Notes

INTRODUCTION


6. My chapters on the antithetical phase address what Carlos Baker writes was "a touchy subject," Hemingway's relationship with his sons (CB to GB, 24 November 1975). Baker's biography glosses over the parent-child problems. He mentions in passing the difficulties between Hemingway and his youngest son, Gregory, intimating that they surfaced during the Christmas of 1950, came to a head with Pauline Pfeiffer's death in October 1951, continued by correspondence for three years, but were finally patched up during 1954 (*Life Story*, pp. 489, 506, 526). But Arthur Waldhorn, *A Reader's Guide to Ernest Hemingway* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1972) (hereafter cited as *Reader's Guide*), notes that Hemingway's twenty-year correspondence with General Charles Trueman "Buck" Lanham reveals that in the mid and late fifties Hemingway's "references to Gregory (Gigi), his youngest son, who was then under psychiatric care, are gratuitously
harsh and explicitly brutal. At the same time he writes tolerantly but with mild condescension about his eldest son, John (Bumby), who had entered a brokerage, and enthusiastically about Patrick (Mouse), who had become a successful professional hunter in Africa” (p. 255). For Gregory’s account of his difficulties with his father during the fifties, see *Papa: A Personal Memoir* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976), pp. 6-16.

7. See David J. Gordon, *Literary Art and the Unconscious* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1976), especially the introduction, pp. xiii–xxx, and "The Unconscious in Literary Criticism," pp. 1–51. As my afterwords and chapters on the antithetical phase will demonstrate, I attend to what Gordon defines as “problematic effects,” any “false note or irrational component which prompts the reader to frame an interpretation that cannot have been intended by the writer.” Such problematic effects, he goes on to explain, “may fit together into a counter-intended meaning if we presume the agency of a specific unconscious process of distortion. What we perceive are imbalances that might plausibly be accounted for according to a hypothesis of unconscious influence” (p. xvi). Gordon would probably disapprove of my use of antithetical to describe Hemingway’s last phase, for to him the term implies, I think, a conscious program that is artistically developed or designed in some “qualifying relation to the rest of [a] work” (p. xvii). But I choose to use it rather than his preferred phrase problematic effects because outside the context of his book the phrase is critically flaccid.


11. See Sydney J. Krause’s unduly ignored “Hemingway’s ‘My Old Man,’” *Explicator* 20 (1962), item 39, to which my reading is indebted.

12. Carlos Baker reprints the text in *Hemingway: The Writer as Artist*, 4th ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), p. 339 (hereafter cited as Artist). While revising my manuscript for publication, I was strongly taken with the idea of adding to this list a second statement. Michael S. Reynolds unearthed it from the manuscripts in the Hemingway Collection, housed in Boston’s John F. Kennedy Library, and used it as the epigraph to his introductory essay, “Hemingway’s Bones,” in his *Hemingway’s Reading, 1910-1940: An Inventory* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), p. 3: “Education consists in finding sources obscure enough to imitate so that they will be perfectly safe.” An ink note penned on the back of an envelope dated New Year’s Eve 1927, this item seems to have been made to order for my purposes as well as Reynolds’s. For surely it indicates that Hemingway sought obscure sources that he could then safely imitate. But there is that vague pronoun referent, “they.” Who or what will be perfectly safe? Surely the obscure sources, the apparent referent of “they,” have no need to be perfectly safe. Hemingway must mean, then, that the works he has written or will write, by imitating obscure sources, will be perfectly safe from detection. Or does this excerpt omit a context that identifies the referent of “they?” In *Catalog of the Ernest Hemingway Collection at the John F. Kennedy Library*, comp. Jo August (Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1982), 1:77 (hereafter cited as Catalog of Hemingway Collection), item 489 records that the inked notes mention Eliot, “The Waste Land,” and Pound. Perhaps, then, this provocative quotation refers not to Hemingway’s practices—at least in 1927—but, sarcastically, to those of Eliot and Pound, the “they” of the quotation?
13. For a different discussion of Hemingway's reasons for being secretive about what he had learned from artists, see Emily Stipes Watts, Ernest Hemingway and the Arts (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971), pp. 171-72.


15. I am convinced of Uncle George's paternity in "Indian Camp," for it accounts for that story's otherwise two basic flaws: why George is in the story at all, and the sensationalism of having an injured Indian commit suicide while "his" child is being delivered. George's paternity explains why he gives cigars to the two Indians who row him, Nick, and Dr. Adams across the lake; why the younger Indian laughs without reserve when the Indian woman bites George and later smirks "reminiscently" when George looks at his bitten arm; why George sarcastically responds to his brother's boasts about having performed the cesarean with primitive equipment; and, finally, why he does not return with his brother(-in law?) and nephew. George's paternity also satisfactorily explains the Indian husband's suicide. His act can be that of a distraught cuckold who, knowing that his wife is giving birth to a white man's child, surrenders his life in an act of futility, as testimony of his feelings of utter impotence. I prefer to see him as an Indian "brave." His suicide aims to inflict a strong sense of guilt on Uncle George, becomes a dignified act that affirms the need to live with dignity or not at all, and lays at the feet of another treacherous white man the death of yet one more of the countless, dispossessed native Americans. I lay no claim to originality by calling George the father, for earlier critics have dealt with the issue. Nevertheless, both G. Thomas Tansell, "Hemingway's 'Indian Camp,' " Explicator 20 (1962), item 53, and Kenneth Bernard, "Hemingway's 'Indian Camp,' " Studies in Short Fiction 2 (1965): 291, assign such a heavy symbolic value to the question that they deserve Philip Young's riposte, Studies in Short Fiction 3 (1966): ii-iii, in which he confesses that he fathered the child.

16. Compare Sheldon Norman Grebstein's analysis of "The Mother of a Queen" in Hemingway's Craft (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973), pp. 56-58. To his reading I would remark that "Hemingway's scorn for homosexuals [which] resounds throughout his work" (p. 113) is not as evident here or elsewhere as Grebstein believes it to be.


were here now to set a lot of people straight on the many untruths and exaggerations that have been written regarding members of our family. But the many family pictures that Mother kept for each of the children in the baby books refute the idea that got started about Mother dressing Ernest as a girl, and that he and Marcelline were dressed as twins" (p. 98). Not only does the generous swarm of photographs Miller includes give the lie to her protest—see pp. 10, 13, 14, 17, 20, 21, 24—but the fact that Marcelline and Ernest were six and five years old when "Sunny" was born also casts some doubt upon her protest. I recognize that Marcelline's recall of her childhood emphasizes different events and impressions than Hemingway's would. But her recall of affect-laden events of their childhood provides an external viewpoint that would differ from his and that would minimize the falsification and distortion that he, like all of us, would color those events with. Her version of those events and of the domestic milieu they shared allows a measure of reliability upon which to attempt to reconstruct some of the forces that shaped his psychic makeup.


24. For a wider collection of Hemingway's nicknames, see Baker, Letters, e.g., 29, 58, 66, 74, 89, 183, 201, 300, 433, 497, 563, 584, 844, 861, 908.


26. The customary practice among neo-Freudians who analyze Hemingway's personality is to oversimplify it and to base their analyses upon Hemingway's public behavior, ignoring how his works qualify and even contradict that behavior. One definition of generic personality traits that seems tailor-made to fit the better-known features of Hemingway's personality is Karen Horney's Neurosis and Human Growth (New York: Norton, 1950), particularly her chapter "The Expansive Solutions: The Appeal of Mastery," pp. 187-213. Two subsequent Horneyan analyses are Jacqueline Tavernier-Courbin, "Striving for Power: Hemingway's Neurosis," Journal of General Education 30 (1978): 137-53; and Irvin D. Yalom and Marilyn Yalom, "Ernest Hemingway—A Psychiatric View," Archives of General Psychiatry 24 (1971): 485-94. In the former, Professor Tavernier-Courbin presents sound evidence of Hemingway's competitiveness. But she proves neither that his competitiveness was neurotic nor that the competitiveness—much less his "striving for power"—dominates his fiction. Indeed, she altogether fails to consider whether Hemingway's characters strive for power as much as they strive for achievement and, even more, affiliation. In the latter, the Yaloms persuade me that it is accurate to define Hemingway's ego ideals as ones that "crystallized around a search for mastery," that exalted masculine traits and subdued "the softer feminine side." But to most boys' formulation of ego ideals that definition applies with equal validity. Consequently, their conclusion not only oversimplifies Hemingway's ego ideals and implies that they must be one-dimensional but also rests heavily upon the public, adult image Hemingway projected. Subscribers though they are to Karen Horney's personality theory, they appear derelict in failing to examine the childhood factors that contributed to Hemingway's ego ideals. Surprisingly, they write off or ignore the best account of the household in which Hemingway grew up, the only account we have that can claim firsthand knowledge and experience of those important early years of Hemingway's life, Marcelline's At the Hemingways. Equally surprising, the Yaloms claim that "all available evidence suggests that the public and private Hemingways are merged: the Hemingway of private conversations, of letters, and of notebooks is identical with the Hemingway who careened across the pages of newspapers and journals and the many Hemingways who fought, loved and challenged death in his novels and stories" (p. 487). Overlooking such dust-jacket rhetoric, I fail to understand why conversations, letters, and notebooks classify as "private documents," particularly Hemingway's twenty-year correspondence with General C. T. "Buck" Lan-
ham, upon which the Yaloms draw so heavily. Admittedly such documents are less public than Hemingway's fiction or his \textit{Esquire} "letters." Nevertheless, letters and conversations are "public" inasmuch as they are shared with others; and notebooks, the product of a verbalizing process, become "public" as soon as they become written. Given Hemingway's "anal-retentive" habits, testified to by the mountain of material he saved—drafts, typescripts, fragments, and so forth—virtually everything he wrote was conceived to be, eventually, public. My point is that all of Hemingway's written material is "public," none of it "private." However much his writing is a screen between his private and public selves, it also reveals his private self.

