

2011

Transatlantic Baggage: Expatriate Paris, Modernism, and the Apprenticeship of Ernest Hemingway

Patrick Blair Bonds

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bonds, Patrick Blair, "Transatlantic Baggage: Expatriate Paris, Modernism, and the Apprenticeship of Ernest Hemingway" (2011).
LSU Doctoral Dissertations. 3304.

https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/3304

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

TRANSATLANTIC BAGGAGE: EXPATRIATE PARIS, MODERNISM, AND THE
APPRENTICESHIP OF ERNEST HEMINGWAY

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of English

by

Patrick Blair Bonds

B.A., Baylor University, 1994

M.A., University, 2000

M.Phil., University of Dublin, Trinity College, 2001

May 2011

For Shannon

who was always there and always believed in me

And Kennedy

who came along mid-way into this project

and showed me what it was all about

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project would not have been possible without the exceptional support and generosity of my dissertation director, J. Gerald Kennedy. His example has given shape to my career as a scholar and an educator. I would also like to acknowledge the expert guidance of my dissertation committee: Joseph Kronick, Michelle Masse, Katherine Henninger, and Elaine Maccio. From the beginning, they have helped me to understand how to ask the right questions.

During the course of this project, I was fortunate to have been awarded two research grants that supported travel to the Ernest Hemingway Collection at the John F. Kennedy Library in Boston, Massachusetts. For this invaluable opportunity, I wish to thank the Ernest Hemingway Society for the Smith-Reynolds Founders Fellowship and the John F. Kennedy Library Foundation for the Ernest Hemingway Research Grant.

Finally, I would like to recognize my family for their unflagging enthusiasm and encouragement. To my parents and my in-laws, I thank you. I would especially like to express my gratitude to my wife, Shannon, for all of the sacrifices that you have made on my behalf. To Kennedy, thank you for understanding in your own way all the times when daddy “gone to work.”

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	v
INTRODUCTION BECOMING MODERN	1
CHAPTER ONE MODERNIST PARIS, MODERN GENDER	9
CHAPTER TWO MENTORS	41
CHAPTER THREE JOURNALISM	74
CHAPTER FOUR THE MARRIAGE TALES	105
CHAPTER FIVE THE MALE TALES	127
CONCLUSION	161
WORKS CITED	172
VITA	181

ABSTRACT

“Transatlantic Baggage: Expatriate Paris, Modernism, and the Apprenticeship of Ernest Hemingway” argues that Hemingway’s expatriation and apprenticeship in modernist Paris from 1921-1925 provided an important impetus for his explorations in gender alterity. The project focuses on a critical-biographical rethinking of Hemingway’s literary development, integrating previous Hemingway biography and gender studies scholarship with new revelations from the manuscript of the forthcoming first two volumes of the Cambridge Edition of the Letters of Ernest Hemingway. An updated study of the author’s literary formation is long overdue; Charles Fenton’s The Apprenticeship of Ernest Hemingway: The Early Years (1954), for example, has served for more than fifty years as a valuable resource for understanding Hemingway’s early influences and sense of craft. But rather than present the arch of apprenticeship as a dynamic progression of received knowledge and job training, the following chapters foreground Hemingway’s instruction as a gendered process, a vocational formation deeply influenced by what Joseph Boone has called the “libidinal currents” of modernism as well as Hemingway’s complicated dealings with male and female tutelary figures, themselves often engaged in unconventional gender roles or sexual practices. Through new correspondence and manuscript analysis, I trace Hemingway’s movement from an objective, spectatorial view of modernist gender toward a more subjective, ambiguous treatment of his own hetero-masculine identity. Far from mastery, then, I show how Hemingway’s gender apprenticeship in Paris led to a progressive disorientation. From this perspective, the landscape of Hemingway’s apprenticeship now looks quite different from Fenton’s study in 1954. Although all the familiar landmarks are there – family, mentors, journalism, marriage, friendships – Hemingway’s transatlantic voyage signaled a sea change – the profound reconstitution of his views on gender and sexual identity.

INTRODUCTION

BECOMING MODERN

In 1915, at the age of sixteen, Ernest Hemingway made a written promise to himself, vowing to “do pioneering or exploring work in the 3 last great frontiers Africa, central south America or the country around and north of Hudson Bay” (qtd. in Reynolds, Young, 29). Within a year, he revised his goal, wishing to become a writer “whose last territory was those last great frontiers” (Reynolds, Young, 30). In his lifetime, Hemingway captured the public imagination and became an icon of American masculinity – world traveller, bullfight aficionado, boxer, hunter, deep-sea fisherman. But based on biographical evidence that was previously suppressed or dismissed, a more complex picture of Hemingway has emerged. For the past twenty-five years, Hemingway criticism has been dominated by a reconsideration of the complex exploration of gender issues throughout his work. In the wake of such publications as The Garden of Eden (published posthumously in 1986), Kenneth Lynn’s biography of Hemingway (1987), Mark Spilka’s Hemingway’s Quarrel with Androgyny (1990), Nancy Comley and Robert Scholes’ Hemingway’s Genders (1994), Carl Eby’s Hemingway’s Fetishism (1999), and Debra Modellmog’s Reading Desire (1999), a more complex picture of Hemingway has had a profound impact on how we view, among other things, the heroic image he so carefully cultivated, including his seemingly uncomplicated model of heterosexual manhood. In these portrayals, his storied heterosexuality and masculinity intermingle with his fascination with sexual twinning, androgynous lovemaking, sexual metamorphosis, and male and female homosexuality. This revised portrait of the author more accurately reflects the unconventional gender and sexual experiences Hemingway sought to understand in his life and in his work.

Similarly, my revisionist study involves an intense re-examination of how Hemingway’s expatriation and apprenticeship in modernist Paris from 1921-1925 provided an important

impetus for his explorations in gender alterity. The project focuses on a critical-biographical rethinking of Hemingway's literary development, integrating previous Hemingway biography and gender studies scholarship with new revelations from the manuscript of the forthcoming first two volumes of the Cambridge Edition of the Letters of Ernest Hemingway. Whereas many notable works of scholarship have focused on Hemingway's Paris years – Michael Reynolds' Hemingway: The Paris Years (1989), Peter Griffin's Less Than a Treason: Hemingway in Paris (1990), James R. Mellow's Hemingway: A Life Without Consequences (1992) – an updated study of Hemingway's literary formation is long overdue. Charles Fenton's The Apprenticeship of Ernest Hemingway: The Early Years (1954), for example, has served for more than fifty years as a valuable resource for understanding Hemingway's early influences and sense of craft. But a revised assessment, incorporating more recent theoretical and biographical knowledge as well as important archival sources not available at the time of Fenton's study, seems indispensable, given the new directions of inquiry and biographical perspectives that the much-awaited collected letters will provide. This project thus engages in a close reading of the 1921-1925 correspondence, especially letters never before printed or cited, paying particular attention to details that fill certain gaps in our biographical understanding of Hemingway's Paris years while identifying and annotating new information that may change our understanding of the young Hemingway and his emerging fiction. As much as possible, I supplement my discussion of Hemingway's fiction from this period with manuscript analysis; in the course of my archival research in the Hemingway Collection at the John F. Kennedy Library, I found it imperative to examine several manuscript versions of a published text, uncovering disguised or censored layers of story that reveal authorial contradictions, ambivalences, or anxieties.

Throughout, I foreground Hemingway's complex exploration of modern gender and sexuality. As a consequence, my view of his education as a writer departs in several distinct

ways from the view of apprenticeship outlined in Fenton's study. Spanning from Hemingway's earliest years in Oak Park to his final months as a journalist for the Toronto Star in 1923, Fenton's research elaborates what Randolph Shaffner in The Apprenticeship Novel has identified as "archetypal" apprenticeship traits (7). The archetypal pattern emphasizes an "idea of becoming [that] portrays itself in stages," Shaffner notes, "unfolding [the literary apprentice's] life from infancy to maturity until that form is attained which the [apprentice] intends" (8). Such a model presupposes that the apprentice reaches a final stage of formation, a definitive point of development in which he is "no longer an apprentice" and can "now prepare to serve with great caution as a master" (Shaffner 12). In these terms, Fenton thus describes his study as "a definition of the process" by which Hemingway "transposed a conventional talent into an artistic skill" (ix). By focusing on a model of craft apprenticeship – a system of education and job training by which important practical information was passed from one generation to the next – Fenton argues that the "principal instrument of [Hemingway's] literary apprenticeship was journalism" (ix). The arc of Hemingway's career in journalism, Fenton claims, "perfected" his "narrative talent" as well as "the development of such an important instrument of his fiction as dialogue" (257-258). Furthermore, the liberty he enjoyed as a foreign correspondent writing mostly feature work, Fenton maintains, "facilitated his training as a fictionalist through his appetite for human interest material" (258). Finally, the goal of a totalizing self-formation informs Fenton's final word, writing that Hemingway "had been a newspaperman, but he had become a writer" (263).

The theoretical framework that informs my re-examination of Hemingway's development during this period also utilizes the archetypal pattern of "definite phases or of a specific sequence of stages" (Shaffner 20). But rather than present the arch of self-formation as a dynamic progression of received knowledge and job training, the following chapters foreground

Hemingway's training as a gendered process, a vocational formation deeply influenced by what Joseph Boone has called the "libidinal currents" of modernism as well as Hemingway's complicated dealings with male and female tutelary figures, themselves often engaged in unconventional gender roles or sexual practices. Describing for his family in Oak Park his fascination with the Jardin des Plantes – one of "the largest zoological gardens in the world," housing an array of specimens such as he "has never seen before" (14 February 1922) – the exotic collection provided the provincial young newsman an apt symbol in microcosm of the frighteningly alien – yet powerfully attractive – display of new sexual and gender identities.

One of Hemingway's earliest stylistic experiments from Paris, an unpublished prose poem titled "Paris 1922," is an exercise in voyeuristic spectatorship that, as discussed in Chapter One, registers his initial impressions of the city's various *quartiers* and demonstrates his new fluency in reading what Mary Louise Roberts has described as the city's "complex visual language" ("Samson," 67). Reading this visual "text," I argue, enabled Hemingway to stage a new kind of modern knowledge – a whole set of gender anxieties revealing the war's effects on Paris, including the blurring or reversal of conventional male and female identities and boundaries. Chapter One traces Hemingway's movement from an objective, spectatorial view of modernist gender toward a more subjective, ambiguous treatment of his own hetero-masculine identity, as viewed in the original version and manuscript drafts of A Moveable Feast, his classic account of his Paris apprenticeship. The recent publication of additional Paris sketches (A Moveable Feast: The Restored Edition, 2009) and previously unpublished correspondence, I show, enables us to perceive with greater clarity the troubling questions and uncertain assumptions about sex, gender, and desire which inform not only his Paris memoir but the entire tenor of his apprenticeship period. I also demonstrate how the secret activities shared by the young writer and his wife, Hadley – an experiment in androgyny undertaken in late 1922 while

vacationing at Chamby sur Montreaux and, later, in Paris in 1924 – constituted for Hemingway more than the breaking of a gender or sexual taboo but threatened the loss of his own identity as a heterosexual male.

While the “secret” experiments and transgendered fantasies begun in 1922 mark the beginning of his lifelong fascination with the permeable borders of gender identity and sexual desire, Chapter Two examines how Hemingway’s early fiction was influenced by his exploration of questions of modern gender and sexuality by focusing on his relations with his principal literary mentors. Here a psychoanalytic approach to Hemingway’s gendered relationships reveals his projection of Oak Park family relations onto a host of Paris associations. In this context, I examine his friendships with Gertrude Stein and Ezra Pound in light of the influence of “strong” mothers and fathers, and his dealings with figures such as Ford Madox Ford and veteran newsman Lincoln Steffens as paternal surrogates. According to Harold Bloom, a younger artist engages in a kind of literary Oedipal struggle with his literary predecessors. Harboring mixed feelings of veneration, envy, and resentment for the strong literary influence, his efforts to overcome or displace his “fathers” results in an originality of his own – a form of literary patricide. Within the theoretical paradigm of Freud’s “family romance” and Bloom’s influence theory, this chapter surveys the gender-anxieties Hemingway professed was the legacy of what he would later call “dangerous families,” a product of what he perceived as a disappointing father and an overbearing mother. His unresolved grievances against his parents back home in Oak Park and his identification with older tutelary figures in Paris portray what Freud identifies as “the fulfillment of wishes and as a correction of actual life” (238). But his relation to Stein, for instance, also served to complicate his perception of homosexuality. Aside from Stein and Grace Hemingway’s closeness in age and physical appearance, Stein’s professed lesbianism was cause for Hemingway to revisit rumors from his childhood that Grace had a lesbian relationship with

her music pupil and household helper Ruth Arnold. Where Freud posits that the replacement of a parent figure is part of the quest for identity, the romance takes on an erotic orientation as curiosity about the sexual activities of the mother are often projected as illicit (van Boheemen 112-114); this curiosity about and identification with the mother, I suggest, figures prominently in Hemingway's fascination (and identification) with lesbians in Paris – with many of whom he became close friends – and it illuminates his repeated representations of lesbianism in texts such as “Mr. and Mrs. Elliot,” “A Sea Change,” and The Garden of Eden. In letters to Pound, Hemingway betrays a sense of gender-anxiety regarding the marital lives – and sexual proclivities – of fellow male artists. By turns viciously homophobic and frankly curious, Hemingway's increasing preoccupation with authors such as T.S. Eliot and Robert McAlmon exposes his internal grappling with different masculinities as he wrestled with doubts about his own masculine identity.

In Chapter Three, I examine Hemingway's quarrel with journalism as an essential marker of his masculinity. His desire to quit news work was thwarted, I argue, by his fear of emasculation and his craving for an uncomplicated hetero-masculine identity. Even though he devoutly wished to devote his full attention to writing serious fiction, abandoning his source of income meant financial dependence on Hadley's trust fund and tacit membership in the ranks of unemployed, aspiring artists who crowded the terraces of Montparnasse cafes. These alternative scenarios presented Hemingway with a crisis of masculinity, for both circumstances utterly challenged his conservative notions of manhood; when Hemingway resigned from the Star in late 1923 to return to Paris after a five-month sojourn in Toronto, the move marked a crucial moment in his gender education. His exposure to – and assimilation of – alternative modern masculinities was gradually taking hold.

The subject of marriage and modern gender inspired Hemingway to return to fiction in 1923, and forms the core of three stories written in 1924. Chapter Four analyzes these so-called “marriage tales” in the context of the 1920s modern domestic ideal – a heterosexual model that challenged his emotional dependence on intimate male-male relationships. For broiling beneath these tales of faltering heterosexual unions is an anxiety about the threat of losing the freedom and camaraderie of same-sex friendships. This apparently irreconcilable conflict between his desire for heterosexual intimacy and male companionship is also at the heart of several Nick Adams stories.

But by 1924-1925, Hemingway’s sexual education in Paris had also complicated his desire for intimacy with other men. Paris presented Hemingway with a disorienting sense of gender and sexual categories in crisis, an anxiety created by what Marjorie Gerber has defined as a “failure of definitional distinction” or “a borderline that becomes permeable, that permits a border crossing from one (apparently distinct) category to another” (16). Chapter Five probes Hemingway’s different perception of homosociality and homosexuality as he became more conscious of his own fascination with alternative sexual experiences and the erotic prospects of androgyny. This stage in Hemingway’s gender training culminated in the composition of The Sun Also Rises and a return to the subject of categories in crisis. About gender identity, as Ira Elliot has observed, the novel questions just “what Jake’s body means now that it lacks the signifying phallus” (251). About sexual identity, the liaison that Jake arranges between Brett and Pedro sets in motion a web in which desire flows in many directions – heterosexually, homosexually, and bisexually. That Hemingway opted to omit Hadley from his thinly-veiled roman à clef is a telling detail, for the triangular web of heterosexual and homosexual desire that the author explores required a relative freedom to position himself in a variety of sexual alignments. About male-male bonding, the novel has something to say about the blurred

borderlines of masculinity, where meanings of the homosexual, the homoerotic, and the homosocial are increasingly unstable.

Far from mastery, then, Hemingway's gender apprenticeship in Paris led to a progressive disorientation. The concluding section that follows looks past the author's formative years in Paris to synthesize the way in which the posthumous novels written at the end of his career persistently returned to an exploration of sex and gender that was initiated in Paris, his primal scene of instruction. From this perspective, the landscape of Hemingway's apprenticeship now looks quite different from Fenton's study in 1954. Although all the familiar landmarks are there – family, mentors, journalism, marriage, friendships – Hemingway's transatlantic voyage signaled a sea change, the profound reconstitution of his views on gender and sexual identity – adrift in the process of becoming.

CHAPTER ONE

MODERNIST PARIS, MODERN GENDER

In a previously unpublished letter from Paris to Oak Park on Valentine's Day, 1922, Ernest Hemingway describes to his family a tour of the exotic Jardin des Plantes, an appointment for tea at the poet Ezra Pound's, and a visit by Gertrude Stein, "who wrote Three Lives and a number of other good things" and "was here to dinner last night and stayed till midnight" [.]. Hemingway adds: "She is about 55 [Stein had just turned 48] I guess and very large and nice. She is very keen about my poetry – [.]" Eight weeks after the arrival of Ernest and Hadley in the capital, Hemingway's letter indicates the good luck of the young couple and their exciting new friendships in Paris. "We know a good batch of people now," Hemingway boasts, "and if we allowed it would have all our time taken up socially." As for Paris, he writes, it "is so very beautiful that it satisfies something in you that is always hungry in America." Not far from their fourth-floor residence at 74 rue du Cardinal Lemoine, he reports, is "one of the largest zoological gardens in the world," housing "hundreds of animals and birds Oinbones [Ernest] has never seen before."

Far from Oak Park, and from the great Middle American cities of Kansas City and Chicago, Hemingway expresses understandable wonder about the neighboring Jardin des Plantes. The exotic collection of specimens provided Hemingway a useful symbol in microcosm of the unconventional cultural, social, and sexual currents he encountered in Paris. "Nothing was simple there," he would later write of the city, least of all relationships between its inhabitants (AMF 58). "It was easy to be confused in Paris," Michael Reynolds observes, "where seemingly responsible adults did not behave as they did in Oak Park, where gender and sexual preferences were not always obvious, and where the rules Hemingway inherited had little bearing on the games being played in the cafes and salons" (33). More than a few of Hemingway's first

friendships in Paris – with Ezra Pound, Dorothy Shakespear, Gertrude Stein, Alice B. Toklas, Sylvia Beach, Adrienne Monnier, and Robert McAlmon – exposed him to individuals whose gender and sexual identities, unconventional heterosexual marriages, and homosexual relationships immediately challenged his inherited Oak Park conservatism. In this chapter, I examine how Hemingway’s early fiction was informed by his exploration of questions of modern gender and sexuality from the standpoint of the sexual turmoil of the 1920s, as viewed from Paris.

I. Gender Identity and the “Paris 1922” Apprenticeship

Much of that unrest sprang from the effects of the Great War, and in France, some of the most visible post-war change affected the sex/gender system. For French men, the horrors of trench warfare damaged the masculine ideal of the autonomous, heroic warrior, while the performance of “male” civilian jobs by women challenged traditional ideas of femininity. In a compelling cultural study, Civilization Without Sexes: Reconstructing Gender in Postwar France, 1917-1927, Mary Louise Roberts illustrates how the most contested debates in post-war French society were formulated as issues of gender, even as they revealed deeper anxieties about the meaning of the war. As post-war observers attempted to comprehend a reconfigured cultural and social landscape, with its dizzying pace and ambiguous spaces, traditional and progressive images of gender provided a way to confront (albeit indirectly) the meaning of post-war change. To negotiate this complex visual language called for “new modes of communication and understanding” as well as ability to decipher “new codes—in both the visual and symbolic senses of the term” (Chadwick 4).

In such a visually charged context, it is not surprising that one of Hemingway’s earliest apprentice works in Paris should explicitly highlight the act of spectatorship. Composed in the late spring and summer of 1922, six one-sentence vignettes titled “Paris 1922” announce

Hemingway's experimentation with visually symbolic codes that enable an innovative, spatially compressed prose style:

I have seen Peggy Joyce at 2 a.m. in a dancing in the Rue Caumartin quarreling with the shellac-ed haired young Chilean who had long pointed finger nails, danced like Rudolph Valentino and shot himself at 3:30 that same morning.

I have stood on the crowded platform of a seven o'clock Batignolles bus as it lurched along the wet lamp lit street and the men who were going home to supper never looked up from their newspapers as we passed Notre Dame grey and dripping in the rain.

I have seen the favorite crash into the Bulfinch at Auteuil and come down in a heap kicking, while the rest of the field swooped over the jump, the white wings jointed up their stretcher, and the crowd raced across the pelouse to see the horses come into the stretch.

I have seen the one legged streetwalker who works the Boulevard Madeleine between the Rue Cambon and Bernheim Jeunes' limping along the pavement through the crowd on a rainy night with a beefy red faced episcopal clergyman holding an umbrella over her.

I have watched the police charge the crowd with swords as they milled back into Paris through the Porte Maillot on the first day of May and seen the frightened proud look on the white, beaten up face of a sixteen year old kid who looked like a prep school quarterback and had just shot two policemen.

I have watched two Senegalese soldiers in the dim light of the snake house in the Jardin des Plantes teasing the king cobra who swayed and tightened in tense erect rage as one of the tall brown men crouched and fainted at him with his red fez. (qtd. in Kennedy, Imagining, 88-89)

Since their first appearance in Carlos Baker's 1969 biography, the "Paris 1922" sentences have attracted considerable attention from critics insofar as they appear to anticipate the paragraph-length vignettes Hemingway would publish in in our time, and because their form suggests the "one true sentence" he famously describes working on in A Moveable Feast (12). Most recently, Milton Cohen has remarked that "Paris 1922" marks "an important step between Hemingway's earlier work and the in our time chapters," noting that "the sentences are not simply stylistic exercises but an embryonic version of 'unwritten stories'" (24). "Each image implies a fuller story," Cohen observes, crediting Hemingway's technique of omission (24). Yet Cohen makes no effort to situate the condensed, "revealing details" in a cultural-historical context to show how

such coded inferences produce meaning. Reading “Paris 1922” in its cultural and historical context reveals the gender conflicts that shaped debate about the war’s impact on French culture and society. Furthermore, a closer examination of how Hemingway depicted the gender-centered change experienced in post-war Paris provides a better understanding of his early relation to the city’s avant-garde culture and to his own emerging identity as modernist artist.

As the war initiated and accelerated a period of sudden, often traumatic change, former structural relations between men and women became increasingly blurred, shaping, Roberts argues, “a civilization without sexes” (4). For many observers, the boundary between “male” and “female” was the most significant casualty of the war. In “Paris 1922,” Hemingway encapsulates the blurring of gendered identity when he writes of having “seen Peggy Joyce” at a late-night “dancing in the Rue Caumartin,” where she is “quarrelling” with an ambiguous young Chilean, “who had long pointed finger nails” and who “danced like Rudolph Valentino.” Based on events widely reported in the French and American newspapers, the scene in the Montmartre nightclub and the Chilean’s subsequent suicide reflect the restlessness and tragic dissolution of postwar life in the French capital. On 2 May 1922, the Paris Edition of the Chicago Tribune headlined the story of William Errazzuriz’ suicide. According to the Tribune, Errazzuriz, a Chilean diplomat, shot himself “some time between six and eight o’clock Sunday morning, following an all night dancing party at which he was present with Peggy [Joyce] and M. Henri Letellier.” Errazzuriz apparently committed suicide over unrequited love for Joyce, for whom he had recently separated from his wife and proposed to marry (Reynolds 48).

On another level, however, the Peggy Joyce sentence suggests a deeper anxiety involving Hemingway’s own desire to construct a distinctly male, avant-garde identity. The cultural reference comparing the thwarted lover to Valentino is perhaps the most penetrating feature of Hemingway’s prose poem, for in 1922 the matinee idol’s masculinity was a popular topic in the

American media. Public debate about the film star focused on Valentino's publicity tour for the Mineralava cosmetics company and his personal endorsement of an expensive line of face powder and complexion treatments that he claimed worked as well for men as for women. Public distrust of a male screen hero who endorsed and used beauty products only confirmed suspicions about the essential nature of the performing arts. "Didn't actors and dancers wear makeup and dress up in costumes," Valentino biographer Emily Leider asks, "and wasn't there something underhanded about all this preening and make-believe?" For many American men and women, the Italian-born Valentino "became the embodiment of a posturing, theatrical, look-at-me quality that they found unsettling" (Leider 253). In part, men's unease with the "effeminate" aspects of Valentino's masculinity illustrates a broader awareness of the precarious construction of an "authentic" or "essential" American manhood. Michael Kimmel contends that since the turn of the century, masculinity "was increasingly an act, a form of public display; that men felt themselves on display at virtually all times; and that the intensity of the need for such display was increasing" (100).

The "Paris 1922" Joyce-Valentino portrayal prefigures a dancing club scene in The Sun Also Rises where Hemingway also stages gender as performance in order to interrogate conflicts of identity and constructions of masculinity. In the novel, Jake Barnes's hatred for Brett Ashley's gay entourage at the bal musette can be located in the larger context of his quest for those elusive values that give coherence and meaning to life. For Jake, the spectacle of men who conspicuously emphasize "effeminate" traits in public, he says, "always made [him] angry." In Hemingway's symbolic economy, gender confusion – Jake's uneasiness with the "composure" with which "they" successfully perform "[t]his whole show" (29) – becomes a central metaphor for the war's impact on cosmopolitan European culture and for the unsettled identity that the novel's major characters must negotiate into meaning.

Other “Paris 1922” sentences also sketch troubled representations of gendered identity. How are we to understand, for instance, the rendering of collective masculinity as observed on the crowded commuter bus, where “men who were going home to supper never looked up from their newspapers as we passed Notre Dame grey and dripping in the rain”? The Batignolles bus scene recalls T.S. Eliot’s similar depictions of lonely urban businessmen. Comparing the two, Milton Cohen points out similarities between Hemingway’s men on the seven o’clock bus and Eliot’s “short square fingers stuffing pipes, / And evening newspapers, and eyes / assured of certain certainties” [“Preludes” IV (1917)] (23). In both cases, modern masculinity is reduced to a monotonous urban existence, with its conformist masses trudging to corporate jobs in large, anonymous offices. For many male observers, the physical, psychological, and spiritual desperation of urban life was the natural consequence of a “cultural feminization” threatening masculine vitality. To some men, the city bred feminization, as architect Frank Lloyd Wright suggested in appraising the urban world as an “enormity devouring manhood” (qtd. in Kimmel 120-121). With modern masculinity increasingly understood in contrast to its opposite—femininity—men anxiously adopted behavioral traits and attitudes that would demonstrate their manhood and avoid their being perceived as effeminate. In “Paris 1922,” the behavior of the men on the Batignolles bus reveals the emotional and spiritual cost of masculine anxiety about cultural feminization; lest their manhood be undone, the male commuters conspicuously ignore the timeless beauty of Notre Dame’s façade in favor of the latest edition of the daily news.

Given the fact that Hemingway wrote little else but newspaper work in 1922, the Prufrockian men on the Batignolles bus may have represented his own desire to quit journalism and focus full-time on serious writing, as Stein advised him to do. Living on Hadley’s trust fund, the Hemingways had sufficient financial resources to allow Ernest to leave the Star to pursue his literary career, a move he did not make, however, for another two years. Perhaps one reason for

his reluctance to quit journalism involves an uneasiness with what Thomas Strychacz has identified as the “‘effeminate’ aspects of cultural endeavors” (80-81). While male writers who had the leisure to write or pursue scholarly activities exclusively were often considered effeminate, when Hemingway took up work as a journalist, the reporter’s role was seen as a necessary form of labor, “‘carried out by men engaged in the rough, tough business of evoking their cultural scene” (Strychacz 80-81).

One of Hemingway’s favored cultural scenes was the races, evoked in “Paris 1922” in an oblique depiction of a steeplechase at Auteuil, featuring the fall of the favorite horse as the crowd turns away in indifference to watch the field vying for a place in the final stretch. The use of synonymous words to indicate the “crowd” of spectators who “raced” across the “pelouse” to catch a glimpse of the remaining horses in “the field” racing across the finish blurs the distinction between the observer and the observed and collapses the boundary between subject and object. The two central actions—the favorite jumper’s fall and the crowd’s race to the finish line—are coordinated in an image of “the white wings” (male ambulance attendants wearing a distinctive white kepi hat with a neck cloth as sun protection) fluttering onto the track where they joint up their stretcher and attend to the injured. In this postwar Paris scene, the reference to ministering “white wings”—suggesting not only male stretcher-bearers, but angels and the iconic wartime nurse’s cap—evokes contrasting cultural signs. An early example of what Gerry Brenner has called Hemingway’s “penchant for doubleness that pervades his work,” the Auteuil sentence simultaneously suggests a traditional portrayal of femininity—the angelic woman in white by the bedside of the wounded—even as it conceals the deeper ruptures of the war, including the collapse of gendered certainties. Sandra Gilbert notes that “[e]ven the most conventionally angelic of women’s wartime ministrations [. . .] must have suggested to many members of both sexes that, while men were now invalid and maybe in-valid, their sisters were

triumphant survivors and destined inheritors” (291). Interestingly, the Stan Laurel comedy “White Wings,” filmed in 1923, reminds us that in Hemingway’s time this term was also used for street cleaners—who in New York City wore a white solar helmet similar to the French kepi. So while the metonymic “white wings” of the war nurse imply a kind of fluttering angelic presence, in 1922, in an additional irony, they would also evoke street cleaners collecting the garbage.

The disorienting, opaque use of language and unrelated cultural images in the Auteuil scene resembles the Surrealist technique of wrenching objects from their familiar contexts to stimulate the unconscious. Hemingway’s Auteuil scene resembles the experimental Surrealist paintings of Max Ernst, produced in Paris from 1921 to 1923, incorporating disparate images combined in unsettling compositions. Although Hemingway studies have paid slight attention to Hemingway’s relationship to the Surrealists, his contemporary Aaron Copland recollected that Paris “then was a time of originality and innovation . . . and we were both [Hemingway and Copland] under the spell of those Paris years, André Breton and Surrealism, Georges Braque, Max Ernst and the other ‘originals’ we used to see at the Dôme and Deux Magots” (qtd. in Hotchner 107-108).

As images of robust manhood and maternity cropped up all over France as part of a national effort to promote repopulation, the government’s cheery predictions of social progress prompted the Surrealist insurrection of the early 1920s. The Surrealist project seized upon what Amy Lyford calls “the palpable disconnect between official discourse and lived reality that national regeneration was still an ideal goal rather than a fact of life” (4). This gap between people’s experience, on the one hand, and the government’s ideals of social progress on the other, Lyford argues, was the inspiration for Surrealism: “Taking advantage of this disparity, the surrealists created images of manhood with two primary goals in mind. First, they sought to

dramatize the physical and psychological trauma of the war that everyone wanted to forget, so that it would not be swept away too quickly. Second, they sought to destabilize the gender roles that had cemented traditional ideas about the family, one of the key institutional building blocks of French national identity” (4-5).

Hemingway’s “Paris 1922” bears the imprint of Surrealism’s critique of the official pro-natalist discourse that charged the populace to procreate for the security of the nation. “Paris 1922” parodies state-sanctioned propaganda promoting family and religion in its representation of an Episcopal clergyman ushering a one-legged prostitute across the Boulevard Madeleine, in the direction of the Church of Saint Mary Magdalene. The ironic association of the church dedicated to Mary Magdalene, canonically portrayed both as a prostitute and a devout disciple of Jesus, emphasizes the contradictions inherent in rhetoric conflating “true” French womanhood with maternity and Christian service. By representing competing images of traditional gender roles—in this case the ironic depiction of the Magdalene, “the beautiful sinner”—Hemingway’s sentence cross-examines the concept of femininity and thereby echoes the Surrealist practice of undermining official efforts for a “return to order.”

