing in the political vein Cixous suggests. Admittedly, the real social context befuddled him as much as it does Catherine, and Cixous does go on to insist that the feminine space she

envisions is “only for poets, not for novelists who stick with representation” (NBW 98). However, her further comment that “poetry exists only by taking strength from the unconscious, and the unconscious, the other country without boundaries, is where the repressed live” seems equally suited to a discussion of *The Garden of Eden* given the obvious correlation between Hemingway’s personal doubts and the themes of the novel. In some sense, the distinction between prose and poetry might not enter into the equation at all, in fact, if we recall Hemingway’s own words about his writing: “nobody really knows or understands and nobody has ever said the secret. The secret is that it is poetry written into prose and it is the hardest of all things to do” (Mary Hemingway 305).

<sup>11</sup> It might appear surprising that Hemingway should be even remotely attuned to what seems specifically a woman’s problem. If it is indeed women, and not men, who are silenced by sexist social practice, his writing of a novel like *Garden* in the first place seems incongruous. However, as Cixous has explained, both men and women have been adversely affected by the politicization of gender and sexuality, and men as much as women need to explore their identities:

men still have everything to say about their sexuality, and everything to write. For what they have said so far, for the most part, stems from the opposition activity/passivity, from the power relation between a fantasized obligatory virility meant to invade, to colonize, and the consequential phantasm of woman as a “dark continent” to penetrate and to “pacify.” (“Laugh” 1091 n.2)

Hemingway’s creation of a character like Catherine, who wishes to explore private and socially taboo interpretations of masculinity and femininity, suggests that he was indeed trying to get beyond an obligatorily virile sense of male sexuality and to relate to women by means other than penetration and pacification.

<sup>12</sup> Manuscript references will be cited according to the current cataloguing method used by the Kennedy Library. As copyright restrictions imposed by the Hemingway family refuse publication of any manuscript work dealing with unpublished material (which applies to the majority of *Garden*), only those selections available in other sources will be quoted directly. All other references to the manuscript will be made by paraphrase, but will still be cited by the Hemingway Collection catalogue number.

<sup>13</sup> Strong argues “that Catherine does not so much need David as a scribe for her artistic expression; rather, she needs David to be a partner in her invention of a world without restrictive gender roles” (275 n.1).

<sup>14</sup> Willingham goes on to argue, quite rightly, that “*Garden* vividly calls into question previous charges of misogyny” against Hemingway, a fact that “demands a reevaluation of [the] literary treatment of women” in all of his work (46).

<sup>15</sup> For a counter argument, see Jones, who is more sceptical of Catherine’s motives: “[s]he . . . attempts to emasculate David as a writer, ridiculing his abilities and endeavoring to control his creative imagination” (3). Similarly, Beegel sees the novel as a conglomeration of “Heironymus Bosch-like nightmares of hysteria, madness, fornication, infidelity, and

androgynous metamorphoses at the soul-destroying whims of a demoniac wife" (quoted in Nagel, "Hunting Story" 329).

<sup>16</sup>. For more on David's authorial isolationism, see Fleming (*Face* 145-58).

<sup>17</sup>. Perhaps it is overly deterministic, though, to assume that David's thoughts are, or are meant to be, totally self-deceiving. We must recall that, after worrying about the improbability of working anytime soon, David reminds himself in the manuscript that he must not become overly moralistic about his writing and that he and Catherine are deserving of their time together (422.1-1 p. 17).

<sup>18</sup>. It makes sense, given this symbolism, that David views Catherine's activities in moralizing terms throughout the novel — a view concretized in his nicknaming her Devil. Comley also suggests that "[t]he problem of morality is one of the unresolved conflicts in *The Garden of Eden*" ("Light" 286).

<sup>19</sup>. Many critics now seem to agree that the Bourne's sexual repertoire involves digital anal penetration by Catherine as part of the change to her masculine self and David's transformation into a feminine self. See Modellmog (*Reading Desire* 69). For a counter-argument, see Peters (20) and note twenty below.

<sup>20</sup>. The words in guillemets, which represent additions Hemingway made at the holograph level, can help to clarify the mechanics of the couple's lovemaking after their transformations. The addition of the word "lower" to the description of Catherine's search implies that she is feeling him, that her hand is reaching lower on *his* body not her own, not so she can guide his penetration of her but so that, presumably, she can penetrate him. Hemingway's other insertion of "inside" to describe the sensation David feels also suggests that he is penetrated not her since the syntactic impression of the sentence after the addition appears to be that the inside is David's own not Catherine's. Were he to penetrate her, it is more likely that the phrasing would be something like "the sensation of being inside." On the whole, it seems fair to assume that what is happening is not simply a reversal of positions in a "normal" heterosexual experience but a reversal of roles as well, with Catherine as the penetrator and David the willingly penetrated. This is further suggested by Catherine's exclamation in that her physical penetration of him would indeed confuse conventional ideas of heterosexual intercourse and make it hard to tell who is filling which sexual role or identity.

<sup>21</sup>. Beegel explores "Hemingway's signature use of the word 'brother,'" suggesting that it "reflects the longing for an Eden where men and women, husbands and wives, . . . might live together on . . . terms [of] equality and fraternity, depending on each other for mutual support. Such a paradise would bring male and female principles, as well as man and nature, into harmony and balance" ("Santiago" 189). Modellmog also examines the connotations of David and Catherine's use of brother ("Queer Families" 243-44).

<sup>22</sup>. Roland Barthes, for example, suggests that "the true place of writing . . . is reading" (123), which liberates the text from the author's control and allows it almost limitless

existence. Foucault concurs that writing becomes “a space into which the writing subject constantly disappears,” meaning that the text no longer fulfils its “duty of providing immortality” for the author because it is the reader’s participation that creates the text (979). David implicitly denies this understanding by his very writing of past experience as a way to relive that experience. His attempt to control his writing counters Barthes’s and Foucault’s ideas in that his relationship to the story remains of primary importance to him. This explains why he is loath to have Catherine read his stories and even debates with himself the correctness of letting Marita see them. As he admits to himself while reading over Marita’s shoulder, their reading of the stories together is some sort of violation of the rules of writing, that he is sharing with her “what he had believed could not and should not be shared” (203). Similarly, in the manuscript, David thinks that his questioning of Marita about the story breaks the code of the writer by showing interest in someone else’s opinion about his creation (422.1-29 p. 25). Nancy McCambell Grace offers a qualification of David’s motivation for writing, arguing that he “writes for himself — to re-member his past, to transform his reality — but [that] he always knows there is another of weighty importance in his artistic equation. The audience, the reader, is always present, standing on the periphery, waiting to be, intended to be, transformed by the experience of art” (239).

<sup>23</sup>. This passion for keeping ordered records of monetary and artistic worth was something Hemingway shared with his fictional counterpart. He was always preoccupied with money, and his stockpiling of manuscripts during the 1950s in the vault of the Bank of Boston in Cuba against future financial or artistic hardship illustrates his belief in art as capital. See Burwell (“West” 218).