27. Miller, "\textit{Sunny}' Remembers, p. 82.


29. Baker, \textit{Life Story}, p. 184. The psychological significance of this story has been best analyzed by Richard B. Hovey, \textit{Hemingway: The Inward Terrain} (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1968), pp. 47–53 (hereafter cited as \textit{Inward Terrain}). I would remark, however, that he stresses unduly the castrative power of the destructive mother and overlooks what I take to be the more crucial issue, Nick's shock at his father's response to Mrs. Adam's deed.

30. My reason for using the term \textit{homoerotic} rather than \textit{homosexual} is not squeamishness. Rather it is that \textit{homosexual} denotes genital sexuality, whereas \textit{homoerotic} denotes a wider range of erotic displacements and sublimations, a range appropriate for my discussion. For an earlier discussion of Hemingway's homoerotic tendencies, see Richard Drinnon, "In the American Heartland: Hemingway and Death," \textit{Psychoanalytic Review} 52 (1965): 5-31.


32. Ibid., p. 5.

33. Ibid.


35. By using the term \textit{feminine} I intend no sexist stereotyping. Rather I use it and its companion, \textit{masculine}, as Freud does, to differentiate between active and passive (assertive and submissive) behavior, between male and female biological functions, and between observable sociological differences in individual men and women. As Freud is careful to point out in \textit{Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex}, trans. A. A. Brill (New York: Dutton, 1962), due to our bisexuality all individuals show a mixture of their "own biological sex characteristics with the biological traits of the other sex and a union of activity and passivity" (p. 77).

36. I do not mean that Hemingway simply fictionalizes his experiences or replicates himself in his protagonists. That idea oversimplifies the man and the individuality of the works he created, as Wyler argues in \textit{Hemingway's Heroes}, pp. 3-9, 223-25. But like all writers Hemingway cannot circumvent the repetition compulsion to project onto his protagonists the anxieties, wishes, and obsessions that reveal his most private self, his deepest fixation, and the dominant patterns that unify his work.

38. Among the reasons for Hemingway’s latent homoeroticism would have been castration anxiety. Antipathy for his mother directed his sexual energy toward his father. But fear of his father’s castrating power would have passively steered him that way, too. (Indeed, Hemingway’s often-remarked misogyny is partly a defense against the threat of castration by his father.) In his fiction, “God Rest You Merry, Gentlemen” explicitly acknowledges castration anxiety. But it also occurs, interestingly, in the Nick Adams “war” stories. Like many Hemingway critics, I too am indebted to Philip Young’s “wound theory.” But I regret that he did not probe the etiology of the wound and failed to see that Hemingway’s war wounding was so traumatic because it was preconditioned: the shelling at Fossalta remobilized repressed castration anxieties. As Fenichel states, “What is most characteristic in the reaction to a trauma is that associative connections are immediately established between the trauma and the infantile conflicts that become activated” (p. 124). One specific association that connects infantile castration anxiety to Hemingway’s late-adolescent wounding is a river, the recurrent setting in “A Way You’ll Never Be,” “Now I Lay Me,” and “Big Two-Hearted River.” In the first story Hemingway projects onto Nick the “emotional spells” he himself undoubtedly suffered, one of which compulsively focuses upon the stretch of river where his wounding occurred. In the second, Nick tries to assuage his “insomnia” by refishing a stream. In the last, of course, he “concentrates all of his available mental energy” upon fishing a stretch of river. (Emotional spells, insomnia and “concentration of all mental energy on one task” are three of the basic symptoms of traumatic neuroses, notes Fenichel, pp. 118–21.) It seems clear that fishing the rivers of the second and third stories is therapeutic, the second one requiring a mental and the third a physical reconfrontation of a place analogous to the setting where he was wounded. Given the well-known specifics of the actual wounding itself—227 bits of shrapnel in the legs and groin—and Hemingway’s fears of amputation, it takes little imagination to link the wounding to castration anxiety. And the source of that anxiety? I think we need look no further than to a young boy’s fishing experiences with his father. Their only deeply disturbing event would be the moments the father takes his knife to the fish and cleans them. When coupled to those “jars of snakes and other specimens that [his] father had collected as a boy and preserved in alcohol” (Stories, 365), the terror of that riverbank or lakeshore scene would have forcefully imprinted such a dread of castration that when shelled at Fossalta on the Piave River Hemingway’s repressed anxiety resurfaced with explosive force.


A FAREWELL TO ARMS


2. The motif of irrationality has been variously dealt with, nowhere more succinctly than in Frederick H. Marcus, “A Farewell to Arms: The Impact of Irony and the Irrational,” English Journal 51 (1962): 527–35. The basic difference be-
tween our views of the thesis is that he believes that Frederic can escape irrational forces by retreating to the world of appetite—sex, drinking, and eating. I do not.


5. Carlos Baker reprints "The Original Conclusion to A Farewell to Arms" in *Ernest Hemingway: Critiques of Four Major Novels* (New York: Scribners, 1962), p. 75 (hereafter cited as *Critiques*). But see Bernard Oldsey, *Hemingway's Hidden Craft: The Writing of A Farewell to Arms* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1979). He not only explains why the version Baker reprinted should more precisely be referred to as "The Original Scribner's Magazine Conclusion" (pp. 71-72) but also analyzes the forty-one variants of Hemingway's conclusions to the novel. Among them, only variant 41, in his listing among "Miscellaneous Endings," expressly "entertains possibility of suicide" (p. 107). That will prove to many readers that Hemingway saw Frederic's suicide as less probable than the other kinds of endings that Oldsey groups under eight headings. And I am taken with Oldsey's idea that Hemingway's final ending subsumes, iceberg-fashion, those other kinds of endings: the Nada, Fitzgerald, Religious, Live-Baby, Morning-After, Funeral, and Combination (i.e., epilogue) endings. Yet not only is the final ending nihilistic, like the Nada endings. But even Oldsey concludes that it was "conceived in the spirit of rejection" and is "a compressed exemplification of the process of rejection and negation" (p. 82). What action would better express that "spirit" and "process," than suicide? Moreover, though Hemingway was uncertain about how to end his novel, the variant endings show that his final version flatly rejected the affirmative variants. Most important to note, Hemingway also discovered that his final ending was so congruent with the novel's character, thesis, and atmosphere that the rest of his text did not require serious modification, extensive revision. Readers who must salvage something positive from the novel, who nurse the illusion that the novel affirms selfless love, will, of course, opt for Frederic's growth or "initiation" and the therapeutic motive behind his storytelling. Like any great novel, this one bears both that reading and mine.

6. Grebstein, *Hemingway's Craft*, p. 73; and Oldsey, *Hemingway's Hidden Craft*, p. 91. My following three sentences present, I hope fairly, the proofs upon which Professor Grebstein bases his conclusion, pp. 73-76; Oldsey, in contrast, offers no support for his assertion, one that he makes in several places.


Sweet, and Stuff: An Essay on Modern Prose Styles (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1966), p. 40. The following questions I raise in the text are based upon Gibson's conclusions about Frederic, pp. 34-41. In fairness to him, he acknowledges that he bases them upon a small sample, the novel's first two paragraphs. But that neither subdues his dogmatism nor causes him to consider the inadequacy of his tidy, triadic format. If, for instance, the speaker of Marvell's "Coy Mistress," a speech by Winston Churchill, and the story told by Frederic Henry all employ "tough" styles, then wherein lies the value of a classification that groups together a lover, a patriot, and a disoriented storyteller? Gibson's case for defining Frederic as "tough" is one of the more explicit discussions of the "Hemingway style." But also see Walter J. Ong, S.J., "The Writer's Audience Is Always a Fiction," PMLA 90 (1976): 9-21, who follows Gibson to conclude that Hemingway's style serves the purpose of casting the reader "in the role of a close companion of the writer" (p. 13). Ong, too, fails to consider that disoriented and neurotic people use language, particularly demonstrative pronouns, "that," and definite articles, in much the same way as Frederic does.


13. Recent scholarship should disabuse me of this view. Professors Reynolds (Hemingway's First War, p. 56), Oldsey (Hemingway's Hidden Craft, p. 64), and Wirt Williams (The Tragic Art of Ernest Hemingway [Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981], pp. 71, 72-74) remark on the poetic quality of the opening. The first two arrange it as a piece of free verse, overlooking the fact that the cadences of a disoriented narrator, an emotionally disturbed person, even a normal person under emotional stress, form rhythmic patterns that could be similarly scanned. Indeed, Oldsey argues that the opening is a poetic and evocative overture to the novel (pp. 62-68). Interesting though this idea is, it reads like an exercise in New Criticism, one that has no basis in the manuscripts that presumably underpin his study.