Subversive constructions of national manhood also abound in the “Paris 1922” sentences. The “May Day” demonstration that turns violent when a “sixteen year old kid” kills two policemen, for example, undercuts visual and rhetorical structures used by the establishment to promote a robust masculinity and instead emphasizes uncertainty, anxiety, and trauma. That the action occurs in an ambiguous space between the Paris city limits and the suburban frontier of “Porte Maillot,” suggests a geographical dislocation similar to the “frightened, proud look” of the young Parisian who “looked like” an American “prep-school quarterback.” The deracination of the youth’s identity and nationality, expressed in a mixed cultural reference, intimates Hemingway’s sensitivity to masculine identities at odds with official representations of a

national or culturally-ideal manhood. Here Hemingway uses the Surrealist techniques of juxtaposition and comparison borrowed from cutting-edge advertising and design, and like the surrealists, “labored to reveal the slippages in meaning that most images of postwar reconstruction tried to avoid” (Lyford 45). As he did with the Peggy Joyce scene, Hemingway culled the details of the May Day shooting from the daily newspaper rather than witnessing it firsthand. Nonetheless, the “self-referential touch he used so often in his feature journalism” would set the “I have seen” or “I have watched” pattern for the other five sentences (Reynolds 96).

At least one piece of Hemingway’s feature journalism for the Toronto Star holds interesting implications for the “Paris 1922” sentences. In “Black Novel a Storm Center,” published in March 1922, he reviewed René Maran’s novel Batoula, winner of France’s prestigious Prix Goncourt, and containing a preface highly critical of French colonialism in Africa. “Launched into the novel itself,” Hemingway writes, “you see the white man as the black man sees him” (DL 112). In “Paris 1922,” Hemingway’s attraction to the viewpoint of a foreign identity is mirrored in the striking image of a Senegalese soldier teasing a “king cobra” with “his red fez.” Using the Surrealist method of encoded political and social symbolism, the subaltern’s mocking defiance of the “king” cobra projects the intensely debated issue of French identity preoccupying political discourse in 1922.

The citizenship of colonial subjects within the French Empire was a particularly contested issue. When France began expanding its African holdings in the 1890s, the republicans in power envisioned that certain colonized subjects would eventually have the opportunity to become French citizens. But as Alice Conklin has observed, by the 1920s “new challenges to France’s authority overseas and a more conservative climate in the metropole after World War I fostered a reconsideration of what it meant to be French” (65-66). “Older colonial categories

were scrutinized and new ones contemplated,” Conklin explains, as “skin color increasingly became a decisive marker of Frenchness. The result was a realignment of cultural and racial boundaries which effectively excluded all claims by the colonized to equal status with the colonizer” (67). In his review of Batoula, Hemingway acknowledges “the swirl of condemnation, indignation and praise” surrounding the book and recounts an episode in the Chamber of Deputies where Maran was “bitterly attacked” as “a defamer of France” and disparaged as a “biter of the hand that fed him” (DL 112).

Debate over who was French was also structured in the same gendered terms used to deny women suffrage in France at the end of World War I. “French-speaking Africans were described as irrational and insufficiently civilized for exercising the full rights of citizenship” (Conklin 67). Hemingway’s arresting image of the Senegalese soldier taunting a snake parallels a signal event of 1922 that both shocked white sensibilities and fit neatly into evolving prejudices. On 24 September, as 60,000 spectators, including Hemingway, watched, an unknown Senegalese prize-fighter known as “Battling Siki” scored a stunning upset over world light-heavyweight champion Georges Carpentier—French national idol, war hero, and cinema celebrity. The ringside press that scrambled to dispatch news of the European champion’s defeat routinely referred to Siki as a brutal savage who, “in an outburst of instinctual rage, had overcome a skillful practitioner of the ‘sweet science’ of self-defense” (Benson 11). Sports writers caricatured Siki’s unusual fighting stance as a “jungle crouch”—a posture insinuated in Hemingway’s 1922 sketch of the “tall, brown” Senegalese who alternately “crouched” and “fainted” at his powerless adversary. In the months following the fight, as Siki disclosed that the bout had been fixed in favor of his opponent, the worldwide press mocked him as “a simple-minded primitive who couldn’t deal with the sophistication of civilization” (Benson 11). For many observers, including veteran journalist Lincoln Steffens, Siki’s triumph over Carpentier

was a defining moment, crystallizing an era of uncertainty as the power vacuum created by the Great War was filling in unexpected ways (Reynolds 74).

The “Paris 1922” miniatures register precarious negotiations of identity at a time of profound historical, social, and cultural change. A decade later, when his own critical reputation as one of the most promising voices of his generation was under fire, Hemingway would revisit the experiences of 1922 in his modernist masterpiece “The Snows of Kilimanjaro” (1936). Through the surrogate figure of Harry, a writer dying on safari in Africa, Hemingway presents a montage of images recollected from his own past. Notably, of the twenty-nine discrete mental “stories” depicted in “Snows,” twenty-five can be dated to 1922. About those stories, Hemingway reveals, “He had seen the world change; not just the events; although he had seen many of them and had watched the people, but he had seen the subtler change and he could remember how the people were at different times. He had been in it and he had watched it and it was his duty to write of it” (CSS 49). The attention to otherwise marginalized male and female identities featured in “Paris 1922”—Valentino’s ambiguous sexuality, the dislocation of a working-class adolescent, a defiant Senegalese soldier, a one-legged prostitute—suggests Hemingway’s sensitivity to modern society’s inability to stabilize conduct and appearance as categorically masculine or feminine and his commitment to questioning culturally-validated gendered identities. In Paris, Hemingway arrived at young manhood at a time of major historical change, marked by the radical reconfiguration of sexual traditions and assumptions about gender roles. The experimental sentences of “Paris 1922” reflect his sense of those changes—socially, politically, and personally. Indeed, the apprenticeship of “Paris 1922” signals—as the author of “Snows” tells us—“the start of all he was to do” (CSS 51).

II. Further Up in Michigan: Sexual Realism and the Landscape of Desire

“Students of modern sexual behavior have quite correctly described the twenties as a turning point, a critical juncture between the strict double standard of the age of Victoria and the permissive sexuality of the age of Freud.” –Paula S. Fass, The Damned and the Beautiful: American Youth in the 1920’s (260)

“Miss Stein sat on the bed that was on the floor and asked to see the stories I had written and she said that she liked them except one called ‘Up in Michigan.’” – Hemingway, A Moveable Feast (15)

As we learn more and more about Hemingway, we come to see him as a fascinating product of his times – and those times were marked with an obsessive interest in sexuality and erotica. While the prewar years had had their “liberation” movements, the years from 1919 to 1929 witnessed the growth of a youthful subculture embracing the belief that sex was pleasure, that sensuality was healthy, and that human relationships benefited from sexual exploration. By the time Hemingway began to write serious fiction in Paris, Linda Wagner-Martin writes, “what he knew most about – the ‘subject’ he had studied, discussed, and explored – was eroticism” (55).

One of Hemingway’s first and most famous short stories, bawdily entitled “Up in Michigan,” describes a sexual act in explicit prose that would have been clearly objectionable to a polite readership of the time. In the story, Hemingway portrays the waitress Liz Coates’ growing physical interest in Jim Gilmore, Hortons Bay’s blacksmith who takes his meals at the village restaurant. “Liz liked Jim very much. She liked it the way he walked over from the shop and often went to the kitchen door to watch for him to start down the road” (CSS 59). One night, when Jim is slightly drunk, he takes Liz on the landing dock: “The boards were hard. Jim had her dress up and was trying to do something to her. She was frightened but she wanted it. She had to have it but it frightened her” (CSS 62). Liz pleads, “You mustn’t do it, Jim. You mustn’t.’ ‘I got to. I’m going to. You know we got to.’ ‘No we haven’t, Jim. We ain’t got to. Oh, it isn’t right.

Oh, it's so big and it hurts so. You can't. Oh, Jim. Jim. Oh'" (CSS 62). Afterwards, Jim is so indifferent to Liz he falls asleep on top of her, so that she must crawl out from under him: "The hemlock planks of the dock were hard and splintery and cold and Jim was heavy on her and he had hurt her. Liz pushed him, she was so uncomfortable and cramped. Jim was asleep" (CSS 62). She tries to shake him awake and tearfully calls his name, but Jim only rolls his head away and goes on sleeping. Liz finally covers him with her coat, tucking in the edges carefully, and leaves the dock to go to bed.

Gertrude Stein pronounced the story *inaccrochable*, like the private erotica an artist might paint on canvas but is unable to show or sell to the public (AMF 15) . Horace Liveright, the publisher, agreed, insisting the story be removed from In Our Time. It was not published in the United States until 1938. Since then, critical discussion has focused on the sexual scene on the dock at the story's conclusion. Lisa Tyler, for instance, argues that "What Liz Coates experiences on that dock is what we have since come to call date or acquaintance rape" (3). By contrast, Marylyn Lupton has presented a defense of Jim, maintaining that Liz "is a strong woman who knows what she wants" (1). In either case, Hemingway's "Up in Michigan" is one of a number of stories produced in Paris that explore a uniquely modern attitude toward sex – no longer coterminous with the family, or with procreation, or with sin, sexuality emerges as a separate and meaningful category of human experience.

In "Up in Michigan," both protagonists are strongly characterized by a sense of instability and transience. As prototypes for the kind of characters who pervade Hemingway's early fiction, they "enter strange worlds whose codes they cannot comprehend, worlds formed at the margins of society where the inhabitants have been doomed by limited opportunity, poverty, or politics" (Lamb 21). Liz lives and works in a boarding house, a position that identifies her as a character in transition, while Jim is a Canadian expatriate, whose frequent hunting trips and interest in the

Toledo and Grand Rapids newspapers “suggest his essential rootlessness, rather than his unity with the Hortons Bay environment” (Maloney 127). While the story is realist with regard to form and verisimilitude, and naturalist in philosophy (in the sense of the deterministic social and physical conditions in which the protagonists negotiate their lives), it nevertheless departs from both of these established forms in its experimental modernist technique of rendering consciousness from both a male and female point of view. Moreover, the female viewpoint controls the narrative in the climactic final episode, so that the reader feels what she feels. And what we feel with Liz is a sense of her misery and emptiness, a response confirmed by Hemingway’s assessment years later, in 1938, that the story is “not dirty but is very sad. I did not write so well then, especially dialogue. [...] But there on the dock it suddenly got absolutely right and it is the point of the whole story and the beginning of all the naturalness I ever got” (SL 468). The narrative’s “naturalness” derives from the author’s dispassionate prose, language always less emotional than the events narrated seem to demand. In what would become the most characteristic feature of a Hemingway story, this understated language is calculated to elicit a strong emotional response from the reader. In “Up in Michigan,” after Jim has fallen asleep, Liz starts to cry, then covers him with her coat. The story ends: “Then she walked across the dock and up the steep sandy road to go to bed. A cold mist was coming up through the woods from the bay” (CSS 62). In the final sentence, Hemingway shifts the reader’s focus from the scene on the dock to the larger phenomenon of the landscape. This final focus on the bay reminds the reader of the historical and cultural reality of Liz’s environment. As Marylyn Lupton has observed, the story occurs at a date near the end of the nineteenth-century, “narrowing Liz’s role even more to that of ‘the angel in the house’” than when the story was completed in 1922 (3). “Jim’s presence disturbs Liz – she feels ‘funny’ – but open discourse between the sexes was not acceptable to the mores of the time,” Lupton notes. “Young and hard-working, Liz is developing a normal, healthy

sexual appetite. Yet Liz's contact with Jim is as circumscribed as the rest of her life" (3). What makes Liz's story "sad," Hemingway suggests, is the conflict between the cultural prescriptions regulating sexual expression and the human desires and needs that refuse to be controlled by those dictates. This conflict is demonstrated in an unpublished manuscript, an alternate ending that details the aftermath of the episode on the dock. Paul Smith, in "Three Versions of 'Up in Michigan,' 1921-1930," quotes:

Liz was frightened and sick when she got up to her room. She put on one of her unwell pads because she was afraid of blood getting on the sheets. She felt ashamed and sick and cried and prayed until she fell asleep. She woke up frightened and stiff and aching. It was still dark. "What if I have a baby?" she thought. It was the first time she had thought about it. It really was. She was so frightened the sweat ran down under her armpits and she was too frightened to cry. She thought about having a baby until it was morning. (168)

Here Liz reveals that she has previously thought about Jim in sexual terms, and in a way that clearly dissociates sex from procreation. By the time Hemingway was working on the story in 1922, the ideas of modern social scientists like Otto Weininger and Edward Carpenter, along with the works of Freud and Havelock Ellis, were challenging Victorian sexual mores regulating sexuality and procreation. As Ann Snitnow, Christine Stansell, and Sharon Thompson discuss in their introduction to Powers of Desire, the sexual sciences of the time "took sex radicalism out of its enclaves and brought it closer to mainstream politics. [...] Throughout the middle class, a growing acceptance of contraception (within marriage) allowed men and particularly women to dissociate sexual pleasure from conception. At the same time, young single people began to move outside the strictures of their families and communities to experiment with sex outside of marriage" (16-17). This cultural attitude concerning sexual freedom versus procreative duty forms a pattern in Hemingway's early work, one that operates in a similar way, for example, in "Mr. And Mrs. Elliot."

“Mr. and Mrs. Elliot tried very hard to have a baby,” the story begins (CSS 123). As Nancy Comley and Robert Scholes have remarked, the opening line sets the tone for the rest of the narration, for rather than evoke the reader’s sympathy by relating the Elliots to people we might know who have been in this position, we rarely “hear of people trying *hard* to have babies. Trying *very hard*? The most simple and direct effect of this intensification is to drain sympathy away from the Elliots’ predicament and make them ludicrous” (82). A secondary effect, however, is a sharp critique of the cultural attitude that regulates sexual behavior as “the object of the satire is not the Elliots as individuals but the culture that has made procreation the sole legitimate object of sexual activity, transforming erotic play into alienated labor” (Comley and Scholes 82). The figure of Hubert Elliot, furthermore, is positioned as Hemingway’s opposite, but an opposite into whom he could project himself imaginatively, according to the story’s sexual codes that “structure the flow of values and pleasure for the reader” (Comley and Scholes 84). A particularly revealing passage describes Elliot’s premarital sexual experience:

He was twenty-five years old and had never gone to bed with a woman until he married Mrs. Elliot. He wanted to keep himself pure so that he could bring to his wife the same purity of mind and body that he expected of her. He called it to himself living straight. He had been in love with various girls before he kissed Mrs. Elliot and always told them sooner or later that he had led a clean life. Nearly all the girls lost interest in him. (CSS 123)

As Comley and Scholes point out, the narrative’s “code of purity is presented as absurd for the very good reason that girls are not interested in men who lack sexual experience. The American girl, in the view presented by this text, is far from being the virtuous, high-minded creature of sentimental literature. She is a practical, sensual person who is simply not interested in male purity” (83). In this story, Hubert is inexperienced at sex and a prude by modern standards while “Ernest wanted to be the reverse of Hubert on that score and perhaps felt himself to be” (Comley and Scholes 85). If Hemingway’s 1921 premarital letters to Hadley are any evidence, his

readings and literary allusions suggest that he was clearly creating a persona of himself that reflected the personalities of his heroes – D.H. Lawrence, T.E. Lawrence, and Byron; his attraction to these men, Michael Reynolds claims, depended not only on their “[f]oreign travel” but by their “[s]exual extravagance” as well (Hemingway’s Reading 25). By 1925, Hemingway was ready with advice on sexual matters. To his friend Bill Smith, Hemingway recommended that he “yence” as often as possible, as it was a great conditioner for a male and helped him to see clearer. When Smith mentioned his landlady as a serious possibility, Hemingway advised, “If she’s married and wants it they ain’t no harm. Now serious yencing should be devoid of consequences and entanglements. Entanglements are what ruin yencing.” Paris, Hemingway assured Smith, was full of young college girls wanting “to have it happen to them.” If he was married but not in love himself, Hemingway claimed, he would yence if there were no consequences (qtd. in Mellow 280).

A similar attitude resonates in one of Hemingway’s finest stories from Paris. In “Soldier’s Home,” a returned veteran of the war, Harold Krebs, confronts a family life that he no longer feels a part of. Krebs articulates his disillusionment by his unwillingness to court any of the local girls: “He would have liked to have a girl but he did not want to have to spend a long time getting her. He did not want to get into the intrigue and the politics. [...] He did not want any consequences. He did not want any consequences ever again. He wanted to live along without consequences” (CSS 112-13). But the story was not just a personal statement; it would become “a classic in the literature of alienation following World War I, a definition of a generation returned from war, dissatisfied with the goals and values of American life” (Mellow 122). For Hemingway’s generation, sexual frankness was the centerpiece in the period’s acts of liberation. As Ellis Hawley has noted, the sexual rebellion of the 1920s found its greatest support from taste makers in literature and the arts and the mass media. Through such support it acquired

“an identification with sophistication, modernity, and personal liberty, all things their opponents found difficult to attack. And reinforcing this kind of support was that derived from the new social sciences. If the traditionalists still invoked biblical authority and the ‘wisdom of the ages,’ the rebels had found Sigmund Freud, John B. Watson, and Havelock Ellis” (138). A youthful postwar subculture viewed the sexual values inherited from America’s past as outdated and detrimental to happy, healthy, and well-adjusted human beings (Hawley 139). Hemingway employs sexual codes in stories such as “Up in Michigan,” “Mr. and Mrs. Elliot,” and “Soldier’s Home” to explore the binary opposition, deeply embedded in American culture, between puritan and libertine forms of sexual conduct. In the “liberated” milieu of 1920s expatriate Paris, Hemingway felt confident that his audience would share his perception that sex as a duty and burden must be ridiculous, even detrimental to human freedom.

This opposition between the individual and society’s sexual expectations is also demonstrated in an unfinished and unpublished sketch intended for A Moveable Feast (1964) and recently included in A Moveable Feast: The Restored Edition (2009). The fragment provides a rare glimpse into the secret activities shared by the young writer and his wife, Hadley. The composition portrays an experiment in androgyny undertaken in late 1922 while vacationing at Chamby sur Montreaux and, later, in Paris in 1924.¹ As the fragment opens, “Hem” describes a tactic for avoiding the expensive temptations of the Right Bank: “I found out very quickly that the best way to avoid going over to the right bank and get[ting] involved in all the pleasant things that I could not afford [...] was not to get a haircut” (Restored 183). As long hair marked a man a bohemian and an outcast, a newspaper associate warns him, “You mustn’t let yourself go, Hem. It’s none of my business of course. But you can’t go native this way” (Restored 184). The narrator claims that after three months without a trim, “your right bank friends would think of you as damned ... I never knew just what it was that you were supposed to be damned to but

after four months or so you were considered damned to something worse. I enjoyed being considered damned and my wife and I enjoyed being considered damned together” (Restored 183-84).

Here hair functions as a visible sign of sexual transgression, an intentional attempt to resist or revise society’s sexual codes. Although he does not specify their transgression, Hem does confess to a disregard for public notions of sexual propriety in 1924 after returning to Paris from Canada: “We lived like savages and kept our own tribal rules and had our own customs and our own standards, secrets, taboos, and delights” (Restored 184-85). For most Hemingway readers, unisex haircuts and tribal taboos sounds familiarly like the unfinished text of The Garden of Eden; actually, as J. Gerald Kennedy has written, manuscript evidence indicates that for a time in the late fifties Hemingway moved back and forth between the novel and the Paris memoir, “on one occasion (at least) scribbling ideas for both on the same sheet of paper” (131). Whereas the memoir was conceived as a self-portrait for public consumption, Kennedy notes, “Hemingway decided to discard the story of how he and Hadley had risked ‘damnation’ by trying to erase gender differences. But the very existence of the fragment alerts us to other traces of sexual ambivalence concealed by macho posturing” (138-39). Indeed, the recent publication of additional Paris sketches and previously unpublished correspondence places the memoir in a new light, enabling us to perceive with greater clarity the troubling questions and uncertain assumptions about sex, gender, and desire which inform Hemingway’s classic account of his Paris apprenticeship.

III. “There is Never Any End to Paris”; or, The Return of the Repressed

“Hunger is good discipline and you learn from it. And as long as they do not understand it you are ahead of them. Oh sure, I thought, I’m so far ahead of them now that I can’t afford to eat regularly. It would not be bad if they caught up a little.” – Hemingway, A Moveable Feast (75)

“...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.” – Hemingway, A Moveable Feast (75)

A Moveable Feast tells the story of how Ernest Hemingway learned to write in Paris. But as Rose Marie Burwell has observed, invoking Paris is a “controlled search” through the *remise* of his memory for a time when he was innocent and his creative future was infinite (164). Recalling Joyce’s A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, the cycle of Hemingway’s portrait recreates the education of a writer “in the town best organized for a writer to write in that there is” (AMF 182). And Hemingway arrived in Paris in the early 1920s, a period marked by a “fabulous confluence of aesthetic and sexual experimentation, owing in part to the singular tolerance offered homosexuality by the Napoleonic Code” (Valente 13). The literary and aesthetic culture of Paris at this time was very much a bookshop, salon, and café culture, and that culture was in turn fashioned and superintended by a largely lesbian and gay community; in turn, “the discourses of avant-garde art overlap in an especially intimate way with the discourses of alternative sexual experience and gender performance” (Valente 13). “Inversion, especially female inversion,” Joseph Valente notes, “acquired a superficially chic and so increasingly familiar aura through a complex intersection of cultural infringements on gender bipolarity and compulsory heterosexuality” (13-14). In Paris, then, Hemingway participated for the first time in a culture, literary or otherwise, in which alternative sexualities was a common part of the universe, so much so that the city was nicknamed Paris-Lesbos.

Yet, curiously enough, the imaginary Paris projected in Hemingway’s memoir is explicitly heterosexual, and its hero in no doubt of his own heterosexual preferences and gendered behavior. As though to underscore this point, the notorious episode “A Matter of Measurements” illustrates “the operating assumption that one’s primary sexual traits naturally

determine both gender (the role one plays as male or female) and desire (sexual attraction or affinity). Hemingway takes for granted a heterosexual determinism and thus undertakes to restore Fitzgerald's masculinity, his sense of gender, by validating his sexual equipment in the bathroom of Michaud's restaurant" (Kennedy 133). There are, moreover, only two moments in which an alternative lesbian identity is revealed. In the first, Hem overhears the lovemaking of Stein and Toklas on the rue de Fleurus and "registers the voice of lesbian desire as unnatural ('I heard someone speaking to Stein as I had never heard one person speak to another; never, anywhere, ever') and rushes away presumably to spare himself further embarrassment" (Kennedy 133). The other instance, in the episode "With Pascin at the Dôme," a "dark, small, beautifully built" model, "a lesbian, who also liked men," is portrayed as sexually interested in the young writer (AMF 102).² "You like me, don't you, Monsieur?" she asks Hemingway, who answers her, "Very much" (AMF 103), yet declines any further advances by explaining that he must return home "to eat with my *légitime*" (AMF 104). Regardless of their larger absence from the memoir, Hemingway in fact encountered so many women in Paris who identified themselves as lesbians it was, in the words of one biographer, "as though he had a tropism for them" (Lynn 320).

Hemingway was not only acquainted with a remarkable number of lesbians, Kenneth Lynn insists, but, "far more remarkably, was able in his imagination to identify himself with them" (322).³ This fascination with what Lynn refers to as "the ambiguities of feminine identity" has led a number of biographers and critics to examine the idea that Hemingway's attraction to and identification with lesbians might be a displacement of his own homosexual desires (Lynn 322; Modellmog 33; Burwell 108). Shari Benstock, for example, writes that the importance for Hemingway and his close friendship with lesbians, among them Gertrude Stein, "may lie in the other direction – that lesbian women (no doubt without his conscious knowledge) affiliated with

his feared and repressed other, the Hemingway whose womanizing was the means by which latent homosexuality was repressed” (173). At the very least, J. Gerald Kennedy suggests, “living in the eroticized Quarter exposed Hemingway to the multiformity of desire and raised troubling questions about sexuality itself. If Paris provided auspicious conditions in which to become a writer, it also aroused in Hemingway certain anxieties about his gendered identity” (139). Such changes in psychosexual orientation appear—initially, at least – completely absent from the memoir; rather, it would appear that Hemingway reserved this Paris material for the unfinished manuscript The Garden of Eden, a novel that “explores the unstable terrain of sexual ambivalence, exposing the multiple forms of desire and the seemingly arbitrary nature of gender” (Kennedy 133).

And yet, Kennedy observes, manuscript evidence indicates that at some point in the composition of the memoir the author began a sketch that would have connected young Hem and Hadley to the novel’s David and Catherine Bourne, and the unorthodox gender experiments they perform (134).⁴ Of this resemblance, Kennedy notes, the “long-haired Hem of the fragment seems to manifest the author’s covert desire to throw off the burden of a hypermasculine gender role and to adopt a more androgynous self-image” (137). That Hemingway had psychological reasons for such a departure from traditional codes of masculinity and heterosexuality have been well-documented; as Kenneth Lynn, James Mellow, Carl Eby, and Mark Spilka have all argued, his upbringing under Grace Hemingway included treating her son as the female twin of his older sister and dressing him in girls’ clothes, apparently for longer than was conventional for the time, leaving him with an irrepressible urge to blur conventional gender distinctions and assume an alternate female identity. For David Bourne, as for Hem, what is at stake in the experiments is not just the breaking of a gender or sexual taboo but the loss of his own identity as a heterosexual male.⁵ Michael Kimmel reminds us that “masculine identity is

born in the renunciation of the feminine, not in the direct affirmation of the masculine, which leaves masculine gender identity tenuous and fragile” (“Masculinity” 127). Thus despite the memoir’s carefully constructed self-image, hints of gender and sexual ambivalence pepper the published and unpublished text of A Moveable Feast.

The opening chapter introduces the memoir as a narrative of sexual encounter. In “A Good Café on the Place St.-Michel,” as Hemingway is writing a story, a pretty girl enters:

I looked at her and she disturbed me and made me very excited. I wished I could put her in the story, or anywhere, but she had placed herself so she could watch the street and the entry and I knew she was waiting for someone. So I went on writing.

The story was writing itself and I was having a hard time keeping up with it. I ordered another Rum St. James and I watched the girl whenever I looked up, or when I sharpened the pencil with a pencil sharpener. [...]

I’ve seen you, beauty, and you belong to me now, whoever you are waiting for and if I never see you again, I thought. You belong to me and all of Paris belongs to me and I belong to this notebook and this pencil.

Then I went back to writing and I entered far into the story and was lost in it. [...] Then the story was finished and I was very tired. (AMF 5-6)

As Donald Pizer has observed, the imagery of the girl deflected into the sharpened pencil is a richly suggestive union of sexual and creative energy. This union is made more complex, moreover, since the “girl’s beauty and desirability, and thus the excitement engendered by her, are equated with Paris itself (‘You belong to me and all Paris belongs to me’). Hemingway can establish this equation because the girl, in the heightened sexuality she introduces into the café, constitutes as well the intensity and excitement of his responsiveness to the city as a whole” (12). For expatriates of the twenties and thirties, Pizer notes, “Paris was above all a world of sexual freedom – a place where the writer could feel desire, could translate (if he or she wished) desire into action, and could write about desire” (12). Indeed, the specific story Hemingway recalls writing in the café – “The Three-Day Blow” – along with its companion piece – “The End of

Something” – are set in the wilderness of upper Michigan and explore the nature of intense male camaraderie.⁶

“The End of Something” has Nick Adams break up with his girlfriend, Marjorie, in the course of a night-fishing expedition on the lake. In a particularly callous way, Nick tells Marjorie that their relationship isn’t fun anymore. Nick is plainly restless and dissatisfied, perhaps going through some kind of emotional crisis: “I feel as though everything was gone to hell inside of me” (CSS 81). When Marjorie asks, “Isn’t love any fun?” Nick gives her a blunt “No” (CSS 81). Marjorie, rebuffed, departs on the boat. As soon as she is gone, Nick’s friend Bill comes out of the woods, asking “Did she go all right?” making it understood that the breakup had been prearranged (CSS 82). Bill asks if there had been a scene to which, irritated, Nick cries, “Oh, go away, Bill!” then softens it: “Go away for a while” (CSS 82). Bill picks up a sandwich from the picnic basket and goes off to check the two fishing rods set at the water’s edge.

There is, however, a curious, jarring interruption at the end of the story when Bill emerges from the woods. Hemingway notes, “Bill didn’t touch him, either” (CSS 82). Presumably, James Mellow notes, it relates to an earlier scene when Nick and Marjorie, watching the moon rise, are sitting on the blanket “without touching each other” (CSS 81). In a manuscript version of the story, Bill’s arrival is described in unusually physical terms: “He lay there until he felt Bill’s arm on his shoulder. He felt Bill coming before he felt his touch” (qtd. in Mellow 109). In this story in which a young man sends his girl away, preferring the company of another male, Mellow observes, Hemingway may have wished to avoid any sense of a homosexual connection. He thus changed the wording to “He felt Bill’s hand on his shoulder” (qtd. in Mellow 109). Finally, Hemingway omitted even that, adding the preliminary mention that Marjorie and Nick had not touched each other and that Bill had not touched him, either. The changes, Mellow allows, “seem to have been dictated more by the author’s fearfulness than by

the narrative logic of the story. In Hemingway's prose, it is one of the earlier indications that he recognized that his celebrations of male camaraderie might have dangerous implications" (109).⁷

The recollection of such writing scenes develops Hemingway's strategy in A Moveable Feast of portraying the young artist's capacity for productivity in Paris, sustained by the physical, intellectual, and emotional nourishment that alternately creates and assuages the hunger necessary for creativity. But Paris offers a sexual counterpoint to America as well. For ironically, it was in the midst of the sexual experimentation and freedom of the expatriate colony of Paris that Hemingway "created for himself a half-remembered, half-invented life of male companionship in the wild, a life free of the pieties, taboos, and inhibitions of Oak Park" (Mellow 161). As though crucially aware, however, of the implications his early Michigan stories might contain, Hemingway disguises traces of sexual ambivalence in the memoir by adopting an outwardly hostile stance toward male homosexuality.

In "Birth of a New School," for instance, the homosexual Hal "invades" the Closerie des Lilas, where Hemingway is working, to complain of writer's block. Angry and resentful of the interruption, Hemingway suggests to Hal that if he can't write fiction he should learn to write criticism: "You could be a good critic," he tells Hal. "There will always be people who will help you and you can help your own people." When Hal inquires, "What do you mean my own people?" Hemingway responds, "The ones you go around with" (AMF 95). Here the depiction of Hal's homosexuality and his failed attempts to write fiction are directly related to the trope of creative potency, associating an insufficiency in creative energy with heterosexual indifference (Pizer 13). But in a previously unpublished account of Hemingway's friendship with the poet Evan Shipman, the difference between "your people" – Hal and other male homosexuals – and Hemingway's own sexual identity is distorted.

In “Nada y Pues Nada,” Hemingway remembers Evan “the last time in Cuba” when he came over suffering from pancreatic cancer. As the two old friends reminisce about “all the funny parts about the old days and the great people” they knew in Paris, Shipman praises Hemingway’s art for its fidelity to the past: ““You were very thoughtful about them, Hem. It is not that things should be published. But I believe now that it is important that they exist. We’ve both existed quite a lot haven’t we Hem?”” (Restored 224). After cautioning, “You don’t mind if I’m serious,” Shipman urges that Hemingway “must keep on because you write for all of us,” to which Hemingway, like Hal, asks curtly: ““Who’s all of us?”” Defensively, Shipman responds, ““Please don’t be difficult. I mean us of the early days ... and the other that only we know who have been at some strange places in some strange times”” (Restored 224).