<sup>24</sup>. Anyone familiar with even the barest details of Hemingway’s life will recognize a comparable tendency to define his success socially. His continued authorial control over his work, evident in his ongoing battles with censorship and hesitancy to discuss his writing, similarly speaks of his fear of being or seeming socially emasculated. His constant use, too, of metaphors of fighting and boxing in describing his desire to be a great writer manifests exactly the attitude Cixous attributes to men, while his tendency to think of writing as a definition of his manhood accurately charts a masculine response to art.

<sup>25</sup>. Marita laments David’s position and blames herself and Catherine (and presumably the other women who have affected David’s life) for his current circumstances: “Poor David. What women do to you” (140). She later describes him as having “been overrun with girls” (244), implying that it is his worldly attachments that are responsible for his problems in writing. David makes similar attempts to soothe his wounded ego by blaming Catherine for the break up of their marriage and for her own current mental state. “Crazy woman burned out the Bournes” (243), he tells Marita, trying to exonerate himself and Marita for their part in the destruction.

<sup>26</sup>. Putnam also “argue[s] that the elephant tale is itself a feminine tale. This elephant with the light side and the dark side that Davey has betrayed through a telling he cannot take back” (176). She describes it as “Eve’s story,” “the tale of betrayal and the suffering and the awareness that came from it.” In fact, writing the story seems to be almost an act of atonement for David, just as writing *Garden* itself could be seen as a similar act by Hemingway’s

repressed feminine side in apology for his overly emphasized masculinity.

<sup>27</sup> The elephant-hunt story is often regarded as some of the best writing in *Garden*, and many early critics of the manuscript felt it to be the only salvageable portion of a rather mediocre book. In fact, it was published as a stand-alone story in the *Finca Vigía Edition of The Complete Short Stories* (545-554). For more on Hemingway's artistry in his creation of David's story, see Nagel ("The Hunting Story").

<sup>28</sup> The aptness of this model to Hemingway's own childhood experience is clear for the economic metaphor Cixous invokes cannot help but remind us of the note Grace left for Ernest at the family cottage in Michigan in the summer of 1920, in which she wrote "a mother's love seems to me like a bank," telling him "you have overdrawn" (Reynolds, *YH* 136, 138). In its entirety, the letter reads as an almost perfect example of the sort of obligation that Cixous suggests terrifies men. It must be noted, too, that after receiving the note Hemingway stayed away from the house for some time; it might even be possible to suggest that Ernest's life-long bitterness toward Grace came to a head over this. Despite his anger, though, Hemingway continued to support his mother financially after his father's suicide, perhaps as a way of quickly and painlessly discharging his debt of life, something Reynolds also speculates (*YH* 140).

<sup>29</sup> Cixous goes on to state that "a girl's journey is farther — to the unknown, to invent" (*NBW* 93). This clearly marks the sort of pilgrimage Catherine makes and offers further evidence of Hemingway's foreshadowing of *écriture féminine*, despite his conscious resistance to his femininity.

<sup>30</sup> For more on Catherine's desire to publish the honeymoon narrative, see Grace (259-63).

<sup>31</sup> The fact that it is only through lesbian encounters that Hemingway addresses same-sex desire in *Garden* does, of course, imply the extent to which he worried over his possible homosexual feelings. As a man, he is safe to explore women loving women because the possible interpretation that he would like to engage in similar activities is denied. Were he to explore male homosexuality in the way he explores Catherine's desires, it would be difficult to deny (to himself or to others) that he was — at the very least — homosexually or bisexually curious. However, the thoughts and feelings he attributes to Catherine regarding her sense of her sexuality provide interesting points of comparison with Cixous's ideas about the manifestation of a feminine sexual dynamic and suggest that Hemingway's dream of a tolerant cultural view of all sexualities looks remarkably like a modern feminist-humanist ethic. See Modellmog (*Reading Desire* 64-82).

There is a biographical precedent for Catherine's attractiveness to lesbian women if we remember the story that, while in college, Hadley was approached by a friend's mother in a manner that suggested the woman's desire for her. That Hemingway would go on to marry Pauline (whose sister was homosexual and who herself had affairs with women after she divorced him) and that the three may have engaged in a *ménage à trois* on two occasions during the mid-20s — as might Pauline, Mary and Ernest thirty years later in Cuba — makes clear the fascination that same-sex desire (at least of the female sort) held for him. See Spilka

(*Quarrel* 9) and Burwell (*Postwar Years* 210 n.2).

<sup>32</sup> Spilka (*Quarrel* 283-90) discusses in some detail the importance of the Rodin statue to the theme of mediated sexuality in *Garden*. See also Comley and Scholes (53-55).

<sup>33</sup> In a foreshadowing of Catherine and David's later tonsorial experiments, Nick grows his hair to match Barbara's. Skillfully combing it forward to hide its length from her as it grows, he surprises her with it prior to their meeting David and Catherine in Hendaye much in the way Catherine surprises David with her short hair. Also similar to the Bourne plot, Hemingway has the couple debate the wickedness of their experiment, though both soon think of it as an accomplishment as Catherine imagines her and David's (422.1-5 p. 5, insert 5).

<sup>34</sup> A similar sense of Cixousian *jouissance* occurs early in the manuscript when Catherine and David make love, during which she speaks in terms remarkably like Dorothy Hollis's orgasmic monologue in *To Have*, with the notable addition that she concentrates on her movement between being a boy and being a girl (422.1-5 p. 13).

<sup>35</sup> A further clue to Hemingway's wish for a tolerance of marginalized desire comes in the form of David's manuscript warning to Catherine, after Barbara has admitted to him an attraction to Catherine, that she must be considerate of Barbara's feelings. He hints that everyone has a sexual secret and that people should be respectful of others' idiosyncracies (422.1-5 p. 13).

<sup>36</sup> Powell also supports this view, suggesting that "Marita slowly usurps Catherine's place in the Bourne marriage" much in the way that, in Hebrew tradition, "Lilith . . . considered Eve the usurper of her place with Adam" (82-3).

<sup>37</sup> Despite Marita's value to David and apparently to Hemingway as a fantasy-woman, we must recognize her introduction into the Bourne's marriage by Catherine as another indicator of Hemingway's tacit refusal to follow social prescription in matters of sexual and gender identity, for the simple fact that she offers to David and Catherine a different way of defining themselves. Her presence in the novel might thus be complicated beyond defining her simply as Hemingway's vehicle for disempowering Catherine through the ultimate victory of the masculinely defined woman. Strong makes the interesting case that Catherine introduces Marita into the Bourne's marriage at least in part as a sort of "puppet regime, . . . importing Marita to fulfill the obligations of the 'good wife' while she gains the space to breathe freely and act out her own desires without feeling self-conscious about her lack of enthusiasm for the wifely ideal" (268). See also Powell (84). This would seem to hold with the supposition that Marita actually helps, at least tangentially, to promote a discovery of non-patriarchal sexual and gender identities, an argument also endorsed by her later re-instatement of David and Catherine's transformations.

<sup>38</sup> See also Raeburn ("Sex and Art" 116).