15. Grebstein, Hemingway's Craft, p. 212; italics added.

16. I wonder if Hemingway ever ruefully felt about A Farewell to Arms what he wryly acknowledged about "Out of Season": that he omitted the end of the story, the old man's hanging himself, basing the omission on his theory that you could omit anything if you knew that you omitted and the omitted part would strengthen the story and make people feel something more than they understood.

Well, I thought, now I have them so they do not understand them. There cannot be much doubt about that. (Feast, 75)

17. Daniel J. Schneider, in "Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms: The Novel as Pure Poetry," Modern Fiction Studies 14 (1968): 283-92, also argues that Hemingway did not intend to create a rich, complex character in Catherine; his argument, however, rests on the idea that Hemingway uses her, as he uses action, only to reflect the lyric consciousness of a narrator concerned with conveying image clusters that reveal his mood of bitterness, despair, and so on. Williams, in The Tragic Art, argues a similar reading, pp. 66-67, 70-85.


**THE SUN ALSO RISES**


5. In contrasting Lady Brett and Count Mippipopolous, Hemingway seems to be juggling the late-Victorian hedonisms of *The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam* and Walter Pater. Both the poem and the esthetician value sensory experience and debunk intellectualization. Unable to gain any rational understanding of the "whithers and thithers" of the universe, the poem urges seizing the day and its triumvirate of bread, wine, and woman. Pater likewise confirms life's inconstancy and impenetrability, rejects abstract theorizing, and urges collecting sensory impressions. Omar, like Brett, asks for no discriminations among pleasure-seeking activity (and Brett shares bread, wine, and bed with nearly all comers). But like the count, Pater demands a discerning mind both to intensify and expand each moment and to achieve a "quickened, multiplied consciousness." To be sure, Pater's esthetic is more epicurean and cultured than the count's. Yet the count's common level of experience domesticates Pater's hedonism, broadens its applicability, and defines the species of hedonistic conduct that the novel advocates.


7. Admittedly, Hemingway does not endorse all Spanish traditions. And so Jake's attempts to worship in church note that belief in institutionalized religion is defunct, is incapable of revival. And Jake is also careful to observe that even the vital traditions of the bullfight can be corrupted by innovations and phony matadors. I also acknowledge that "traditionalism" is but a different form of hedonism
insofar as it sublimates a hedonist's more elementary means of gratification. Still, the dichotomy helps us see the differences between immediately gratified sensations and displaced or sublimated ones.


9. Other critics who find in Jake limited vision are Rovit, *Hemingway*, who calls Jake “a particularly opaque first-person narrator” (p. 148), and Hovey, *Inward Terrain*, who sees the ambiguity of Jake's relationship to Hemingway due to Jake's psychological unreliability (pp. 62-67). Like me, they affirm Jake’s success as narrator, but for reasons that differ from mine. For a provocative essay on this issue, see Doody, “Hemingway’s Style and Jake’s Narration.” Doody assumes that Hemingway is incapable of characterizing Jake ironically and that “there is nothing else in Hemingway’s work or career to support such a reading” that he could create “a portrait of the artist as a middle-aged loser” (p. 221). And so he concludes that the novel is flawed, that Hemingway does not know what he is doing with Jake, “has not thought out the first person novel and its demands with care.” Not only does Doody overlook Hemingway’s “portrait of the artist as a middle-aged loser,” Richard Gordon of *To Have and Have Not*, but he also asserts that a novelist must finally give some clear idea of when, where, why, and to whom a narrator tells his story, some “formal recognition of the motive or the occasion of Jake's retrospect,” some “indications of his imaginative agency in producing the narrative, if even only for the purpose of his own self-discovery” (p. 220). As I would argue about both this novel and *Farewell*, such a prejudicial expectation violates an author's right to defy any expectation or convention. It also insists that narrators always be so integrated that they can address openly such expectations or that their creators allow us some clear signal of distance between themselves and their narrators. Shades of Wayne Booth's prescriptive categories!


**AFTERWORD TO THE THESIS PHASE**


2. Much less, of course, does Hemingway violate the entire novel with the kind of optimism Paramount furnished the ending of its 1932 filming of the novel. Returning to the bedside of Helen “Catherine” Hayes, Gary “Frederic” Cooper lifts her sheet-draped, dead body from the hospital bed and carries her to the threshold of her room’s balcony. A breeze ruffles the gauze curtains of the open door and sunlight pours in, accompanied by the orchestral sounds of Armistice bells. Overhead fly innumerable doves, symbols, I think. My Hemingway teacher, Harry Burns, enjoyed repeating what Hemingway told him in response to that ending: “‘Why the Hell didn’t they have her give birth to the American Flag!’”


5. For the record, Hemingway did not extensively revise the Madrid episode. In fact, his ambivalent treatment of Brett was not affected by his subsequent adultery with Pauline Pfeiffer. Nevertheless, in the same notebook in which he drafted the ending to *The Sun Also Rises* (item 194 in *Catalog of Hemingway Collection*, p. 27), Hemingway added what reads like a summary. In this undated passage Jake blames Cohn for what happened, says that he is writing his story just as it occurred, and sees that because it does not conform to the standards of other novels, many readers will not find it credible. He goes on to declare that his “passion and longing” for Brett were so genuine that at times he thought they would tear him apart, but at other times when she was absent, he got along fine. Not only does this sound as though it were Hemingway expressing his “passion and longing” for Pauline, but so too do Jake’s last statements in this manuscript material. In what
reads like the feelings Hemingway would later in the same year express during his and Pauline's separation before marriage, Jake admits to the agony he felt just after he left Brett: that the world was empty, that nothing any longer had its old shape, that life was hollow, something to get through. Compare the manuscript with Hemingway's letters to Pauline, 12 November 1926 and 3 December 1926, Letters, pp. 220–23 and 234–35.


8. My chapter on A Moveable Feast treats the issue of Hemingway's filial betrayal during the twenties.

9. Sanford, At the Hemingways, pp. 183, 188.

DEATH IN THE AFTERNOON

1. Fatal though it may be to my argument in the following few pages, I, well, take the bull by the horns here to admit that none of the existing records of Hemingway's reading or libraries has turned up a copy of Walton's Compleat Angler. I find it hard to believe, however, that he had not encountered it at one time or another. And the resemblances that I discuss seem to me to be too strong for them to be merely coincidental.


4. "The Dangerous Summer," Life, 19 September 1960, p. 87. Comparable statements appear in Afternoon, but Hemingway here adopts a perspective I can better return to in this chapter's last section.


8. I use voyeurism advisedly. The sense of eavesdropping on sexual intimacies would be confirmed by a psychoanalytic interpretation of the ritual of the bullfight. As I remark later, among other things the bullfight enacts the primal scene fantasy, externalizing a child's notion of sexual intercourse as violent.

9. In At the Hemingways Marcelline tries at times to make her father appear to be good-humored. But the dominant impression she conveys is Clarence Hemingway's sternness and authoritarianism; see, e.g., pp. 31, 39–40, 44–45. Indeed, none of the sibling accounts of the Hemingway family portrays Clarence as a man who allowed himself much pleasure. Not even in "Sunny" Remembers does one find a picture of the doctor displaying anything that resembles his older son's most prominent feature, a broad smile. Of the book's eighteen pictures of him, he scarcely betrays a perceptible smile; most often he is in profile, looking at someone else in the photograph.

10. For a comparable view see Tony Tanner, The Reign of Wonder: Naivety and
Reality in American Literature (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1965). The prose sketches in In Our Time “are exercises in the unhysterical treatment of horror, attempts to achieve maximum factual clarity when confronted by scenes which are most calculated to stimulate a writer to emotional rhetoric” (p. 250).

11. Sanford, At the Hemingways, p. 124.

12. See, e.g., Grebstein, Hemingway’s Craft, p. 77; Hovey, Inward Terrain, p. 105–7; and Sheridan Baker, An Introduction, p. 87. Hemingway included the story in his next collection, Winner Take Nothing, minus the conversations between Author and Old Lady.

13. Waldhorn, in his Reader’s Guide, sides with the surgeon who “already knows what the officer must learn, that holding tight is almost all a man can salvage” (p. 134).


15. Hovey, Inward Terrain, p. 110.

16. For a succinct account of the conversion thesis, see Keneth Kinnamon, “Hemingway, the Corrida, and Spain,” Texas Studies in Literature and Language 1 (1959): 44–61, rpt. in Wagner, Five Decades, pp. 57–74. For an extreme version of the thesis, see Broer, Hemingway’s Spanish Tragedy, who argues that Hemingway’s “unwillingness to entertain any perspective other than that dictated by particularismo and pundonor [respectively, extreme anarchistic individualism and primitive aggressiveness] underlies the author’s work from Green Hills of Africa until the end of his life” (pp. 113–14). For a repetitive and overly rhetorical version of the conversion thesis, see Jose Luis Castillo-Puche, Hemingway in Spain: A Personal Reminiscence of Hemingway’s Years in Spain by His Friend, trans. Helen R. Lane (Garden City: Doubleday, 1974), pp. 213, 297 et passim.