One of the strangest episodes repressed from the published version of the memoir describes Hem and Hadley’s plan to grow their hair out to the same length. In this exchange, their androgynous experiment is likened to cultivating a garden:

“Other people would think we are crazy.”
“Poor unfortunate other people,” she said. “We’ll have such fun, Tatie.”
“And you’ll really like it?”
“I’ll love it,” she said. “But we’ll have to be very patient. The way people are patient with a garden.”
“I’ll be patient, or I’ll try anyway.”
“Do you think other people have such fun with such simple things?”
“Maybe it’s not so simple.”
“I don’t know. Nothing can be simpler than growing.” (Restored 187)

In the same manuscript fragment, crossed out, Hemingway suggests how such “simple” experiments may become complicated: “When we lived in Austria in the winter we would cut each other’s hair and let it grow to the same length. One was dark and the other dark red gold and in the dark in the night one would wake the other swinging the heavy dark or the heavy silken red gold across the others lips in the cold dark in the warmth of the bed. You could see your breath if there was moonlight (Restored 186). Significantly, the dominant paradigm of

homosexuality to emerge from the sexual sciences at the time Hemingway came to sexual awareness in the United States and Paris was one of gender inversion. In Foucault's words, "the psychological, psychiatric, medical category of homosexuality was constituted from the moment it was characterized [...] less by a type of sexual relations than by a certain quality of sexual sensibility, a certain way of inverting the masculine and feminine in oneself" (43). In turn, homosexuality "appeared as one of the forms of sexuality when it was transposed from the practice of sodomy onto a kind of interior androgyny, a hermaphroditism of the soul" (43). Debra Moddelmog has situated Hemingway's sexual identity "on the border between the homosexual and the heterosexual, in the tension of negotiating these supposedly antithetical desires" (61). While he became bound by this dichotomous system, Moddelmog writes, "he continued to feel the effects of its instabilities and to question its validity as a grid for understanding human desire" (51). Although the 1964 memoir was carefully edited to resemble those works published in the author's lifetime on the assumption that readers would want a book like his previous works, the recent publication of additional episodes in some cases sheds new light on Hemingway's conflicted desires.

One such case occurs in an episode which subtly contrasts male friendship with his marital relationship with Hadley. In "A False Spring," Hemingway's unsuccessful attempt to remember "the whole story of the wisteria vine" (AMF 54) told by his homosexual friend Jim Gamble may mark one such moment of gender ambivalence, its active repression, or denial (Kennedy 138). Captain James Gamble, 36 years old, was the Field Inspector for the American Red Cross canteen service for the northeastern Italian front at the time of Hemingway's wounding by trench mortar on 8 July 1918. Gamble accompanied the wounded Hemingway on the two-day train trip from the field station in Fornaci to Milan. During Hemingway's convalescence, the two men became fast friends, so that at the end of the war Gamble paid his

young compatriot's expenses for a 16-day, late-December vacation in Taormina, Sicily, and offered to underwrite the cost of Hemingway's prolonging his stay for a year in Europe. At the urging of his sweetheart and war nurse, Agnes von Kurowsky, however, Hemingway rejected the offer, bent on returning home to begin putting himself in a financial position to marry his nurse (Brenner, "Enough" 92). Curiously enough, after the week spent with Gamble in Taormina, Hemingway would tell his British friend Chink Dorman-Smith that in fact he had never even reached Taormina or seen anything of Sicily "except from a bedroom window," because his hostess in the first hotel he stayed in had hidden his clothes and kept him to herself for seven days (qtd. in Lynn 89). More likely, the fabricated story told to his friend in Milan may have been a screen for his actual memory of the week with Gamble (Lynn 89). After Hemingway returned to the States, he sent Gamble – whom he called "Chief" – an uncharacteristically gushy letter:

Every minute of every day I kick myself for not being in Taormina with you. It makes me so damned homesick for Italy and whenever I think that I might be there with you. Chief, honestly I can't write about it. When I think of old Taormina by moonlight and you and me, a little illuminated some times, but always just pleasantly so, strolling through that great old place and the moon path on the sea and Aetna fuming away and the black shadows and the moonlight cutting down the stairway back of the villa. Oh Jim it makes me so damn sick to be there. (SL 21)⁸

Here the conspicuous repetition of moonlight imagery associates the memory of Gamble and Taormina with Hemingway and Hadley's androgynous coupling ("You could see your breath if there was moonlight"). This associative cluster perhaps clarifies as well Hemingway's cryptic remark to Grace Quinlan on 8 August 1920 that, "In Sicily they say it makes you queer to sleep with the moon on your face. Moon struck. Maybe that's what ails me."

The "False Spring" sketch of A Moveable Feast concludes with a poignant meditation on moonlight and hunger – metaphors for the nameless and unnamable intricacies of desire:

It was a wonderful meal at Michaud's after we got in; but when we had finished and there was no question of hunger any more the feeling that had been like hunger when we were on the bridge was still there when we caught the bus home. It was there when we came in the room and after we had gone to bed and made love in the dark, it was there. When I woke with the windows open and the moonlight on the roofs of the tall houses, it was there. I put my face away from the moonlight into the shadow but I could not sleep and lay awake thinking about it. We had both wakened twice in the night and my wife slept sweetly now with the moonlight on her face. I had to try to think it out and I was too stupid. Life had seemed so simple that morning. [...] But Paris was a very old city and we were young and nothing was simple there, not even poverty, nor sudden money, nor the moonlight, nor right and wrong nor the breathing of someone who lay beside you in the moonlight. (AMF 57-58)

This apparently simple scene compresses several notable insights. Ironically enough, the men's room at Michaud's is where Hemingway surveyed F. Scott Fitzgerald's penis and assured him, contrary to Zelda Fitzgerald's complaint, that "the matter of [his] measurements" was "perfectly fine" (AMF 190). The reference to the restaurant is also associated with James Joyce ("It was where Joyce ate with his family then"), whose modernist masterpiece Ulysses Hemingway greatly admired (AMF 56). He especially esteemed Joyce's invention of Molly Bloom, regarding her as "the greatest [fictional character] in the world" ("On Writing" 238). The "hunger" for literary success of course is an important motif of the memoir. As importantly, the homage to Joyce – "He'd made Mrs. Bloom up" ("On Writing" 238) – signals Hemingway's implicit understanding of what Valente calls "a cardinal project of high-modernist art generally and Joyce's art in particular: the achievement of a cross-gendered voice" (Valente 13).

Among the author's papers for A Moveable Feast at the Kennedy Library is a one-page document containing a number of false starts written on what appears to be a photocopy of annotated passages from James Joyce's Finnegans Wake. As an assistant editor of the Paris-based transatlantic review in 1924, Hemingway had helped to prepare the first published fragment of Joyce's book when it appeared in the magazine's April issue. The eight-page "Mamalujo" sketch appeared under the title "From Work in Progress," a name Joyce adopted to

refer to his final work until its publication as Finnegans Wake in 1939.⁹ Whereas Ulysses was what Joyce called a day book, Wake is the book of the night and, as such, required and justified a special language. “In writing of the night, I really could not, I felt I could not, use words in their ordinary connections,” Joyce wrote in a letter. “When morning comes of course everything will be clear again” (Ellmann 546). In another letter Joyce observes, “It’s natural things should not be so clear at night, isn’t it now?” (Ellmann 590). Similarly, as Carl Eby has elsewhere observed, “Hemingway associated night with loneliness, depression, and a mysterious transgressive psychosexuality, ‘nocturnal sports’ that had to be denied by the light of the day” (195). The published version of A Moveable Feast is Hemingway’s book of the day, conceived and composed as a self-portrait for public consumption; in turn, the repressed Paris sketches provide a fascinating glimpse into the sexual ambivalence that lies just beneath the surface of Hemingway’s exceedingly hetero-masculine persona.

Notes

¹ A 23 January 1923 letter from Hemingway to Ezra Pound postmarked from Chamby, Switzerland prefigures the later 1924 experiment recounted in Feast. Hemingway writes, “We have 6 to 8 months grub money ahead. I have laid off the barber in order that I wont be able to take a newspaper job no matter how badly St. Anthonied. The follicles functioning at a high rate of speed. I am on the point of being thrown out from all except the society of outliers like yourself. It is several weeks since I would have shown at the Anglo-American [the Anglo-American Press Club in Paris].”

² Omitted from this passage in the 1962 version is the sentence: “She was a lesbian who also liked men” (Restored 84).

³ Lynn reviews some of the famous lesbians that Hemingway met while in Paris, including Natalie Barney, Sylvia Beach, Adrienne Monnier, Gertrude Stein, Alice Toklas, Jane Heap, Margaret Anderson, Georgette Leblanc, Byher (Annie Winifred Ellerman McAlmon), Jinny Pfeiffer, Janet Flanner, Nancy Cunard, Solita Solano, and Djuna Barnes (320-22)

⁴ The memoir’s excised sketch “Secret Pleasures,” parallels the text of The Garden of Eden in its discussion of the couple’s plan to achieve unisex haircuts as part of their androgynous project:

“It’s growing wonderfully. You’ll just have to be patient.”

“All right. I’ll forget about it.”

“If you don’t think about it maybe it will grow faster. I’m so glad you remembered to start it so early.”

We looked at each other and laughed and then she said one of the secret things.

“That’s correct.”

“Tatie, I thought of something exciting.”

“Tell me.”

“I don’t know whether to say it.”

“Say it. Go on. Please say it.”

“I thought maybe it could be the same as mine.”

“But yours keeps on growing too.”

“ No. I’ll get it just evened tomorrow and then I’ll wait for you. Wouldn’t that be fine for us?”
 “Yes.”
 “I’ll wait and then it will be the same for both.”
 “How long will it take?”
 “Maybe four months to be just the same.”
 “Really?”
 “Really.”
 “Four months more?”
 “I think so.”
 We sat and she said something secret and I said something secret back.
 “Other people would think we are crazy.”
 “Poor unfortunate other people,” she said. “We’ll have such fun, Tatie.”
 “And you’ll really like it?”
 “I’ll love it,” she said. “But we’ll have to be very patient. The way people are patient with a garden.”
 “I’ll be patient, or I’ll try anyway.”
 “Do you think other people have such fun with such simple things?”
 “Maybe it’s not so simple.”
 “I don’t know. Nothing can be simpler than growing.” (Restored 186-87)

Although there isn’t any explicit mention of a gender change, Kennedy notes “the recurrent references to “secret things” (which echo the novel’s “devil things”) imply the sexual aspect of the experiment (136).

⁵According to the studies of Freud and Havelock Ellis, both familiar to Hemingway, having a sexual object of the opposite gender is taken to be the normal form of an interest in the Other, thus acquiring the name *heterosexuality*, or a sexuality of otherness. According to this logic, “homoerotics is an unrecognized version of autoerotics, or more precisely of narcissism; both are seen as essentially an interest in the self rather than in the other” (Warner 190). By “inverting” his sex, Hemingway would thus set into motion a string of inversions having to do with gender and sexual orientation.

⁶ Although the memoir rather vividly recalls writing “The Three-Day Blow” in January of 1922, manuscript evidence suggests the story was written in March 1924, either at the same time or soon after composing “The End of Something” (Smith, Guide, 56). These two stories, Philip Young has argued, are meant to be read as if they were two related chapters, one a dramatic act and the other a dialogue revealing something of that act’s motive and response (qtd. in Smith, Guide, 34-35).

⁷ Similarly, a manuscript fragment of “The Three-Day Blow,” contains a false start eventually discarded for a more conventional beginning: “Bill and Wemedge [Bill Smith’s nickname for Ernest] lay in front of the fire, rolled up in the blanket and quiet together” (Item 762, Ernest Hemingway Collection, John F. Kennedy Library, Boston).

⁸ When in 1920 Gamble again invited Hemingway to join him for an expense-free year in Italy, his new sweetheart, Hadley, quite understandably regarded Gamble as a rival. With, perhaps, Agnes’ prior objections about Gamble in mind, Hemingway wrote Hadley on 23 December, “Jim Gamble is great – I love him a lot – but not like I love you – you dearest, Dearest, Dear.” He also sent Gamble a cable, regretfully turning down his offer. His typewritten copy reads: “Rather go to Rome with you than heaven stop [Not married. crossed out] Too sad for words stop. Writing and selling it stop [Unmarried. crossed out] but don’t get rich stop all authors poor first then rich stop. Me no exception stop. Wouldn’t we have a great time stop Lord how I envy you” (qtd. in Mellow 132). A significant feature of the copy is that Hemingway “twice intended to tell Gamble he was unmarried – and that twice he thought better of doing so” (Mellow 132).

⁹ The transatlantic review sketch would appear in the final published text, in radically altered form, as chapter 2.4.

CHAPTER TWO

MENTORS

In the previous chapter I argued that the unconventional cultural, social, and sexual atmosphere of Paris challenged Hemingway's conservative assumptions about sex and desire and raised certain troubling questions about his gendered identity. This chapter continues to examine how Hemingway's early fiction was influenced by his exploration of questions of modern gender and sexuality by focusing on his relations with his two principal mentors – Ezra Pound and Gertrude Stein.

Although Hemingway's relationship with Ezra Pound was brief – they shared less than six months together in Paris in 1922, a short visit at Rapallo in 1923, and two more months in the fall of 1924 – its effects were intense and long lasting. With the great generosity he customarily showed to fellow writers, Pound took the aspiring author under his wing and educated him. Pound's greatest service, as Michael Reynolds notes, was in Hemingway's literary education, particularly his reading. Hemingway eagerly devoured everything the older poet recommended, including the nineteenth-century novelists Flaubert, Stendhal, and James; the Metaphysical poets, particularly Donne; and such ancient authors as Homer, Ovid, Chaucer, Dante, and Villon. Pound would also have Hemingway read everything by Joyce as well as the poetry and critical essays of T.S. Eliot, whose long poem The Waste Land Pound had recently edited, pruning it by about a third. "Reading The Waste Land with Ezra Pound at one's elbow," Reynolds writes, "is no bad way to pick up a thing or two. Whatever else Pound told Hemingway about the poem, he must have drilled home the necessity of cutting, revising, eliminating the dross" (28-29).

Pound also helped Hemingway revise several of his early Paris manuscripts, showing him how less can be more. Many of Pound's *Imagiste* principles of this period concerned textual

concision by means of cutting, eliminating, omitting, and compressing, and the second of his three imagist tenets was “To use absolutely no word that did not contribute to the presentation” (Pound 210). Pound, moreover, would tell Hemingway that symbols first must be natural objects in order to keep their symbolic function from obtruding into the work. In poetry as well as prose, Pound advocated a simple yet disciplined technique: let action speak for itself. While Hemingway arrived in Paris already alert to a technique of accuracy and economy learned from his journalism training on the Kansas City Star, he profited from Pound’s advice to allow images to convey meaning rather than telling readers how to respond. By the end of Hemingway’s Paris apprenticeship, simplicity, suggestion, understatement, and irony were his perfected tools; of his composition method, Hemingway would later allow that “[h]alf the writing I do is elimination” (Only Thing 95). Pound described Hemingway’s fiction as “imagist” and possessed of “the sensitivity of real writing” that showed the “touch of the chisel” (qtd. in Carpenter 425). But this is exactly what his poet-mentor had taught him to do, as acknowledged by Hemingway in a mid-November 1925 letter to Pound, crediting him as “the only guy who ever told me anything sensible and practical about prose,” and adding that “I know damn well you are the only guy who can say, as a technician, this is wrong and this is the way to make it right.” But if Hemingway recognized the importance of Pound’s literary influence, he nevertheless felt that Pound was of greater consequence to him as a friend and companion than as an editor (Baker 8).

Pound and Hemingway became fast friends when, shortly after their meeting, Pound surprised the youth by announcing that he wanted to learn to box. “I’ve been teaching Pound to box wit [sic] little success,” Hemingway reported to Sherwood Anderson. “He habitually leads wit [sic] his chin and has the general grace of the crayfish. [. . .] Pound sweats well, though, I’ll say that for him. Besides, it’s pretty sporting of him to risk his dignity and critical reputation for

something that he don't know nothing about" (SL 62). In Ezra Pound, as Reynolds observes, Hemingway found more than a sporting friend, however; he found the father (Pound was fourteen years his senior) he most needed in his early years in Paris, "a sensible man who enjoyed the physical life, a frank, sexual man" (28). It is not surprising, then, that in A Moveable Feast sketch devoted to Pound ("Ezra Pound and His Bel Esprit") Hemingway would contrast his having been recognized and "adopted" by Pound to what he calls "dangerous families" and the "terrible things and intimate harm" they can cause (AMF 108). Of his own family in Oak Park, Hemingway writes, "even when you have learned not to look at [them] nor listen to them and have learned not to answer letters, families have a way of being dangerous" (AMF 108). This chapter will consider Hemingway's relationship to his principal literary mentors in light of the gender-anxieties he perceived as the legacy of a "dangerous" family.

I. Writing Old Wrongs: Reconfiguring the Family Romance

"Feel good for the first time in months. Certainly feel good. Feel so good there's nothing to write about. Don't remember any news on leaving Paris." – Letter from Hemingway to Ezra Pound, July 1925

"Portable Corona number three. That's been my analyst." – Hemingway, in conversation, Madrid, 1954¹

Drafting his 1954 Nobel Prize acceptance address, Hemingway wrote but did not incorporate the following:

There is no lonelier man than the writer when he is writing except the suicide. Nor is there any happier, nor more exhausted man when he has written well. If he has written well everything that is him has gone into the writing and he faces another morning when he must do it again. There is always another morning and another morning. (qtd. in Burwell 25)

In her study of Hemingway's posthumous texts, Rose Marie Burwell traces the origins of Hemingway's life-long sense of emotional isolation and its relation to his writing. The early relationship of Hemingway to his family, Burwell claims, bound the artist in a life-long conflict

with women, for “the deepest roots of his self-identity united his maleness and his vocation as a writer” (32). While Burwell acknowledges that Hemingway’s dependency on women “was always mixed with a fear and mistrust [...] probably more complex in its origin than we will ever know” (29), certainly there was the belief that his mother Grace had called the shots in his childhood and adolescence.² In Ernest’s memory, Grace became “the ‘bitch’ he consistently labeled her in later years, while his father became a weakling and, as Ernest fancied himself, a victim of his mother’s tyranny” (17). Whatever Clarence and Grace Hemingway had done, or failed to do, Burwell observes, “it was inevitable that Hemingway would eventually find himself protecting his art from a vision of female power” (32). In the style he forged in his first years in Paris, Hemingway worked to purge it of words that had a big sound but were spiritually and emotionally empty – “the sort of words, that is, that his mother loved” (Lynn 212). If the platitudinous language of his childhood was to Hemingway, quite literally, “mother tongue” (Burwell 32), his instinctive resistance to language he regarded as feminine was endorsed by Ezra Pound, who in the early twenties maintained some strong opinions about the relationship between creativity, gender, and sexuality.

In the summer of 1922 Pound published a translation of Rémy de Gourmont’s The Natural Philosophy of Love. In a “Translator Postscript,” Pound included some remarks about creative thought, claiming ideation to be a masculine power similar to a “phallus or spermatozide,” whose natural target was “the female chaos” of life. As Peter Nicholls has argued, the “Men of 1914” saw the work of immediate precursors, such as the Decadents, as degenerate, as embodying the feminine and as associating the production of art with a feminine value system. In turn, they “felt and demonstrated an artistic necessity in their own work to reestablish a set of masculine values which would inform their modern(ist) production” (Dennis

265). A decade later, in Death in the Afternoon, Hemingway would similarly allude to effeminate (and homosexual) Victorian precursors, condemning Oscar Wilde, for example, as an artist who “betrayed a generation,” adding as well “the nasty, sentimental pawing of humanity of a Whitman and all the mincing gentry” (205). Hemingway was also sympathetic to Pound’s theory of the connection between sex and writing. In a letter to Ezra from Chamby, Switzerland (29 January 1923), Hemingway alludes to the poet’s idea of creative genius rising from the crotch to the brain: “This high altitude has made me practically sexless. I don’t mean that it has removed the sexual superiority of the male but that it has checked the activity of the glands.” Even as The New Freewoman was putting the case for woman’s suffrage, and as new women were attempting to break the mould of Victorian gender formations, the vanguard figure of modern verse was still working with a traditional aesthetic of the feminine. Thus despite the appearance of avant-gardism in Pound’s art, Helen Dennis contends, the function of woman exists in part “to provide the material conditions which will make his artistic production possible, by relieving his anxieties about his immediate contingent circumstances” (269). By all evidence, Hemingway shared Pound’s distrust of the influence of strong-minded women on male creativity.³

And yet, Hemingway’s letters to Pound reveal a number of gendered tensions. Of note, for instance, is Hemingway’s habit of regularly belittling fellow male writers and poets in letters to Pound, as though determined to lower Pound’s regard for their accomplishments. “I still think you are the only living poet,” the young apprentice writes in one letter (c. late November 1922), “altho. [sic] I am glad to read Herr Elliot’s [sic] adventure away from impeccability. If Herr Elliot would strangle his sick wife, buggar the brain specialist and rob the bank he might write an even better poem.” In another, Hemingway writes that he suspects Ford Madox Ford, one of

Ezra's oldest friends from his London years, "of writing in praise of his own work under various pseudonyms in *Transatlantic Review*" (SL 116). To some degree, Hemingway's sense of competitiveness can be traced to an earlier intense rivalry with his sibling, the "know-it-all, hypertalkative, ultrahandsome Marcelline," the older sister with whom he was twinned (Lynn 54). In this light, Hemingway's letters to Pound reveal a similar grudge against any associate of Pound's who threatens to crowd him out, as in his query of 13 October 1923: "Who is this man Sanford? He sounds like approximately the *geuwind*. I feel however that I should be there when you meet any new male friends" (SL 95).

Their correspondence also reveals Hemingway's keen interest in the marital lives of fellow writers. In the thirties, Rose Marie Burwell has remarked, Hemingway developed a close relationship with the editor Max Perkins, due in part, she claims, to Perkins' place at the center of an information network through which Hemingway kept track of fellow artists like F. Scott Fitzgerald, Waldo Pierce, Evan Shipman, and Mike Strater. In keeping Hemingway updated on the activities of the writers and painters they both knew who were having marital and creative problems, Burwell observes, Perkins "fed the mother-haunted Hemingway obsession with the destructive effect of women on male creativity" (30-31). But in the early twenties, Hemingway's letters to Pound reveal a strikingly similar preoccupation with the domestic circumstances of several male authors, as the advice that Eliot "strangle his wife" attests. These letters demonstrate, moreover, the extent to which Hemingway thought of writing in gendered terms.

From the start, Hemingway used his writing to cultivate a public image of masculinity. In a study of twentieth-century gender history, Rena Sanderson observes the centrality of Hemingway and his work in a cultural "re-masculinization" of American society. This movement, Sanderson says, was to some extent formed as a reaction to the growing influence of

“a diverse range of New Women, including political feminists, flappers, and career women” (183). Mirroring Pound’s derision for the Decadent poets and writers, Hemingway harbored an animosity for the “female influence in the publishing industry on critical standards and on popular tastes [that] threatened to stigmatize the writing profession as effeminate and to devalue the style and marketability of men’s writings” (Sanderson 183). In his correspondence, Hemingway repeatedly betrays a sense of gender anxiety regarding the marital lives and masculine authority of fellow male artists. Of his contemporaries, Hemingway’s letters to Pound contain several references to T.S. Eliot, in whose domestic concerns and long modernist poem – The Waste Land – he shows a distinct interest.

Letters to Pound in November 1922 suggest that Hemingway was well aware of Eliot’s mental collapse, his treatment and convalescence in Lausanne, Switzerland, and his tumultuous marriage to Vivienne Haigh-Wood, herself subject to psychological troubles and nervous breakdowns. Most likely, Pound had told Hemingway of Eliot’s deteriorating mental condition and of the demands of caring for Vivienne, whom Ezra once described as “an invalid, always cracking up, & needing doctors” (Lynn 247). A 15 November 1922 letter from Eliot to Pound, in fact, reveals Eliot’s sense of obligation to his wife, even as the demands on his time frustrated his claims to a poetic career.⁴ “I am responsible to her in more than the ordinary way,” Eliot writes. “I have made a great many mistakes, which are largely the cause of her present catastrophic state of health, and also it must be remembered that she kept me from returning to America where I should have become a professor and probably never written another line of poetry, so that in that respect she should be endowed” (Letters 597). The endowment Eliot refers to was a plan proposed by Pound to raise funds from private donors in order to allow Eliot to leave his position as a clerk at Lloyds in London and devote his full attention to poetry. The scheme was christened

“Bel Esprit” by Pound, who sent to Eliot in 1923 about £120, far short of the £600 a year Eliot told Pound he would require (Gordon 197).

In A Moveable Feast, Hemingway lampoons Bel Esprit in a passage that is clearly meant to emasculate Eliot:

Ezra founded something called Bel Esprit with Miss Natalie Barney who was a rich American woman and a patroness of the arts. . . . [S]he had a salon at her house on regular dates and a small Greek temple in her garden. Many American and French women with money enough had salons and I figured very early that they were excellent places for me to stay away from, but Miss Barney, I believe, was the only one that had a small Greek temple in her garden.

Ezra showed me the brochure for Bel Esprit and Miss Barney had allowed him to use the small Greek temple on the brochure. [...] It was always a disappointment to me that we had not been able to get the Major out of the bank by Bel Esprit alone, as in my dreams I had pictured him as coming, perhaps, to live in the small Greek temple and that maybe I could go with Ezra when we would drop in to crown him with laurel. I knew where there was fine laurel that I could gather, riding out on my bicycle to get it, and I thought we could crown him any time he felt lonesome or any time Ezra had gone over the manuscript or the proofs of another big poem like *The Waste Land*. (AMF 110-112)

Barney’s replica of a Greek temple, called the Temple à l’Amitié, was dedicated to friendship, thus its use by Bel Esprit, but as the backdrop for Barney’s famous females-only gatherings, it was created to pay homage to Sappho and invoke in the walled garden of 20, rue Jacob, a contemporary community of Paris Lesbos. As Shari Benstock has observed, Barney’s Académie des Femmes (a counterpart to the then all-male Académie-Française) provided an alternative lesbian culture, a venue where women could perform, create, and safely express their desire for one another. Hemingway literally situates Eliot within this contemporary Sapphic circle to cast doubt on Eliot’s manhood as well as his powers as a creative artist, crediting Ezra instead for the success of The Waste Land.

Three months after the December 1922 Boni and Liveright publication of The Waste Land, Hemingway wrote a nasty satire, “The Lady Poets With Footnotes:”

One lady poet was a nymphomaniac and wrote for Vanity Fair.¹
One lady poet's husband was killed in the war.²
One lady poet wanted her lover, but was afraid of having a baby.
When she finally got married, she found she couldn't have a baby.³
One lady poet slept with Bill Reedy got fatter and fatter and made
half a million dollars writing bum plays.⁴
One lady poet never had enough to eat.⁵
One lady poet was big and fat and no fool.⁶

¹ College nymphomaniac. Favourite lyric poet of leading editorial writer N.Y. Tribune.

² It sold her stuff.

³ Favourite of State University male virgins. Wonderful on unrequited love.

⁴ Stomach's gone bad from liquor. Expects to do something really good soon.

⁵ It showed in her work.

⁶ She smoked cigars all right, but her stuff was no good.⁵ (Poems 77)

The six lady poets, according to Michael Reynolds, were probably Edna St. Vincent Millay, Alice Kilmer, Sara Teasdale, Zoe Akins, Lola Ridge, and Amy Lowell – none of whom Hemingway knew personally (109). His parody of Eliot's attachment of footnotes to The Waste Land – and the coupling of Eliot's technique with assertions about the private lives of prominent female poets – suggests a more complex motive than either contempt or envy, for it also says something about Hemingway's own doubts about his masculinity at this time. If Hemingway sympathetically adopted Pound's view that women and wives represented a threat to the writing male, his fears of emasculation were years in the making. The emasculation or psychological castration of his father at the hands of his mother that Hemingway witnessed as a child left a deep and lasting impact on his sense of masculine identity. What Ernest believed was his father's degrading subservience to Grace, at least one critic has observed, resulted in a loss of respect, "which was then intensified by Dr. Hemingway's abject departure from home in 1912 to take a 'rest cure' for his nerves" (Lynn 63). That Eliot's personality and private life – including his nervous breakdown and treatment in Lausanne at Lac Lemman – was incorporated in The Waste Land was not lost on Hemingway. Along with the gossip he absorbed about the poet,

Hemingway also read “Mr. Apollinax,” “Rhapsody on a Windy Night,” and “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock” with an eye for authorial vulnerability. His conclusion was that Eliot was “absolutely panicked by the challenge of adult sexuality” (Lynn 247). This realization prompted Hemingway to change the manuscript title of “Mr. and Mrs. Smith” – a story based on the marital troubles of the poet Chard Powers Smith and his wife, Olive – to “Mr. and Mrs. Elliot,” as well as to insinuate that “Elliot” was either sterile or impotent.⁶

Hemingway also took the opportunity to publicly attack Eliot in the transatlantic review, a Paris “little magazine” founded by Ford Madox Ford. Encouraged by Pound, Ford took on the young Hemingway as an assistant editor early in 1924. In the first issue, Ford ran a long letter from Eliot, in which he disapproved of Ford’s vision that the review operate as a vehicle for young writers: “I object that this is an unnecessary discrimination in favor of youth,” wrote Eliot, insisting that a review is not measured by the number of new writers it discovers. Eliot also took the occasion to argue that American literature, as distinct from English literature, did not exist. Claims to the contrary, Eliot argued, were merely manifestations of the “mistaken nationalism” of the “singularly stupid” present age (qtd. in Lynn 232). Hemingway resented Eliot because he used his authority to influence Ford’s editorial policies in ways he did not approve. “Ford’s running the whole damn thing as a compromise,” he raged in a c. 2 May letter to Pound. “In other words anything Ford will take and publish can be took and published in Century, Harpers etc. [...] Goddam it he hasn’t any advertizers to offend or any subscribers to discontinue why not shoot the moon?” (SL 116). When left in charge during Ford’s American tour, Hemingway dropped the serialized instalment of Ford’s novel, Parade’s End, slated for the August 1924 issue. Instead, he published a number of American upstarts in defiance of what he felt was Ford’s preference for more established, conservative writers. In the “Conrad Supplement” to the

September 1924 issue, Hemingway included in the course of his tribute to the late novelist a few remarks intended to offend Eliot:

If I knew that by grinding Mr. Eliot into a fine dry powder and sprinkling that powder over Mr. Conrad's grave Mr. Conrad would shortly appear, looking very annoyed at the forced return and commence writing I would leave for London tomorrow morning with a sausage grinder. One should not be funny over the death of a great man, but you cannot couple T.S. Eliot and Joseph Conrad in a sentence seriously ... and not laugh.

By insulting Ford's longtime friend, Hemingway in part attempted to ridicule both men by attacking their attitude of superiority. From the start, the relationship between editor and assistant was strained, for despite their potential affinities, and despite Pound's attempts to mediate between them, Hemingway refused to acknowledge the debt he owed Ford or allow any chance of a friendship to develop between them. As Michael Reynolds has described, "Ernest seldom had a kind word for the 'Master,'" as Ford liked to be called. "It was a curious editorial relationship in which Ford tried desperately to keep some continuity between the pre-war gentlemen of literature whom he sorely missed and the post-war brood of iconoclasts so eager to abandon their heritage" (171). Despite the differences in their editorial stances, however, Ford remained enthusiastic about Hemingway's new prose and generously patronized him, later claiming, "I did not read more than six words of his before I decided to publish everything he sent me" (qtd. in Lynn 230). In the short lifespan of the review – it lasted only a year – Ford published three of Ernest's early stories after they were rejected by American periodicals.⁷ But Hemingway's reaction against Ford was as much personal as it was literary.