<sup>39</sup> The possibility that Catherine's suicide was Hemingway's most sustained idea for a conclusion to her story is indicated by the fact that the suicide note Barbara Sheldon leaves for

Andy was originally attributed to Catherine in the manuscript (422.2-5 p. 25bis). Hemingway consistently used Catherine's name in place of Barbara's, and only after his completing the scene and writing the note twice was the name changed. Of course, part of the reason for this might stem from his confusion about the two plots given that they were both fairly similar; however, the possibility that he wanted to end Catherine's story as he had Barbara's also seems likely.

Valerie Hemingway, too, suggests that Hemingway was specifically against a tidy and peaceful conclusion to the book:

Ernest had no intention that the book would end up where it does now. In 1959 he was plotting how his characters would wind up. It was not to be "happily ever after." As we drove along the narrow Provençal roads, he sought out a suitable spot to stage a fatal car crash. . . . He sought to ascertain in accurate detail the impact between a car and a motorcycle crash which was to take Catherine's life. To my knowledge this ending was never actually written but at that time as Ernest pondered the final scene he was determined to leave no detail unexplored. As far as I know he did not return to work on the book and he was still unsatisfied with that manuscript at the time of his death. (110)

It is suggestive of Hemingway's mood concerning the possibility of a feminine victory that one of the last endings he imagined was to involve Catherine's death. It is not necessary to assume, though, that he felt constrained to destroy her because of her transgressive nature. Rather, we might view the death as an indication that he was ultimately unable to resolve the conflict within himself between personal identity creation and political gender allegiance. In other words, Catherine's death can be seen not as a punishment by her male creator, but as a sign of his fear of what happens to people unable to fit the role prescribed for them socially.

<sup>40</sup> Comley calls this possible conclusion "a mature ending, free of the male fantasy that makes the Scribner's version of a proper manuscript so insipid" ("Light" 292).

## Bibliography

- Aneja, Anu. "Medusa's Slip: Hélène Cixous and the Underpinnings of *Écriture Féminine*." *LIT: Literature, Interpretation, Theory* 4.1 (1992): 17-27.
- Baker, Carlos. *Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969.
- . *Hemingway: The Writer as Artist*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- Balbert, Peter. "From Hemingway to Lawrence to Mailer: Survival and Sexual Identity in *A Farewell to Arms*." *The Hemingway Review* 3.1 (1983): 30-43.
- Baldwin, Marc D. *Reading The Sun Also Rises: Hemingway's Political Unconscious*. New York: Peter Lang, 1997.
- Banting, Pamela. "The Body as Pictogram: Rethinking Hélène Cixous's *écriture féminine*." *Textual Practice* 6.2 (1992): 225-46.
- Barea, Arturo. "Not Spain but Hemingway" *The Literary Reputation of Hemingway in Europe*. Roger Asselineau, ed. New York: New York University Press, 1965. 197-210.
- Barlowe, Jamie. "Hemingway's Gender Training." *A Historical Guide to Ernest Hemingway*. Linda Wagner-Martin, ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. 117-53.
- Barlowe-Kayes, Jamie. "Re-Reading Women: the Example of Catherine Barkley." *The Hemingway Review* 12.2 (1992): 24-35.
- Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author." *Twentieth Century Literary Theory: A Reader*. K. M. Newton, ed. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997. 120-23.

- Bederman, Gail. *Manliness and Civilization*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Beegel, Susan F. "Hemingway and Hemochromatosis." *The Hemingway Review* 10.1 (1990): 57-66.
- , "Santiago and the Eternal Feminine: Gendering *La Mar* in *The Old Man and the Sea*." *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice*. Lawrence R. Broer and Gloria Holland, eds. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, forthcoming. 180-213.
- Bell, Millicent. "A Farewell to Arms: Pseudobiography and the Personal Metaphor." *Ernest Hemingway: The Writer in Context*. James Nagel, ed. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984. 107-128.
- Bennett, Warren. "'That's not very polite': Sexual Identity in Hemingway's 'The Sea Change.'" *Hemingway's Neglected Short Fiction*. Susan Beegel, ed. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1989. 225-46.
- Benson, Jackson. *Hemingway: The Writer's Art of Self-Defense*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969.
- Benvenuto, Bice, and Roger Kennedy. *The Works of Jacques Lacan: An Introduction*. London: Free Association Books, 1986.
- Beverly, John. "Dispelling the Romantic Myth: A Study of *A Farewell to Arms*." *The Hemingway Review* 9.1 (1989): 18-25.
- Binhammer, Therine. "Metaphor or Metonymy? The Question of Essentialism in Cixous." *Tessera* 10 (1991): 65-79.
- Birkett, Jennifer. "French Feminists and Anglo-Irish Modernists: Cixous, Irigaray, Beckett, and Joyce." *Miscelánea: A Journal of English and American Studies* 18 (1997): 1-19.
- Blackmore, David. "'In New York it'd mean I was a . . . .': Masculinity, Anxiety and Period Discourses of Sexuality in *The Sun Also Rises*." *The Hemingway Review* 18.1 (1998): 49-67.
- Boker, Pamela, A. "Negotiating the Heroic Paternal Ideal: Historical Fiction as Transference in Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *Literature and Psychology* 41,1-2 (1995): 85-112.
- Brasch, James, and Joseph Sigman. *Hemingway's Library: A Composite Record*. New York: Garland, 1981.
- Breit, Harvey. "Talk with Mr. Hemingway." *Conversations with Ernest Hemingway*.

- Matthew J. Bruccoli, ed. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 1986. 60-62.
- Brenner, Jerry. *Concealments in Hemingway's Works*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1983.
- , "Once a Rabbit, Always a Rabbit? A Feminist Interview with Maria." *Blowing the Bridge: Essays on Hemingway and For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Rena Sanderson, ed. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1992. 131-42.
- Brogan, Jacqueline Vaught. "Parody or Parity: A Brief Note on Gertrude Stein and *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *The Hemingway Review* 15.2 (1996): 89-96.
- Bruccoli, Matthew J. *Fitzgerald and Hemingway: A Dangerous Friendship*. New York: Carroll & Graf, 1994.
- , *The Only Thing That Counts: The Ernest Hemingway-Maxwell Perkins Correspondence*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1996.
- Buckley, J. F. "Echoes of Closeted Desire(s): The Narrator and Character Voices of Jake Barnes." *The Hemingway Review* 19.2 (2000): 73-88.
- Burwell, Rose Marie. "*The Garden of Eden*: Resistance of Things Past and Protecting the Masculine Text." *Texas Studies in Language and Literature*. 35.2 (1993): 198-225.
- , *Hemingway: The Postwar Years and the Posthumous Novels*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- , "West of Everything: The High Cost of Making Men in Ernest Hemingway's *Islands in the Stream*." *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice*. Lawrence R. Broer and Gloria Holland, eds. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, forthcoming. 214-34.
- Cheatham, George. "'Sign the Wire with Love': The Morality of Surplur in *The Sun Also Rises*." *The Hemingway Review* 11.2 (1992): 25-30.
- Cixous, Hélène. "At Circe's, or the Self-Opener." Carol Bové, trans. *Boundary 2: A Journal of Postmodern Literature* 3 (1975): 387-97.
- , "Castration or Decapitation?" Annette Kuhn, trans. *Signs* 7 (1981): 36-55.
- , "The Character of 'Character.'" Keith Cohen, trans. *New Literary History* 5 (1974): 383-402.
- , "Coming to Writing." "*Coming to Writing*" and *Other Essays*. Deborah Jenson, ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991. 1-58.