18. For a similar interpretation, see John Reardon, “Hemingway’s Esthetic and Ethical Sportsmen,” University Review 34 (1967): 13–23; rpt. in Wagner, Five Decades, pp. 131–44.

19. The obvious source for my discussion here is James Joyce’s A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man. Hemingway’s friendship with the Irishman and high regard for his work seem sufficient to me to indicate that he knows—and that at some level of consciousness may be responding to—the working definitions of Saint Thomas Aquinus, so ably discussed by Stephen Dedalus; page references in my text are to the paperback Compass edition (New York: Viking Press, 1956).

20. Students of Kenneth Burke will recognize the debt my discussion of Hemingway’s esthetic owes to “Beauty and the Sublime” in Burke’s revised and abridged edition of The Philosophy of Literary Form (New York: Vintage, 1957). I quote him here at length to avoid editorial distortion and to indicate how extensively his theorizing applies to Hemingway’s practice:

> The whole subject of “beauty” became obscured in much aesthetic theory of the nineteenth century because it tended to start from notions of decoration rather than from notions of the sublime. There are many possible ingredients behind this motivation, among them being the fact that aesthetic theorizing was largely done by people in comfortable situations for people in comfortable situations. But there is a subtler factor operating here; poetry is produced for purposes of comfort, as part of the consolatio philosophiae. It is undertaken as equipment for living, as a ritualistic way of arming us to confront perplexities and risks. It would protect us.

> Let us remind ourselves, however, that implicit in the idea of protection there is the idea of something to be protected against. Hence, to analyze the element of comfort in beauty, without false emphasis, we must be less monistic, more “dialectical,” in that we include also, as an important aspect of the recipe, the element of discomfort (actual or threatened) for which the poetry is “medicine,”
therapeutic or prophylactic. And I submit that if we retraced the course of aesthetic speculation, until we came to its earlier mode, we should get a much more accurate description of what is going on in poetry. I refer to the time when the discussion explicitly pivoted about the distinction between the ridiculous and the sublime.

As soon as we approach the subject in these terms, we have in the very terms themselves a constant reminder that the threat is the basis of beauty. Some vastness of magnitude, power, or distance, disproportionate to ourselves, is "sublime." We recognize it with awe. We find it dangerous in its fascination. And we equip ourselves to confront it by piety, by stylistic medicine, and by structural assertion (form, a public matter that symbolically enrolls us with allies who will share the burdens with us). The ridiculous, on the contrary, equips us by impiety, as we refuse to allow the threat its authority; we rebel, and courageously play pranks when "acts of God" themselves are oppressing us.

Should we not begin treating all other manifestations of symbolic action as attenuated variants of pious awe (the sublime) and impious rebellion (the ridiculous)?

By starting with "the sublime and the ridiculous," rather than with "beauty," you place yourself forthwith into the realm of the act, whereas "beauty" turns out to be too inert in its connotations, leading us rather to over-stress the scene in which the act takes place. Confronting the poetic act in terms of "beauty," we are disposed to commit one or another of two heretical over-emphases: either we seek to locate beauty in the object, as scene, or by dialectical overcompensation we seek to locate it in the subject, as agent. Confronting the poetic act in terms of the sublime and the ridiculous, we are disposed to think of the issue in terms of a situation and a strategy for confronting or encompassing that situation, a scene and an act, with each possessing its own genius, but the two fields interwoven. [Pp. 51-52, 54]

Burke strikes me as employing some sophistry here. Responding to the sublime or the ridiculous we evaluate an agent performing an act within a scene; hence we evaluate not simply a "situation-confronting strategy" but the agent performing it as well, since it is he or she who interweaves those two fields. In effect Burke's esthetic theory, fond as it is of disembodied symbolic acts, seems partly an attempt to disguise the reentry of morality and ethics into the domain of esthetics. But his definition of the function of art as "a ritualistic way of arming us to confront perplexities and risks" assigns to art an ethical and didactic purpose that agrees well with Hemingway's work. Moreover, his three emphases—upon threat as the basis of beauty (a typical Burkean transmogrification of Freud's notion of art as wish-fulfillment), upon the act an agent performs in a scene rather than upon the scene or subject itself, and upon the obligation to accord judgments of sublime, ridiculous, or "attenuated variants" of those two—all three emphases remove art and the study of beauty from being a disinterested activity on the part of both creator and spectator. They insist upon the beauty of action, which applies cogently to the art of the matador.

21. Hemingway's study of the bullfight is consistent with his lifelong interest in athletics. But I would emphasize that his interest has been mistakenly viewed as an outgrowth of largely competitive and aggressive appetites. Those appetites exist in him, as they do in us, to be sure. But not to the exclusion of esthetic appetites as well. Indeed, inasmuch as no sport lacks some degree of esthetic movement—of linear grace, tactile fluency, physical rhythm, perceived vitality, muscular discipline, and improvisation—a good share of Hemingway's "outdoorsman's" interests seem dictated by a desire to see beauty and so to experience those emotions accruable to esthetic apprehension. Even more, Hemingway deserves some belated recognition as a pioneer in the esthetics of athletics. His efforts have been taken up more recently by educators and estheticians. See, for example, H. T. A. Whiting and D. W. Masterson, eds., Readings in the Aesthetics of Sport (London:
GREEN HILLS OF AFRICA


2. In "Notes on Dangerous Game: The Third Tanganyika Letter," By-Line, pp. 167-71, Hemingway assigns only the lion and the leopard the status of "dangerous game."

5. See ibid., pp. 403-16.


10. Hovey, Inward Terrain, p. 110.
11. I refer here to Watts, Hemingway and the Arts, and to Raymond S. Nelson, Hemingway: Expressionist Artist (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1979) (hereafter cited as Expressionist Artist). Watts does not ignore the esthetic of hunting, for she discusses Hemingway's "analogy between hunting kudu and visiting the Prado" (pp. 208-12). But it is puzzling why she fails to address the larger issue of how Hemingway's works respond to or challenge esthetic theories. Philip Young's foreword to the British edition of By-Line (London: Collins, 1968) also remarks the esthetics of hunting (pp. 23-24).


13. "Miss Mary's Lion," part 1, African Journal, Sports Illustrated, 20 December 1971, p. 4. The manuscripts of African Journal are still inaccessible, and I do not discuss this work at length elsewhere in my text. So perhaps this is the place to note that however piecemeal or patched Journal may be, its unifying principle is not Green Hills' esthetic one. Its unifying principle instead revolves around Hemingway's preoccupation with responsibilities, duties, obligations, pledges, and service. It, not Green Hills, deserves Philip Young's objection to Hemingway's "grinding need for self-justification" (Reconsideration, p. 97).

14. Hovey, Inward Terrain, p. 117; Waldhorn, Reader's Guide, arrives at a similar conclusion, p. 139.
16. Ibid.
17. Ortega y Gasset, Meditations on Hunting, p. 106.
18. Baker, Artist, cites Hemingway's description of the dead rhino as an example of ugliness (pp. 66-67).
19. Ortega y Gasset: "Suddenly, on the spine of a low ridge the stag appears to the hunter; he sees him cut across the sky with the elegant grace of a constellation,
launched there by the springs of his slender extremities. The leap of roe deer or stag—and even more of certain antelope—is perhaps the most beautiful event that occurs in Nature" (Meditations on Hunting, p. 91).


AFTERWORD TO THE ESTHETIC PHASE

1. Hovey, Inward Terrain, p. 117; for similar conclusions see Young, Reconsideration, p. 97, and Waldhorn, Reader’s Guide, p. 139.

2. Carlos Baker (Artist, pp. 165-74) and Sheridan Baker (An Introduction, pp. 90-96) are among the few who read Green Hills favorably, the latter even calling it “Hemingway’s most mature book” (p. 90).


6. Peterson, in Direct or Oblique, disapproves of the catalogue on the grounds that it is “meaningful primarily to himself of all the other things that he might have said about Spain but didn’t. This kind of catalogue seems to me illegitimate writing, a private indulgence in nostalgia” (p. 145).

7. Sanford, At the Hemingway’s, p. 26.

8. In the third section of his discussion of Afternoon, Carlos Baker (Artist, pp. 154-61) argues the basic pragmatism of the Hemingway hero. Yet if, as he contends, the matador offers the model of the hero, then the trait the matador shares with the Spanish people in general—impracticality—is a trait that ipso facto denies pragmatism. To define the Hemingway hero as pragmatist notes only muscle and ignores the strong sinew of idealism and principles that I find in even his least heroic protagonists. After all, even the matador does not believe, as a pragmatist should, that the end justifies the means. Were he to do so, the bullfight would lack all semblance of art. Neither can one validly declare, though Baker tries to, that the matador and the Hemingway hero are only empiricists, “perfectly practical Benthamites,” utilitarians. To argue this ignores the compound motives behind their actions. Worse, it fails to see that anyone who puts his life on the line for a symbolic act shows little practical judgment and deserves a more accurate label.