II. "A sweetly acrid quality:" Sniffing Around Scenes of (Failed) Instruction

At the time Ernest began working under Ford on the transatlantic review, Ford was fifty-one, only two years younger than Dr. Clarence Hemingway. While the relationship between Hemingway and Ford has been largely neglected by both Hemingway and Ford critics alike, the

cruX of their encounter has been viewed chiefly as a clash of generations and literary traditions. Although initially fascinated with Ford's stories about his collaboration with Joseph Conrad and friendship with Henry James, Hemingway soon found Ford's mannerisms tiresome, especially his pretense as the last of a dying breed of Old Tory squires and his frequent references to his volunteering for active service, though in his forties, in World War I, and to the gas attack he had suffered that had altered the quality of his voice. In A Moveable Feast, Hemingway thus recalls Ford "breathing heavily through a heavy, stained mustache and holding himself as upright as an ambulatory, well clothed up-ended hogshead" (83). The allusion to the "heavy, wheezing, ignoble presence of Ford himself, only touching distance away," moreover, presents Ford as an out-of-date man of letters, carelessly imposing his suffocating presence on the younger writers of a post-war Paris cultural scene (86). For many critics, Hemingway's repulsive reaction to Ford represents a younger generation's inner feeling for both the man and a pre-war artistic world out of step with the contemporary period. Elena Lamberti, for example, cites Hemingway's adverse feelings for Ford as symbolically representing "the extreme consequence of the degeneration of previous values, including the values of the pre-war artistic traditions" (244). Indeed, Nathan Asch, a twenty-two year-old Polish-American writer in Paris whose first stories were also published in the transatlantic review, recalls of that time the feeling that Hemingway "could not function unless he fought and destroyed older men" (qtd. in Poli 82). And yet the deep affinities between Ford and Hemingway simply cannot be ignored, including their inability to tell the straightforward truth about their war experiences.

In a previously unpublished letter, Hemingway writes to Pound (c. mid-November 1925) that "Ford is on the third vol of his colossal trilogy of *The Soldier (British)* as represented by the Master himself. This refers to Ford not to Christ. Readers confidently expect that in this last Vol

The Soldier will actually reach the FRONT. Personally I don't think the Master will dare risk it. Christ what an orgy of stylistic faking it will be if he does." To a casual observer, Hemingway's remarks to Pound are in line with similar abuses against Ford. But when one considers how Hemingway portrayed his own war experience in his journalism and fiction, his comments about Ford's war novel suggest an anxiety both personal and literary. In Hemingway's First War: The Making of a Farewell to Arms, Michael Reynolds illustrates how as early as 1922, young Hemingway had already researched enough historical accounts to pose as an expert on a war in which he had served only briefly and that "he later admitted he did not understand" (13). In his journalism for the Toronto Daily Star, Reynolds observes, Hemingway was able to create the voice of a seasoned veteran, alluding to many more events than he ever personally experienced. In recalling the haunting terrain of "the rocky Carso," "Gorizia," and "Mount San Gabrielle" in his article "A Veteran Visits Old Front" (July 1922), for instance, Hemingway had never seen these places, and when the road turned to dust at Schio in 1916, as he remembers it, "looking out the window [...] where the arc light was making a dim light through the rain," he was actually at home in Oak Park, preparing for his senior year in high school (Reynolds 14). If in 1922 Hemingway had performed his own bit of "fakery" on his unsuspecting Canadian readers, it was a stylistic method he was prepared to use again to write A Farewell to Arms (1929), his only novel set on terrain with which he did not have any personal experience. Aided rather by his imagination, military histories, and veterans' accounts, Hemingway's first war novel was essentially a masterful research work. Ironically, it was Ford who told Hemingway in 1924 while working on the transatlantic review about Stephen Crane's research method in The Red Badge of Courage. Ford had known Crane during the Brede Manor days and one thing Ford knew – and

that was not public knowledge – was the way in which Crane had researched his famous war novel (Reynolds 12-13).⁸

More indirectly, Hemingway's relationship with Ford also informs one of his finest early stories. Composed in March-April 1924 while closely working with Ford on the transatlantic review, the aforementioned "Soldier's Home" tells the story of Harold Krebs, an alienated veteran of World War I. At first, we're told, Krebs "did not want to talk about the war at all," but later, when he felt the need to talk, no one wanted to listen: "His town had heard too many atrocity stories to be thrilled by actualities. Krebs found that to be listened to at all he had to lie, and after he had done this twice, he, too, had a reaction against the war and against talking about it" (CSS 111). On the composition of "Soldier's Home," Paul Smith has suggested that some remarks Hemingway made to Ezra Pound about Ford might mark the occasion that led him to begin the story. In a letter of 17 March 1924, Hemingway writes that Ford "has never recovered in a literary way from the mirricle [sic] [...] of his having been a soldier" (SL 113). Unlike DeMaupassant, Balzac, Stendhal, and, by implication, Hemingway, who "just learned from" the war, Ford was "always going on under the social spell of it. I'm going to start denying I was in the war for fear I will get like Ford to myself about it" (SL 113). But as Smith points out, if anyone had been under "the social spell" of war it was Hemingway in early 1919, when he returned from Italy with "the trappings of a hero, a few real but most of them secondhand souvenirs" (68-69). His letter to Pound, Smith observes, more than recalls the discrepancies between his own war experiences and the heroic tales he told at home, including the stories he told to civic clubs, high school audiences, and his own friends (69). Like many veterans of any war, particularly those who have not been engaged in combat, Hemingway made up for it, as Krebs does, with "quite unimportant lies [that] consisted in attributing to himself things other

men had seen, done or heard of, and stating as facts certain apocryphal incidents familiar to all soldiers” (CSS 112). And like Krebs, who reads about the engagements he had been in and looks forward “with a good feeling to reading all the really good histories when they would come out” (CSS 113), Hemingway’s own service on the Italian front in 1918 produced a lifelong preoccupation with warfare. In turn, his “professional identity emerged from that violent episode, and he developed a proprietary attitude toward combat that informed his fictional program” (Kennedy and Curnutt 7).

In Torrents of Spring (1926), for example, Hemingway writes of the war that “[n]obody had any damn business to write about it [...] that didn’t at least know about it from hearsay. Literature has too strong an effect on people’s minds” (57).⁹ Momentarily dropping the farcical tone of the novella, Hemingway explains the psychic stages of soldiering, describing the development of the combat soldier in four distinct phases and, in the process, inferring his personal familiarity with each new experience:

In a good soldier in the war it went like this: First, you were brave because you didn’t think anything could hit you, because you yourself were something special, and you knew that you could never die. You were really scared then, but if you were a good soldier you functioned the same as before. Then after you were wounded and not killed, with new men coming on, and going through your old processes, you hardened and became a good hard-boiled soldier. Then came the second crack, which is much worse than the first, and then you began doing good deeds, [...] and storing up treasures in heaven. (Torrents 56-57)

Interestingly, Hemingway more than coincidentally refers in each stage to “the good soldier,” a repetition that recalls Ford’s 1915 masterpiece, The Good Soldier. By appropriating Ford’s phrase in a passage intended to establish himself as an expert, the allusion to Ford’s first war novel reveals Hemingway’s struggle to assume his place within a rich literary tradition of war writing.

Other references to Ford's war novels signal Hemingway's artistic conflict with his literary predecessor. In a study of Hemingway's indebtedness to Ford, Linda Wagner-Martin illustrates how the young novelist reworked Ford's The Good Soldier in writing The Sun Also Rises (1926), and, more extensively, in A Farewell to Arms (1929). In The Good Soldier, Wagner-Martin writes, "the themes of love and war are carefully, if ironically, intertwined. One cannot exist without the other; yet the ostensible tone and texture of the work belie its subtitle, A Tale of Passion" (187). Whereas Wagner-Martin's intertextual study focuses on Hemingway's later borrowings from The Good Soldier, a previously unpublished letter Hemingway wrote Ezra Pound (c. 10 April 1925) reveals just how closely the "Master's" former apprentice was reading each new installment of his four-part Parade's End. "Ford is on the third vol.," Hemingway writes, "and Teajans [Ford's English protagonist] and the wench have not screwed yet. Readers will be demanding their money back. The poor bloody heroine is the one that ought to have her money back I think." In the opening sections of his first novel, Hemingway's remark about Ford reappears in a deleted manuscript version of The Sun Also Rises:

In Braddocks's [Ford's] novels there was always a great deal of passion but it took sometimes two and three volumes for anyone to sleep with anyone else. In actual life it seemed there was a great deal of sleeping about among good people [,] much more sleeping about than passion. [...] Who knew anything about anybody? You didn't know a woman because you slept with her any more than you knew a horse because you'd ridden him once." (qtd. in Svoboda 85)

Here, Wagner-Martin's observations are instructive, for "[r]ather than point to Ford's presentation of war and postwar conflict," she writes, "Hemingway chose to focus on the relentless romance plot" (188). In a conscious misreading of Ford's war novels, Hemingway deliberately misrepresents his predecessor's ironic presentation of pre-war "passion" as irrelevant to postwar readers. Such a strategic misreading also accounts for his private comments

about Ford, always emphasizing the side of Ford's personality "involved in being the dregs of an English country gentleman," so much so that "you get no good from him" (SL 113).

While the source of Hemingway's one-sided antagonism toward Ford has evaded observers since the 1920s, the recent publication of an additional Paris sketch on Ford sheds new light on the uneasy relationship between the "Master" and his assistant editor. In an omitted episode of *A Moveable Feast*, Hemingway writes that while "[a]lmost everyone lies and the lies are not important," Ford "lied about things that left scars" (Restored 199). This admission is curiously similar to reflections elsewhere in the memoir about the "terrible things" and "intimate harm" inflicted on the young artist by "dangerous" families (AMF 108). By the spring of 1924, Hemingway was writing stories that "he knew his parents could not read without being deeply hurt. Deep within him he needed their approval and support, but a part of him continually raised barricades to prevent the possibility" (Reynolds 191). The story "Soldier's Home, for example, projects the inability of his parents to understand and accept his work (Reynolds 191). Similarly, the widening rift between Ford and Hemingway places the conflict between the absent father and son in "Soldier's Home" in a new light. In a 17 March 1924 letter to Ezra Pound at Rapallo, Hemingway reports on "writing some damn good stories" but wishes Pound was in Paris to either confirm or correct his judgment. In Pound's absence, he writes, he only has Ford to read his work. Playing on a title of Ford's reminiscences about his own literary mentors, Hemingway complains to Pound that Ford only "explain[s] stuff i.e. Thus to Revisit or Thus to Revise-it" (SL 113). In other words, Hemingway insinuates, Ford is unavailable for instruction.

At a time when his stories were virtually writing themselves (Reynolds 41), Hemingway's remarks nevertheless indicate a degree of uncertainty and resentment toward Ford for not recognizing his need for the older author's advice and approval. But the way in which

Hemingway would later remember Ford – particularly his physical aversion for the older man – suggests a subtext far more ambiguous. In an excised episode of his Paris memoir, Hemingway recalls his now familiar revulsion for the famous editor of the transatlantic review:

I had a completely unreasonable physical antipathy to Ford which was not simply for his bad breath, although I found I could alleviate it by trying to always keep to windward of him. He had another very distinct odor that had nothing to do with his breath that made it almost impossible for me to be in a closed room with him. This odor would increase when he was lying and it had a sweetly acrid quality. [...] I tried always to see him in the open air if possible and when I would go down to Bill Bird's hand press on the Quai D'Anjou at the Ile St. Louis where he edited his review to read manuscripts for him, I always took the manuscripts out of the shop and sat on the wall of the Quai under the shade of the big trees to read them. I would have read them out there anyway as it was pleasant on the Quai and the light was good but I always had to go out of the shop as soon as I could when Ford came in. (Restored 201)

Likewise, the autobiographical 1933 short story “Fathers and Sons” has Hemingway's protagonist – the writer Nick Adams – remember a similar sensory impression of his tortured father: “Nick loved his father but hated the smell of him and once when he had to wear a suit of his father's underwear that had gotten too small for his father it made him feel sick and he took it off and put it under two stones in the creek and said that he had lost it” (CSS 375). The narrative of the story of Nick forced to wear his father's maldorous underwear, his claim of having lost it, and his being punished for it in the woodshed reaches its climactic intensity as Nick imagines murdering his father: “I can blow him to hell. I can kill him” (CSS 375). Instead, he goes to the Indian camp, presumably to see Prudy Boulton, “walking there in the dark, to get rid of the smell” (CSS 375).

As Ann Edwards Boutelle has speculated, “[i]t is the smell of sex, of adult paternal sex,” that Nick smells in his father's underwear that makes him feel sick (145). This connection between the odor of mortality and adult sexuality constitutes a problematic for Nick in his relationship with his father. On matters of sex, Nick tells us, his father was profoundly

“unsound” (CSS 370), a fact that emerges as Nick remembers reading in the paper that Enrico Caruso had been arrested for mashing:

“What is mashing?”

“It is one of the most heinous of crimes,” his father answered. Nick’s imagination pictured the great tenor doing something strange, bizarre, and heinous with a potato masher to a beautiful lady who looked like the pictures of Anna Held on the inside of cigar boxes. He resolved, with considerable horror, that when he was old enough he would try mashing at least once.

His father had summed up the whole matter by stating that masturbation produced blindness, insanity, and death, while a man who went with prostitutes would contract hideous venereal diseases and that the thing to do was to keep your hands off of people. (CSS 371)

After this, the relationship begins to “devolve in ambivalence, even hatred, rather than to evolve in filial love” (Nakjavani 98). Indeed, Nick makes it clear that “after the age of fifteen he had shared nothing with him [his father]” (CSS 496). Nick’s patricidal declaration in the woodshed, Erik Nakjavani argues, is thus “a remarkable Oedipal moment” because it is “more a matter of *tyrannicide* than of patricide” (99). More precisely, “it is the father *arresting* the growth of his son’s fantasy of omnipotence in its most extensive (read destructive as well as creative) sense that has to be blown to hell, with the very gun that his father has provided him” (Nakjavani 99). The “unsound” father represents, then, “the Other to Nick, the symbolic sum of all that withholds sexual potency. Nick equates the ‘unsound’ father with powerlessness and emasculation. He portrays his father as sentimental, unlucky, trapped, and betrayed by all” (Nakjavani 99).

If Nick’s evocation of the failure of his father “was not good remembering” (CSS 371), Hemingway likewise prefaces his sketch on Ford by contending that “I tried to be just to him and not be severe, nor judge him, but only to get along with him; but to think and write about him with accuracy and exactitude was crueler than any judging” (Restored 199). Similarly, Hemingway emphasizes aspects of Ford’s powerlessness and the betrayals he suffered, recounting times when “Ford had found himself cruelly persecuted and many of his friends had

behaved shabbily towards him” (Restored 200). But in the end, despite the fact that Ford, like Nick’s father, “deserved sympathy of a kind” (Restored 200), the sketch suggests Hemingway’s inability to disassociate the “acrid smell” of Ford and the painful memory of Clarence Hemingway. These remembrances constitute a leitmotif that Harold Bloom calls the “scene of instruction,” in which a one-time pupil reimagines his artistic development. In this case, however, rather than look for the “fault that is not there” in the work of a “Great Original” who influenced him (30), Hemingway collapses the scenes of absent instructors and failed instruction to represent a memory of himself as a successful artist despite his father’s narrow Victorian morality and Ford’s tutelary unresponsiveness.¹⁰

By contrast, Hemingway’s student-pupil relationship with Gertrude Stein and the “scene of instruction” at her famous atelier at 27, rue de Fleurus, was so considerable that the recurring anxiety he felt over her influence would entail repeated revisions of the legend of his apprenticeship. When Hemingway arrived in Paris in 1921, a letter of introduction from Sherwood Anderson enabled Hemingway to make the acquaintance of Stein and her companion Alice Toklas. During the spring of 1922, Hemingway often met Stein in the Luxembourg Gardens and was soon told to call at her studio whenever he was in the neighborhood. There, Hemingway admired the paintings and received instruction from the experimental author of Three Lives and Tender Buttons. On one hand, their relationship was based on a mutual interest in the writer’s craft or *métier*, a concept Stein had adopted and one that Hemingway energetically took up as well. On another level, James Mellow observes, Stein was a “mother figure” whom Hemingway could approve; unlike Grace Hemingway, Stein championed the sense of freedom that Paris provided, unencumbered by “the social pieties that ruled Oak Park” (151). Stein served as a surrogate mother who physically and emotionally had much in common with Grace Hall

Hemingway but, unlike her, took his literary ambitions seriously and encouraged him at a time when he desperately needed such support. For a while, Hemingway enjoyed Stein's attention and regarded her as an important voice of modern literature. Hadley claimed that in those early years, Hemingway had been "profoundly occupied" with the theories of Stein (Mellow 152), and his regard for her literary opinion persisted into 1923 when he acknowledged to her: "I've thought a lot about the things you said about working and am starting that way at the beginning" (SL 79).

During the period in which Hemingway came to know Stein, she was committed to an aesthetic program of "pure objectivity, removing from her fiction anything known from memory or experience and instead relying exclusively on what can be perceived through the senses at any given moment" (Lamb 115). In these efforts, she attempted to write fiction based on the principle that one should not draw upon the experiences of one's own life because the subject is so subjectively organized that it is too difficult to recover it exactly as it existed at the moment of being experienced. Hemingway also wanted to represent moments as they are experienced, but whereas Stein achieved what she called "a continuous present" by eschewing linear narrative for discrete sentences that do not build upon each other, Hemingway's impressionism adopts Stein's technique of using progressive tenses and gerunds to convey the impression of ongoing action. Another important lesson Hemingway learned from Stein was the use of repetition. Because Stein's "continuous present" had to repeat phrases in order to prevent each clause or sentence from connecting with one another, she "called her form of repetition *insistence*, stating that 'there is no such thing as repetition,'" for even when something is repeated, "'emphasis can never be the same'" (Lamb 116). Stein used as an analogy the cinema, in which "each frame slightly differs from adjacent frames" to show that "nothing (including words) can ever really be repeated because each moment, and the sentence or clause representing it, is unique" (Lamb

116). Hemingway's most effective use of Stein's method is illustrated in "Soldier's Home," where the pattern of "he liked" sentences carries the feeling of Krebs's ambivalent feelings about the girls in his hometown:

He liked the girls that were walking along the other side of the street. He liked the look of them much better than the French girls or the German girls. But the world they were in was not the world he was in. He would like to have one of them. But it was not worth it. They were such a nice pattern. He liked the pattern. It was exciting. But he would not go through all the talking. He did not want one badly enough. He liked to look at them all, though. It was not worth it. Not now when things were getting good again. (CSS 113)

As Robert Lamb has remarked, Hemingway "surely learned" this sort of repetition from Stein; and although such passages are largely atypical in Hemingway's work, the discovery that by "repeating a word in a different context you can foreground a different denotation or connotation and change the word's meaning" is a technique that would become "central to Hemingway's use of repetition in his nondialogue prose" (121).

But as he learned his craft and began to regularly publish the stories he was writing, he "grew impatient with Stein's imperious manner and looked to establish his literary independence" (Kennedy and Curnutt 3). As Michael Reynolds remarks, by early 1924, Hemingway "no longer needed Gertrude Stein," for his stories were virtually writing themselves (41). And yet, Hemingway still required Stein's approval; evidence suggests that there were no "ostensible personal confrontations" between Hemingway and both Sherwood Anderson and Stein before the October 1925 publication of In Our Time. While Hemingway clearly wanted to end comparisons of his work with Anderson's, his "later break with Stein had a more direct cause," one that involved the reception of his new story collection (Mellow 316). Writing to Ezra Pound (8 November 1925) about the book, he complains:

La Grand Gertrude Stein warned me when I presented her with a copy not to expect a review as she thought it would be wiser to wait for my novel. What a lot

of safe playing kikes. Why not write a review of one book at a time? She is afraid that I might fall on my nose in a novel and if so how terrible it would have been to have said anything about this book no matter how good it may be. (qtd. in Mellow 316)

A further grievance against Stein, Hemingway tells Pound, had to do with publication in T.S.

Eliot's magazine The Criterion: "Eliot doesn't know whether I am any good or not. He came over and asked Gertrude if I were serious and worth publishing and Gertrude said it were best to wait and see – that I am just starting and there wasn't any way of knowing yet" (qtd. in Mellow 316). Two weeks later, in an explosion of sardonic humor, Hemingway wrote The Torrents of Spring, a parody of Anderson's Dark Laughter that he expected to "start plenty of rows" (SL 174). Still smarting from Stein's refusal to write a review and endorse him to Eliot as a serious writer, Hemingway tells Pound that his intent in Torrents is to "show up all the fakes of Anderson, Gertrude, Lewis, Cather" and satirize the "faking pretentious bastards" into early retirement. "I don't see how Sherwood will ever be able to write again," he proudly tells Pound, adding that "stuff like Gertrude isn't worth the bother to show up. It's easier simply to quote from it" (qtd. in Mellow 318). What this assessment obscures, however, is the extent to which Torrents "is as personal as any of Hemingway's works," albeit through "disguise and misdirection" (Coltrane 159). While critical interest has thus focused on reading the novella in light of Hemingway's complicated intimacy in late 1925 with both Hadley and Pauline Pfeiffer, what has largely escaped the attention of both critics and biographers is the extent to which Hemingway's satire employs an allusive strategy to confront his sense of reception anxiety as well as free himself from the persistent influence of Gertrude Stein.

III. "A piece of secret history:" Gertrude Stein and The Torrents of Spring

"That's all there is to the story."

“There’s more than that,” Scripps said. “I’d stake my life there’s more than that.”

– Hemingway, The Torrents of Spring (22)

Whereas the plot of Torrents evolves in upper Michigan, the city of Paris is nevertheless the centerpiece of the text, for it provides not only the narrative frame of reference but is evoked as a place of scandal, intrigue, and romance that significantly informs the lives of the main characters. Thus Yogi Johnson, who works with Scripps O’Neil at the pump factory, has been left impotent as a result of a sexual exploit during a visit to Paris during the war. Diana, the elderly waitress to whom Scripps is married briefly, recounts an elaborate tale of her involvement in a hushed-up scandal on the eve of the Paris Exhibition of 1900. Even Scripps succumbs to long reveries of Paris but then remembers that he has never been there.

Hemingway’s authorial perceptions of Paris are depicted in the satire’s frequent authorial asides. The city he describes is characterized by its intellectuals (John Dos Passos, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Gertrude Stein); its refined cuisine and vintages; and its stimulating conversations about “Art” in such forums as the Café du Dôme. But as Welford Taylor has observed, these emblems are not immune to parody; Fitzgerald, for example, is pictured in a drunken prank (76) while Dos Passos appears only long enough to announce “Hemingway, you have wrought a masterpiece” (71). Furthermore, the author foregoes discussing Art with Dos Passos at the Dôme in order to return home and write another chapter yet invites the reader to mail him a writing sample in care of his personal table at his favorite café on the Boulevard Montparnasse (47). Similarly, speaking of Paris as represented by Gertrude Stein, Hemingway writes of his mentor: “Where were her experiments in words leading her?” (74). As if to answer the question, Hemingway parodies her in signature Steinese: “Paris in the morning. Paris in the evening. Paris at night. Paris in the morning again. Paris at noon, perhaps. Why not?” (75). Here Hemingway attempts to conflate Stein’s experimental prose with the monotonous repetition and pointless

questions that plague Anderson's prose style in Dark Laughter (Curnutt 126). Yet the slight toward Stein is so veiled – it is attributed to Yogi Johnson rather than included in one of the intermittent authorial intrusions – that “Stein was more offended for Anderson's sake than for her own” (Curnutt 126).

According to Carlos Baker, Hemingway composed Torrents in “seven to ten days,” from 23 to 30 November 1925 (590). As several critics have observed, the decision to write the satire was largely influenced by two connected events: the arrival, in mid-September, of a copy of Dark Laughter, forwarded at Anderson's request; and the October 5 publication of In Our Time, which immediately elicited comparisons with Anderson's work from reviewers (Taylor 104). But as Mellow's biography implies, a further motivation for the parody was the resentment Hemingway felt toward Stein for her refusal to write a review of his book, as evidenced in his 8 November letter to Pound. If the ultimate goal of the satire was to serve as a renunciation of Anderson, it also provided a means of fictionalizing his personal frustrations by commenting indirectly on Stein. A brief summary of two passages from Torrents will demonstrate how Hemingway used his parody to disguise his intensely private anxieties about his literary work and ambitions during this period.

Early in the novella, Diana, Scripps O'Neil's elderly wife, tells a story about travelling to Paris from England with her mother for the Paris Exposition of 1900. They take adjoining rooms at a hotel in the Place Vendôme where, after dining alone together, go to bed early in anticipation of the opening of the exhibition. In the morning, however, Diana awakens to find that her mother has vanished and an elderly French general now occupies her bed. Summoning the hotel management, Diana is shown the guest-register and is told that she registered with the general and that they know nothing about her mother. Diana interviews a merchant whose shop she

visited with her mother the day before as well as the cab driver who brought them from the *gare* to the hotel. Both the merchant and driver swear that they remember Diana but insist that she was accompanied by the elderly general rather than her mother. At the British embassy, it is finally established that Diana had crossed the channel with her mother but they could do nothing to help find the vanished woman. “I never saw Mummy again,” Diana explains, “Never again. Not even once” (22). In the author’s postscript, however, Hemingway returns to the story of the vanished woman, thinking that the reader “might be interested to know the real explanation” (89). What actually happened, we learn, is that the “mother was taken violently ill with the bubonic plague in the night, and the doctor who was called diagnosed the case and warned the authorities” (89). As it was the opening day of the exposition, the authorities feared what a case of the plague would do for “publicity” so they “simply had the woman disappear” (90). The elderly French general, who was “one of the big stockholders in the exposition,” was installed in the mother’s place and the French police “hushed the whole matter,” including the testimony of the merchant and the cab driver (90). Anyway, Hemingway confesses, “as a piece of secret history it always seemed to me like an awfully good story, and I know you would rather have me explain it here [in the postscript] than drag an explanation into the novel, where really, after all, it has no place” (90).

Interestingly, the origin of Diana’s story was a popular urban legend circulating Paris throughout the 1920s. Variations of the tale appear in Belloc Lowndes’ The End of Her Honeymoon (1913), Lawrence Rising’s She Who Was Helena Cass (1920), and Sir Basil Thomson’s The Vanishing of Mrs. Fraser (1925). While the locale may vary, the usual setting of the story is Paris during the Exposition of 1900. In most variations, the daughter returns from a pharmacy with medicine for her sick mother to find that the room has been completely

refurbished or does not exist, and no one remembers having seen either the daughter or her mother.¹¹ In most cases, the mother's contagious disease is the reason for the elaborate deception. Hemingway's adaptation of the Paris legend, however, includes several autobiographical additions to suggest that the "vanished" or "lost" mother is coded in the anecdote as a source of wish fulfillment.

With the stories of In Our Time in print and Stein's refusal to recognize their achievement fresh on his mind, the inclusion of Diana's lengthy narrative in his short satire reveals the extent to which Hemingway was thinking about mother figures. In a letter to Archibald MacLeish, for instance, Hemingway confesses his annoyance with Grace Hemingway and her penchant for comparing him unfavorably with Anderson:

My mother sent me your review of *Dark Laughter* from the *Atlantic Monthly*. [...] My mother always sends me everything that shows up *Sherwood* or when he gets a divorce or anything because she has read that I am much the same thing only not so good and she naturally wants me to know how the master is getting along. (SL 178)

As recent biographers such as Kenneth Lynn, Bernice Kert, and James Mellow consistently point out, Ernest's early relationship with his mother was marked by Grace's tendency "to control her children's lives, to mold them to her expectations and desires, rather than allow them to express and pursue their own likes and dislikes" (Boker 173). In a biography of her brother, Madelaine Hemingway writes, "[T]hough mother loved all her children, she had very high standards of conduct and achievement that she wanted us to live up to. While we all did much that she wanted done, it sometimes seemed as if we could never really satisfy her. Her criticisms and disappointment could show unexpectedly – and sometimes we thought unfairly" (16). If the overall motive for Torrents was a declaration of independence from Anderson's influence, it also served as a renunciation of Grace Hemingway's persistent misjudgments of his work. At the

same time, the mystery of Diana's lost mother – on the eve of the *ville lumiere's* important Exposition – evokes Hemingway's association with Stein, who, according to Peter Griffin, “was Paris to Hemingway” (Less Than A Treason 73). In Stein, according to Pamela Boker, Hemingway found “the phallic/creative mother whom he could envy and with whom he could identify,” thus enabling him “to play out his own phallic contest with his mother, [...] young Hemingway's first source of artistic envy and inspiration” (192). It is thus a significant detail of Diana's story that Hemingway assigns her “strange background” to “England, the Lake Country,” where “the wind blow[s] at Windermere” (37) – also the name (Windemere) Grace christened the Hemingways northern Michigan cabin on Walloon Lake. Moreover, Hemingway was ousted from his mother's home a few days after his majority birthday. While Grace's gesture of defiance in kicking Hemingway out of the house in 1920 was “the culmination of his heated conflictual relationship with this phallic maternal figure” (Boker 192), the anecdote of Diana's lost mother reveals a fictionalized resolution to the dominant and contentious personalities that threatened his independence.

Another autobiographical detail is insinuated in the figure of the French general who takes the mother's place in her bed. While Hemingway derived much of his artistic talent, ambition, and creative sensibility from his mother, throughout his life Ernest blamed Grace for his problematic “masculine identification with his father” (Boker 192). As evidenced in the Nick Adams stories of In Our Time, Hemingway's stories present scenes from an early family life wherein an absent or weak father disappoints a son who seeks the “protective or reassuring peership of an idealized father figure” (Boker 193). Likewise, biographers and critics commonly evoke a portrait of the young Hemingway in search of a father figure whom he could idealize and who possessed the grandiose, heroic attributes that his demanding and ambitious mother

expected him to have. Perhaps, as Kenneth Lynn suggests, Ernest saw this paternal ideal in his grandfather, Ernest Hall, a Civil War hero, who in his mother's estimation was "the finest purest noblest man I have ever known" (30). Similarly, the elderly French general summoned by the authorities to the bed in the same room where Diana's mother had been, Hemingway declares, "always seemed to us like a pretty brave man" (90). Through indirection and disguise, the story of the vanquished mother thus reveals what Boker has identified in the In Our Time stories as the "son's denied dependency on the mother, or on women in general, and his denial of the grief inspired by his willful separation from her" (172). Further, the displacement of the mother in exchange for the heroic general suggests "an attempt to use an idealized image of the father as a defense – or totem – against his lingering emotional dependency upon the mother, and as a way of achieving male individuation and a masculine self-identity structure" (Boker 172).

In the same vein, albeit more directly, the theme of physical and emotional emasculation becomes a subject for ridicule in Torrents through the character of Yogi Johnson, a veteran of the war who has been made impotent through his experiences while a soldier in Europe. As a returned veteran, Yogi's lack of sexual desire is reminiscent of Harold Krebs, the veteran in "Soldier's Home." Yet the source of Yogi's problem is not the result of his war experience; unlike Krebs, Yogi's impotence is due to a disappointment in love. Specifically, Yogi is rendered impotent when he learns that his sexual encounter with a beautiful woman in Paris has provided "peep-show" entertainment for soldiers who pay to watch. Hemingway satirizes Yogi's impotence by allowing us to understand that Yogi has never figured out that the lady who "seduced" him was a prostitute and that Yogi is embittered because he believes the woman abandoned him for another man (79-81). What is not made readily visible, however, is how Hemingway projects some of his own personal and artistic anxieties onto the character of Yogi.

In the many revisions of the legend of his Paris apprenticeship, a recurring motif is Hemingway's relation to the city and the theme of creativity versus artistic impotence. Throughout the 1920s, according to Kirk Curnutt, Hemingway strove "to displace the reputation of Stein's salon as the epicenter of literary Paris by contesting her territorial claim to the city" (124). In accounts of Paris and his prose, Hemingway routinely employed strategies of "misreading" as he struggled to alleviate his anxiety of influence. In A Moveable Feast, as Curnutt further observes, Hemingway's misreadings attempt to "prove that the scene of Stein's instruction was a mere detour on the route to artistic triumph. Only by remapping his expatriate apprenticeship to disassociate the rue de Fleurus from those landmarks inspiring his artistic formation can he chart the effect of the city upon the scene of his writing" (124). Similarly, Rose Marie Burwell has remarked upon Hemingway's association of the expatriate capital and the scene of writing with a symbolic sexual act. Between daily writing sessions, Hemingway relates in Feast, he tried hard not to think about writing, choosing instead to walk the streets of Paris so that his "subconscious would be working on it and at the same time I would be listening to other people and noticing everything, I hoped; learning, I hoped; and I would read so that I would not think about my work and make myself impotent to do it" (13). In the metaphorical equation of creative production and "potency," and his own inability to create if he has not restored himself between writing sessions, Hemingway demonstrates the value of the Paris scenes he observes as it increases his reservoir of material and renews him for another day of work. Statements in the memoir such as "all Paris belongs to me [as] [...] I belong to this notebook and this pencil" (AMF 6) thus demonstrate Hemingway's efforts to distinguish himself from Stein's salon by projecting his autonomy upon the larger landscape of the city.