- . "Conversations with Hélène Cixous and the Centre d'Etudes Féminines." *Writing Differences: Readings from the Seminar of Hélène Cixous*. Susan Sellers, ed. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1988. 141-54.
- . "Difficult Joys." *The Body and the Text: Hélène Cixous, Reading and Teaching*. Helen Wilcox, et al, eds. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990. 5-30.
- . "Enter the Theatre (in between)." Brian Mallet, trans. *Modern Drama* 42.3 (1999): 301-314.
- . "Extreme Fidelity." *Writing Differences: Readings from the Seminar of Hélène Cixous*. Susan Sellers, ed. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1988. 9-36.
- . "From the Scene of the Unconscious to the Scene of History." *The Future of Literary Theory*. Ralph Cohen, ed. New York: Routledge, 1989. 1-18.
- . "The Last Painting or the Portrait of God." "Coming to Writing" and Other Essays. Deborah Jenson, ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991. 104-131.
- . "The Laugh of the Medusa." Keith Cohen and Paula Cohen, trans. *The Critical Tradition*. David H. Richter, ed. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989. 1090-1102.
- . *Readings: The Poetics of Blanchot, Joyce, Kafka, Kleist, Lispector, and Tsvetayeva*. Verena Conley, trans. and ed. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991.
- . "Rethinking Differences: An Interview." *Homosexualities and French Literature: Cultural Contexts, Critical Texts*. George Stambolian and Elaine Marks, eds. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979. 70-86.
- Cixous, Hélène, and Catherine Clément. *The Newly Born Woman*. Betsy Wing, trans. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.
- Cohen, Peter F. "'I won't kiss you . . . I'll send your English girl': Homoerotic desire in *A Farewell to Arms*." *The Hemingway Review* 15.1 (1995): 42-53.
- Comley, Nancy R. "The Light in Hemingway's Garden: Regendering Papa." *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice*. Lawrence R. Broer and Gloria Holland, eds. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, forthcoming. 277-92.
- Comley, Nancy R., and Robert Scholes. *Hemingway's Genders: Rereading the Hemingway Text*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Conley, Verena. *Hélène Cixous*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.

- . *Hélène Cixous: Writing the Feminine*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1991.
- . "Saying 'Yes' to the Other." *Dalhousie French Studies* 13 (1987): 92-99.
- Cook, Ellen Piel. *Psychological Androgyny*. New York: Pergamon Press, 1985.
- Cooper, Stephen. *The Politics of Ernest Hemingway*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1987.
- Cornell, Sarah. "Hélène Cixous and *les Etudes Féminines*." *The Body and the Text: Hélène Cixous, Reading and Teaching*. Helen Wilcox et al, eds. Hemel Hemstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1990. 31-40.
- Corredor, Eva L. "The Fantastic and the Problem of Re-presentation in Hélène Cixous's Feminist Fiction." *Papers in Romance* 4 (1982): 173-79.
- Cowley, Malcolm. "Introduction." *The Portable Hemingway*. New York: Viking, 1945. viii-xxiv.
- Craig, Robert J. "Hemingway Analyzed — Contributions to Psychology XXIII." *Psychological Reports* 76.3 (1995): 1059-79.
- Crowley, John W. *The White Logic: Alcoholism and Gender in American Modernist Fiction*. Amherst: University of Massachussets Press, 1994.
- Davidson, Donald. "Perfect Behavior." *Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms*. George Monteiro, ed. New York: G. K. Hall, 1984. 84-87.
- Davidson, Arnold E., and Cathy N. Davidson. "Decoding the Hemingway Hero in *The Sun Also Rises*." *New Essays on The Sun Also Rises*. Linda Wagner, ed. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1987. 83-108.
- Davis, Robert Con. "Woman as Oppositional Reader: Cixous on Discourse." *Papers on Language and Literature* 24.3 (1988): 265-82.
- DeVost, Nadine. "Hemingway's Girls: Unnaming and Renaming Hemingway's Female Characters." *The Hemingway Review* 14.1 (1994): 46-59.
- Djos, Matts. "Alcoholism in Ernest Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises*: A Wine and Roses Perspective on the Lost Generation." *The Hemingway Review* 14.2 (1995): 64-78.
- Doctorow, E. L. "Braver Than We Thought." *The New York Times Book Review*. 18 May 1986: 44-45.
- Donaldson, Scott. *By Force of Will: The Life and Art of Ernest Hemingway*. New York:

- Viking, 1977.
- , "Hemingway's Morality of Compensation." *Ernest Hemingway's The Sun Also Rises*. Harold Bloom, ed. New York: Chelsea House, 1987. 71-90.
- Drew, Fraser. "April 8, 1955 with Hemingway: Unedited Notes on a Visit to Finca Vigia." *Fitzgerald/Hemingway Annual 1970*. 108-116.
- Dubbert, Joe L. *A Man's Place*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1979.
- Eastman, Max. "Bull in the Afternoon." *Hemingway: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982. 172-80.
- Eby, Carl. *Hemingway's Fetishism: Psychoanalysis and the Mirror of Manhood*. Binghamton: State University of New York Press, 1998.
- Elliott, Ira. "A Farewell to Arms and Hemingway's Crisis of Masculine Values." *LIT: Literature, Interpretation, Theory* 4.4 (1993): 291-304.
- , "Jake and Masculine Signification in *The Sun Also Rises*." *American Literature* 67.1 (1995): 77-94.
- Ellis, Havelock. "Erotic Symbolism." *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*. Vol. 2. New York: Random House, 1936. 1-114.
- Farr, Cecelia Konchar. "Moving Earth: Ecofeminist Sites in Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls* and Gellhorn's *A Stricken Field*." *Hemingway and the Natural World*. Moscow, ID: University of Idaho Press, 1999. 153-64.
- Ferrero, David J. "Nikki Adams and the Limits of Gender Criticism." *The Hemingway Review* 17.2 (1998): 18-30.
- Fetterley, Judith. *The Resisting Reader*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978.
- Fiedler, Leslie. *Love and Death in the American Novel*. New York: Stein and Day, 1966.
- Finnegan, Robert Emmett. "Adieu Identity — Mirrors and Newspapers in Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms*." *Durham University Journal* 86.2 (1994): 259-70.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. *A Life in Letters*. Matthew J. Bruccoli, ed. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994.
- Fleisher, Michael Lack. "Twin Fantasies, Bisexuality and Creativity in the Works of Ernest Hemingway." *The International Review of Psycho-Analysis* 17.3 (1990): 287-98.
- Fleming, Robert E. "The Endings of *The Garden of Eden*" *American Literature* 61 (1989):

261-70.

----- . *The Face in the Mirror: Hemingway's Writers*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1994.