10. Hemingway objects to Waldo Frank, Virgin Spain: Scenes from the Spiritual Drama of a Great People (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1926), for interpreting the bullfight as “a searching symbol of the sexual act. The bull is male; the exquisite torero, stirring and unstirred, with hidden ecstasy controlling the plunges of the bull, is female” (p. 235). But the bullfight, like any richly symbolic action, condenses different levels of meaning and significance. So it is also valid to interpret it as does Steven R. Phillips “Hemingway and the Bullfight: The Archetypes of Tragedy” (Arizona Quarterly 29 [1973]: 37-56), as archetypally enacting the Dionysian myth and, thus, the religious, ritual slaying of the god. And Peterson, Direct and Oblique, correctly contends that the bullfight is also “a systematic, ordered, regressive ceremony” in which “one’s irrational or animal-like impulses are symbolically destroyed and one is symbolically cleansed” (p. 38). For an excellent summary of the folkloric origins and meanings of the bullfight as marriage

11. Rovit, *Hemingway*, pp. 70–71; Hovey, *Inward Terrain*, p. 118. A full psychoanalytic reading of the bullfight would also see in it the primal scene, the child’s imagined version of parents’ brutal violence during sexual intercourse.


14. Sanford, *At the Hemingway’s*, p. 82.

**TO HAVE AND HAVE NOT**


3. For a different reading of this novel as tragedy, see Wirt Williams, *The Tragic Art*, pp. 107–22.


8. My following discussion draws upon Gerald F. Else’s brilliant translation and commentary, *Aristotle’s Poetics: The Argument* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963); parenthetical numbers in the text are page references to this edition. For a fine, brief discussion of Else’s major points about tragedy, especially “catharsis,” see Lois M. Welch, “Catharsis, Structural Purification, and Else’s Aristotle,” *Bucknell Review* 19 (1971): 31–50. So far none of the records of Hemingway’s libraries or reading show that he even knew Aristotle’s work, but, as Reynolds demonstrates, Hemingway was a compulsive reader of literary criticism and was well versed in the classics (*Hemingway’s Reading*, pp. 23, 25, 26, 30, 31).


14. For a view of Harry as victim, see Baker, *Artist*, p. 213.

15. Donaldson, *By Force of Will*, p. 110, also notes this ambiguity.


17. See, however, Hemingway’s letter to Lillian Ross, 28 July 1948, in which he asks her to tell Brendan Gill of the worth of To Have and Have Not. He likens it to a jerry-built, quickly fortified military position that is flawed but defensible. He goes on to say that the novel is considerably better than most people regard it. And he admits that when he wrote it he was “all fucked up,” “threw away about 100,000 words” that were superior to much of what he kept. He concludes by calling it “the most cut book in the world” (Letters, pp. 648–49).


FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS


3. See, for example, Lionel Trilling, “An American in Spain,” in The Partisan Reader, ed. William Phillips and Philip Rahv (New York: Dial Press, 1946), rpt. in Baker, Critiques, p. 78; and Hovey, Inward Terrain, who designates it a “gaudy tour de force made tolerable by Hemingway’s romanticizing the subject as a curiosity of gypsy lore” (p. 167).

4. In a letter to Max Perkins dated 26 August 1940, Hemingway vigorously objected to the suggestion that he cut this material, insisting about the smell-of-death material, for example, that it was necessary to the various effects he was after. He even compares such cuts to pulling a bass or an oboe from a symphony orchestra (Letters, 513).
5. To measure the epic inflation this passage experienced, compare its 47-word predecessor in *Death in the Afternoon*, p. 44.

6. See, for example, Frohock, "Violence and Discipline," pp. 259-60. Readers would do well to heed C. S. Lewis's observation in *A Preface to Paradise Lost* (London: Oxford University Press, 1942): "The misunderstanding of the species (epic narrative) I have learned from the errors of critics, including myself, who sometimes regard as faults in *Paradise Lost* those very properties which the poet laboured hardest to attain and which, rightly enjoyed, are essential to its specific delightfulness" (p. 2).

7. Else, Aristotle's *Poetics*, p. 569; subsequent citations from this edition are included in the text.


9. For a scholarly discussion of the kinds of epic see Else's commentary, pp. 525-33 and 595-600.


11. Martha Gellhorn remembers that at the time Hemingway was composing the novel in Cuba he was also reading "The History of the Peninsular Wars," (MG to GB, 7 March 1976). I assume that she has confused *Peninsular for Persian*, that Herodotus's nine-volume history was the work Hemingway was reading, for he includes the episode "The Pass at Thermopylae" in his 1,100-page anthology of war stories, *Men at War: The Best War Stories of All Times* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1942). Hemingway also includes in this epic-sized volume "Horatius at the Bridge" from Livy's *The History of Rome* (Robert Jordan alludes to the heroes of both works on p. 164) and "The March to the Sea" from Xenophon's *Anabasis*. This last abounds in epic struggles to cross mountain passes and rivers, those two geographic features essential to the heroism of Leonidas, Horatius, and now Robert Jordan.


13. See Werner Jaeger, *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, trans. Gilbert Highet (New York: Oxford University Press, 1945), vol. 1, esp. the chapters entitled "The Culture and Education of the Homeric Nobility" (pp. 15-34) and "Homer the Educator" (pp. 35-56).


17. See Keneth Kinnamon, "Hemingway, the *Corrida*, and Spain," for a comparable conclusion on Hemingway's use of type characters: "Hemingway had to sacrifice a minor point of psychological propriety in order to gain the more important objective of national scope. The microcosm of the guerrilla band is intended to represent the macrocosm of the whole Spanish people" (p. 60).


19. The power of the supernatural might also be imbedded in the novel's language, as Robert O. Stephens argues in "Language Magic and Reality in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*," *Criticism* 14 (1972): 151-64, rpt. in Wagner, *Five Decades*, pp. 266-79.


21. For a different view of the novel's structure, see Baker, *Artist*, pp. 245-47, and Grebstein, *Hemingway's Craft*, pp. 42-51. I commend the thoroughness of
Grebstein’s analysis but do not share his conclusion about all the antitheses, counterpoint, and patterns of alternation: “the result is anything but monotonous or mechanical” (p. 47).

22. The exception to Hemingway’s use of the civil war metaphor is the relationship between Jordan and Maria, little conflict or tension visible in it. Although congruent with epic conventions, it is incongruent with the novel’s metaphor.


AFTERWORD TO THE ARISTOTELIAN PHASE

1. Lloyd (“Pappy”) R. Arnold, in High on the Wild with Hemingway (Caldwell, Idaho: Caxton Printers, 1968), recalls Hemingway commenting on his father’s suicide: “But, he said that the basis of his father’s dilemmas was domination, ‘by my mother, she had to rule everything, have it all her own way, and she was a bitch! . . . True, it was a cowardly thing for my father to do, but then, if you don’t live behind the eyes you can’t expect to see all of the view. I know that part of his view, and I suppose he was mixing it up some . . . and you do such a thing only when you are tortured beyond endurance, like in a war, from an incurable disease, or when you hasten a drowning because you can’t swim all of the sea’ ” (p. 79; Arnold’s punctuation).

2. Hemingway’s antagonism toward capitalism may have been aimed at his uncle George Hemingway for failing to help his brother Clarence during the latter’s period of financial troubles, which contributed to his suicide. See Hemingway’s letter to his mother, 11 March 1929, Letters, p. 296.

3. The brilliant dramatic monologue “After the Storm,” in which Harry’s prototype is first given voice, supports this identification. The anonymous narrator is depicted as a barroom brawler and an amoral opportunist, someone who sees only loot, not human suffering, in the sunken ocean liner he happens upon. But his failure to penetrate the liner’s porthole and to strip the jewels from the drowned woman in the stateroom suggests either his impotence or his unwillingness to gratify erotic impulses. Either way, his primary wish, to get paternal approval, seems evident in his motives for telling his story. One motive is to reveal that he is not an erotic rival. Another is to demonstrate his concern for a father figure. The last third of the story, that is, documents his attempt to reconstruct for his listener precisely what must have occurred and how the captain of the sunken liner must have felt when surprised by the quicksand. This act of imagination, compassion, and empathy reveals his feeling for a father figure, one who died a victim of the treacherous waters whose hidden quicksand erotically horrifies Hemingway’s unconscious as the vortex in “The Descent into the Maelstrom” does Poe’s and the shivering sands in The Moonstone does Wilkie Collins’s.

4. Several letters Hemingway wrote during this period vouch for his self-contempt and his contempt for Pauline. He wrote to her mother 26 January 1936 confessing that he had been “gloomy” and had “had the real old melancholia” (Letters, pp. 435-36). A year later, on 9 February 1937, along the right margin of a letter to “The Pfeiffer Family” he wrote a note that seems to protest too much: “I’m very grateful to you both for providing Pauline who’s made me happier than I’ve ever been” (Letters, p. 458). Two months before this letter Hemingway had already met his next wife. See also EH to Archibald MacLeish, 5 May 1943, Letters, pp. 545-46.