Through the character of Yogi Johnson, Hemingway parodies his persistent concern over his mentor's influence by effectively diminishing his "scene of instruction" to the setting of a dirty joke. Stein's famous salon becomes the "mansion" wherein "What I thought was a very beautiful thing [that] happened to me in Paris [...] turned out to be the ugliest thing that ever happened to me" (79). But on the "happiest day" of Yogi's life (81), he regains full control of his powers when he decides to stop blaming his sexual impotence "on the war," or "on France," or "on the decay of morality in general," or "on the younger generation" (81). Rather, his sense of autonomy is restored by projecting the scene of his recent independence away from Paris onto an American landscape.

In a letter to Pound on the day the book was completed (30 November 1925), Hemingway casually remarks of the work that it is the "first really adult thing [I] have ever done." This is a curious statement when we consider the stylistic accomplishment of In Our Time and the fact that Torrents was written only after an impressive first draft of The Sun Also Rises was already complete (Coltrane 150). To read this cryptic remark to mean that he finally felt free from the suffocating influence of Stein would be an exaggeration, as his denials and denunciations of her influence over the next thirty years testify (Curnutt 126-136). Rather, the remark reads like an appraisal of Hemingway's adult life at the end of 1925 – as a husband and father himself, he attempts to reckon with the legacy of a distant father and an over-exacting mother. Writing to F. Scott Fitzgerald, Hemingway would later advise, "We are all bitched from the start and you especially have to be hurt like hell before you can write seriously. But when you get the damned hurt use it – don't cheat with it" (SL 408). With the stories of In Our Time, Hemingway's forged a modern prose style based on the masterful use of repressed emotions to transform plot into art. This technique, according to Pamela Boker, "allows the reader to

experience what might be described as a mourning response to the unmourned-for and un-grieved-for losses, disappointments, and grief that Hemingway's characters are themselves unable to feel" (182). The motivational impulse behind the satirical method in Torrents, likewise, explores a son's struggle to transcend the disappointment of a biological father and the difficulty of separating himself emotionally from Grace Hemingway and Gertrude Stein, despite the fact that, as the author of Torrents tells us, "I do not believe in these protracted good-bys" (90).

Describing the satiric Torrents as a blend of talent and haste, Charles Fenton called the book Hemingway's "journalistic epitaph" (261). While the next chapter examines how Hemingway's news work informs his early fiction from Paris, it also outlines the ways in which the young correspondent used his published nonfiction to further distinguish himself from the anxious influence of his Paris mentors.

Notes

¹ Quoted in A.E. Hotchner's Papa Hemingway, p. 139.

² The correspondence of Clarence and Grace Hemingway, Burwell illustrates, shows Hemingway's belief erroneous, "for his father was often a very agitated and troubled man, and it is clear that in any conflict Grace chose the way that impinged least upon her own time – which meant that Clarence's rigidity was enforced by Grace" (29). Despite the fact that almost from the beginning of his life as a writer Hemingway mistrusted the impact of women on his work, his marriages were serial. In fact, Burwell observes, "he never broke with a wife until her successor had committed herself to him and set in motion her arrangements for the life they would share" (27).

³ As Helen Dennis summarizes, Pound's perception of women and their poetic representation tended to "associate them with an imaginary neo-Platonic landscape or with their role as divine intermediary or mantra. His sources for this conception were Provençal poetry, Renaissance love poets and Rossetti. Yet he sometimes perceived their 'new Woman' modernity as intrusive and therefore dealt with it in a somewhat jokey fashion. The strong-minded women Pound collaborated with were struggling to establish their own autonomous identity, while Pound at times was still trying to ensnare them in amorous subject positions" (266).

⁴ Eliot's brother, Henry, was often inclined to blame Vivienne for Eliot's condition, as he put it to their mother in 1921: "I am afraid he finds it impossible to do creative work (other than critical) at home. Vivien demands a good deal of attention, and I imagine is easily offended if she does not get it well buttered with graciousness and sympathy" (Gordon 171).

⁵ Published in Der Querschnitt (November 1924). Reprinted in Complete Poems, ed. Nicholas Gerogiannis (77).

⁶ That Hemingway did not choose to call the story "Mr. and Mrs. Eliot" probably has less to do with Eliot's privacy than the fact that Hemingway was habitually uncertain about how to spell T.S. Eliot's name. In his correspondence, Hemingway occasionally hit upon the correct spelling, but more generally referred to him as "Elliott" or "Elliot."

⁷ "Indian Camp" appeared in the transatlantic review in April, 1924; "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife" in November; "Cross Country Snow" in December.

⁸ In his early years with Scribner's, Reynolds observes, Hemingway was particularly anxious to keep biographical statements about his war experiences out of print. In letters to his editor, Max Perkins, for instance, he urged that

misinformation that Scribner's had unknowingly given out to the media be corrected for fear of "anyone think[ing] him a faker, a liar, or a fool" (Reynolds, Hemingway's First War, 16).

⁹ The passage continues, "Like this American writer Willa Cather, who wrote a book about the war where all the last part of it was taken from the action in The Birth of A Nation, and ex-servicemen wrote to her from all over America to tell her how much they liked it" (57). Three years earlier, Hemingway had expressed a similar view in a 25 November 1923 letter to Edmund Wilson: "[L]ook at [Cather's] One of Ours. Prize, big sale, people taking it seriously. You were in the war weren't you? Wasn't that last scene in the lines wonderful? Do you know where it came from? The battle scene in Birth of a Nation. I identified episode after episode, Catherized. Poor woman she had to get her war experience somewhere" (SL 105).

¹⁰ In January 1927, Ford was the guest of Clarence and Grace Hemingway at Oak Park. On 27 January, Dr. Hemingway wrote his son: "I am so pleased to write to you and tell you of our very delightful dinnerparty this Noon with your great admirer present, Mr. Ford Madox Ford [...] He came on time and made a very charming guest. He sure does appreciate you and your work. He gave us a wonderfull word picture of you and your boy. [...] Mother was so pleased with the Englishman. He seemed to enjoy his dinner and the Tea and all the other eats" (qtd. in Mizener 355-356). Ford was not as impressed with Oak Park, thinking it a "particularly Puritan and ridiculous suburb," adding that "Hemingway would never forgive you if you let people know that he was born there" (qtd. in Mizener 355).

¹¹ On the source and variations of "The Vanishing Room" legend, see Tom Burnam's More Misinformation (83-84); Gail de Vos's Tales, Rumors, and Gossip (174); and Paul Smith's The Book of Nasty Legends (108).

CHAPTER THREE JOURNALISM

En route to Germany on 26 March 1923 to cover an assignment on the French occupation of the German Ruhr for the Toronto Star, Hemingway writes his father: “I’ve been 38 hours on the train and am awfully tired. I’ve travelled nearly 10,000 miles by R.R. this past year. Been to Italy 3 times. Back and forth Switzerland – Paris – 6 times. Constantinople – Germany – Burgundy – The Vendee – Sure have a belly full of travelling” (SL 81). No doubt, for a young journalist with literary aspirations, Hemingway’s frequent travel as a roving European correspondent for the Toronto Star left him little time to pursue a career as a writer of fiction. After having written for his high school newspaper, trained as a cub reporter in Kansas City, and worked as a correspondent on and off from 1920, by late November 1923, Hemingway was ready, he told Gertrude Stein, “to “chuck journalism” (SL 101), although he continued to write for newspapers and magazines periodically throughout his career.

In his influential The Apprenticeship of Ernest Hemingway, Charles A. Fenton presents one of the first in-depth explorations of the impact of Hemingway’s journalism on his fiction, arguing that his “literary apprenticeship was journalism” (ix). Although in later years Hemingway often dismissed the lasting value of his journalism, Fenton claims that his fiction brings together the best aspects of his work as a reporter. Fenton remarks that those “qualities that give stature and immediacy to Hemingway’s early short stories of 1924 and 1925 – selectivity, precision, uncompromising economy, deep emotional clarification – were never dominant in his journalism of this period” but were separately present in every article or in entire sections which contained them all (143). In his correspondence with the author, Fenton set out the main argument of his book, writing that “journalism was a lot more important than the critics have recognized, as a training not only in technique, but in the treatment of material, and, indeed,

in the very choice of material. The critics have conventionally presented you as one part [Ezra] Pound, two parts Gertrude Stein. This has never made complete sense to me” (qtd. in Weber 6). For Fenton, the heady milieu of Paris in the 1920s was less formative than the newsrooms of Kansas City and Toronto.

The apprenticeship, Fenton insists, began on the *Kansas City Star*, where in 1917 Hemingway was trained with the aid of a style sheet of 110 rules governing the newspaper’s prose rules. The style sheet’s first paragraph bore an obvious consequence for the development of Hemingway’s early prose style: “Use short sentences. Use short first paragraphs. Use vigorous English. Be positive, not negative” (qtd. in Fenton 31). This “First Commandment” (30) would become “synonymous” with the surface characteristics of Hemingway’s style, Fenton observes, adding that nothing else Hemingway learned “in the next decade of apprenticeship would supplant this precept” (31). But as Ronald Weber has pointed out, in pursuing the importance of Hemingway’s early work in journalism, Fenton might have “overvalued it,” for “there were some significant cautions from some of Fenton’s informants, particularly about Kansas City days, that remained tucked away in the scholar’s files” (19). The influence of the newspaper’s style sheet, for example, “seemingly so instructive for a young writer, was hardly noticed by some *Star* reporters of the time” (Weber 20). One Kansas City informant told Fenton, “I never heard of or saw a *Star* style book,” whereas another remarked: “I never knew The *Star* had a style book ... As to peculiarities of style, it didn’t have any.” Still another wrote to say that “I don’t believe our style sheets of 1917-18 were widely distributed. As I recall it a few of the copy desks had the galley sheets containing the admonitions on style” (qtd. in Weber 20). Carlos Baker judiciously concludes that Hemingway’s *Kansas City Star* training was a “useful beginning” for a career in fiction (37), and Jeffrey Meyers adds that his experience as a European

reporter “influenced but did not entirely account for the development of his distinctive literary manner” (110).

So how did a background in journalism inform his early fiction from Paris? Accounts of Hemingway’s origins in journalism inevitably include a discussion of the kinds of newspaper stories he wrote for the Canadian readers of the Toronto Star. As a cub reporter in Kansas City, he was assigned a regular beat covering the railroad station, general hospital, and police station number four – a general assignment he eagerly resigned to join the ambulance service in Italy in World War I. But on his second stint as a journalist, this time with the Toronto Daily Star and, later, as a contributor to the Star’s weekend edition, the Star Weekly, he was not assigned a regular beat; rather, he worked as a space-rate feature writer, reporting on anything that interested him and that might interest his Toronto readers.

By all evidence, the young reporter did not disappoint; in late March 1922, he was assigned to cover the International Economic Conference at Genoa, Italy, the first European summit meeting since the Versailles Peace Conference. From Genoa, Hemingway wrote or cabled some twenty-three pieces. In a gossipy style, the stories are colorful and anecdotal, emphasizing situations and personalities rather than analyzing the underlying issues of the talks. In a typical dispatch, for example, Hemingway describes Germany’s Chancellor Joseph Wirth, who looks like a tuba player in a German band, and Hugo Stinnes, the “sinister peacetime kaiser,” who wears a black derby hat and ready-made neckties and has “the meanest face in Europe” (DL 156). Compared to the “kindly” impression of Chancellor Wirth, he reports, Stinnes is neither “kindly, forgiving, Christian or sentimental,” so when his “shadow [...] passes over occasionally [it] gives you the same sensation as seeing the black eagle on the flag that hangs over the German consulate at Genoa” (DL 155-156). The series of Genoa articles made

entertaining reading – the kind of “froth,” or human-interest news, that John Bone, the editor of the Toronto Star, expected Hemingway to deliver.

Quite correctly, critics underscore the good fortune that allowed Hemingway in 1922-23 to witness some of the most important historical events of postwar Europe: the Genoa Economic Conference, the Greco-Turkish War, the Lausanne Peace Conference, and the French occupation of the German Ruhr. More than a matter of being in the right place at the right time, however, his role as a freelance feature writer allowed for an unusual amount of editorial freedom. This arrangement, Fenton concludes, permitted him to tell stories more than report on “factual” events, thereby encouraging his natural gifts for narrative as well as allowing him to experiment with methods. The most effective journalism of this period, moreover, reveals Hemingway’s interest in writing behind-the-scenes glimpses of both high-profile politicians and anonymous civilians engaged in what Fenton has described as “intense [...] human situations,” narratives that usually involved the “unscrupulous use of their biographies” (125). Hemingway’s knack for observing the telling personal detail, according to Fenton, makes “more understandable his apparent transformation [...] from an obscure string correspondent into a finished technician” (125). But this same ability must also account for his ultimate decision to quit journalism at the end of 1923 in favor of pursuing his own “serious” work, for as he would later explain, “I found I would put my own stuff into it and then, once written, it would be gone” (qtd. in Fenton 126).

Following Fenton’s lead, a number of critics have commented on the importance of how Hemingway selected and handled the subject matter of his feature stories. Elizabeth Dewberry, for one, has observed that when Hemingway covered an assignment his articles were usually supplemented by wire reports, “an arrangement that allowed him to continue choosing which stories, and which parts of stories, to tell” (23). Of this arrangement, Dewberry speculates,

Hemingway was applying to his journalism the theory he was evolving for his fiction, as recounted in A Moveable Feast, wherein “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” (75). Hemingway’s familiar “iceberg principle,” Dewberry writes, “may have its beginning in his realization that he could tell stories that communicated truth about the world while leaving out the basic information that wire reports would have provided” (23).

In the same terms, James Mellow has described the extent to which Hemingway researched French politics, interviewing French politicians and taking detailed notes tracing the current political problems of France in 1923 to the ill-advised political policies issuing from the Versailles treaty. For whatever reason, however, very little of the background research was used in the published stories Hemingway filed from France. In these articles, Mellow conjectures, Hemingway’s research provided an opportunity to apply his theory that “the writer, so long as his knowledge was accurate, did not need to provide the details, that they would still carry a kind of subliminal weight and authority” (232).

Hemingway’s evolving “iceberg” principle for his fiction was partly indebted to his preoccupation with the technical possibilities of the transatlantic cable report, or “cablese.” According to the American newsman George Seldes, he and fellow veteran correspondent Lincoln Steffens gave Hemingway “a quick course in cablese and within a week Hemingway mastered it. He came in one night [in Genoa] and said: ‘Stef, look at this cable: no fat, no adjectives, no adverbs – nothing but blood and bones and muscle. It’s great. It’s a new language’” (qtd. in Meyers 94). As the need for faster reporting increased, and because economy of expression cost less (cables were billed by the word), reporters were inclined to cable stories using the fewest words – and simplest syntax – possible. This need for speed, clarity, and

simplicity created a specialized style; an example of a cable Hemingway sent to the Toronto Star to be rewritten for immediate release appears in his papers at the Kennedy Library:

TURKS POSTCHILD CONFERENCE ARRIVED COMPROMISE PLAN STOP
PRESENT TOMORROW ADAMANT REFUSAL XXXX NATIONAL
ARMENIAN HOME REFUSE ALLOW GREEK PATRIARCHATE STAY
CONSTANTINOPLE BUT WILLING COMPROMISE INTERNATIONAL
COMMISSION PROSUPERVISION XX MINORITIES AS YUGOSLAVIA
BULGARIA CZECHOSLOVAKIA STOP WILL ASK TIME XX DECIDE
WHETHER TO ACCEPT LEAGUE NATIONS PLANNING REFER
ANGORWARDS STOP LEARN EXBRITISH SOURCES CURZON
ANGRIEST CONSTANT INGIVINGS FORCED HIM TURKWARDS
BROKEN WITH SIR WILLIAM TYRELL PERMANENT HEAD FOREIGN
OFFICE INTENDS MAKE STAND PRONATIONAL ARMENIAN HOME
GREEK PATRIARCHATE AND LET CONFERENCE UPBREAK IF XXXXX
NECESSARY THOSE POINTS STOP BRITISH TONIGHT TRYING
UPPATCH (qtd. in Cohen 28-29)

Characteristic of “cablese,” the sentence fragments highlight key phrases and “economically compress phrases like ‘patch up’ and ‘break up’ into inverted fusions: ‘unpatch,’ ‘upbreak.’ Similarly, ‘from British’ becomes ‘exBritish;’ ‘giving in’ becomes ‘ingivings;’ ‘towards [the] Turk[ish position]’ shrinks to the admirably concise ‘Turkwards’” (Cohen 29). From the technical style of “cablese,” Hemingway undoubtedly learned something about adapting its simple syntax and economic compressions.

In the paragraph-length vignettes originally published in The Little Review’s 1923 “Exiles” issue under the title “In Our Time,” Hemingway worked at crafting prose stories devoid of traditional narrative conventions. Indeed, as Milton Cohen has noted, one of Hemingway’s prospective titles for the Little Review paragraphs was “Unwritten Stories Are Better,” a designation that succinctly suggests the innovative style of the pieces (37). Beginning in media res and shorn of any conventional plot or character development, the “unwritten” vignettes are carefully crafted fragments. Reflecting the “modernist form that best captures the ontology of modern experience,” Cohen observes, “[w]hat these six fragments most resemble are snatches of

monologue, spoken by several distinct voices, each recalling an experience or describing an event” (37). The second “In Our Time” piece, for instance, brief enough to quote in full, describes a scene Hemingway witnessed while on assignment covering the 1922 Greco-Turkish conflict:

Minarets stuck up from the rain out of Adrianople across the mud flats. The carts were jammed for thirty miles along the Karagatch road. Water buffalo and cattle were hauling carts through the mud. No end and no beginning. Just carts loaded with everything they owned. The old men and women, soaked through, walked along keeping the cattle moving. The Maritza was running yellow almost up to the bridge. Carts were jammed solid on the bridge with camels bobbing along through them. Greek cavalry herded along the procession. Women and kids were in the carts crouched with mattresses, mirrors, sewing machines, bundles. There was a woman having a kid with a young girl holding a blanket over her and crying. Scared sick looking at it. It rained all through the evacuation. (IOT 20)

Written in a flat, dispassionate voice, and emphasizing “factual statements focused on an outward event,” as Cohen has observed, the “journalistic” style of the vignettes nevertheless manipulates the reader’s responses through elements such as sentence structure and symbolic images (28). The pervasive rain, for instance, heightens the intensity of misery endured by the refugees while the ambiguous pronouns and omission of explanatory details (why the refugees march, for instance) are used to contrast journalistic clarity. These omissions, Cohen has noted, “create a scene abstracted from the causal world of journalism and focused on the newness of the events themselves” (28). How Hemingway achieved this sense of “newness” reveals how much the young journalist was learning about the crafting of fiction, for the civilian retreat vignette derives directly from two news stories Hemingway dispatched for the Star from Eastern Thrace. “A Silent, Ghastly Procession” (20 October 1922) and “Refugees from Thrace” (14 November 1922) both contain in-depth coverage of how hundreds of thousands of Greek Christians, fearing persecution from the Turks, were fleeing Eastern Thrace for Greece. Even with a ready-made text in hand, however, Hemingway completely reworked his material, cutting the Star stories

almost two-thirds by eliminating exposition, cutting colorful but inessential details, and emphasizing certain imagistic details for emphasis (Cohen 138). In short, the vignette omitted the “who?-what?-where?-when?-why?” principle of journalism for an aesthetic of compression whereby “the single image stand[s] for a plethora” (Cohen 139).

At the invitation of Bill Bird, European director of the Paris-based Consolidated Press Association and expatriate publisher, Hemingway continued throughout 1923 to expand his collection of vignettes, eventually contributing eighteen paragraph-length pieces published as in our time for Bird’s new Three Mountains Press. As in the Little Review publication, each of the vignettes describe a scene that Hemingway either personally witnessed (for example, the refugee evacuation from Eastern Thrace); heard secondhand from another reporter or eyewitness (the description of combat in a garden at Mons is from his British friend, Captain Eric Dorman-Smith); or read in the newspaper (the account of the Greek cabinet ministers’ execution). The link between journalism and the vignettes was made explicit by Bird’s idea to surround each chapter with wide margins filled with contemporary newsprint. In this modernist collage, the headlines and story texts drawn from American and Greek newspapers underscore the chapters’ quasi-journalistic experiment in narrative style and the depiction of real-life contemporary events.

As Robert Stephens has remarked, because of the unusual, free-wheeling approach to feature journalism that the Star allowed Hemingway, he was able to “linger at the scenes of action long enough to see the consequences of events” and “probe into their causes” in more depth than a reporter (49). This freedom allowed Hemingway a “claim to expertness” and “behind-the scenes knowledge” that would become a hallmark of Hemingway’s nonfiction (Stephens 49). Soon after his arrival in Europe in 1921, he was inclined to write a certain kind of

feature story: in a knowing, matter-of-fact voice, his subjects ranged from character sketches of politicians, revealing the “face behind the statesman’s mask” (Stephens 49), to the realities of inflationary prices in France, Germany, Italy, and Austria, finding that for the same rate one could stay in first-class resorts in Switzerland and avoid overcrowded French hotels. At the same time, his coverage of crucial postwar political and ideological conflicts reveals an increasingly caustic disillusionment with political leaders, international conferences, and military campaigns such as the Greco-Turkish War. The distrust with which Hemingway came to view the modern geopolitical landscape raises interesting questions in regard to his efforts to create modernist writings that are less concerned with realist accuracy for its own sake than it is with creating, in the words of Elizabeth Dewberry, “forms of representation that require interpretation” (3).

A survey of Hemingway’s travel features in the early twenties, moreover, reveals far more than the typical American or Canadian travel-writing pieces of the period; unlike many traditional travel narratives, his dispatches from Europe do not marvel “at the monuments or customs of Old World civilization. He would not return again and again to some gallery [...] to absorb the spirit of a particular [...] civilizing influence” (Stephens 65). Rather, as Stephens has observed, Hemingway tended to report on the places and events of his vacation trips “as they provided insights for social analysis” (65). In a 2 September 1922 Star feature, “Fishing in Baden Perfect,” for example, Hemingway celebrates the pristine streams of Germany’s Black Forest as part of “the larger picture of inflationary and bureaucratic bungling in postwar Germany” (Stephens 65). Even on his vacation trips with Hadley into Italy, his reports are full of colorful details to suggest the disturbing implications of militant nationalism.

Biographies and accounts of Hemingway’s journalism unfailingly underscore the historical import of his political and military assignments but have largely dismissed the stories

Hemingway filed about Paris in the early twenties, regarding them as either trivial accounts of “general interest” or as “frivolous,” more useful for “cocktail-party opinions than for hard facts on world conditions” (Stephens 11; Fenton 142; Stephens 66). Fenton describes the impetus behind the Paris dispatches as a means of making money in the long weeks between travel assignments, claiming that Hemingway’s trips for the Star produced “more rewarding material than the problems of insolent French officials at the Jardin des Plantes and aggressive Parisians on crowded buses” (134). Similarly, Stephens identifies the international conferences Hemingway reported on as “high points of his early work” (10) whereas the Paris articles of this same period are depicted as “scenes of French life that were more properly travel observations than news reporting” (66). Such estimations encapsulate a more general belief that while the Paris articles offer some colorful portraits of “Gay Paree” for American and Canadian readers back home, Hemingway’s journalism was at its finest when he was engaged with the “more demanding” and “serious” newspaper work away from the French capital (Weber 15). But in a recent publication, Becoming Americans in Paris: Transatlantic Politics and Culture between the World Wars, Brooke Blower provides an analysis of Parisian archival material that reveals the political implications behind expatriates’ “pleasure seeking and socializing in the capital that have so far been left to stand as innocuous and entertaining side notes to the more serious history of the period” (10). Considering both American and European perspectives, Blower’s narrative recalibrates the motivating question of similar studies, eschewing the familiar question “Why Americans went to Paris” to ask, rather, what happened once they were there, as “conspicuous participants” in the capital’s public life (11). The often anxious and volatile interactions between expatriates and native residents – as registered in municipal records and city chronicles – enable

us to rethink the social and political insights collected in the sixteen Star articles Hemingway wrote about Paris.

I. Paris Stories

“Each tale is much longer than the measure of its lines.” – Ford Madox Ford on Hemingway’s art,
transatlantic review (April 1924)

On 4 February 1922, Hemingway recorded his first impressions of postwar Paris for readers of the Toronto Star: “Paris in the winter is rainy, cold, beautiful and cheap. It is also noisy, jostling, crowded and cheap. It is anything you want – and cheap” (DL 88). This notion of the capital’s accessibility and “universal relevance – the sense that its beauties and lessons belonged to anyone who proposed to look for them – elevated Paris to the status of a world city” (Blower 5). But the strength of the dollar, “either Canadian or American, Hemingway writes, “is the key to Paris,” emphasizing again that “it is a very effective key” (DL 88). One can live in a comfortable hotel, he reports, and dine out at excellent restaurants on an income that, in the United States or Canada, would cause one to “starve to death” (DL 88). “Exchange,” he declares, “is a wonderful thing” (DL 88).

In A Moveable Feast, Hemingway would nostalgically evoke the capital as a place of unlimited accessibility, both economically and artistically. But the Paris of the memoir is a deeply personal space; Hemingway stripped the city of its ominous newspaper headlines, its polarized political scene, its refugees, and its growing xenophobia. Daily life in postwar Paris, as Blower has skillfully shown, was much “more fraught than is suggested by references to the stereotypical ‘années folles,’” for “France’s international standing seemed to be slipping, and many Parisians imagined they lived in an unfriendly world” (59). A particular fear for many native residents was a concern for the local impact of affluent Americans and the unfair

exchange advantage of the dollar. With the devaluation of many postwar European currencies, Americans in the early 1920s “had crisscrossed the continent conspicuously in search of good deals” and France, more than anywhere, “drew the most American buyers” (Blower 69). To French witnesses, much of this spending “smacked of exploitation” as accusations that “profiteering Americans treated Paris as a giant bargain basement reverberated across the political spectrum” (Blower 69-70). A common thread in French periodicals of the period was that the capital’s best establishments had become too expensive for Parisians and a “steal” for others (Blower 70). As one native citizen told American Ambassador Myron Herrick, she could not help but feel “vanquished” seeing her own postwar income plummet where “everywhere you Americans [are] filling the restaurants and the hotels and [...] invading all France, you who are so rich and prosperous and smiling” (qtd. in Blower 70). The city, it seemed, was “dividing into two distinct regions with their own economies, one where Americans bought and the other where they did not” (Blower 70).

If Hemingway’s first report from Paris failed to register any concern for the unfair advantage of the dollar, his next two Star articles, dated 25 March 1922, explicitly address the problems that tourist dollars have created for those who wish to find “authentic” Paris culture. In “American Bohemians in Paris,” Hemingway told his readers about Left Bank cafés like the Rotonde:

The scum of Greenwich Village, New York, has been skimmed off and deposited in large ladles [...] They have all striven so hard for a careless individuality of clothing that they have achieved a sort of uniformity of eccentricity. [...] You can find anything you are looking for at the Rotonde – except serious artists [...] for the artists of Paris who are turning out credible work resent and loathe the Rotonde crowd. [...] They are nearly all loafers [...] talking about what they are going to do and condemning the work of all artists who have gained any degree of recognition. (DL 114-115)

Hemingway's visceral reaction to the Rotonde crowd betrays his conservative Oak Park upbringing. His scorn for ill-dressed grown men who whiled away their time talking rather than working angered his sense of propriety. Regardless of the fact that at the time of writing Hemingway knew next to nothing at all "about artists in Paris or how they used the cafes as social clubs," or that Hemingway himself would appear in less than two years "as unkempt and ill dressed" as the Rotonde regulars he ridicules (Reynolds 24), this early article about Paris rightfully observes the relationship between the foreign tourist and the changing landscape of the city. "The fact that there are twelve francs for a dollar brought over the Rotonders," Hemingway explains, "along with a good many other people, and if the exchange ever gets back to normal they will all have to go back to America" (DL 115).

This new influx of Americans in Paris flocked to Montparnasse, a quarter centered on the Carrefour Vavin, a double intersection where the rue Vavin and the boulevard Raspail crossed the boulevard du Montparnasse. Anchored by its landmark cafés – the Rotonde, Select, Dôme, and eventually the Coupole, this quadrangle was a more modernized, flashier, bohemia than the old Latin Quarter. Where before the Dôme had been "an unassuming workman's bistro with no outside seating" and the Rotonde "only a modest zinc," by 1923 the owner of the Dôme quadrupled the size of the property, and in the following year, its competitor the Rotonde began renovations to covert "the old Bolshevik hideout into a sprawling café with a dance hall, upstairs banquet room, and ample gallery wall space" (Blower 82-83). The astonishing transformation of this once remote and peaceful neighborhood – inhabited mainly by artisans, bourgeois families, and a few artists and Sorbonne professors – attracted fierce criticism by native chroniclers alarmed by the rapid changes besetting the metropolis.

Whereas sections of the capital's inner city had become highly commercialized in the wake of wartime visitors and postwar revelers, many local observers bemoaned "the sudden appearance of those same markers of modernity that had been the main preserve of the Right Bank: dense traffic, incandescent movie theaters, shining storefronts and restaurants, and multistoried luxury hotels" (Blower 81-82). For many locals, Americans were to blame for reducing Montparnasse to a motley collection of would-be artists, unsavory exhibitionists, and gawking tourists. Above all, many charged, Americans in Montparnasse had ousted "the more authentic literary cafés, and all kinds of American characters had supplanted the genuine French artists and students of prewar days" (Blower 82). On this score, Hemingway's Star article is instinctually in sync, alleging that those Montparnasse denizens who "insist on posing as artists" are something of a mockery to "the good old days when Charles Baudelaire led a purple lobster on a leash through the same old Latin Quarter" (DL 115). Since the appearance of "the gang that congregates at the corner of the Boulevard Montparnasse and the Boulevard Raspail," he concludes, "there has not been much good poetry written in cafés" (DL 115-116). And yet, as J. Gerald Kennedy has observed, Hemingway was himself something of an "imposter," for he had yet to publish anything of a "literary sort" (Imagining 85); and despite his contempt for the poseurs of Montparnasse, his article betrays "as much pretension as ignorance" as he misidentifies the poet with the pet lobster as Charles Baudelaire (it was Gérard de Nerval) and naively identifies the Rotonde as located in the Latin Quarter (Imagining 85-86). The intensity of his scorn for the café idlers, Kennedy notes, betrays a deeper, more personal conflict: "as a working journalist, he blasted the casual morality and bohemian idleness which on another level he seems to have found deeply seductive" (Imagining 86).

As elusive as locating an authentic artist at work on a Montparnasse terrace, Hemingway suggests in the Star feature “Wild Night Music of Paris” (25 March 1922), it is equally difficult for the tourist to discover genuine Paris entertainment. In a glitzy nightclub of Montmartre, perhaps, “After the cork has popped on the third bottle and the jazz band has brayed the American suit- and cloak-buyer into such a state of exaltation that he begins to sway slightly with the glory of it all, he is liable to remark thickly and profoundly: ‘So this is Paris!’” (DL 117). And unfortunately, Hemingway quips, “There is some truth in the remark. It is Paris,” but it is “an artificial and feverish Paris,” a “special performance by a number of bored but well-paid people of a drama that has run many thousands of nights and is entitled ‘Fooling the Tourist’” (DL 117-118). He identifies with the plight of the pleasure-seeker and suggests a more authentic venue – a little Bal Musette that one can always find “around the corner” (DL 118). Here one can drink and dance to the “music of man with an accordion who keeps time with the stamping of his boots” among people who “do not need to have the artificial stimulant of the jazz band to force them to dance” (DL 118).