Foucault, Michel. "What is an Author?" Josué Harari, trans. *The Critical Tradition*. David H. Richter, ed. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989. 978-88.

Franke, Catherine Anne. "Interview with Hélène Cixous." *Qui Parle: Literature, Philosophy, Visual Arts, History* 3.1 (1989): 152-79.

Freeman, Barbara. "'plus corps donc plus écriture: Hélène Cixous and the Mind-Body Problem.'" *Paragraph* 11.1 (1988): 58-70.

Freeman, Sandra. "Bisexuality in Cixous's *Le Nom d'Oedipe*." *Theatre Research International* 23.3 (1998): 242-48.

Freud, Sigmund. "The Infantile Genital Organization: An Interpolation into the Theory of Sexuality." *The Standard Edition of the Complete Works of Sigmund Freud*. Vol. 19. James Strachey, ed. London: Hogarth Press, 1961. 139-45.

----- . "The Interpretation of Dreams." *Standard Edition*. Vols. 4 and 5. James Strachey, ed. London: Hogarth Press, 1961.

Gadjusek, Robert. "Elephant Hunt in Eden: A Study of New and Old Myths and Other Strange Beasts in Hemingway's *Garden*." *The Hemingway Review* 7.1 (1987): 15-19.

----- . "A Farewell to Arms: The Psychodynamics of Integrity." *The Hemingway Review* 9.1 (1989): 26-32.

----- . *Hemingway and Joyce: A Study in Debt and Repayment*. Corte Madera: Square Circle Press, 1984.

----- . "'Is He Building a Bridge or Blowing One?': The Repossession of Text by the Author in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *The Hemingway Review* 11.2 (1992): 45-51.

----- . "The Oxymoronic Compound and the Ambiguous Noun: Paradox as Paradigm in *A Farewell to Arms*." *North Dakota Quarterly* 63.3 (1996): 40-49.

----- . "Pilar's Tale: The Myth and the Message." *The Hemingway Review* 10.1 (1990): 19-33.

Gallop, Jane. *Reading Lacan*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Gibbs, Anna. "Cixous and Gertrude Stein." *Meanjin* 38 (1979): 281-93.

- Gilbert, Sandra M. "Introduction: A Tarantella of Theory." *The Newly Born Woman*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986. i-xviii.
- Gilbert, Sandra M., and Susan Gubar. *No Man's Land, the Place of the Woman Writer in The Twentieth Century*. Vol. 2, *Sexchanges*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Gladstein, Mimi Reisel. "Hemingway." *The Indestructible Woman in Faulkner, Hemingway, and Steinbeck*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1986. 47-73.
- Gould, Thomas E. "'A Tiny Operation with Great Effect': Authorial Revision and Editorial Emasculation in the Manuscript of Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *Blowing the Bridge: Essays on Hemingway and For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Rena Sanderson, ed. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1992. 67-81.
- Grace, Nancy McCampbell. *The Feminized Male Character in Twentieth Century Literature*. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995.
- Griffin, Peter. *Along With Youth: Hemingway, The Early Years*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- . *Less Than a Treason: Hemingway in Paris*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. *Jacques Lacan: A Feminist Introduction*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Gwin, Minrose. *The Feminine and Faulkner: Reading (Beyond) Sexual Difference*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1990.
- Harding, Brian. "Ernest Hemingway: Men with, or without, Women." *American Declarations of Love*. Ann Massa, ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991. 104-21.
- Hatten, Charles. "The Crisis of Masculinity, Reified Desire, and Catherine Barkley in *A Farewell to Arms*." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 4.1 (1993): 76-98.
- Hays, Peter L. "Ministrant Barkley in *A Farewell to Arms*." *Hemingway in Italy and Other Essays*. Robert W. Lewis, ed. New York: Praeger, 1990. 11-19.
- Haytock, Jennifer A. "Hemingway's Soldiers and Their Pregnant Women: Domestic Ritual in World War I." *The Hemingway Review* 19.2 (2000): 57-72.
- Heilbrun, Carolyn. *Toward a Recognition of Androgyny*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1982.
- Helbling, Robert E. *The Major Works of Heinrich von Kleist*. New York: New Directions

## Books, 1975.

- Hemingway, Ernest. *Across the River and into the Trees*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950.
- . *The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway. Finca Vigia Edition*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1987.
- . *Dateline: Toronto*. William White, ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1985.
- . *Death in the Afternoon*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932.
- . *A Farewell to Arms*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.
- . *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940.
- . *The Garden of Eden*. Tom Jenks, ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1986.
- . *The Garden of Eden Manuscript*. Hemingway Collection, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston.
- . *Green Hills of Africa*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996.
- . "Introduction." *Men At War*. New York: Bramhall, 1979.
- . *Islands in the Stream*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970.
- . *A Moveable Feast*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1964.
- . *The Nick Adams Stories*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972.
- . *The Old Man and the Sea*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952.
- . *Selected Letters, 1917-1961*. Carlos Baker, ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1981.
- . *The Sun Also Rises*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.
- . *To Have and Have Not*. New York: P. F. Collier & Son, 1937.
- Hemingway, Gregory. *Papa: A Personal Memoir*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.
- Hemingway, Leicester. *My Brother, Ernest Hemingway*. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1961.
- Hemingway, Mary. *How It Was*. New York: Knopf, 1976.

- Hemingway, Valerie. "The Garden of Eden Revisited: With Hemingway in Provence in the Summer of '59." *The Hemingway Review* 18.2 (1999): 103-113.
- Hillman, James. "The Elephant in *The Garden of Eden*." *Spring: A Journal of Archetype and Culture* 50 (1990): 93-115.
- Irigaray, Luce. *Speculum of the Other Woman*. Gillian C. Gill, trans. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.
- , "Volume Without Contours." David Macey, trans. *The Irigaray Reader*. Margaret Whitford, ed. London: Blackwell, 1991. 53-67.
- , "This Sex Which is Not One." Claudia Reeder, trans. *New French Feminisms*. Elaine Marks and Isabelle de Courtivron. New York: Schocken Books, 1981. 99-106.
- Jays, Nancy. "Gender and Dichotomy." *A Reader in Feminist Knowledge*. Sneja Gunew, ed. London: Routledge, 1991. 89-106.
- Jenks, Tom. "Editing Hemingway: *The Garden of Eden*." *The Hemingway Review* 7.1 (1987): 30-33.
- Jones, Ann Rosalind. "Writing the Body: Toward an Understanding of *L'Écriture féminine*." *The New Feminist Criticism*. Elaine Showalter, ed. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985. 361-377.
- Jones, Robert B. "Mimesis and Metafiction in Hemingway's *The Garden of Eden*." *The Hemingway Review* 7.1 (1987): 2-13.
- Josephs, F. Allan. "Hemingway's Poor Spanish: Chauvinism and Loss of Credibility in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *Hemingway: A Reevaluation*. Tory: Whitson, 1983. 205-223.
- Justice, Hilary K. "Alias Grace: Music and the Feminine Aesthetic in Hemingway's Early Style." *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice*. Lawrence R. Broer and Gloria Holland, eds. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, forthcoming. 293-317.
- Kamif, Peggy. "To Give Place: Semi-Approaches to Hélène Cixous." *Another Look, Another Woman: Retranslations of French Feminism*. Binghamton: Vail Ballou, 1995. 68-69.
- Kastely, James L. "Toward a Politically Responsible Ethical Criticism: Narrative in *The Political Unconscious* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *Style* 22.4 (1988): 535-58.