7. David J. Gordon, “The Son and the Father: Responses to Conflict in Hem-
ingway’s Fiction,” in his Literary Art and the Unconscious, remarks that “the private nature of the battle Jordan is fighting” is due to his father’s suicide, but concludes that it has no “formal relation to the narrative” (p. 188).

8. Hovey, Inward Terrain, regards Anselmo and Pablo as the novel’s only “two contrasting father figures” (p. 163).

9. Richard Drinnon, “In the American Heartland: Hemingway and Death,” discusses the homoerotic aspect of military society in Hemingway (pp. 12-18) and Jordan’s disingenuous discussion of marriage with Maria (p. 15).

10. As my discussion here implies, the unconscious implications of For Whom the Bell Tolls also address Hemingway’s ambivalence toward women. His several marriages show his need for heterosexual relationships, and his early and middle work values women enough to tie his plots to love stories. But the excessive brutality he writes into Maria’s background suggests a deep-seated hostility toward women. After all, Hemingway’s dramatization of Maria’s character would be unchanged if she had only been raped. But to that disgrace he adds the horror of having her watch her parents’ execution and the mortification of being sexually disfigured, as the shearing of her hair indicates. These details argue Hemingway’s sadistic pleasure in vilifying Maria and, through her, the female sex. Jordan’s rejection of Maria at the novel’s end unequivocally demonstrates this to me; for that gesture reveals Hemingway’s fundamental feeling that allegiance to women is ultimately an unworthy or ignoble commitment for a man. Likewise, Hemingway’s ambivalence surfaces in his portrait of Pilar. He respects her strength and assertiveness inasmuch as they enable her to assume leadership of the band when Pablo defaults. Yet those very qualities figured large in the contours of the woman Hemingway presumably hated, his domineering mother. (For an interesting discussion of Pilar’s resemblance to a second woman who generated strongly mixed feelings in Hemingway, Gertrude Stein, see Nelson, Expressionist Artist, pp. 38-40.) Despite their manifest differences, Mrs. Hemingway’s alliance to a man whose professional status belied his private weakness seems duplicated in Pilar’s alliances with Pablo and Finito, the latter a man whose professional status as courageous matador belies his private fear of bulls, even when presented with the mounted head of one as a tribute. Finally, though the novel might reflect Hemingway’s love for his blond-haired third wife, projected as she seems to be in the tawny-haired Maria, the reverse seems more likely. For Martha Gellhorn, to whom the novel is dedicated, little resembles the adoring “rabbit,” Maria. Indeed, the novel defines the kind of woman to whom Hemingway thinks he could be devoted and true—a subservient female who, despite “a great soreness and much pain” (341), will nevertheless suffer coitus with him. A woman with backbone who pursued her own career, Martha might well regard Hemingway’s portrayal of Maria as a slap in the face. I am not surprised at her declaration that she dislikes the book. But according to her own account, if there is some malice toward her in the novel, Hemingway had reason for putting it there: she was not an approving audience to the early version of the novel; and so, feeling abused and angry, he found hunting and fishing friends to read his material to (MG to GB, 7 March 1976).

ACROSS THE RIVER AND INTO THE TREES


2. Respectively, Benson, Self-Defense, pp. 52-53; Young, Reconsideration, pp. 117-18; D’Agostino, “The Later Hemingway,” p. 158; and Hovey, Inward Terrain, pp. 177-78.


4. I own that this idea must seem farfetched. And that is exactly how Mary Hemingway saw it, as a sufficiently outlandish example of the kind of queries we
English professors bother her with to single it out for ridicule in *How It Was*: “The professors are invariably writing dissertations or articles for scholarly reviews on such ambiguous or abstruse topics as that *Across the River and into the Trees* is an ‘imitation’ of the *Divine Comedy*. Did Ernest discuss Aristotle’s *Poetics*, this scholar asked recently, and was he reading Dante and discussing him with me or others while he was writing the Venice book?” (p. 532). She did answer my inquiry, thought my “imitation” idea purely charlatanical, and emphasized that Hemingway took no time to read—and certainly not to discuss—Dante, either with his wife or friends. Indeed, the idea of discussing any book he was in the process of writing was completely alien to him. In their seventeen years together, he never once discussed his work with her, she maintains (MH to GB, 4 August 1975). There is this, however, in a letter Hemingway wrote to John Dos Passos on 17 September 1949: “Since trip to Italy have been studying the life of Dante. Seems to be one of the worst jerks that ever lived, but how well he could write! This may be a lesson to us all” (Letters, p. 677).

5. Perhaps I should accede to what Carlos Baker says, writing of resemblances between Hemingway’s works and “the European masters,” “that Hemingway’s doctrine of ‘imitation’ is of a special kind. What he imitates is nature, the world around him, expansed before his eyes. Dante, like his renaissance audience, is dead. What [Hemingway] seeks to imitate is not the texture, it is the stature of the great books he reads and the great pictures he admires” (*Artist*, p. 186). But Baker’s statement fails to define Hemingway’s special kind of imitation; the statement applies equally to a host of writers who could also be said to imitate nature, Alexander Pope among them. And Baker fails to specify what Hemingway does to imitate the stature of great books; indeed, one can emulate the stature of something else but not imitate its stature. Moreover, what makes Baker’s own book so valuable is his analysis of Hemingway’s artistic experimentation and literary sophistication. His critical approach might almost be called generic, so alert is he to the traditional genres, modes, literary devices, and allusions that surface so often in Hemingway’s works that they are the means by which Baker discerns Hemingway’s experimental virtues. Of *Across the River*, for example Baker remarks that its “mood is Dantesque” and that “it occupied a different genre within the broad range of possibilities which fiction may legitimately invoke” (*Artist*, p. xviii).


7. The novel’s allusions to *Othello* might make us think that if Hemingway is consciously competing with a dead man, it is Shakespeare, not Dante. But those allusions have so little to do with the novel’s plot or Cantwell’s preoccupations that I see them—as I do the novel’s frame tale of duck-hunting—as decoys. Hemingway would doubtlessly scoff at my reading, having rejected Philip Young’s comparable notion that “the basic symbols in ‘The Snows of Kilimanjaro’ were derived from Flaubert and Dante,” as Baker records in *Life Story*, p. 509. But to take in good faith Hemingway’s rejections of specific interpretations would be critical naivety. It would ignore his defensiveness, his acknowledgment that undiscerned things may lurk in his fiction, his unwillingness to discuss his writing lest it crack the structure of the fragile part of writing, and his long-standing anxiety that “you’ll lose it if you talk about it.” (*Sun Rises*, p. 245). For a different conclusion of Hemingway’s rival, see Nicholas Gerogiannis, “Hemingway’s Poetry: Angry Notes of an Ambivalent Overman,” *College Literature* 7 (1980): 248–62, who finds evidence that *Across the River* was indebted to Gabrielle D’Annunzio’s novels *Notturno* and *The Flame*.

8. Peter Lisca, “The Structure of Hemingway’s *Across the River and into the Trees*,” *Modern Fiction Studies* 12 (1966), discusses this feature: “the novel is really a first person narration of events in the past but disguised as third person narration through the device of using the shooter as a persona through
whom the Colonel thinks about himself. The result is that we know the Colonel only as he knows himself, but with the authority and the effects which accrue to the interior monologue by virtue of its disguise as omniscient third person narration” (p. 236).


13. Hemingway includes this episode in *Men at War*, pp. 531–39.


15. This comparison is also noted by Lisca, “The Structure,” p. 250, and Lewis, *Hemingway on Love*, pp. 182.

16. Baker, *Artist*, pp. 268–74, also attends to Cantwell’s divided nature, with different conclusions.

**AFTERWORD TO THE IMITATIVE PHASE**


4. Harold Bloom explores this idea, albeit esoterically, in *The Anxiety of Influence*.


8. Having asserted this earlier, I should acknowledge that there is some critical dispute over precisely what Renata’s “disappointment” for Cantwell is. Lewis, *Hemingway on Love*, p. 186, argues that she is pregnant, a conclusion that Wylder, *Hemingway’s Heroes*, concurs with, pp. 188–93. Not only do I find more persuasive Lisca’s argument in “The Structure,” p. 236, that she is menstruating, but I do not understand how Renata’s pregnancy would be a disappointment to a man who has no children, no way to keep his memory alive. Cantwell pities his “poor Daugh-
ter’ " (110) simply because she will experience only a clitoral orgasm achieved through the manipulations of “his ruined hand” (153).


10. Sanford, At the Hemingway’s, pp. 224–32.

11. Baker, Life Story, p. 475, 487, remarks on the composite identity of Cantwell. Though Hemingway dedicated this novel to Mary Hemingway, his letters to Lan­ham indicate his deep respect for this professional soldier as well as his wish to be deserving of Lanham’s regard; see, e.g., his letters of 15 April and 11 September 1950, Letters, pp. 686–88, 714–16.