In this article, Hemingway echoes a number of urban critics concerning the city’s teeming nightlife resorts. To begin with, because these businesses cater to the tourist, one critic complained, they “adopt all the same jazz tunes and tangos, the same gleaming décor and overpriced champagne [and] are thereby steadily losing their individual character” (Blower 67). Similar accounts compared the prewar night life of Montmartre with the “prefabricated entertainments” that dominated the area’s nightscape. “This was not the old Montmartre ‘qui pense [that thinks],’” one observer noted, “but the new Montmartre ‘qui dépense [that spends]’” (Blower 68). Where Hemingway advised his readers to abandon the automatic unisons of the commercial music-hall and champagne-and-jazz clubs, opting instead for a more modest night

out spent with locals who “dance for the fun of it” because they “enjoy life” (DL 118), he identified with a number of the city’s inhabitants who felt that Paris was in fact two separate cities. As many saw it, the city “itself seemed to promote two competing ways of life after the war,” represented in the “growing dissimilarity between those quarters deemed most modern and cosmopolitan and the capital’s other, more modest and traditional enclaves” (Blower 85). For many residents, especially for those who championed “French” ways of living, Paris was a city divided into two competing and mutually exclusive factions: “one étrangère, guided by mindlessness, hedonism, materialism, and amèricanisme, and the other healthy, quiet, sensible, French” (Blower 85).

Under this rubric, French journalists, chroniclers, and preservationists mounted an informal campaign against the perceived invasion of American tastes and habits. As countless postwar periodicals attest, “Parisians repeatedly contrasted their own urban practices with those of their transatlantic guests” (Blower 85). In the 8 April 1922 Star article “Active French Anti-Alcohol League,” Hemingway describes an advertising campaign promoting French wines and beers. Exhibits of “ravaged brains and livers, dramatic colored charts, posters showing father brandishing a drink in one hand and a black bottle in the other, while he kicks the children about the house” are conspicuously displayed on “a great window frontage on the Boulevard St. Germain,” Hemingway reports. The building that houses the exhibit is the home of the Ligue Nationale Contre Alcoolism, “a name that needs no translating,” Hemingway says, adding that “just across the offices of the league is the Deux Magots, one of the most famous of the Latin Quarter cafés” (DL 124). Despite Hemingway’s shaky geography (the Deux Magots on the Boulevard St. Germain is not located in the Latin Quarter), he describes the café’s scene: “Here at the tables you see students sipping the liquors that cause tuberculosis, quaffing the apértifs that

are deadly poisons, and swigging the picons that often lead to insanity,” he writes (DL 125). While these students cast a nervous eye from time to time at the exhibits, “thirst-driven Americans see the exhibit and shudder,” for they are “afraid it presages the beginning of the end of what they regard as the golden age of European culture; the present blissful time when the French bartender has at last learned to mix a good martini and a palate-soothing bronx” (DL 124). At the bottom of the posters, Hemingway notes, are reminders of the virtues of the national wines and beers of France that describe “their good effects so attractively that the reader usually leaves the poster in search of a café” (DL 124). On one hand, Hemingway has a bit of fun at the expense of an anti-alcohol campaign that tempts one to find the nearest watering hole and order a drink; but more seriously, the article subtly indicates how Americans played a prominent role in the capital’s postwar transformation and how American and French identity were in part constructed by a process of exchange and conflict. Where one goes to drink – and the way the drink is poured – became a symbolic marker of the difference of civilizations.

Similarly, a 12 August 1922 article, “The Great ‘Apéritif’ Scandal,” recounts a wave of protests in the wake of the 14 July Bastille Day celebrations. The “great French holiday,” Hemingway writes, continued unabated for five days and nights, “with a street ball every two blocks where the people of that quarter danced” (DL 182-183). The streets themselves were decorated “with colored lanterns and flags and music furnished by the municipality” (DL 183). In the cause of “encouraging patriotism,” Hemingway reports, “the government spent some millions of francs on the party,” noting that “French flags were everywhere, fireworks went off at all times, [and] there was a great military review at Longchamps” (DL 183). Once the revelry was over, however, an official inquiry had been launched to investigate the “enormous banners advertising the different brands of apéritifs” that had hung above all the dancing places” (DL

183). At one place, for example, “the people of the quartier would be dancing in an ecstasy of patriotism under the legend ‘Vive Anis Dellosa – the Finest Apéritif in the World’” (DL 183).

The underlying tension of the scandal stemmed in part from a general perception among French preservationists and others who linked Americans to the capital’s permanent advertisement displays. This “troublesome explosion of imagery on the streets,” like the billboard for Ford Motor Company that spanned an entire building on the place de l’Opéra, evoked an “‘American’ city experience that many Parisians found troubling” (Blower 73-74). Even if the products were not American in origin (like the apéritifs advertised at the Bastille Day celebrations), they were usually thought of as such. And even though commercial campaigns using advertising posters had been pioneered in Paris, Americans were nonetheless implicated in the spread of advertising because “such signs demarcated those urban corners most sought out by individuals from across the Atlantic” (Blower 74).

Hemingway’s apéritif article betrays a persistent preoccupation in his journalism with the subject of money. The French government sold banner space to the aperitif manufacturers, Hemingway observes, indicating a corruption in high places similar to the revelation in a 21 April 1923 story that the French government routinely bought news column space in French papers and published its version of the news. Likewise, Hemingway reported how Italian bankers and industrialists bankrolled the Fascisti to subdue the communists and then had to hire mercenaries to police fascist violence (DL 174-175). In Germany, the young journalist admits, obtaining a fishing license is too bound up in bureaucratic red tape; rather than abide official channels, he advises, simply bribe a game warden if caught (DL 197-200). In Adrianople, he observes, the innkeeper Madame Marie fleeced guests for a room they had to share with the lice. But because she ran the only hotel, she can confidently scoff, “It is better than the street? Eh?”

(DL 249-252). Apparent throughout Hemingway's journalism, Scott Donaldson has remarked, there "runs a strong moralistic tone and a deep suspicion of the motives of almost everyone where money is concerned" (13). This "combination of high-mindedness, as to his own standards, and cynicism, as to the standards of others, forms but one of several contradictions in Hemingway's economic attitudes," Donaldson notes. On the one hand, Hemingway gained something of a reputation among Paris associates as a sponger; on the other, in his fiction and nonfiction alike, he proposes an extremely high standard of financial responsibility that is "organized around a strict morality of compensation" that, on the evidence, Hemingway was unable to achieve during his period of apprenticeship in Paris (Donaldson 21).

II. "everything has a money angle:" the transatlantic review and This Quarter

"... over here living on nothing is a game." – Letter from Hemingway to Bill Smith, 9 January 1925

In Oak Park, the Hemingways regularly attended the Sunday services of Congregationalist minister Reverend William E. Barton, who championed the Protestant ethic of free enterprise and its compatibility with the teachings of Christianity. Nancy Comley and Robert Scholes have demonstrated the importance of the minister's sermons within the Hemingway household, for "it was Grace [Hemingway] who took the lead in an attempt to transform the Reverend Barton's capitalist Christianity into a code of conduct" (23). There was no disagreement about Ernest's responsibilities – and the allowance he received – until Ernest returned home from Italy after the war. In the summer of 1920, Ernest and his friend Ted Brumback, who had been a fellow reporter on the *Kansas City Star*, spent the summer fishing and loafing at Windermere, Grace Hemingway's summer cottage in upper Michigan. When Grace assigned the boys chores like digging holes for garbage, dishwashing, and painting, Ernest rebelled; the tension between Grace and her oldest son reached a boiling point when Ernest and

his younger sister attended a late night party on the lake with other young people. Grace ordered Ernest off the property. Shortly after, on the occasion of Ernest's twenty-first birthday, a milestone Grace regarded as his nominal entry into manhood, she composed a letter "cast in the rhetoric of the Reverend Barton" (Comley and Scholes 24) that compared a mother's love with a bank account on which her son made excessive withdrawals:

Unless you, my son Ernest, come to yourself, cease your lazy loafing and Pleasure seeking; borrowing with no thought of returning; stop trying to graft a living off anybody and everybody; spending all your earnings lavishly and wastefully on luxuries for yourself [...] unless, in other words, you come into your manhood, — there is nothing before you but bankruptcy.
You have overdrawn. (qtd. in Comley and Scholes 25)

If Grace Hemingway's message was, as Donaldson has noted, one that Ernest "could neither forgive nor forget" (15), its moral principle would nonetheless underwrite the public image Hemingway began to cultivate in Paris in the early twenties.

As an assistant editor of Ford Madox Ford's Paris-based little magazine, the transatlantic review, Hemingway contributed editorial matter, letters, and some of his best fiction. Although the review published only twelve issues between January 1924 and 1925, it marked a significant detour from the feature stories Hemingway was writing for the Star before his return to Paris from Toronto in early 1924. For as John Raeburn has described, the proportion of fiction and journalism Hemingway allotted the transatlantic review would remain constant throughout his career, allowing Hemingway to speak "in his own voice more often than other fiction writers of his generation. And the tone as well as the quantity of his nonfiction suggest that he intended more through it than earning extra money or doing preliminary sketches for later stories" (14-15). Although very few of Hemingway's editorial contributions for Ford's magazine can be described as reportage, "the strongest impression evoked by these pieces is of the writer's personality – his attitudes, biases, character, and behavior" (Raeburn 15).

One of his transatlantic review pieces, published in the October 1924 issue, alludes to the Pamplona bullfight fiesta yet evades actually reporting on the event. Claiming that an essay detailing what one can find in Pamplona would be merely journalism, and that the sole purpose of writing journalism was for money, Hemingway posits an image of himself as a professional of extreme artistic integrity. Once one puts a thing into words, he contends, “unless you do it on your knees, you kill it. If you do write it on your knees [...], the thirty francs a page is only supplementary reward.” He describes an interruption in his Pamplona hotel room and replaces the pencil and paper he was writing on for a Corona typewriter. It was easy to write on a typewriter with interruptions in a newsroom, he says, but not as easy to write fiction his readers could believe in: “It is only by never writing the way I write in a newspaper office, though, that I make you believe I can write.” His insistence that he was an artist seriously committed to his work is implied in the contrast between the two instruments. His “Pamplona Letter” concluded with yet another reason to avoid writing about the bullfight fiesta: “The less publicity it has, the better,” he writes, acknowledging that almost everyone from the Paris set “who deserved to be at Pamplona had been there.” As Raeburn has written, the “implication that he was a member of a select fraternity of initiates became familiar to readers of his fiction, and it was important as well in his public personality. He often assumed the role of taste-arbiter, expressing contempt for ‘outsiders’ or ‘tourists,’ anyone who did not share his preferences in food, drink, locales, literature, and sports” (18). This insider/outsider motif in Hemingway’s writings from this period is based on a principle of financial responsibility.

The criterion for membership in this “select fraternity of initiates” requires a strict standard of compensation. As Donaldson observes, a “metaphor of finance” is the key to understanding the moral code of Hemingway’s first novel:

Between the beginning and the end, Hemingway specifically mentions sums of money, and what they have been able to purchase, a total of thirty times. [...] Such a practice contributed to the verisimilitude of the novel, denoting the way it was; it fitted nicely with Jake's – and his creator's – obsession with the proper way of doing things; and mainly it illustrated in action the moral conviction that you must pay for what you get, that you must earn in order to be able to buy, and that only then will it be possible, if you are careful, to buy your money's worth in the world – essentially the same position taken by Hemingway's parents during his youth and young manhood. (23)

Throughout The Sun Also Rises Hemingway carefully contrasts Jake Barnes with Mike Campbell and Brett Ashley, who are careless at best with their finances, and with Robert Cohn, a blocked writer, who is tight-fisted with his inherited money. Jake holds down a steady job in journalism, receives no income from home, and spends thoughtfully and conscientiously. Most importantly, however, is the fact that Jake embraces a code of conduct, a way of living, that values any gratification that, as Jake puts it, shows one “how to live in” the world (SAR 152), how to live life “all the way up” in a way at once exhilarating and authentic (SAR 18).

The appearance of Count Mippipolous toward the end of the Paris section of the novel serves to underscore the lessons of Jake's “morality of compensation;” the count's impeccable tastes and his talk about the “secret” of getting to know certain “values” (SAR 67) leaves a deep impression on Jake, who struggles in Paris between his love for Brett and the dissipating life of the Quarter. Interestingly, the introduction of the Count, who drinks real champagne at the Select and knows from wide experience that what he orders is the best value money can buy, actually inverts previous “value alignments” found in Hemingway's Star articles about the Montmartre jazz and champagne clubs (Stephens 242). In the novel, Hemingway renders the Count's consumption of the finest wines and his knowing appreciation of the American jazz at Zelli's bar as more complex than his Star reports on the inauthentic cafés catering to tourists would have it.

This shift to a version of Montmartre nightclubs as “a good place to buy in” (SAR 152) is due in part to the composite expatriate persona Hemingway had been publicly cultivating as early as his nonfiction contributions to the transatlantic review. In the May 1924 issue, for instance, Hemingway published a piece for the magazine’s department of gossip and news (the “Chroniques.” pages) entitled “And to the United States.” A deliberate reversal of the usual direction of transatlantic news, the title is an exile’s reply to the conventional American Letter, headed “And from the United States” (Joost 88). Dated “The Quarter. Early Spring,” its sixteen news items range from an attack on the New York-based journal The Dial and the announcement of its annual literary award (the 1923 award went to literary critic Van Wyck Brooks) and sketches of modern writers, artists, and composers (Gertrude Stein, Pablo Picasso, Djuna Barnes, Ezra Pound, George Antheil) to accounts of Paris prizefights, Spanish bullfights, and the availability of excellent oysters. In a conventional journalistic style, the piece poses as a burlesque on “the doings of the expatriates caught up in the New Movement as though he were a society or a shipboard-news reporter” (Joost 88). But a more implicit strategy for writing, as Nicholas Joost has shown, was to construct an image of himself as “a man of the world,” to present “a bright, hard mosaic portrait of a time and place – and of a writer” (90-91). Every item of the composition thus presents “an accomplishment of the writer’s career or of his fiction:” “Bullfighting, the Spanish scene, the life of the expatriates, Paris, the sporting scene with its racing and boxing, the Quarter, the circle of artists and composers and poets from many lands, [...] all counted in the formulation of the writer and in the composition of his work” (Joost 91). No doubt, as the subject of expatriation fascinated the American press throughout the 1920s, Hemingway’s nonfiction contributed to his status as a representative American artist abroad.

In The Sun Also Rises, Jake Barnes' newspaper work is not drawn from Hemingway's own journalism so much as his friendship with Bill Bird, European director of the Consolidated Press Association. Hemingway met Bird at the 1922 Genoa economic conference and the experienced correspondent immediately impressed him. After graduating from Trinity College in Connecticut, Bird had co-founded with David Lawrence a wire service to broadcast Lawrence's Washington political column. As Ronald Weber has shown in News of Paris, an informative study of American news agencies in the interwar capital, Hemingway used Bird's journalistic background for material later cut from galleys of The Sun Also Rises. In the discarded section, the Consolidated Press Association is the Continental Press Association, David Lawrence is Robert Graham, and Bill Bird is essentially Jake Barnes:

In 1916 I was invalided home from a British hospital and got a job on The Mail in New York. I quit to start the Continental Press Association with Robert Graham, who was then just getting his reputation as a Washington correspondent. We started in one room on the basis of syndicating Bob Graham's Washington dispatches. I ran the business end and the first year wrote a special war-expert service. By 1920 the Continental was the third largest feature service in the States. I told Bob Graham that rather than stay and get rich with him the Continental could give me a job in Paris. So I made the job, and I do not try to run the salary up too high because if it ever got up past a certain amount there would be too many people shooting at my job as European Director of the Continental Press Association. (qtd in Weber, News, 152)

As Weber has observed, Bird's "overriding attraction" as Jake's original may have been as simple as his "special situation as a journalist. As European Director of a news service he helped found, he had a degree of independence unusual even for a foreign correspondent, able to set his work hours and subjects he wrote about while drawing a comfortable salary that permitted pursuit of his twin avocations" (News 156). Bird's two abiding passions were French wines and fine printing on a seventeenth-century iron hand press in his own shop on Quai d'Anjou, a cramped room within a massive wine vault on the Ile St. Louis. Bird later shared the space with

Ford Madox Ford, who used the upstairs gallery to edit the transatlantic review; in his own office, Bird stored the books he printed as well as spare copies of the review (Joost 70). In 1922, Bird printed his A Practical Guide to French Wines; Hemingway had a copy of the guide and shared his enthusiasm for the rare volume with friends, writing to Gertrude Stein that Bird was afraid his stenographer misaddressed the edition she had purchased “and is sending you another to your present address” (c. late August 1924). In The Sun Also Rises, impressed with Count Mippipopulous’ knowledge of wine and its attendant ceremonial significance, Jake tells the Count that he “ought to write a book on wines” (66). In the discarded draft of the novel, Hemingway has Jake nicely settled in Bill Bird’s job:

When you have a title like that [European Director of the Continental Press Association], translated into French on the letter-heads, and only have to work about four or five hours a day and all the salary you want you are pretty well fixed. I write political dispatches under my own name, and feature stuff under a couple of different names, and all that trained-seal stuff is filed through our Office. It is a nice job. I want to hang on to it. (qtd in Weber, News, 156)

As a roman à clef, however, Jake Barnes’ commanding salary was a case of his creator’s wishful thinking. At a time when he and Hadley were economizing, according to Kenneth Lynn, Hemingway was extremely envious of people who had never had financial worries, yet “all around him in the expatriate community he saw such people” (238). To make ends meet, Ernest and Hadley stopped buying clothes for themselves, repaired torn or frayed elbows of jackets with patches, and “skimped on lunch and allowed other people to pay for the piles of saucers they accumulated in cafés” (Lynn 239). In the words of the composer Virgil Thomson, “Hemingway never bought anybody a drink” until “he paid them off in *The Sun Also Rises* [...] He bought all his friends drinks in that book” (qtd. in Donaldson 21). To Hadley’s longtime friends George and Helen Breaker, Hemingway complained, “We’ve been so darned poor that everything has a money angle” (27 August 1924). But the same sentiment, coaxingly repeated to Bill Smith, casts

some doubt on their conspicuous thriftiness: “The people that are broke in Paris all the time are those that never learned like I and you to utilize a paper seed and while not gluing it to the manual yet treat it with some respect [...] You’d have a good time wit [sic] us men – it would be swell for us and over here living on nothing is a game” (9 January 1925). Hemingway invested in a public persona – first cultivated in the pages of the transatlantic – that championed himself as a down-to-earth, fiscally responsible, hard-working writer.

After the dissolution of the transatlantic review, in an effort to further advance his career and make an occasional franc, Hemingway performed editorial labors for Ernest Walsh and Ethel Moorhead on This Quarter. Though previous biographies mention Hemingway’s involvement with the modernist periodical, a comprehensive collection of as-yet-unpublished letters to its editors reveals for the first time the full range of his editorial activities. Between January and November 1925, Hemingway wrote some twenty-seven letters to Walsh and Moorhead concerning the production of their new magazine. Walsh had been an aviator in the war and had seriously damaged his lung in a plane crash and suffered from tuberculosis. Moorhead, a wealthy middle-aged Scotswoman, “jealously guarded and cared” for the younger Walsh as well as furthered his career by naming him coeditor of their proposed magazine (Mellow 285). Due to Walsh’s failing health, the duo set up residence in Pau, where Hemingway bombarded the couple with suggestions of contributors and practical advice for editorial content. When they solicited Hemingway for something for the inaugural issue, he sent them his newly-finished story “Big Two-Hearted River,” which he wanted to send to mainstream American periodicals but “Moorhead promised to pay on acceptance and Hemingway’s nagging worries about money led him to go for the quick payment” (Reynolds 263). Hemingway followed up his submission by offering a list of possible contributors, writing to Walsh on 29 January 1925 that he had spread

the word about the new publication to “Gertrude Stein, [Evan] Shipman, John Herman in N.Y., [Nathan] Asch in Berlin and [Robert] McAlmon.” The last two, he assured Walsh, “are great news spreaders.” He also suggested that Walsh write William Carlos Williams and promoted a number of his current friends: Harold Loeb (who “could write you some very good criticism or a New York Letter”); Edmund Wilson (“He does first rate criticism”); Lewis Galantiere (“writes excellent criticism of French books and could do you very damned well as Paris correspondent”); and Don Stewart (“has more bowels than all the college bred combined”).

Both parties recognized that the relationship was a good one. As a replacement for the transatlantic review and a rival of The Dial, Hemingway regarded This Quarter as an outlet for publishing his stories that were still unwanted by American periodicals; for the magazine’s editors, Hemingway’s offer to serve as their man in Paris, reading proofs and shadowing procrastinating printers and seeing the first issue through production, was an arrangement they were only too happy to accept. That Hemingway would take on such a time-consuming role without any compensation can in part be credited to his genuine joy that he was selling his fiction to This Quarter for a price he felt commensurate to his efforts. Writing Robert McAlmon about the new periodical, Hemingway exalts, “I sent them the Big Two Hearted River story and just got a check for 1,000 francs [about \$50.00]. This is about 400 francs more than all my writings paid last year so feel good and cheerful” (c. late January or February 1925). To Ethel Moorhead, Hemingway responded with unusual magnanimity: “I got the splendid check and I cashed it. We are going to pay the rent with it. Pay a first installment on a suit of clothes. Buy a lot of groceries and go to the six day bicycle race. I wish you were going along and could help us eat the groceries and sit in the house where the rent is paid” (c. March 1925).

In his letters to Walsh, Hemingway demonstrates an astonishing range of knowledge about the behind-the-scenes assembling of a periodical. As Michael Reynolds has noted, his correspondence is “quite explicit about the details of making plates, pulling proofs, harassing printers and running the production of a magazine” (277). But new letters to Walsh show an even greater proficiency for production and marketing techniques. A letter to Walsh on 13 February 1925, for example, offers advice about news clipping services in New York, including his suggestion to add the editors’ names as well as This Quarter to ensure all the reviews are noticed. The same letter conveys copyright information and warns Walsh not to allow an attorney “to form a Societe Anonyme or any sort of fancy company to publish the review under. That is all just red tape and monkey business.” Similarly, Hemingway’s 10 April 1925 letter to Walsh reports: “The Review is on the press and being printed. I finished correcting the last of the pagination yesterday i.e. final proofs on the last made up pages authors names across the tops, numbering the pages and contents etc.” Showing a shrewd marketing sense, Hemingway adds, “I have changed the Spine of the cover to read SPRING 1925 instead of APRIL 1925. By the time it gets to the states the April will be no bloody good and only hurt your sales. Same in England. Think SPRING is better on a quarterly. [. . .] Then your publication date is April as announced and the magazine labeled Spring is Fresh [sic] when it gets there in May.”

In return for his efforts, Hemingway submitted to the second issue of This Quarter his latest story, “The Undefeated,” noting in a 27 March letter to Walsh that he worked on “the big bull fight story” for three months but “it’s been turned down by every reputable and disreputable magazine” in the States as “[t]oo strong for the readers.” That Hemingway took the opportunity to contribute (and receive payment for) this second story for the next installment of This Quarter before the appearance of the first issue is due in part to a cooling off in relations between

Hemingway and the magazine's editors. The relationship became damaged when in early March Hemingway began to push Walsh and Moorhead to hire his friend Bill Smith. Ever since hearing from Smith again in early 1925 after a silence of almost three years, Hemingway had been trying to talk his best buddy into a trip to Paris. When he heard that Smith had finalized plans to join him and Hadley in April, Hemingway wrote Walsh (c. March 1925) suggesting that Bill take over his assignments of editing copy, printing and distributing the magazine, and overseeing sales. All of this, he assured Walsh, "Bill would do for a 1000 francs a month if I put it up to him." But Walsh balked at the idea, stating that Hemingway was meddling too much in the business affairs of the review. He also insinuated that Hemingway's plan was in some way a pretext for getting money out of Moorhead. Naturally, the rebuff angered Hemingway, who had only offered a reasonable solution for a job he had been doing for months for free. Drafting an unsent response to Walsh (c. March 1925), Hemingway's remarks reveal some insight into his anxieties about money and his fiction. "I myself am not a rich man," he tells Walsh, "I quit newspaper work at \$125 a week to have the liberty to write. I write slowly and with a great deal of difficulty and my head has to be clear to do it. While I write the stuff I have to live it in my head." Another letter to Walsh dated c. March 1925 echoes a similar unease: "I've got to get back to work on my own hook. If I don't it means I'm not producing anything and if that occurs [sic] we don't eat. Besides I have to produce for other reasons. If I'm not creating I'm absolutely miserable and ugly and I have to have my mind clear to write the stuff I'm working on now."

If the initial enthusiasm of their friendship had ended, Hemingway had further reason to maintain a working relationship with Walsh. As James Mellow has remarked, Hemingway's attentiveness to his unpaid editorial assignments no doubt also "derived from the fact that Walsh and Moorhead planned to reward excellence in the form of an annual prize of \$2500 to the

contributor whose work in This Quarter was judged the best. A second, lesser prize of \$1200 was to be given to the best young contributor” (287). At some point in Hemingway’s dealings with the editors, according to Mellow, Walsh “confidentially informed Hemingway that the prize, or one of the prizes, was to be awarded to him” (287). Walsh advised Hemingway to keep contributing to the review, to which he replied on 20 July 1925: “Don’t worry there’s going to be more Litrachure [sic] produced. I had a bad spell, financial worries, etc health etc. but am going again now.” Of the contributor’s prize, Hemingway writes, “I won’t say anything about the award to anybody including myself because I don’t want to figure on anything that would be so damned wonderful and then maybe lose out on it. Money is so important to us that I cant [sic] play around with the idea of it.”

This Quarter did not award the prize to Hemingway or anyone else; in his memoir many years later, in a chapter called “The Man Who Was Marked for Death,” Hemingway would scathingly portray Walsh as a con man who used his consumption to trade for sexual favors, economic subsidies, and the sympathy of fellow writers. In A Moveable Feast, Hemingway suggests that Walsh’s purpose in treating Hemingway to an expensive lunch is to manipulate him into contributing to the magazine and seeing through the many labors of its production. During the course of the meal, Hemingway writes, Walsh confidentially assures him: “‘There’s no use beating around the bush,’ he said. ‘You know you’re to get the award, don’t you?’” (AMF 127). But Hemingway in the memoir is too wise to fall for the trap: “I looked at him and his marked-for-death look and I thought, you con man conning me with your con” (AMF 127). Much later, after Walsh had hemorrhaged to death in 1926, Hemingway continues:

I met Joyce who was walking along the Boulevard St.-Germain [and] he asked me to have a drink with him and we went to the Deux-Magots and ordered dry sherry although you always read that he drank only Swiss white wine.

“How about Walsh?” Joyce said.

“A such and such alive is a such and such dead,” I said.
“Did he promise you that award?” Joyce asked.
“Yes.”
“I thought so,” Joyce said.
“Did he promise it to you?”
“Yes,” Joyce said. (AMF 128-129)

Here Hemingway aligns himself with Joyce, famous for his artistic achievement – and for his poverty. For the story Hemingway tells in A Moveable Feast is the success story of its author, and like all such stories, it emphasizes the author’s accomplishments by exaggerating the depths from which he rose. And if the Hemingway persona of the memoir is a carefully crafted portrait of the young artist – international journalist, expatriate author, avant-garde prose stylist, sporting enthusiast, and (responsible) denizen of the Left Bank café scene – that public image had its beginnings in the *Star* features and modernist periodicals of his earliest years in Paris. His journalistic experiments in form and style significantly informed the shaping of his early prose style. But journalism also influenced some of Hemingway’s most innovative work, particularly in his creative merging of fictional and nonfictional genres. In his novelistic travelogue of a 1933 East African safari, Green Hills of Africa, Hemingway indirectly compares the impatience of trophy hunting to his own literary apprenticeship: “But here we were, now, caught by time, by the season, and by the running out of our money, so that what should have been as much fun to do each day whether you killed or not was being forced into that most exciting perversion of life; the necessity of accomplishing something in less time than should truly be allowed for its doing” (12). On the evidence, Hemingway’s debt to journalism is no fiction.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE MARRIAGE TALES

In late April, 1923, Ernest and Hadley Hemingway returned to Paris from a trip to Rapallo and Cortina, Italy, to discover a rather embarrassing misunderstanding. Ernest had offered the humorist Donald Ogden Stewart the couple's vacant apartment at 74 rue du Cardinal Lemoine to live in while he looked for a permanent residence. Upon the Hemingways' return, however, they learned that their guest had been ejected. Apparently, the apartment manager had angrily evicted Stewart on the basis that a sublet of the flat was forbidden. Wishing to clear up the matter, Hemingway wrote an unsigned (and perhaps unsent) letter to the owner of the property, telling her that her "invaluable knowledge of English and French makes it better for us to write to you" rather than directly to the offended manager. Requesting that the bilingual landlady intercede on their behalf, he tells her, the episode has "naturally caused us rather acute embarrassment [sic]," but "we [do] not wish to risk endangering our most pleasant and cordial relations in an argument where the barrier of different languages might cause misunderstandings" (27 April 1923). This discomfiting incident, it seems, was eventually resolved, as the Hemingways vacated the apartment eight months later on good terms.

Interestingly enough, an occasion of linguistic confusion similarly vexes a fictional expatriate American couple in Hemingway's "Out of Season," a story written during the same period as the author's correspondence to his apartment owner. Set in Cortina, "Out of Season" describes an unsuccessful fishing expedition with an alcoholic guide named Peduzzi who promises to escort them to the local fishing streams even though, as the title suggests, the season has passed. The young woman, Tiny, is against the illegal excursion and a disagreement arises when her husband stubbornly refuses to abandon the idea, even though he is clearly reluctant to

break the law. “Of course you haven’t the guts to just go back,” she tauntingly says to him as they follow Peduzzi through the town (CSS 137). “Why don’t you go back? Go back, Tiny,” he urges her, and when he suggests it a second time, she returns to the hotel (CSS 137). Upon reaching the stream, however, the men discover that they have no lead to weight the fishing lines. The husband seizes the opportunity to call off the fishing party and arranges to meet Peduzzi the next morning – an appointment that the husband clearly has no intention of keeping.

Although an outline of the story’s events cannot do complete justice to the series of darkly comic errors and miscommunications, at least one passage exemplifies the thematic link between cultural and linguistic barriers and the American couple’s estrangement:

They were walking down the hill toward the river. The town was in back of them. The sun had gone under and it was sprinkling rain. “There,” said Peduzzi, pointing to a girl in the doorway of a house they passed. “My daughter.” “His doctor,” the wife said, “has he got to show us his doctor?” “He said his daughter,” said the young gentleman. The girl went into the house as Peduzzi pointed. They walked down the hill across the fields and then turned to follow the river bank. Peduzzi talked rapidly with much winking and knowingness. [...] Part of the time he talked in d’Ampezzo dialect and sometimes in Tyroler German dialect. He could not make out which the young gentleman and his wife understood the best so he was being bilingual. But as the young gentleman said, “*Ja, Ja,*” Peduzzi decided to talk altogether in Tyroler. The young gentleman and his wife understood nothing. (CSS 137)

Midway into the story, Hemingway reveals that the actual cause of the couple’s discontent is not the illegal fishing trip but a prior unresolved and more intimate problem. “I’m sorry you feel so rotten, Tiny,” the husband admits, “I’m sorry I talked the way I did at lunch. We were both getting at the same thing from different angles” (CSS 137). But the wife is inconsolable: “It doesn’t make any difference,” she insists, “None of it makes any difference” (CSS 137). While it is clear to readers that the couple have problems that they are unable to

resolve, “Out of Season” is an early example of Hemingway’s emerging approach to fiction: the subject of the couple’s conflict is not revealed.