- Kennedy, J. Gerald. "Hemingway's Gender Trouble." *American Literature* 63.2 (1991): 187-207.
- Kerrigan, William. "Something Funny About Hemingway's Count." *American Literature* 46.1 (1978): 87-93.
- Kert, Berenice. *The Hemingway Women*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1983.
- Kiberd, Declan. *Men and Feminism in Modern Literature*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985.
- Kimmel, Michael. *Manhood in America*. New York: The Free Press, 1996.
- Kleinman, Craig. "Dirty Tricks and Dirty Words: The Politics of Recollection in *A Farewell to Arms*." *The Hemingway Review* 15.1 (1995): 54-71.
- Kleist, Heinrich von. "Penthesilea." Humphry Trevelyan, trans. *Heinrich von Kleist: Plays*. Walter Hinderer, ed. New York: Continuum, 1982. 165-268.
- Knodt, Ellen Andrews. "Diving Deep: Jake's moment of Truth at San Sebastian." *The Hemingway Review* 17.1 (1997): 28-37.
- Knot, Toni D. "One Man Alone: Dimensions of Individuality and Categorization in Hemingway's *To Have and Have Not*." *The Hemingway Review* 17.2 (1998): 78-87.
- Kogan, Vivian. "'I want Vulva!' Cixous and the Poetics of the Body." *L'Esprit Créateur* 25.2 (1985): 73-85.
- Kory, Fern. "A Second Look at Helen Ferguson in *A Farewell to Arms*." *Hemingway in Italy and Other Essays*. Robert W. Lewis, ed. New York: Praeger, 1990. 21-33.
- Kreigel, Leonard. "After Hemingway and Freud." *Nation* 23 Dec. 1996: 30-32.
- Kumar, Sukrita Paul. "Woman as Hero in Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises*." *Literary Endeavor* 6.1-4 (1987): 102-108.
- Lacan, Jacques. *Ecrits: A Selection*. Alan Sheridan, trans. London: Tavistock, 1977.
- . *Feminine Sexuality*. Juliet Mitchell and Jacqueline Rose, trans. and eds. New York: W. W. Norton, 1982.
- . *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. Jacques-Alain Miller, ed. Alan Sheridan, trans. London: The Hogarth Press, 1977.
- . *Lacan and the Subject of Language*. Ellie Ragland-Sullivan and Mark Bracher, eds. New York: Routledge, 1991.

- . *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan*. Jacques-Alain Miller, ed. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- . *Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis*. Anthony Wilden, trans. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981.
- Lapham, Aaron. "A Farewell to Machismo." *The New York Times Magazine* 16 October 1977: 51-55.
- Larson, Kelli A. *Ernest Hemingway: A Reference Guide, 1974-89*. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1991.
- Lawson, Kate. "Imagining Eve: Charlotte Brontë, Kate Millett, Hélène Cixous." *Women's Studies* 24 (1995): 411-26.
- Lewis, Robert W., Jr. *A Farewell to Arms: The War of the Words*. Boston: Twayne, 1992.
- . "Hemingway, Malraux, and the Warrior-Writer." *North Dakota Quarterly* 60 (1992): 58-71.
- . *Hemingway on Love*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965.
- Lockridge, Ernest. "Faithful in Her Fashion: Catherine Barkley and the Invisible Hemingway Heroine." *Journal of Narrative Technique* 18.2 (1988): 170-78.
- Lydon, Mary. "Re-Translating no Re-Reading no, rather: Rejoycing (with) Hélène Cixous." *Yale French Studies* 87 (1995): 90-102.
- Lynn, Kenneth S. *Hemingway*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987.
- MacCannell, Juliet Flower. *Figuring Lacan: Criticism and the Cultural Unconscious*. London: Croom Helm, 1986.
- Makward, Christine. "Interview with Hélène Cixous." *Sub-Stance* 13 (1976): 19-37.
- Mandel, Miriam B. "Ferguson and Lesbian Love: Unspoken Subplots in *A Farewell to Arms*." *The Hemingway Review* 14.1 (1994): 18-24.
- . "A Lifetime of Flower Narratives: Letting the Silenced Voice Speak." *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice*. Lawrence R. Broer and Gloria Holland, eds. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, forthcoming. 318-341.
- . *Reading Hemingway: Facts in the Fictions*. Metuchen: Scarecrow, 1995.
- Martin, Wendy. "Brett Ashley as New Woman in *The Sun Also Rises*." *New Essays on The*

- Sun Also Rises*. Linda Wagner, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. 65-82.
- . "Seduced and Abandoned in the New World: The Image of Woman in American Fiction." *Women in Sexist Society*. Vivian Gornick and Barbara K. Moran, eds. New York: Basic Books, 1971. 226-39.
- McLellan, John M. "The Unrising Sun: The Theme of Castration in Hemingway and Sterne." *Studies in English Literature and Linguistics* 18 (1992): 57-61.
- Mellow, James R. *Hemingway: A Life Without Consequences*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1992.
- Merrill, Robert. "Demoting Hemingway: Feminist Criticism and the Canon." *American Literature* 60.2 (1988): 255-68.
- Meyers, Jeffrey. *Hemingway: A Biography*. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.
- Meyers, Jeffrey, ed. *Hemingway: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.
- Miller, Linda Patterson. "Brett Ashley: The Beauty of It All." *Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's The Sun Also Rises*. James Nagel, ed. New York: G. K. Hall, 1995. 170-84.
- . "Hemingway's Women: A Reassessment." *Hemingway in Italy and Other Essays*. Robert W. Lewis, ed. New York: Praeger, 1990. 3-9.
- . "In Love with Papa." *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice*. Lawrence R. Broer and Gloria Holland, eds. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, forthcoming. 14-40.
- Moddelmog, Debra A. "Queer Families in Hemingway's Fiction." *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice*. Lawrence R. Broer and Gloria Holland, eds. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, forthcoming. 235-59.
- . *Reading Desire: In Pursuit of Ernest Hemingway*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999.
- Moi, Toril. *Sexual/Textual Politics*. London: Methuen, 1985.
- Montgomery, Constance Cappel. *Hemingway in Michigan*. New York: Fleet, 1966.
- Moreland, Kim. "To Have and Hold Not." *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice*. Lawrence R. Broer and Gloria Holland, eds. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, forthcoming. 114-129.