13. Baker reports that when Hemingway was composing Across the River he got his gorge up against his mother. Hearing of her intention to grant an interview to McCall’s magazine, he warned her that if she granted it “he would cut her off without a penny.” In the same context Baker reports, “Sometime in the Depres­sion, when Ernest had ordered her to sell the worthless Florida real estate, she had warned him never to threaten her: his father had tried it once when they were first married, and he had lived to regret it” (Life Story, p. 474). Now that his mother was seventy-seven, he had little fear of reprisal. See his letters to Charles Scribner, Sr., 27 August 1949, and to his mother, 17 September 1949, Letters, pp. 670, 675–76.


16. MH to GB, 4 August 1975.

THE OLD MAN AND THE SEA


3. For a different reading of Santiago’s wishes, see Baker, Artist, pp. 306–7, and Benson, Self-Defense, p. 174.

4. Rovit, Hemingway, sees Santiago in mythic terms that echo the brother’s keeper role, saying that Santiago “has been a champion of mankind for men and not for himself. He has brought back from his isolation a fragmented gift offering to his fellows, an imperfect symbol to suggest where he has been and what he has found there” (p. 89). For a different emphasis upon the fraternal motif see Lewis, Hemingway on Love, pp. 203–6, 211–12.

5. I agree with Hovey, Inward Terrain, pp. 201–3, who contends that among Hemingway’s motives for writing Old Man is his wish for reconciliation with his own father. Having reached the age at which his long-internalized father presumably poses no real threat to his own psyche, and harboring guilt for parricidal wishes in daydreams and in earlier works, Hemingway may here be making fictional amends. A sure way to do this is to create a father image refulgent with benevolence, courage, and harmlessness. This possible intention is buttressed by seeing Hemingway’s wish for reconciliation projected in Manolin’s worshipful at­titude toward Santiago. Further, because the marlin’s “power and his beauty” complement Santiago’s qualities, the old man and the huge marlin form a double image of an idealized father whom this novella applauds. Nevertheless, from a slightly altered perspective Santiago and the marlin are the ancient antagonists, son and father, of the Oedipal struggle. If we rightly interpret killing bulls and
shooting large animals as displaced enactments of parricidal wishes, then the logic of identifying oversized creatures with father images must apply here too.


9. Ibid., p. 489.


11. For a well-researched and cautious conjecture that the novella was written in the mid-thirties, see Darrell Mansell, “When Did Hemingway Write The Old Man and the Sea?” Fitzgerald/Hemingway Annual 1975, pp. 311-24.


13. Baker, Life Story, p. 506. See also Waldhorn, Reader’s Guide, p. 255; and Hemingway’s letters to Philip Percival, 4 September 1955, Letters, pp. 845-46; to Charles Scribner, Jr., 25 February 1952, p. 756; and to Archibald MacLeish, 15 October 1958, p. 886. This last letter’s reference to “Gigi” is one of the few letters in which Carlos Baker uses ellipses: “Occasional brief deletions have been made in order not to hurt the feelings of living persons” (p. xxv).

14. Wylder, Hemingway’s Heroes, pp. 219-21; see also Leonard Lutwack, Heroic Fiction: The Epic Tradition and American Novels of the Twentieth Century (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1971), p. 87, and Benson, Self-Defense, p. 178: “Santiago catches his fish to prove, in part, that he is a more worthy father-mother than the boy’s real parents.” Unlike me, neither Wylder, Lutwack, nor Jackson questions Santiago for such motives. Though Wylder calls them “sinfully human,” he also insists upon their saintliness inasmuch as they perform the Christ-like function of delivering “Manolin from the authority of his parents,” of “setting a man at variance against his father,” says Wylder, quoting from Matthew 10:35. What Wylder is unwilling to question is why Santiago’s authority is preferable to Manolin’s parents’. A nobler motive would be to free Manolin from the authority of all father figures, to encourage the boy’s independence and, thereby, his maturation.

15. For a different view of this conflict, see William J. Handy, “A New Dimension for a Hero: Santiago of The Old Man and the Sea,” in Six Contemporary Novels: Six Introductory Essays in Modern Fiction, ed. William O. S. Sutherland, Jr. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1962), pp. 63-64. I emphasize “ordered” to remark that it is one of the few additions Hemingway made to his typescript of the novel, inserting the words “at their orders” in the novella’s third sentence, “and the boy had gone at their [his parents’] orders in another boat . . .” See item 190 in the Hemingway Collection. This addition emphasizes, I think, Santiago’s conflict with Manolin’s parents and with Manolin’s obedience.


18. Hofling, “Hemingway’s The Old Man and the Sea and the Male Reader,” acknowledges that Santiago “is in conflict about the dependent aspects of” his and Manolin’s relationship. But surprisingly he regards it as a conflict of “only moderate intensity” and accepts at face value “the essentially unambiguous nature of the Old Man’s emotions and behavior toward Manolin. The fisherman shows a sustained kindness to the boy, a graciousness even, which could not exist in the presence of strong, negative feelings” (p. 165; italics added).
ISLANDS IN THE STREAM

1. Carlos Baker, *Artist*, pp. 379-84, 389, 397, tells that Hemingway wrote a nearly 1,000-page draft of the "Bimini" section between 1946 and April 1947, although he may have begun it as early as 1945. He returned to the section during the summer of 1951 and began revising it, cutting by three-fifths a 484-page portion of the original manuscript. But it remained a relatively amorphous manuscript until Mary Hemingway and Charles Scribner, Jr., worked on it during the winter of 1969-70. Drafted in the early weeks of December 1950, the "Cuba" section was completed, Hemingway declared, on Christmas Eve. He apparently never returned to it. Mary Hemingway made only a "few block-deletions" in it. The "At Sea" section, written during the spring months of 1951, required only "copy-editing." My study of the *Islands* manuscripts shows that Mary Hemingway and Charles Scribner, Jr., resolved, for better or for worse, four problems. One was the narrative point of view. On the revised manuscript/typescript that Hemingway worked over between 1 May and 6 August 1951, he questions whether to leave the section as a first-person narrative told by George Thomas, a painter, or to change it to a limited third-person narrative, told through George's perspective (*Catalog of Hemingway Collection*, p. 15, item 103). A second problem was whether to keep what Hemingway had drafted as four chapters of book 2, Roger and Helena (i.e., Audrey), lovers, driving from Miami to Louisiana (*Catalog of Hemingway Collection*, p. 14, item 98, sections 14-18, pp. 680-907 in holograph; or p. 15, item 102, 180-page uncorrected typescript). The third problem was whether to change Roger Hancock's or George Thomas's name to Thomas Hudson. The significance of this problem cannot be underestimated, for along with it came the fourth problem of whether to keep the three sons Roger's, as in the original and revised manuscripts, or to make them George Thomas's.

5. Had Mary Hemingway and Charles Scribner, Jr., left Roger Hancock (Davis) father to the three boys and then assigned him the name of Thomas Hudson, as the corrected typescript shows Hemingway did in places, then Hudson's aggressiveness and brooding remorse in "Cuba" and "At Sea" would be consistent with his character as portrayed in "Bimini."

11. See his letters to Charles Scribner, 20 July and 5 October 1951; to Patrick Hemingway, 16 September 1950; and to Wallace Meyer, 4 and 7 March 1952; *Letters*, pp. 730-32, 738, 734, 757.
12. See, for example, the collection of reviews on the novel in Stephens, *Critical Reception*, pp. 439-76.
22. Hemingway’s filicidal wishes would have focused upon Gregory. His refractoriness included, he owns, experimentation with drugs and taking sides with his mother against Hemingway (Papa, pp. 6-8). His attitude toward Old Man as “sentimental slop” would not mollify his father’s wishes (Baker, Life Story, p. 506).

THE DANGEROUS SUMMER

1. Hotchner, Papa Hemingway, pp. 237, 239; I parenthesize in my text subsequent page references to this book. Baker, Life Story, says the finished manuscript was 120,000 words (p. 552).
2. Castillo-Puche, Hemingway in Spain, comments upon Hemingway’s distraught tinkering (pp. 318-22, 325); I parenthesize in my text subsequent page references to this book. Among the more conspicuous unravelings are the references to seeing Antonio at Cordoba—an episode never directly addressed in the text—and the vagueness in the Valencia bullfights in the second installment; with no clear transition Hemingway switches from a standard corrida with its three matadors to the first genuine mano a mano, Ordóñez and Dominguín each fighting three bulls.
3. Mary Hemingway declares that because the published chapters are so abridged, any reading of The Dangerous Summer is completely irrelevant. Even more, there can be, she maintains, no justification for believing that the work is an important part of Hemingway’s canon (MH to GB, 14 February 1976). Now that the manuscripts, typescripts, notes, and fragments for Summer are a part of the Kennedy Library’s Hemingway Collection, students and scholars may be able to determine for themselves whether the text is important to Hemingway’s canon. See Catalog of Hemingway Collection. “Recent Accessions,” 5 January 1982, Items 354, a-g, n.p., Vol. I.
5. See also Shay Oag, *In the Presence of Death: Antonio Ordóñez* (New York: Coward-McCann, 1969), p. 172: "The overall treatment of the fights [Hemingway] saw and the conclusions he drew are not only portentous and melodramatized, but in some cases unjust and inaccurate too. Given the fact that he was understandably impassioned by Ordóñez and for years had been aware of the quality of his art, there was surely no need to work up the rivalry of Los Dos into some kind of bloodthirsty *Duel in the Sun.*"

6. For the Spanish reaction see, for example, Castillo-Puche, *Hemingway in Spain,* pp. 244-47. In noting these discrepancies I admit that there is a question of Hotchner's and Castillo-Puche's reliability. But the two authors' antipathy for each other is some guarantee of their fidelity to many of the facts of the summers of 1959 and 1960. And when in doubt, I have consulted Oag's book. Castillo-Puche made no attempt to hide his contempt for Hotchner (e.g., pp. 82, 196), causing Hotchner to sue the Spaniard's American publisher for libel, a suit that won Hotchner $125,000, even after the decision was appealed. For his part, Hotchner does not acknowledge that Castillo-Puche even existed, much less that he was part of the quadrilla that danced attention around "Ernesto."