Typical of his early fiction dealing with relationships between men and women, there is little exposition and even less narrative commentary. The culmination of this aesthetic technique is of course the famous 1927 story “Hills Like White Elephants,” wherein a couple’s source of conflict, an abortion, is entirely omitted. “This reluctance to erect signposts was deliberate in Hemingway, who as a modernist aimed to write on the principle of the iceberg,” Scott Donaldson observes (129). “There is seven eighths of it underwater for every part that shows,” Hemingway explained. To discern the emotional undercurrents of a Hemingway story requires one to seek below the surface for a sense of what is unrevealed. In “Out of Season,” Carlos Baker first recognized the tale’s “metaphorical congruence of emotional atmospheres” – the inner emotional lives of the American couple with the rotten weather, the illegal fishing out of season, and the linguistic miscommunication. “With this story,” Baker writes, “he discovered for the first time the infinite possibilities of a new narrative technique. [...] This first successful use of it was the foremost esthetic discovery of Ernest’s early career” (109). While critics disagree about the exact nature of the couple’s discontent, the presumption is that the young woman may be pregnant and that the earlier argument alluded to in the story was “brought on by the young husband’s broaching the subject of an abortion” (Mellow 224). In this scenario, a crisis of communication organizes a crisis of reproduction as the characters’ conversational limitations forestall the realization of a modern nuclear family.

The subject of marriage inspired Hemingway to return to fiction in 1923, and is at the center of three stories written in 1924. As a representative example of a cluster of marriage tales, “Out of Season” shares with the stories “Cat in the Rain,” “Cross-Country Snow,” and “Mr. and

Mrs. Elliot,” scenes of expatriation and faltering romantic unions. But the group of stories also betrays a pattern of linguistic and cultural miscommunication that signals a larger crisis of family ideals, reproductive ambivalence, and parental self-doubt. This chapter surveys this pattern in the cultural-historical context of the 1920s modern domestic ideal.

By March 1923, Hadley’s pregnancy was an established fact. Ernest and Hadley had been practicing birth control, and he “carefully recorded the dates of her menstrual periods so they could time unprotected intercourse for the days when she was least likely to become pregnant” (Diliberto 131). But Hadley was eager to have a child, even though she knew parenthood was low on Ernest’s list of priorities. Indeed, as Hadley’s biographer Gioia Diliberto reports, Ernest refused to tell his family the news of Hadley’s pregnancy until a month before the baby was due. “Hadley explained in a letter to the Hemingways that she and Ernest wanted to spare the older couple unnecessary worry,” Diliberto notes, but adds that something else was also at work: “Ernest did not want his parents deeply involved in his life. There was no place for them in his invention of himself as The Great Writer and Paris Bohemian” (158).

Gertrude Stein accounted for Hemingway’s anguish over Hadley’s pregnancy in terms of his fears for his career. Writing as Alice Toklas in her autobiography, Stein observes:

He and Gertrude used to walk together and talk together a great deal. [...] Hemingway said he undoubtedly intended to be a writer. He and his wife went away on a trip and shortly after Hemingway turned up alone. He came to the house about ten o’clock in the morning and he stayed, he stayed for lunch, he stayed all afternoon, he stayed for dinner and he stayed until about ten o’clock at night and then all of a sudden he announced that his wife was enceinte and then with great bitterness, and I, I am too young to be a father. We consoled him as best we could and sent him on his way. (213)

If Stein tried her best to relieve Ernest’s anxieties about his impending fatherhood, his other principal mentor, Ezra Pound, did little to help assuage his fears. In Pound’s view, artists and their wives should not have children; “lesser mortals” should be the world’s parents, Pound

insisted (Diliberto 154). In 1925, after his mistress, Olga Rudge, gave birth to a daughter, “she and Pound handed the infant over to a peasant woman in the maternity ward whose own child had died. The woman raised Marie Rudge as her own. In Paris, Pound and Shakespear even refused to allow children in their studio” (Diliberto 154). Writing to the Hemingways in December 1923, after their son John, nicknamed “Bumby,” was born in Toronto, Bill Bird reported that Pound had cancelled “a holiday party because he didn’t want children in his studio. ‘But Ezra,’” Sally Bird had asked, “‘who’s going to read your poems if we don’t have children?’” (19 December 1923). In an interview with Alice Sokoloff, Hadley recalled that just before they left Paris for four months in 1923, Pound “got hold of her” and gave her a “very worn out” brown velvet smoking jacket as a farewell gift. He told her that he might just as well say goodbye to her now, Hadley remembered, for having a baby would “change her completely. You just won’t be the same again at all” (64). Pound believed that motherhood ruined women (Sokoloff 64).

Among postwar literary circles, Pound’s lack of interest in children was not uncommon. Many expatriate couples chose not to have children, and “those who did typically abandoned them to servants” (Diliberto 154). This attitude toward parenting marks a larger cultural-historical shift in early twentieth-century marriage as birth control became more readily available and reproduction more voluntary. “The ability to control whether and when one had babies,” Meg Gillete observes, “obliged moderns to reflect increasingly on their own desires and aptitudes to be parents. In the judgment of [early twentieth-century] family experts Ernest R. Groves and Gladys Hoadland Groves, the question ‘Shall the child come?’ was the defining crisis of the modern marriage” (51). This question, as well as one’s aptitude for parenthood, is hauntingly evoked at the end of Hemingway’s first novel, The Sun Also Rises. In an

unconventional reading, Diliberto contrasts domestic maternity against Brett Ashley's decision not to marry the handsome, virile matador Pedro Romero, opting instead to return to her former fiancée, a dissipated alcoholic. In a Madrid hotel, Brett tells Jake Barnes: "I'm thirty-four, you know. I'm not going to be one of these bitches that ruins children. [...] I'm not going to be that way. I feel rather good, you know. I feel rather set up. [...] I'm going back to Mike. [...] He's so damned nice and he's so awful. He's my sort of thing. [...] I won't be one of those bitches" (SAR 247). Rather than read Brett's reference to ruining "children" as her way of saying that she sent the youthful Romero away, Diliberto suggests that Brett is referring more widely to literal progeny and domestic maternity.

Likewise, a number of Hemingway's early stories portray a male protagonist who resists fatherhood for some reason or another. For many of these male characters, Nancy Comley and Robert Scholes suggest, a "problem of maturity" is "the major focus of thought and feeling" as they desire a degree of adult responsibility without the consequences of fatherhood (12). The desire for such a place "animates much of Hemingway's most interesting writing – writing that is interesting precisely because in it this desired position is both proposed and contested in a variety of ways"(Comley and Scholes 12).

In Hemingway's early marriage stories, this crisis of maturity is dramatized in the irreconcilable ideals of the modern companionate marriage at odds with the reality of parental responsibilities. The modern domestic ideal in the 1920s, according to Elaine May, "was clearly an extension of the youth cult: fun, carefree, innocent, and consciously devoid of the serious concerns of life. According to the formula, youthfulness was an essential element for marriage" (May 75-76). Writing to Kate Smith in January 1922, Hemingway describes the pleasures of exploring the Swiss countryside with Hadley: "Yesterday Binney [Hadley] and I took a hike way

up the mountain through tall pines, like aisles in a cathedral.” When they reached the mountain side, he reports, “we rolled boulders down; they would start jumping down like rabbits and then take great bounding leaps and then smash against the railroad at the bottom. We hoped we’d busted the tracks.” On one hand, Hemingway portrays for Kate, a former romantic interest, the new-found excitement which the couple are sharing (“We have a hell of a lot of fun together”). But also implied in the anecdote is Hemingway’s strong desire to cultivate a carefree lifestyle devoid of serious adult responsibilities, as symbolized in his wish that the boulders destroy the rail lines. While the marriage age dropped steadily in the decades from 1890 to 1920, due in part to the fact that American economic prosperity encouraged early matrimony, “the attempt to capture youth within wedlock” was also a significant factor that contributed to this trend (May 76-77). This emphasis on youthfulness, according to May, complimented the notion that matrimony was intended to “promote the happiness of the spouses. A certain amount of fun and amusement was expected as part of the bargain” (May 90).

In “Out of Season,” the fact that the young husband insists that his reluctant wife accompany him on the ill-conceived fishing party contributes to the underlying tension of the story. “I’m going to stay with you,” the wife declares, adding ironically, “If you go to jail we might as well both go” (CSS 137). The couple’s excursion is only abandoned after yet another instance of miscommunication with the guide. When they finally reach a spot on the river suitable for fishing, the wife turns back after mistakenly believing that they have to continue further. “He says it’s at least a half hour more. Go on back, Tiny,” her husband tells her. “You’re cold in this wind anyway. It’s a rotten day and we aren’t going to have any fun, anyway” (CSS 138). On one hand, the husband’s solicitousness serves as a “backhanded reminder” that her condition has “jeopardized their freedom, sentiments Hemingway was beginning to feel on

facing fatherhood for the first time” (Mellow 224). On another level, though, the husband’s sudden change of heart about fishing out of season suggests a degree of guilt about allowing his wife to return to town without him. In this view, the use of the lead sinker to symbolize male inadequacy (Mellow 223) deftly illustrates the ambiguous evolution of marriage: at the same time, spouses were expected to be exciting as well as good providers, fun-loving pals as well as responsible and family-minded adults. “On the whole,” May writes, “couples hoped that marriage would include fewer sacrifices and more satisfactions” (91). Hemingway himself married young, at twenty-one, and at first resisted the idea of fatherhood as incompatible with his life and career as an expatriate writer; thus, as Scott Donaldson has noted, the characterization of his male characters in the early marriage stories suggests “something about the burden of guilt the author carried around with him” (141). The insistent tone of a 20 June 1923 letter to his mother betrays Hemingway’s new ambivalence about his relationship with Hadley and her pregnancy. “You know that Hadley besides being a very wonderful musician is probably a better natural athlete than Sunny [his younger sister],” he declares. “This isn’t the way people are usually writing about their husbands or wives after they’ve been married as long as we have under as many trying circumstances. We have more fun all the time because we know everything bad about each other and appreciate everything good about each other and would rather be around together than with any one else.” Even though Hemingway had not yet broken the news to his family that Hadley was expecting, the letter reveals an anxiety about the effect her pregnancy and parenthood will have on their relationship.

Similarly, a journalistic piece for the Toronto Star that prefigures “Out of Season” suggests Hemingway’s acute awareness of his own marital shortcomings. The article recounts a solitary fishing excursion to the Swiss town of Chamby-sur-Montreux, near Aigle, in May 1922.

But what makes the account especially interesting is its exclusion of Hadley, who along with Ernest's friend Chink-Dorman Smith accompanied him on the outing. The author of "Fishing the Rhone Canal" describes the enjoyment of fishing for trout and drinking beer at an inn in Aigle:

The beer goes foaming out in great glass mugs that hold a quart and cost forty centimes, and a barmaid smiles and asks about your luck. Trains are always at least two hours apart in Aigle, and those waiting in the station buffet, this café with the golden horse and the wisteria-hung porch is a station buffet, mind you, wish they would never come. (DL 170-171)

Here the reporter expresses the pleasures of an idyllic afternoon spent among like-minded travelers. But as Miriam Mandel has pointed out, this "glorification of solitary pleasure" is complicated by an "unspoken yet clearly present system of values" (243). The narrator, Mandel observes, "has sneaked away from responsibilities and commitments. In his native Oak Park, such behavior would be considered antisocial, irresponsible, self-indulgent and childish, and his awareness of this makes the narrator uneasy" (243). This discomfort is evidenced in the "awkward expansion of the single self into 'those waiting in the station buffet,'" which is clearly an attempt to validate his behavior by vaguely positing other unidentified, similarly inclined individuals" (Mandel 243). Decades later in A Moveable Feast, Hemingway would present the afternoon differently by writing Hadley and Chink back into the narrative:

"Do you remember the inn at Aigle where you and Chink sat in the garden that day and read while I fished?"

"Yes, Tatie."

I remembered the Rhone, narrow and grey and full of snow water and the two trout streams on either side, the Stockalper and the Rhone canal. The Stockalper was really clear that day and the Rhone canal was still murky.

[...] "We all three argued about everything and always specific things and we made fun of each other. I remember everything we ever did and everything we ever said on the whole trip," Hadley said. "I do really. About everything. When you and Chink talked I was included. It wasn't like being a wife at Miss Stein's." (AMF 54)

While the episode is consistent with the rest of the memoir in its idealization of Hemingway's years with Hadley, such "exaggerated portrait[s] of himself" as an attentive, responsible husband reveals that Hemingway very likely "felt vulnerable" in his role as an ideal companion to Hadley (Brenner 224).

The early stories written in Paris perceptively and skillfully draw on Hemingway's relationship with Hadley and portray strong, sympathetic female leads and insensitive or uncaring male companions. Although the characters of these stories are introduced with such apparent objectivity as "the young gentleman" and "the American wife," Hemingway's sympathies are clearly aligned with his troubled, female spouses. In "Cat in the Rain," for example, the restless wife is dissatisfied with her transient life and her marriage to an unresponsive husband. While he largely ignores his wife and her plan to rescue a stray cat from the rain, his self-absorption is contrasted to the attentive hotel keeper who gives her a "feeling of being of supreme importance" (CSS 130). Her unsuccessful attempt to retrieve the cat from the rain elicits a litany of other longings, thus providing us with a clue to her unhappiness:

"I want to pull my hair back tight and smooth and make a big knot at the back that I can feel," she said. "I want to have a kitty to sit on my lap and purr when I stroke her."

"Yeah?" George said from the bed.

"And I want to eat at a table with my own silver and I want candles. And I want it to be spring and I want to brush my hair out in front of a mirror and I want a kitty and I want some new clothes."

"Oh, shut up and get something to read," George said. He was reading again. (CSS 131)

While the wife's wish list indicates her desire for a home and some stability, her wish for a cat might also represent her desire for a child. Indeed, critical attention to the story has largely focused on whether the woman wants to have a baby or whether she is already pregnant.

According to Carlos Baker, in mid-February, 1923, during a stay in Rapallo, Italy, Hemingway "began to make some notes for a short story to be called 'Cat in the Rain'" (107). "It

was about himself and Hadley and the manager and the chambermaid at the Hotel Splendide,” Baker adds (107). By mid-February Hadley had discovered that she was pregnant and the couple cut short their second winter stay in Switzerland and headed for the warmer climate of Italy. Despite a dinner in Milan to celebrate the forthcoming child, Ernest seems to have felt some ambivalence about the prospect of parenthood. From the Hotel Splendide, Hemingway gave Gertrude Stein a sense of his mood: “The sea is weak and dull here and doesn’t look as though there was much salt in the water. The tide rises and falls about an inch. When the surf breaks it sounds like someone pouring a bucket of ashes over the side of a scow” (SL 79). The constricted, claustrophobic imagery of “Cat in the Rain” parallels the emotional and psychological isolation of the couple, especially the American wife.

The opening sentences evoke an atmosphere similar to “Out of Season” as the narrator immediately alerts us to the physical and linguistic isolation of the expatriate couple: “There were only two Americans stopping at the hotel. They did not know any of the people they passed on the stairs on their way to and from their room” (CSS 129). In both stories, moreover, the pattern of miscommunication is twofold, signifying the couple’s present estrangement as well as the larger question of fertility. In “Cat in the Rain,” this latter point is illustrated in the wife’s attempt to rescue the wet cat from the courtyard:

With the maid holding the umbrella over her, she walked along the gravel path until she was under their window. The table was there, washed bright green in the rain, but the cat was gone. She was suddenly disappointed. The maid looked up at her.

“*Ha perduto qualche cosa, Signora?*”

“There was a cat,” said the American girl.

“A cat?”

“*Si, il gato.*”

“A cat?” the maid laughed. “A cat in the rain?” (CSS 130)

The wife's disappointment is compounded by her inability to express the importance of the cat to the maid. The wife's question, asked in Italian and without translation, is significant as it "both disguises and emphasizes" the words that "may be heard to resonate through the rest of the story" (Barton 73). Even as Hemingway provides a number of clues to suggest the wife's condition, the "idea of pregnancy is rigorously repressed, as the husband and wife avoid the topic – and each other – through distractive pursuits. The wife seeks the cat in the rain, projecting upon it her apparent sense of deprivation and fear of abandonment, while the husband blocks his pent-up irritation by reading" (Kennedy 79). Hemingway omits any explicit reference to the wife's pregnancy since the story "has to do with a problem that is unresolved because the couple cannot yet talk about it" (Kennedy 80). The changes made in various manuscript versions, in fact, are all directed toward making the husband less communicative, providing a contrast to the gracious hotel keeper who intuitively understands the young wife's loneliness.

A comparison of the manuscript versions with the published story reveals an additional, if similarly repressed, crisis. In her climactic closing speech, the wife tells her husband:

"I'd like to pull my hair back tight and smooth and make a big knot and wear a Spanish comb and have on a Yteb gown and a cat to sit in my lap and purr in front of the fire while I waited for someone to come home."

"You're a swell mixture," George said.

"I want a table set with my own silver and candles lit – and I don't want to know what's going to happen." (KL 319)

In this version, Hemingway contrasts the wife's conflicted desire for domestic maternity ("I'd like to pull my hair back tight and smooth and make a big knot and wear a Spanish comb") against the excitement and sensuality of donning the latest French fashion ("a Yteb gown") while waiting "for someone to come home" to do something unexpected. The fashion house Yteb, opened in Paris in 1922 by aristocratic Russian emigres, represented all the sexy extravagance associated with the cosmopolitan "Modern Woman." Recognizing this apparent contradiction,

George's response, "You're a swell mixture," confirms his wife's conflicted longings for the stability of traditional domesticity and the excitement of a liberated, modern feminine identity. By 1920, men and women both seemed to want a more satisfying home life, but there was "a confusion surrounding domestic aspirations that had not been present" only a few decades earlier, for "[a]lthough they displayed desires for new excitement and sensuality, most were caught between traditions of the past and visions of the future" (May 158). In fact, a study of hundreds of 1920 divorce cases has revealed a "consistent theme" in "the desire for the new vitality and the old morality to coexist within the home. But judging from these conflicts, the domestic realm could not easily sustain both at once" (May 81). Some men, Elaine May points out, "were torn by desires for both excitement and purity; and few women could satisfy both. Some men were attracted to the sensual 'new woman,' but then wanted virtuous wives" (78-79).

Jeffrey Meyers has identified these irreconcilable identities as one of the "penetrating revelations" that informs "Cat in the Rain" and its depiction of a disintegrating marriage. For the story's author, Meyer notes, an eight-year age difference became increasingly obvious as Hadley began to want "a quieter life, found it difficult to keep up with all his energetic activities and was not 'fun' anymore" (152-153). "She gradually exchanged the role of wife for that of mother," Meyers explains, and in one advice-filled message "wrote that he [Ernest] must 'be sure to eat well, sleep well, keep well and work well,' and signed the letter 'with Mummy's love.' His youthful sweetheart was awfully nice, but he had outgrown her. He was living among the bohemians and expatriates of Paris, and wanted someone more sophisticated and exciting" (153).

Important to his acceptance within modernist Paris circles moreover was Ernest's identity as a successful writer, a career that he felt was threatened by Hadley's pregnancy; the Hemingways relationship was also strained in February, 1923, by the devastating loss of Ernest's

unpublished manuscripts two months earlier. In the discarded early chapters of Islands in the Stream, published posthumously as “The Strange Country,” the account of how Hadley packed all of her husband’s manuscripts in a valise that was stolen in the Gare de Lyon retains all of the agony of the original episode. Refusing to believe that Hadley had packed all the handwritten originals, the typed originals, and the carbons, Hemingway made a hasty overnight trip to Paris, alone, to search the apartment and determine the extent of the loss. Finding that she had put everything into the stolen suitcase, the author recalls a sympathetic conversation with the horrified apartment concierge, who cannot understand how his wife could have committed such a blunder. “Why were copies made to lose them with the originals?” she pointedly asks. “I said madame had packed them by mistake. It was a great mistake, she said. A fatal mistake” (CSS 648). The concierge continues, “I have seen monsieur work at the café on the corner. I’ve seen monsieur at work at the table in the dining room when I’ve brought things up. [...] Then she started to cry. [...] What unhappiness, she said” (CSS 649).

The parallel between the Paris concierge and the hotel keeper in “Cat in the Rain” is striking – sympathetic and attentive, both figures empathize as well as appreciate their younger acquaintances’ despair. In both accounts, the older character provides a contrast to the offending partner. In “Cat in the Rain,” for example, the parallel series of “‘She liked ...’ in respect to the padrone is contrasted to the series of ‘I want ...’ in respect to the husband” (Meyers 153). The Paris concierge, in turn, provides the young author with a sense of confidence by believing in his talent: “To the new works, she said. To them, I said. Monsieur will be a member of the Académie Française. No, I said. The Académie Americaine, she said” (CSS 649). After the loss of the manuscripts, Ernest blamed Hadley for not understanding or properly valuing his work. The painter Mike Strater, who spent time with the Hemingways in Rapallo in 1923, recalled

Hemingway saying to him, “‘You know, Mike, if you had those manuscripts in your trunk, you would not have left them to go and get something to read.’ In other words, I was a fellow artist and if he had given them to me I would have never left them in an exposed position. He was very upset because it showed how little she valued what he was doing” (qtd. in Brian 41). By contrast, the sensitive hotel keeper of “Cat in the Rain” assuages the wife’s acute sense of emptiness when he sends to her room a large tortoise-shell cat; although not the original cat she spied from her second-floor window earlier that afternoon, the padrone’s gift acts as a substitute for a substitute – an alternative cat to physically satisfy the wife’s intangible need for emotional intimacy. In this first story Hemingway tried to write after losing his manuscripts, the cat serves as an objective correlative to signify “an unnameable lost object” (Eby 137). And indeed, the symbolic resonance of the story conveys a paralyzing impasse – unappreciated and unable to move into a desired future, the author of “Cat in the Rain” communicates a lack of control or agency at a time when Hemingway “did not think [he] could write any more” (AMF 74).

But after completing “Cat in the Rain” in March, 1923, Hemingway continued to mine the experience of marriage and pregnancy; in “Cross-Country Snow,” written a month later, Nick Adams tries “to reconcile himself to the fait accompli of his impending fatherhood” and come to terms with a loss of masculine autonomy (Stewart 77). The origins of the story are recalled in a 17 July 1923 letter to Bill Horne in which Hemingway recounts for his friend his many expatriate adventures, including the news of Hadley’s pregnancy and of their plans to move to Toronto to have the baby. “Gee we’ve had fun Bill – It just doesn’t seem possible we’re going to leave it all,” he writes. “But when there were just two of us it didn’t make any difference how near broke we were [...]. But I figure I’ve got to have a steady job during the First Year of the

Baby and expenses etc anyway. Soon as he gets old enough he or she can take his or her chances with the rest of the family” (SL 88).

The narrative framework of this Swiss alpine story moves from a thrilling description of downhill skiing to an enclosed scene indoors at an inn, where Nick and his buddy George are served apple strudel and wine by a pregnant waitress: “The girl came in and Nick noticed that her apron covered swellingly her pregnancy. I wonder why I didn’t see that when she first came in, he thought” (CSS 145). Still exhilarated by their outdoor activity, Nick’s lapse in initially observing the waitress’ condition illustrates his unconscious wish to postpone the new demands of fatherhood. As Helen’s baby is not yet due for some months, Nick is still adjusting to the idea of a baby; noticing a woman’s pregnancy is new to him. When the waitress cuts short their questions about her singing, Nick tells George that she is from “up where they speak German probably and she’s touchy about being here and then she’s got that baby coming without being married and she’s touchy” (CSS 145). When George asks him how he knows she isn’t married, Nick points out, “No ring. Hell, no girls get married around here till they’re knocked up” (CSS 145).

Interestingly enough, at this point in an earlier manuscript version, Nick carefully watches the waitress as she re-entered “the room and picked up a cat that had slipped through when she brought in the wine” (KL 345). The symbolic association of the cat and pregnancy, as in the story “Cat in the Rain,” has its origin in some notes Hemingway jotted down in Rapallo in 1923. An unpublished fragment titled “Rapallo” begins: “Cats love in the garden. On the green tea table to be exact. The big cat gets on the small cat. [...] Hadley and I are happy sometimes. [...] We are happiest in bed. In bed we are well fed. There are no problems in bed” (qtd. in Eby 135). Of this fragment, Carl Eby has observed, “Ernest connected the sex life of the two cats

with his own sex life with his wife” (135). The erotic connection between the cats and lovemaking also implies, however, that the couple’s happiness is only complicated by the reproductive consequences of sex. The associative imagery of the cat in the original draft of “Cross-Country Snow” links the appearance of the waitress cradling the cat with Nick’s reluctance to take on the responsibilities and restrictions of fatherhood. Nick’s underlying frustration at having to give up these good times with George and return to the United States is projected upon the waitress who appears, like himself, trapped biologically.

Following the pattern of the other “marriage tales” surveyed in the chapter, Nick’s ambivalent attitude toward reproduction in “Cross-Country Snow” is initially embedded in a transcultural misunderstanding. Nick and George are the only foreigners at the inn; and as Joseph Flora has observed, Hemingway makes us pay attention to this fact, for as soon as Nick makes his remark about the local peasant custom of having pregnancy precede marriage, a gang of woodcutters enters and the waitress serves them. “To typical American ears of the 1920s,” Flora writes, “the statement would bespeak mainly low morals and gross insensitivity” (194). But the reason behind the pattern of peasant marriages, Flora adds, “is that the culture puts a major value on fertility, on having children. The peasant man does not want to marry a woman who will not give him children” (194). Ironically, Nick’s threatening self-pity is at odds with “the values of the culture where he now finds himself,” for he has wanted the companionship of marriage but without parenthood (Flora 194).

By contrast, the story “Mr. and Mrs. Elliot,” written in the same month as “Cross-Country Snow,” describes Hubert and Cornelia Elliot’s Victorian attitudes toward marriage and pregnancy as incongruous with the cultural codings of the 1920s. Nancy Comley and Robert Scholes have discussed the story in relation to what they term the American Puritan sexual code

(sex solely as a means of reproduction) and, indeed, as twentieth-century Americans turned away from the ascetic codes of their predecessors, shedding the Victorian reticence concerning sex became a symbolic gesture of a youthful, modern identity. That Hemingway positions Hubert Elliot as inexperienced at sex and something of a prude is meant, Comley and Scholes suggest, to be a reversed or inverted image of what the young author supposed himself to be (84-86). More specifically, this identity includes a complicated connection between professional and creative desire. This association is succinctly suggested in Hemingway's correspondence with Ezra Pound; writing from Chamby, Switzerland, in January 1923, for example, Hemingway alludes to the idea of creative genius rising from the crotch to the brain: "This high altitude has made me practically sexless. I don't mean that it has removed the sexual superiority of the male but that it has checked the activity of the glands" (SL 79). From Toronto, after the birth of his son, Bumby, he writes to Pound that Hadley "still likes [him] better than the baby," explaining that "the joys of Motherhood are sung principally by those who are not married to a pukka student of the *Ars Amoris*" (SL 96). In contrast to the artistic pretensions of poets like Hubert Smith, Hemingway closely identifies artistic creativity with heterosexual desire.

Paul Smith has persuasively shown how several details in the story are meant to ridicule the artistic airs of rich, American expatriates like the poet Chard Powers Smith, whose wife had just lost a baby; the reach of the satire, furthermore, aims at neutralizing the powerful literary influence of T.S. Eliot by maliciously slighting the author of The Waste Land for suffering a loveless marriage of "sexual ineptitude" (Smith 23). And yet, Smith adds, nothing in the personal lives of either Smith or Eliot "fully accounts for some of the story's details, and so we might add a third couple to this composite portrait: Mr. and Mrs. Hemingway" (24-25). Like the Elliots, the Hemingways sailed to Europe after their marriage and, like Hubert Elliot, Ernest was aged 25 in

1924. Both men married women considerably older than themselves. If the story reflects a number of Hemingway's personal experiences of the three years before it was written, Smith observes, "it was uncannily prophetic of the next three. It was in the Loire valley of Touraine in the spring of 1926 that Hadley, motoring with Pauline and Jinny Pfeiffer, first recognized her competition. By June, Ernest and Hadley and Pauline were at a hotel in Juan-des-Pins, where, in Carlos Baker's nice phrase, 'there were three of everything'" (25). In Hemingway's story, after trying unsuccessfully to have a baby in Paris and Dijon, Cornelia Elliot "prevailed upon [Hubert] to send over to Boston for her girl friend" (CSS 125). After some travel, the threesome settle down in a country house on the Loire, where Elliot "lived apart in his own room" writing late into the night and "Mrs. Elliot and the girl friend now slept together in the big medieval bed. They had many a good cry together. In the evening they all sat at dinner together in the garden under a plane tree and the hot evening wind blew and Elliot drank white wine and Mrs. Elliot and the girl friend made conversation and they were all quite happy" (CSS 125).

If the story was eerily familiar to Hemingway by 1926, as Smith suggests, there is some reason for its prophetic fulfillment. Because Ernest was "married first of all to his work," a biography of Hadley describes, she "was condemned to long hours alone," a situation made more difficult by her reluctance to explore alone the rough quarter of their first residence in Paris and the linguistic limitations of her "schoolgirl French" (Diliberto 104). Increasingly, Hadley relied upon visits from female friends to ease the loneliness she felt while Ernest worked or was away on frequent assignments for the Toronto Star. In Chamby, Austria, for instance, the Hemingways were joined by Hadley's English friend "Dossie" Johnston. Despite the fact that Ernest felt she was taking up too much of his wife's time, Hadley insisted on enjoying "the companionship during the long periods when Ernest would be working" (Sokoloff 76). Another of Hadley's

companions, Alma Estelle Lloyd, also irritated Ernest. In an unpublished sketch, he ridiculed her artistic pretensions: “Lloyd was a fat girl who came to Paris to study music. [...] On the boat [...] she opened conversations with perfectly nice inoffensive people by asking, ‘What do you do that’s interesting?’ If they did not do anything interesting she left them and had nothing more to do with them” (qtd. in Diliberto 165). The sketch also pokes fun at her ambition to have an affair, but as she isn’t able to find a suitable man to sleep with, she stays in her room, listening to the couple next door making love.

Although Ernest, too, enjoyed having new female friends around, he was nevertheless sensitive about any companion of Hadley’s who seemed to command too much of her time and attention. While Ernest’s intolerance for many of his wife’s female friends betrays “a reflection of his own self-doubts” (Diliberto 165), the pressure for modern couples to put their marriage “first and foremost” in their lives contributed to a deeper feeling of insecurity and even distrust (Coontz 205). The pressure put on modern couples, Stephanie Coontz has observed, “led many women to become *more* dependent on their relationships with men” (205). As a result, “proponents of ‘modern’ sexuality and marriage were deeply suspicious of close ties between women. By the 1920s the profound female friendships that had been such an important part of nineteenth-century female culture were under attack” (Coontz 205). If “Mr. and Mrs. Elliot” draws a vicious picture of the closet homosexuality of genteel Harvard types like Hubert Elliot, it is equally cruel toward Cornelia Elliot who, Hemingway infers, is despicable “in that she uses Hubert to maintain appearances so that she can carry on her lesbian relationship with her ‘girl friend’” (Perloff 679-680). Most remarkable, however, is the fact that both “Cross-Country Snow” and “Mr. and Mrs. Elliot,” written together in the same month, feature characters who experience the threat of losing the freedom and camaraderie of same-sex friendships. In “Cross-

Country Snow,” for example, Nick realizes that the moments spent with his friend George – skiing, drinking, joking, and reminiscing – are what make life “worth while” (CSS 146).

In a similar vein, the original ending of “Big Two-Hearted River” continues to explore the anxiety of being cut off from male camaraderie. The deleted ending, published posthumously as “On Writing,” reveals that Nick is haunted, not by his war experience but by the friends who have faded from his life since he and Helen were wed: “When he married he lost Bill Smith, Odgar, the Ghee, all the old gang. He lost them because he admitted by marrying that something was more important than fishing” (234). How expatriation both intensified Hemingway’s fears of losing the pleasures of male camaraderie as well as complicated many of his male friendships is the focus of the next chapter.