- Morrison, Toni. *Playing in the Dark*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Nagel, James. "Brett and the Other Women in *The Sun Also Rises*." *The Cambridge Companion to Ernest Hemingway*. Scott Donaldson, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. 87-108.
- . "Catherine Barkley and Retrospective Narration in *A Farewell to Arms*." *Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms*. George Monteiro, ed. New York: G. K. Hall, 1994. 161-74.
- . "The Hunting Story in *The Garden of Eden*." *Hemingway's Neglected Short Fiction*. Susan Beegel, ed. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1989. 329-38.
- Nahal, Chaman. *The Narrative Pattern of Hemingway's Fiction*. Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson Press, 1971.
- Nolan, Charles J. Jr. "Hemingway's Women's Movement." *The Hemingway Review* 3.2 (1984): 14-22.
- O'Sullivan, Sibbie. "Love and Friendship/Man and Woman in *The Sun Also Rises*." *Arizona Quarterly*. 44.2 (1988): 76-97.
- Payne, Michael. *Reading Theory: An Introduction to Lacan, Derrida, and Kristeva*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1993.
- Peters, K. J. "The Thematic Integrity of *The Garden of Eden*." *The Hemingway Review* 10.2 (1991): 17-29.
- Phelan, James. "The Concept of Voice, and Voices of Frederic Henry, and the Structure of *A Farewell to Arms*." *Hemingway: Essays of Reassessment*. Frank Scafella, ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991. 214-32.
- Plate, Leideke. "'I come from a woman': Writing, Gender, and Authorship in Hélène Cixous's *Book of Promethea*." *Journal of Narrative Technique* 26.2 (1996): 158-71.
- Pleck, Elizabeth and Joseph Pleck. "Introduction." *The American Man*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1980. 1-49.
- Plimpton, George. "The Art of Fiction: Ernest Hemingway." *Conversations with Ernest Hemingway*. Matthew Bruccoli, ed. Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 1986. 109-29.
- Powell, Tamara M. "Lilith Started it: Catherine as Lilith in *The Garden of Eden*." *The Hemingway Review* 15.2 (1996): 79-88.

- Prescott, Jeryl J. "Liberty and Just(us): Gender and Race in Hemingway's *To Have and Have Not*." *CLA Journal* 37 (1993): 176-88.
- Pullin, Faith. "Hemingway and the Secret Language of Hate." *Ernest Hemingway: New Critical Essays*. A. Robert Lee, ed. London: Vision Press, 1983. 172-92.
- Putnam, Ann. "On Defiling Eden: The Search for Eve in the Garden of Sorrows." *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice*. Lawrence R. Broer and Gloria Holland, eds. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, forthcoming. 152-79.
- Rabine, Leslie W. "Ecriture Féminine as Metaphor." *Cultural Critique* 8 (1987-88): 19-44.
- Raeburn, John. *Fame Became of Him: Hemingway as Public Writer*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- . "Sex and Art in *The Garden of Eden*." *Michigan Quarterly Review* 29 (1990):111-22.
- Reynolds, Michael S. *Hemingway: The Final Years*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1999.
- . *Hemingway's First War: The Making of A Farewell to Arms*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.
- . *Hemingway: The Homecoming*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1992.
- . *Hemingway: The 1930s*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1997.
- . *Hemingway: The Paris Years*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1989.
- . *Hemingway's Reading: 1910-1940*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.
- . *The Young Hemingway*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1986.
- Richards, Angela. "Editor's Introduction." *The Interpretation of Dreams. The Pelican Freud Library*. Vol. 4. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975. 33-43.
- Roe, Steven C. "Opening Bluebeard's Closet: Writing and Aggression in Hemingway's *The Garden of Eden* Manuscript." *The Hemingway Review* 12.1 (1992): 52-66.
- Rogal, Samuel J. *For Whom the Dinner Bell Tolls*. Bethesda: International Scholars Publications, 1997.
- Romesburg, Rod. "Shifting Orders: Chaos and Order in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *Hemingway and the Natural World*. Moscow, ID: University of Idaho Press, 1999.

139-52.

Ross, Lillian. *Portrait of Hemingway*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1961.

Rotundo, E. Anthony. *American Manhood*. New York: Basic Books, 1993.

Rovit, Earl. *Ernest Hemingway*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1963.

Rudat, Wolfgang. "Brett's Problem: Ovidian and Other Allusions in *The Sun Also Rises*." *Stylus* 19.3 (1985): 317-25.

-----, "Jacob Barnes and Onan: Sexual Response in *The Sun Also Rises* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology* 10.1-2 (1989): 50-58.

-----, "Sexual Dilemmas in *The Sun Also Rises*: Hemingway's Count and the Education of Jacob Barnes." *The Hemingway Review* 8.2 (1989): 2-13.

-----, "Hemingway's Rabbit: Slips of the Tongue and Other Linguistic Games in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *The Hemingway Review* 10.1 (1990): 34-51.

-----, "Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises*: Masculinity, Feminism and Gender-Role Reversal." *American Imago* 47.1 (1990): 43-68.

-----, "Macho Posturing in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*: The Role of Andrés from Villaconejos." *ANQ* 9.1 (1996): 27-30.

-----, "The Other War in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*: Maria and Miltonic Gender-Role Battles." *The Hemingway Review* 10.2 (1991): 8-24.

-----, "Wounds to Manhood: Hemingway, Jake Barnes, and *Tristram Shandy*." *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology* 14.3-4 (1993): 223-37.

Sanderson, Rena. "Hemingway and Gender History." *The Cambridge Companion to Ernest Hemingway*. Scott Donaldson, ed. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1996. 170-96.

Sanford, Marcelline Hemingway. *At the Hemingway's: A Family Portrait*. Boston: Atlantic-Little, Brown, 1962.

Sankovitch, Tilde. "Hélène Cixous: The Pervasive Myth." *French Women Writers and The Book: Myths of Access and Desire*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1988. 127-52.

Sarason, Bretram D. *Hemingway and The Sun Set*. Washington: NCR, 1972.

Savage, D. S. "Ciphers at the Front." *Twentieth Century Interpretations of A Farewell to*

- Arms*. Jay Gellens, ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1970. 91-102.
- Scafella, Frank. "Clippings from *The Garden of Eden*." *The Hemingway Review* (7.1) (1987): 20-29.
- Schwartz, Nina. "Discourse in *The Sun Also Rises: A Cock and Bull Story*." *Criticism: A Quarterly for Literature and the Arts* 26 (1984): 49-69.
- Schwenger, Peter. "The Masculine Mode." *Speaking of Gender*. Elaine Showalter, ed. New York: Routledge, 1989. 101-112.
- Scribner, Charles, Jr. "Preface." *The Garden of Eden*. New York: Collier's, 1987. n.p.
- Sellers, Susan. *Hélène Cixous: Authorship, Autobiography and Love*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press, 1996.
- Shiach, Morag. *Hélène Cixous: A Politics of Writing*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Simpson-Zinn, Joy. "The *Différance* of *l'écriture féminine*." *Chimeres: A Journal of French and Italian Literature* 18.1 (1985): 77-93.
- Sinclair, Gail. "Revisiting the Code: Female Foundations and 'The Undiscovered Country' in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice*. Lawrence R. Broer and Gloria Holland, eds. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, forthcoming. 130-151.
- Singer, Linda. "True Confessions: Cixous and Foucault on Sexuality and Power." *The Thinking Muse: Feminism and Modern French Philosophy*. Allen Jeffner and Marion Young, eds. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989. 136-55.
- Smith, Carol H. "Women and the Loss of Eden in Hemingway's Mythology." *Ernest Hemingway: The Writer in Context*. James Nagel, ed. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984. 129-44.
- Smith, Paul. *A Reader's Guide to the Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway*. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1989.
- Solotaroff, Robert. "Sexual Identity in *A Farewell to Arms*." *The Hemingway Review* 9.1 (1989): 2-17.
- Souhami, Diana. *Gertrude and Alice*. London: Pandora, 1991.
- Spanier, Sandra Whipple. "Catherine Barkley and the Hemingway Code: Ritual and Survival in *A Farewell to Arms*." *Ernest Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms*. Harold Bloom, ed. New York: Chelsea, 1986. 131-48.