7. Although he is not known for distinguished literary criticism, John O'Hara came to much the same conclusion in a September 1960 letter to William Maxwell, his editor at the *New Yorker*: "There was always great art in Hemingway, often when he was at his mumbling worst. But in the *Life* pieces we see our ranking artist concerned with a disgusting spectacle, adopting a son-hero and wishing him dead in conflict with a former son-hero, Dominguin, whom he also wishes dead. He wants to see them die, to be there when they die, and I got the feeling that he particularly wanted Dominguin to die because Dominguin had not been as easy to adopt as Ordóñez. Hemingway is *afraid* to lose Dominguin in life, and rather than lose him in life he wishes him dead. The competition between the two bull-fighters, as presented by Hemingway, actually gets us away from the bull ring and could just as well have been a fight with knives between the two son-heroes. It is a terrible thing to get old that way, as Hemingway has done; to feel so strongly about two young men that you want them to kill each other, to play the one you like less against the one you like more—Ordóñez against Dominguin" (in Matthew J. Bruccoli, *The O'Hara Concern: A Biography of John O'Hara* [New York: Random House, 1975], p. 270).


10. Ibid., p. 532.


12. Hotchner, of course, was no more present at Manolete's goring than Hemingway had been at Joselito's, Granero's, or Varelito's fatal gorings, even though *Death in the Afternoon* implies that he was. For a more detailed account of the Manolete-Dominguin rivalry, see Viertel, "Dominguin," pp. 126, 128.


14. See Hemingway's letter to Patrick Hemingway, 5 August 1959: "Being around Antonio is like being with you or Bum except for having to sweat him out all the time" (*Letters,* p. 895).

**A MOVEABLE FEAST**


3. For the history of Hemingway's composition of *Feast,* see Baker, *Artist,* pp. 351-54, and, more recently, Jacqueline Tavernier-Courbin, "The Mystery of the Ritz Hotel Papers," *College Literature* 7 (1980): 289-303. Both scholars remark that the alleged chronology of the book's composition is riddled with contradictions. And there is proof, of course, that some of the material had been composed long before 1957, most notably the Ford Madox Ford sketch. It had formed part of the two chapters that Hemingway cut from *The Sun Also Rises*—following F. Scott Fitzgerald's advice—as reported in Philip Young and Charles W. Mann, "Fitzgerald's *Sun Also Rises*: Notes and Comments," *Fitzgerald/Hemingway Annual* 1970, pp. 1-9.


7. See, for example, Edmund Wilson's review of *Islands in the Stream,* "An Effort at Self-Revelation," *New Yorker,* 2 January 1971, in which he comments that Hemingway "allows himself little scope for malignity" in the novel (p. 60).

8. Hemingway's contempt for Fitzgerald's irresponsible ways would have been plainer had the published version of this epigraph included the sentence that Hemingway's finished typescript had left in: "He [Fitzgerald] ever needed some one as a conscience and he needed professionals or normally educated people to make his writing legible and not illiterate." See Jacqueline Tavernier-Courbin, "The Manuscripts of *A Moveable Feast,*" *Hemingway notes* 4 (1981): 12.

9. Hemingway's draft of an unpublished section on Ford harshly condemns him for his lies and for his offensive odors (item 180, Hemingway Collection, pp. 1, 3).

10. Hemingway's compulsion to be responsible is further verified by the trip he made to Paris in September 1959 to ensure the correctness of the Paris streets he refers to. Even Mary Hemingway was infected, making a trip to Paris in October 1963 to double-check his accuracy. See Baker, *Artist,* pp. 353 n, 358 n; Valerie Danby-Smith, "Reminiscence of Hemingway," *Saturday Review,* 9 May 1964, pp. 30-31, 57; and Mary Hemingway, *How It Was,* p. 502.

11. Item 188 in *Catalog of Hemingway Collection,* p. 26, is the typescript of Hemingway's "finished" version of *Feast,* a version that differs significantly from the published text. Though many of the changes made by Mary Hemingway and L. H. Brague, with whom she worked on *Feast,* were perhaps necessary, the decision to alter Hemingway's sequence of the early chapters was neither necessary nor wise. Hemingway has the chapter "Une Génération Perdue" follow "The End of an Avocation" and precede "Hunger Was a Good Discipline." Although the published sequence provides continuity by keeping together the first two chapters on Stein, his sequence better emphasizes the contrast between Stein and Sylvia Beach, the bad and good mothers of *Feast.* The second chapter, "Miss Stein Instructs," balances Gertrude's dogmatic condescension against Sylvia's trusting assistance in Hemingway's intended third chapter, "Shakespeare and Company." Similarly if "Génération" had been left to come just before "Hunger," Hemingway's intended point would have again been italicized, for Stein includes him among the lost generation that has "no respect for anything." But Sylvia, a concerned "mother" in "Hunger," is confident of his ability: "But, Hemingway, don't
worry about what [your stories] bring now. The point is that you can write them. 

They will sell" "(71). In addition, though a minor point, early in the "Généra-
tion" chapter Hemingway mentions that he could get books "from Sylvia Beach's 
library or find [them] along the quais" (26). This might well puzzle a reader the first 
time through Feast, since it is not until the next two chapters that Hemingway 
acquaints us with both Sylvia and the bookstalls along the quais. For several of 
the changes in Hemingway's Feast manuscripts, see Jacqueline Tavernier-
Courbin, "The Manuscripts of A Moveable Feast." For the significant changes see 
my article, "Are We Going to Hemingway's Feast?" in American Literature 
54 (1982): 528-44.

12. Hemingway's full account of his behavior after returning to Paris—to find 
that Hadley had indeed lost everything—is in the Hemingway Collection mate-
rials for Islands in the Stream. See pages 883-907 of item 98, the manuscript ver-
sion of book 2 of "Bimini," and pages 34-43 of items 102 and 103, the typescript of 
same, Catalog of Hemingway Collection, pp. 14-15.

13. Hemingway's reference to Hadley's "work at the piano" verbally slights her 
talent as a pianist. He also acknowledges no gratitude for the $8,000 left her when 
her maternal uncle died. That money propitiously expedited their first trip to Eu-
rope and enabled him to practice his craft without the immediate threat of poverty 
(Sokoloff, Hadley, p. 40).

14. Hemingway's only rival would be Joyce, the only other responsible family 
man in the memoirs. But Joyce, Hemingway notes, can afford to dine habitually at 
Michaud's, an "expensive restaurant for us" (56). And the one exchange Heming-
way has with Joyce occurs after a chance encounter on the boulevard Saint-
Germain. Hemingway insinuates that Joyce was returning from a self-indulgent 
afternoon at the matinee by himself (212).

15. Baker, Artist, p. 353. This holograph is not among the Hemingway Collection's items for Feast. And Charles Scribner, Jr., who has seen it, declares that he 
does not know where it might be.


17. See also Hemingway's letter to Philip Percival, 25 May 1956, Letters, p. 860.

18. Compare Grace Hemingway's letter chastizing her son's supposed miscon-
duct shortly after he turned twenty-one (Baker, Life Story, p. 72).

19. EH to Mrs. Madelaine H. ("Sunny") Mainland, ca. 15 August 1949, Letters, 
p. 663.

20 Hovey, Inward Terrain, p. 217, also identifies Gertrude Stein as a surrogate 
mother.

21. Sanford, At the Hemingways, p. 49.

22. Ibid., pp. 59-60; see also pp. 5, 18.

275; other excerpts from "Homage" are on pp. 269, 278.


26. Sanford, At the Hemingways, p. 123; Norman, Pound, pp. 280-82.

27. See Hemingway's letters dated 4 April, 10 and 31 August 1943, Letters,pp. 
544-45, 548, 549-50.

28. Eustace Mullins, This Difficult Individual, Ezra Pound (New York: Fleet 
Publishing Co., 1961), records both Hemingway's gift of money to Pound (p. 19) 
and his use of the Nobel Prize to announce that 1954 was "a good year to release 
1967), confirms this latter fact and notes that Pound framed in plastic the $1,500 
check Hemingway sent him after receiving the Nobel Prize (p. 84). Baker, Life 
Story, notes that Hemingway had sent an earlier check for $1,000 to Pound during

30. Ibid., p. 129.
31. Ibid., pp. 223–32.
32. Ibid., p. 229, italics added.
33. Ibid., p. 228.

EPILOGUE