- Spilka, Mark. "The Death of Love in *The Sun Also Rises*." *Twelve Original Essays on Great American Novels*. Charles Shapiro, ed. Wayne State Press, 1959. 238-56.
- . *Hemingway's Quarrel with Androgyny*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990.
- . "Repossessing Papa: A Narcissistic Meditation." *Hemingway Repossessed*. Kenneth Rosen, ed. Westport: Praeger, 1994. 37-49.
- Stanton, Domna C. "Language and Revolution: The Franco-American Dis-Connection." *The Future of Difference*. Hester Eisenstein and Alice Jardine, eds. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1980. 73-87.
- Stanton, Edward F. *Hemingway and Spain: A Pursuit*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1989.
- Stearns, Peter N. *Be a Man! Males in Modern Society*. 2nd ed. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1990.
- Stein, Gertrude. *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1933.
- Steinke, Jim. "Harlotry and Love: A Friendship in *A Farewell to Arms*." *Spectrum* 21.1-2 (1979): 20-24.
- Stephenson, E. Roger. "Hemingway's Women: Cats Don't Live in the Mountains." *Hemingway in Italy and Other Essays*. Robert W. Lewis, ed. New York: Praeger, 1990. 35-46.
- Stevens, Crista. "Hélène Cixous: Portraying the Feminine." *Beyond Limits*. Liesbeth Brouwer, et al, eds. Groningen: University of Groningen, 1990. 83-96.
- Still, Judith. "A Feminine Economy: Some Preliminary Thoughts." *The Body and The Text: Hélène Cixous, Reading and Teaching*. Helen Wilcox et al, eds. Hemel Hemstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1990. 49-60.
- Stoltzfus, Ben. "In Another Time: Proust, Hemingway, and the Fourth Dimension." *The International Fiction Review* 22 (1995): 15-20.
- . "A Sliding Discourse: The Language of *A Farewell to Arms*." *New Essays on A Farewell to Arms*. Scott Donaldson, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. 109-136.
- Stoneback, H. R. "From the rue Saint Jacques to the Pass of Roland to the 'Unfinished Church on the Edge of the Cliff.'" *The Hemingway Review* 6.1 (1986): 2-29.

- Strong, Amy Lovell. "‘Go to sleep Devil’: The Awakening of Catherine’s Feminism in *The Garden of Eden*." *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice*. Lawrence R. Broer and Gloria Holland, eds. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, forthcoming. 260-76.
- Strychacz, Thomas. "Dramatizations of Manhood in Hemingway’s *In Our Time* and *The Sun Also Rises*." *American Literature* 61.2 (1989): 245-60.
- Svoboda, Frederic J. *Hemingway & The Sun Also Rises*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1983.
- Sylvester, Bickford. "Winner Take Nothing: Development as Dilemma for the Hemingway Heroine." *Pacific Coast Philology* 21.1-2 (1986): 73-80.
- Tavernier-Courbin, Jacqueline. *Ernest Hemingway’s A Moveable Feast: The Making of a Myth*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1991.
- Teunissen, John J. "For Whom the Bell Tolls as Mythic Narrative." *Ernest Hemingway: Six Decades of Criticism*. Linda Wagner, ed. Ann Arbor: Michigan State University Press, 1987. 221-37.
- Theweleit, Klaus. *Male Fantasies*. 2 vols. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.
- Tyler, Lisa. "Dead Rabbits, Bad Milk, and Lost Eggs: Women, Nature, and Myth in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *Hemingway and the Natural World*. Moscow ID, University of Idaho Press, 1999. 125-137.
- . "‘Women Have a Bad Time Really’: Gender and Interpretation in *To Have and Have Not*." *Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings Journal of Florida Literature* 7 (1996): 57-66.
- Updike, John. "The Sinister Sex." *The New Yorker* 30 June 1986: 85-88.
- Varsava, Jerry A. "En-Gendered Problems: Characteral Conflict in Hemingway’s *Garden*." *LIT: Literature, Interpretation, Theory* 3.2 (1991): 115-35.
- Villard, Henry S., and James Nagel. *Hemingway in Love and War: The Lost Diary of Agnes Von Kurowsky*. New York: Hyperion, 1985.
- Wagner, Linda L. "‘Proudly, Friendly and Gently’: Women in Hemingway’s Early Fiction." *College Literature* 7.3 (1980): 239-47.
- Wagner-Martin, Linda. "Favored Strangers": *Gertrude Stein and Her Family*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1995.

- . "Racial and Sexual Coding in Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises*." *The Hemingway Review* 10.2 (1991): 39-41.
- Wainwright, Andrew J. "The Far Shore: Gender Complexities in Hemingway's 'Indian Camp.'" *Dalhousie Review* 66.1-2 (1986): 181-87.
- Wexler, Joyce. "E.R.A. for Hemingway: A Feminist Defense of *A Farewell to Arms*." *The Georgia Review* 35.1 (1981): 111-23.
- Whitford, Maragret. "Introduction." *Luce Irigaray: Philosophy in the Feminine*. New York: Routledge, 1991. 1-16.
- Whitlow, Roger. *Cassandra's Daughters: The Women in Hemingway*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1984.
- Whitmore, Tony. "Gaiety and Psyche: *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." New York: Oxford University Press, 1991. 234-44.
- Willingham, Kathy. "Hemingway's *The Garden of Eden*: Writing with the Body." *The Hemingway Review* 12.2 (1993): 46-61.
- Wilson, Edmund. "Hemingway: Gauge of Morale." *The Wound and the Bow*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1941. 147-97.
- Wilson, Emma. "Hélène Cixous: An Erotics of the Feminine." *French Erotic Fiction: Women's Desiring Writing, 1880-1990*. Oxford: Berg, 1996. 121-45.
- Woods, Gregory. "The Injured Sex: Hemingway's Voice of Masculine Anxiety." *Sexuality and Textuality: Reading Theories and Practices*. Judith Still and Michael Worton, eds. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993. 60-172.
- Wylder, Delbert E. *Hemingway's Heroes*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1969.
- . "The Two Faces of Brett: The Role of the New Woman in *The Sun Also Rises*." *Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's The Sun Also Rises*. James Nagel, ed. New York: G. K. Hall, 1995. 89-94.
- Young, Philip. *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1966.