On both sides of the Atlantic, the fervent pursuit of pleasure in the 1920s took on a new urgency as men and women sought through each other a personal quest for happiness; the rising rate of marriage and the soaring rate of divorce thus reflects “a larger historical drama” – the emergence of modern life and “the great expectations for personal fulfillment that came with it” (May 156). In the marriage tales of 1923-24, Hemingway registers the underlying conflict of a domestic ideal that promises to offer fewer sacrifices and more satisfactions. Due to the unprecedented control over whether and when the family should include children, a certain ambivalence about the value of marriage and the irreconcilable differences between companionship and parenthood informs these portraits of domestic dissatisfaction. Set in foreign countries among alien peoples, languages, and customs, the stories provide a powerful framework for exploring the anomie and uncertainties of a postwar world. As such, Hemingway’s early marriage stories bracket the larger concerns of the stories collated as In Our

Time. In renumerating that most familiar of themes – the conflict between husband and wife – Hemingway ironically introduces us to a modern world in which every element is in fact foreign.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE MALE TALES

“The writer who cannot leave his country,” Hemingway once observed, “is the local color writer,” but if a writer “deals with the human heart [...] then you can be sure he does not have to stay [...] for fear he will lose it. He can make the country [...] five thousand miles away from it looking at the whitewashed wall of a cheap room in any land you name and make it truer than anyone can who lives in it.”¹ Nevertheless, while working on the early Nick Adams stories in Paris throughout the spring of 1924, Hemingway pinned to the wall in front of his writing table a detailed, blue-tinted map of the northern Michigan peninsula (Reynolds 202). All the familiar names were there, the setting of almost every summer from his birth until his marriage: Hortons Bay, the “point” at Lake Charlevoix, Petoskey, Boyne City, and Walloon Lake. Decades later, he would explain the relation between writing in a foreign city and the nostalgia he felt for native scenes. Recalling a cold autumn day in Paris that put him in mind of Michigan, he writes: “I had already seen the end of fall come through boyhood, youth and young manhood, and in one place you could write about it better than in another. That was called transplanting yourself, I thought, and it could be as necessary with people as with other sorts of growing things” (AMF 5). But other conditions, apart from the local weather, also contributed to Hemingway’s psychic attachment to northern Michigan.

Although only recently married and settled in Paris, an early 1922 poem reflects what would become a recurring, even obsessive, theme throughout his earliest years abroad: the sense of a lost period in his life. Hemingway’s Michigan landscape is thus transformed into an irrecoverable idyll, a country that can only exist for him now in memory and imagination:

“Along with Youth”

A porcupine skin,
Stiff with bad tanning,
It must have ended somewhere.
Stuffed horned owl
Pompous
Yellow eyed;
Chuck-wills-widow on a biased twig
Sooted with dust.
Piles of old magazines,
Drawers of boys’ letters
And the line of love
They must have ended somewhere.
Yesterday’s Tribune is gone
Along with youth
And the canoe that went to pieces on the beach
The year of the big storm
When the hotel burned down
At Seney, Michigan. (Poems 51)

The poem consists of two sections: in the first part the narrator leads us on a tour (of an attic, perhaps?) to show a number of discarded taxidermy trophies now “sooted with dust.” The narrator also notes the old magazines and letters from boys, perhaps the narrator’s boyhood friends with whom he shared hunting activities. These items, the poet repeats, “must have ended somewhere,” suggesting that their existence ended at some place unknown. In the second part, the narrator tells us that yesterday’s newspaper, perhaps the Chicago Tribune, is also gone. It departed along with the poet’s youth. The poem ends in a series of images relating to loss – the beached canoe has “gone to pieces” in the year of a destructive storm, and the old hotel at Seney has “burned down.”

Similarly, in his finest Michigan story, “Big Two-Hearted River,” Hemingway has his fictional persona Nick Adams arrive by train to Seney where he looks at the foundation of the Mansion House Hotel, its stone “chipped and split by the fire” (CSS 163). These ruins, we are told, “was all that was left” (CSS 163). While a majority of critics agree that the ghost town of

Seney represents a lost or even scarred earlier segment of Nick's life as he attempts to restore a sense of order and balance in his life after the war, the original ending of "Big Two-Hearted River" (known as "On Writing") suggests a more specific loss – his concluded bachelorhood and the pleasures of hunting, fishing, and camping with friends. For as the fragment known as "On Writing" reveals, Nick's anxiety while fishing the Big Two-Hearted River "is not postcombat trauma so much as an agonizing consciousness that in getting married, becoming a writer, and moving to Paris, he has forfeited the halcyon world of northern Michigan" (Kennedy 94). Thinking of "Bill Smith, Odgar, the Ghee, all the old gang" who faded from his life after he and Helen were wed, Nick in "On Writing" concludes that "he lost them all" because he "admitted by marrying that something was more important than fishing" (234).

"On Writing" also shows Nick measuring his attachment to "all the old gang" against his shared expatriate life in Paris. He thinks fondly of Ezra Pound, one of his new European pals, but concedes: "Ezra thought fishing was a joke." Curiously, the next line, crossed out in the manuscript, reads: "Ezra didn't know anything. Really. Not a damn thing. How could he write like that and not know anything?" (KL 274). While Nick Adams admires his literary friends, their inability to share his passion for fishing – and the homosocial intimacy of the sporting life – intensifies the yearning that pervades several In Our Time stories and especially "Big Two-Hearted River." Nick Adams' lonely return in "Big Two-Hearted River" should be read alongside other stories in the In Our Time collection that probe men's fears of losing the pleasures of male camaraderie. Together, these "male tales" also explore the shifting codes that defined modern masculinity in the early decades of the twentieth century. This chapter will examine how the experience of expatriation influenced and altered Hemingway's explorations of male friendship and the complications of homosocial intimacy.

I. "Once Bill meant Bill Smith:" A Modern Bromance

"When I said about looking back I didn't mean to throw off the old places. A big part of my brain has lived exclusively in the bay, the Black, the Sturgeon and all that country. It means more to a male than anything." – Hemingway, 17 February 1925 letter to Bill Smith

"All the love went into fishing and the summer. He had loved it more than anything." – Hemingway, "On Writing" (235)

"When he married he lost Bill Smith," Hemingway concludes in "On Writing," whereas before he wed he "had loved digging potatoes with Bill in the fall, the long trips in the car, fishing in the bay, reading in the hammock on hot days, swimming off the dock, playing baseball at Charlevoix and Petoskey, living at the bay" (235). As a meta-fictional narrative, "On Writing" features Hemingway's fictional Nick Adams remembering the author's own past and experiences, including the loss of his best male friend, Bill Smith. "Bill had never fished before they met," Hemingway recalls, but afterward they always fished together: "The Black, the Sturgeon, the Pine Barrens, the Upper Minnie, all the little streams. Most about fishing he and Bill had discovered together" ("On Writing" 234). In a curious twist to the relationship, however, remembering Smith's jealousy over Hemingway's fishing different rivers with other men, he depicts Bill in an ambiguously feminine role, saying, "Bill forgave him the fishing he had done before they met. He forgave him all the rivers. He was really proud of them. It was like a girl about other girls. If they were before they did not matter. But after was different" ("On Writing" 234).

In contemporary parlance, the Hemingway-Smith friendship reveals a "bromance" – an unusual intimacy between two outwardly heterosexual men. Their correspondence from 1918 until Ernest's marriage to Hadley in 1921 reveals a mutual passion for fishing the streams and lakes of upper Michigan.² Writing to "Hemingstein," then bound for Italy, Smith on 5 June 1918

assures him: “We must, we shall get together after the Huns are annihilated and have at least a week in the Barriers, then a cruise on Pine Lake and possibly up into the Georgian Bay.” “Form no alliance,” Smith pleads, “which might interfere.” But inevitably, other alliances – female entanglements – did interfere. Smith’s letter thus betrays anxiety about the prospect of losing his best fishing buddy. Learning of Ernest’s hasty engagement to his wartime nurse, Agnes von Kurowsky, Smith reveals his hurt by addressing the letter to “him that no longer thinks of her.” Casting himself as the forgotten female, Smith possessively asks Hemingway to send a photo of his rival: “I want to know the sort of dame that’s going to have a place by our campfire. In spite of your descriptions the prospect makes me a bit nervous” (17 December 1918).

Then, after outlasting Agnes, Smith gets jealous less than a year later about Ernest’s flirtation with Marjorie Bump, warning that she is sure to misinterpret his attentions: “I speak with the voice of discretion when I say that unless you are more careful you’ll make a hash of the poor kid’s life. It is utterly childish and ridiculous for you to even suggest that you don’t rate anything with her.” One wonders whether Smith is speaking for himself or for Marjorie, however, when he adds: “As a matter of fact you rate everything. And you know it. With that knowledge you have no moral right whatever to leave Marj. the smallest grounds on which to build the hope that you’ll some day care for her” (24 January 1920). While the 1924 story “The End of Something” chronicles the breakup of Hemingway’s surrogate Nick Adams with a fictionalized Marjorie Bump, it also suggests Hemingway’s complex relationship with Bill Smith, who (as “Bill”) emerges at the departure of “Marjorie” to reinforce their homosocial bond.

The tone of the “The End of Something” is indirectly suggested through an extensive opening description of the demise of Hortons Bay, a once-thriving lumber town. Accounting for

fully one-sixth of the story, the lengthy exposition is similar to Hemingway's symbolic rendering of landscape in "Along with Youth" and "Big Two-Hearted River," for nothing remains, we're told, of the town's old lumber mill "except the broken white limestone of its foundations showing through the swampy second growth" (CSS 79). Where once there had stood "the one-story bunk-house, the eating house, the company store, the mill offices, and the big mill itself," one day the timber ran out and the lumber schooners arrived, carrying away "everything that had made the mill a mill and Hortons Bay a town" (CSS 79). Against this metaphorical backdrop, most critics have viewed the tale as an emotional lesson in the young life of Nick Adams – the ruins of the once-thriving town are Hemingway's objective correlative for a ruined youthful love. Yet the symbolic significance of Hortons Bay's fate (the town ran out of lumber, packed up, and moved on) also reflects Hemingway's own decisions in 1921: his marriage to Hadley, his expatriation to Paris, and his chosen vocation as a writer. According to Carlos Baker, Hemingway knew before he married that his decision would "destroy the kind of life he had been living," and yet he continued to dream of camping and fishing trips to the Sturgeon and the Black (79). All his life, he wrote to Smith in 1921, "a man loved two or three streams better than anything else in the world. Then he fell in love with a girl and the 'goddam streams [could] dry up' for all he cared" (qtd. in Baker 79). But he did care, and he continued throughout his early years in Paris to long for the Michigan wilderness and the company of sportsmen. He would also try in his fiction to come to terms with the decisions that had cut him off from a place and a way of life that he loved "more than anything" ("On Writing" 235).

In "The End of Something," the primary action described in the story is fishing – an activity that appears to be the focal point in Nick and Marjorie's relationship – with Nick playing the role of instructor. To this end, the Nick-Marjorie relationship resembles the bond between

Hemingway and Bill Smith described in “On Writing;” whereas Smith had never fished before they met, Hemingway claims, he takes credit for initiating Smith into the art. Moreover, as James Mellow has remarked, the real-life “Marjorie” Bump denied that the fishing episode in the story had ever taken place, thus revealing “an instance of Hemingway’s transference of a masculine episode to a male-female exchange in the story” (110). In Paris, isolated from his old friends, Hemingway ruminated on the failure of his former relationships, but he was especially haunted by the loss of Smith.

Precipitated by events just a few months after serving as best man at Ernest’s wedding, the loss of Smith’s friendship was a void that “he felt more deeply than his estrangement from his family” (Mellow 161). Ostensibly, the best friends had a falling out due to Ernest’s intrusion into the marital affairs of the wife of his Chicago roommate, Smith’s brother Y.K. When Hemingway wrote to Y.K. to tell him that he and his wife, “Doodles,” were no longer welcome to his parents’ twenty-fifth wedding anniversary party, Bill Smith took the affront personally and allowed the friendship to cool. But James Mellow suggests an additional factor: Bill Smith suffered a “manic-depressive episode” triggered, one assumes, by Hemingway’s marriage to Hadley (163). For Hemingway, as well, the break with Smith was devastating. Writing to Smith’s sister Kate, Ernest’s distress is evident: “I haven’t heard from Bill although I have wrote [sic] him four letters altogether without answer. If he wants to make it permanent I wish he would let me know in some way so that I can start forgetting him. As it is he is my best male friend and there isn’t any one to take his place” (27 January 1922). Although he was having a “hell of a good time” exploring Paris with Hadley and was excited that his writing was “coming along,” Hemingway nevertheless felt cut off from male activities, reporting to a friend that he

hadn't "seen a fight since I was here on acct no one to go with – but they have very good bouts all the time" (SL 64).

In "The Three-Day Blow" (a companion piece to "The End of Something"), Hemingway explores the tension between the homosocial intimacy of hunting and fishing with male friends in Michigan and committing himself to a heterosexual relationship. The title refers to an autumn storm that is blowing outside as Nick and Bill spend the night in Bill's family cottage, where the boys drink Irish whiskey, talk about baseball and books, and try to avoid the topic of Nick's recent breakup with Marjorie. Eventually Bill broaches the topic, making clear his own belief that by marrying, a man's "absolutely bitched," for it means a loss of freedom: "He hasn't got anything anymore. Nothing. Not a damn thing. He's done for" (CSS 90). Although Bill tries to console Nick by explaining that he has done the right thing by putting an end to "that Marge business," Nick is less sure, assenting to his friend's emphatic declarations without revealing the least sign that he has made the right choice. "The big thing was that Marjorie was gone," Nick thinks, "and that probably he would never see her again. He had talked to her about how they would go to Italy together and the fun they would have. Places they would be together. It was all gone now" (CSS 91). But by the end of the story, Nick takes comfort in the idea that "there's always a chance" that he and Marjorie can get back together: "He felt happy now. There was not anything that was irrevocable. [...] Nothing was finished. Nothing was ever lost. [...] He felt lighter, as he had felt before Bill started to talk about it. There was always a way out" (CSS 92). Hemingway allows Nick to indulge in a self-deception, in the false hope that "nothing was ever lost." As Matthew Stewart observes, a return to "once meaningful places and recapturing former joys will become a familiar theme in Hemingway's work and will often be shown to be an attractive delusion, impossible to accomplish;" this delusion, Stewart notes, is "partly the product

of [Nick's] youth and partly an expression of the common desire to escape the necessity of facing the consequences of one's actions" (50). Texts such as "On Writing," "The End of Something," and "The Three-Day Blow" reveal the author's anxiety of being cut off from the male camaraderie he shared in northern Michigan and the consequences of his commitment to a wife and a writing career in Paris.

This theme is specifically addressed in "The Three-Day Blow" as Hemingway projects into the story an alternative history for his fictional surrogate Nick Adams. In an attempt to console Nick, Bill points out that had Nick "gone on that way" with Marjorie they "wouldn't be here now," meaning that the two of them wouldn't be sharing each other's company and enjoying the prospect of several days together hunting and fishing. To this, Nick thinks: "That was true. His original plan had been to go down home and get a job. Then he had planned to stay in Charlevoix all winter so he could be near Marge. Now he did not know what he was going to do" (CSS 91). Interestingly, Nick's inchoate plans parallel several significant decisions Hemingway himself brooded over during 1919-20. His "original plan" to return home and secure a job recalls Ernest's plan after his 1919 return from Italy to Oak Park to gain employment and earn enough money to marry his wartime nurse, Agnes von Kurowsky. In order to marry Agnes, however, Hemingway (at Agnes' urging) declined an offer by Jim Gamble for a year in Italy, expenses paid, just to pal around with him. Instead, Agnes sent Ernest home to get a job, "saying she would not marry some loafer on the bum in Europe" (qtd. in Reynolds, Young, 48).

A few months later, Hemingway wrote Gamble to tell him that it had been a mistake to come home. Agnes had informed him that she was engaged to an Italian count and that she had never seriously intended to marry him. His letter to Gamble relates his regret for the missed opportunity to travel Italy: "Every minute of every day I kick myself for not being at Taormina

with you” (SL 21). By the end of the year, he was involved in another entanglement – with Marjorie Bump, one of the “summer people” from the Bay. If the fictional Nick Adams doesn’t know what to do after his plan to “be near Marge” dissolves, the author of “The Three-Day Blow” must have thought about how in 1919 he took a rented room in Petoskey (where Marjorie was in high school) after it became too cold to stay on at Hortons Bay (Reynolds, Young, 88). As Michael Reynolds notes, Hemingway needed the support and attention of women, an admiring female presence to fulfill his need for approval. But he also deeply resented any relationship that threatened to constrain his freedom (Reynolds, Young, 200). Nick’s dilemma in “The Three-Day Blow” – between his desire for heterosexual intimacy and the freedom of male companionship – is one of the earliest indications in Hemingway’s fiction of this apparently irreconcilable conflict.³

The 1924 story “Cross-Country Snow” further explores the consequences of homosociality. In the opening scenes, Hemingway captures the physical exhilaration of skiing and equates the sensation to the sense of freedom that Nick Adams and his friend George share: “George and Nick were happy. They were fond of each other. They knew they had the run back home ahead of them” (CSS 145). But the second half of the story, in contrast to the excitement of the run down the mountain, is set indoors at a local tavern. The mood abruptly shifts when George broaches the topic of Nick’s marriage to Helen, his impending fatherhood, and his certain return home: “George sat silent. He looked at the empty bottle and the empty glasses. ‘It’s hell, isn’t it?’ he said” (CSS 146). While the empty bottle and glass serve as metaphors for the brevity of their shared adventure and the uncertainty of any future activities between them, Nick’s answer to George’s rhetorical question, “No. Not exactly” (CSS 146), signals his ambivalent resignation. Between their shared desire to “just bum together” (CSS 145) across the

Alps (recalling Jim Gamble's offer to travel together and Agnes' refusal to marry "some loafer on the bum in Europe") and Nick's sense of responsibility to Helen, the story succinctly weighs the consequences of heterosexual commitments against the freedom and pleasures of shared male activities.

In both "The Three-Day Blow" and "Cross-Country Snow" (written in March and April 1924), Hemingway employs long conversations marked by indirection to reveal how characters discuss the implications of heterosexual desire by avoiding it. Even when they do broach the topic, their speech is noncommittal, with phrases like "I guess so" and "I don't know," or, of course, instances of plain silence ("Nick said nothing"). In these stories, we see Hemingway at work perfecting one facet of what Susan Beegel calls his "craft of omission" by willfully avoiding direct treatment of the theme of the story. Of "Big Two-Hearted River," his most sustained attempt to write a story without addressing its subject, he later claimed it was "about coming back from the war but there was no mention of the war in it" (AMF 76). Beegel has observed that Hemingway's process of revision "was principally a business of omission, of discovering the story in the stream of consciousness, and eliminating the personal material leading to it and sometimes from it" (11). The stories of In Our Time, Beegel notes, transmute the raw material of Hemingway's experience into art by focusing on objects and actions, allowing the reader to respond without the author directly stating his characters' or his own emotional responses. In this regard, the deleted coda known as "On Writing" – written in the stream-of-consciousness mode to contain Nick Adams' commentary as he contrasts his former activities in Michigan against his current adventures as an expatriate in Europe – fails to maintain his emerging technique of indirection and concealment.

A 1 November 1924 letter from Hemingway to Robert McAlmon thus alludes to the inconsistent shift in the story's ending, with Ernest admitting that he got a "hell of a shock" when he "realized how bad" the "mental conversation" was (SL 133). Then, in an as yet-unpublished letter of 3 November to Donald Ogden Stewart, who was circulating the In Our Time manuscript between New York publishers, Hemingway instructs Stewart to strike the last eleven pages of "Big Two-Hearted River." Hemingway tells Stewart that "an important development has arisen. I have discovered that the last eleven pages of the last story in the book I sent you are crap, i.e. faecal matter, to wit shit, either bovine or equine." In three separate places in the letter, Hemingway directs Stewart to replace the "original ending" with five new pages, apologizing for the trouble and underscoring, "Thanks ever so go[d] damn much." What Hemingway conceals in both letters, however, is the intervention of Gertrude Stein, who only a few days earlier had read "the little story of meditations" tacked onto "Big Two-Hearted River" and told Hemingway "remarks are not literature" (Stein 219). Stein's presumed advice – that Nick's ruminations spoiled both the fishing story and In Our Time itself – accounts for the urgency of Hemingway's letter to Stewart.

But as J. Gerald Kennedy and I have argued, Stein may have spotted something else – hints of what in The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas she later called "the confessions of the real Ernest Hemingway" (216). Stein, we hypothesize, disconcerted Hemingway by saying something about Hemingway's explicit longing for the boys; perhaps she asked him about that queer reference to Bill Smith's jealousy over Hemingway's fishing different rivers with other men: "Bill forgave him the fishing he had done before they met ... It was like a girl about other girls. If they were before they did not matter. But after was different" ("On Writing" 234). What was "different" for Hemingway in 1924, we argue, was his remorse about losing Smith.⁴

Undoubtedly, composing his long fishing story had brought back poignant memories of old friends and the fishing that had brought them together. Just as Hemingway had recruited buddies from Michigan and Kansas City for fishing expeditions before the war, he organized similar outings in 1919 and 1920, adding friends from Oak Park and the Italian ambulance corp.⁵ Tellingly, on the eve of his marriage in 1921, he planned a fishing excursion to mark the end of his bachelorhood. One friend Hemingway tried to recruit for the 1919 trip was his former commander in Italy, Captain Jim Gamble. A brief reconsideration of Gamble's offer to subsidize Hemingway's extended stay in Italy in 1919 is essential to understanding the awkward problem posed by Bill Smith when he unexpectedly re-entered Hemingway's life in December 1924.

Captain James Gamble, 36 years old, was the Field Inspector for the American Red Cross canteen service for the northeastern Italian front at the time of Hemingway's wounding by trench mortar on 8 July 1918. Gamble accompanied the wounded Hemingway on the two-day train trip from the field station in Fornaci to Milan. During Hemingway's convalescence, the two men became fast friends, so that at the end of the war Gamble paid his young compatriot's expenses for a 16-day, late-December vacation in Taormina, Sicily, and offered to underwrite the cost of Hemingway's prolonging his stay for a year in Europe. At Agnes von Kurowsky's urging, however, Hemingway rejected the offer, bent on returning home to begin putting himself in a financial position to marry his nurse (Brenner, "Enough" 92).

After Hemingway returned to the States, he sent Gamble – whom he called "Chief" – a remarkably emotional confession:

Every minute of every day I kick myself for not being in Taormina with you. It makes me so damned homesick for Italy and whenever I think that I might be there with you. Chief, honestly I can't write about it. When I think of old Taormina by moonlight and you and me, a little illuminated some times, but always just pleasantly so, strolling through that great old place and the moon path on the sea and Aetna fuming away and the black shadows and the moonlight

cutting down the stairway back of the villa. Oh Jim it makes me so damn sick to be there. (SL 21)

From Oak Park, six weeks later, Hemingway's 18 and 27 April 1919 letter to Gamble declares that he is again a "free man" after the breakup with Agnes, adding that he is free to "fall in love with any one." When in 1920 Gamble again invited Hemingway to join him for an expense-free year in Italy, his new sweetheart, Hadley, quite understandably regarded Gamble as a rival. With Agnes' prior objections about Gamble in mind, perhaps, Hemingway wrote an alarmed Hadley on 23 December: "Jim Gamble is great – I love him a lot – but not like I love you – you dearest, Dearest, Dear." Four days later he sent Gamble a telegram, writing, "Rather go to Rome with you than heaven stop," but regretfully declined his offer. But as Mellow notes, the cable includes a curious feature, for "twice he intended to tell Gamble he was not married – and that twice he thought better of doing so" (132).

Keenly aware of how an extended Italian residence would look not only to Hadley but also to his closest male friends, Hemingway decided against Gamble's offer. Once before, returning from Sicily with Gamble in 1918, he swore to his British friend Chink Dorman-Smith that he had never reached Taormina because a hostess in the very first hotel he stayed in had hid his clothes and kept him to herself for seven days. The story, of course, was completely made up; as Kenneth Lynn suggests, the fabrication served as a screen for Hemingway's actual memory of his week with Gamble (89). That the young American invented such a tale for Dorman-Smith, an acting major in the Northumberland Fusiliers, helps us recognize Hemingway's nervousness about the shifting codes that defined modern masculinity.

As Victor J. Seidler remarks, the early twentieth century saw a reconfiguration of constructions of manhood as "toughness was now admired, while tenderness was a cause for scorn" (7). Men began "to suppress feelings that did not fit into a model of instrumental action,"

Seidler observes, as they defined their sense of masculinity “against emotionality and connectedness” (7). Fleeing domesticity, middle-class American men began to represent the most extreme form of manliness as self-control, dismissing sentiment and self-examination as feminine emotional tendencies. At the same time, the emergence of women as a political and economic force to be reckoned with unsettled the idea of the home as the female sphere. To this end, Hemingway’s perception of his father complicated his masculine self-identity, for Dr. Clarence Hemingway handled most domestic work in the Oak Park household. For years, he did the grocery shopping, housekeeping, and frequently the cooking as well. In the course of a house call, Lynn notes, Dr. Hemingway phoned home to tell whoever answered that it was time to remove a pie from the oven (34). For Ernest, housework compromised his father’s masculinity and left the son with a perplexing, embarrassing model of manhood.

Anxious to secure a strong, coherent sense of masculine identity, young men of Hemingway’s generation turned to pursuits deemed constitutive of manhood itself. Among these activities, Michael Kimmel observes, sports provided the most popular way to assert one’s manhood (137). Since the turn of the century, Kimmel notes, boxing was especially popular for American men; as a counter to the perceived feminization of modern culture, the boxing ring heralded the “triumphant return” of the mythic hero and “celebrated his traditional virtues: toughness, prowess, ferocity” (139). Beginning in his early twenties, Scott Donaldson notes, Hemingway set about altering the facts about his athletic record; to his new Paris associates, Hemingway “spun apocryphal yarns about running away from home, about brawls in and out of the ring, about the tough neighborhoods he had frequented” (Donaldson 62). If sports turned boys into men, Hemingway’s enthusiastic participation and interest in cycling, tennis, football, and boxing provided opportunities to display manly qualities and “prove” his masculinity.

Michael Kimmel has observed how “the emergence of a visible gay male subculture in many large American cities around [1900] gave an even greater moral urgency to men’s flight from being perceived as a sissy” (98). During the same era, Kimmel notes, heterosexuality became a required part of manliness while “homosexuality and effeminacy” were added to “the repertoire of men’s anxieties” (100). In adolescence, Hemingway’s unguarded affection for his male companions shows no sign of apprehension about possible misinterpretation. But during the early twenties, after his encounters with Gamble and the sexual education he received in Paris, Hemingway was becoming more aware of his attractiveness to gay men. He was also becoming more conscious of his own fascination with alternative sexual experiences, especially lesbian identities. With Hadley he experimented with the erotic prospects of androgyny (as discussed in Chapter One), even as he affected intolerance toward homosexual men, relentlessly ridiculing the “fairies” of Montparnasse. This “attraction to sexual reversal and contempt for male ‘deviance,’” writes J. Gerald Kennedy, “defined his own conflicted manhood three years after the Jim Gamble predicament” (“Married to Fishing”).

One of the “stranger coincidences” in Hemingway’s life was that Bill Smith was so much on his mind throughout 1924 (Mellow 278), for less than a month after he suppressed the “mental conversation” from “Big Two-Hearted River,” he received a conciliatory letter from Smith. Hemingway enthusiastically agreed to resume the friendship and a spate of letters followed as Hemingway caught Smith up on his latest adventures in Europe. The renewal of their friendship struck a nostalgic chord, allowing Hemingway to relive their shared experiences as well as acknowledge their influence on his writing; on 6 December 1924 he confessed: “I know how damn good all our old stuff was Bird because almost everything worth a damn I’ve written has been about that country. It was the whole damn business inside me and when I think about

any country or doing anything it's always that old stuff" (SL 136-137). Similarly, on 17 February 1925, he told Smith, "A big part of my brain has lived exclusively in the bay, the Black, the Sturgeon and all that country. It means more to a male than anything."

In their correspondence, Hemingway assumed the role of an experienced, tutelary figure; ready with advice on sexual matters, he recommended that Smith "yence" as often as possible, as it was a great conditioner for a male and helped him to see clearer. Paris, Hemingway assured Smith, was full of sexual adventures for an unattached male. He advises heterosexuality as an antidote for Smith's personal problems (encouraging him to bed his landlady if she is receptive) and insistently derides "fairies" as unmanly. He also began making plans for Smith to join him in Spain that summer for drinking, fishing, and bullfights. J. Gerald Kennedy and I have argued that the proposed trip was designed to masculinize Smith and to curb what he perhaps regarded as Bill's latently homosexual softness. In bullfighting, the author assured Smith in a letter of 17 February 1925, a code of conduct was to be found, just as Hadley's "whole idea of life" was changed when "she got hold of what courage was" by viewing the bullfights. Watching what the bullfighter Maera was able to endure, he tells Smith, enabled her to give birth, alone, in a Toronto hospital. An 8 March 1925 letter thus asks Smith to carefully "preserve" Hemingway's "screeds on bull battles" as they are "the best possible way to I could get a lot of psychological questions straight." Though "motivated by friendship," Kennedy notes, "Hemingway's determination to rehabilitate Smith's heterosexual masculinity ultimately betrays the author's own uneasiness about the dangers of a prolonged homosocial orientation" ("Married to Fishing"). After four years in Paris, Hemingway by 1925 had an altogether "different response to Smith's devotion to him" ("Married to Fishing").

The consciousness of a radical, necessary choice between heterosexual desire and homosocial intimacy figures prominently in the suppressed fragment, “On Writing.” Essentially, the piece elegizes an irrecoverable masculine happiness, an affectionate camaraderie lost when Ernest “admitted by marrying that something was more important than fishing” (“On Writing” 234). In “Big-Two Hearted River,” Nick is alone not simply because he has been traumatized by the war. His solitude expresses both Hemingway’s nostalgia for the male friends so conspicuously absent and his determination to face the consequences of his marrying. By 1924, arguably, his own experiences had complicated his desire for intimacy with other men, and that ambivalence informs Nick Adams’ lonely return to the country of his youth. About his decision to eliminate “On Writing” from the concluding story of In Our Time, Hemingway told McAlmon that he restored it to “the way it ought to have been all along” (SL 133). Gamble, McAlmon, Paris itself had queered Hemingway’s feelings about male friendships. And in the end, there was nothing to do but “cut it all out,” leaving nothing but the “straight fishing” (SL 133).

II. “Sex explains it all:” Bill Smith, Gertrude Stein, and The Sun Also Rises

“Homosexuals [...] do all the good things in all the arts, and when I ran down the male ones to Hemingway it was because I thought he was a secret one.” – Gertrude Stein, from Dear Sammy: Letters from Gertrude Stein and Alice B. Toklas (56)

“Ernest Hemingway, disciple of Gertrude Stein, started a lot closer to the center of Modernism [...] and moved away from it more rapidly.” – David Trotter, “The Modernist Novel” (89)

In Book II of The Sun Also Rises, as an interlude between the dissipated life of Montparnasse and the heroics of the Spanish bullring, Hemingway stages a fishing expedition on the Irati River, where Jake and Bill share a rowdy meal at a rustic inn at Burguete and enjoy some fine trout fishing. The sojourn, James Mellow notes, is intended to be Hemingway’s depiction of “a male idyll, or Eden, bereft of women” (311); undoubtedly, the renewal of

Hemingway's friendship with Bill Smith provided the motivation to include in his novel what Mellow counts as one of the author's "unabashed paeans to male camaraderie" (312). But embedded in the friendly banter between old friends is an unmistakable ambivalence about the limits of homosocial intimacy.

In the published text, after a long-winded joke about irony and pity in literature, their talk turns to the business of professional writing, with a slur against New York critics and the New York literary establishment. In a moment of surprising sentimentality, Bill announces that Jake is a good guy, and then, with guarded affection, says, "Listen. You're a hell of a good guy, and I'm fonder of you than anybody on earth. I couldn't tell you that in New York. It'd mean I was a faggot" (SAR 121). One hears in Bill's criticism of New York literary circles an echo of Hemingway's own edginess a year earlier about the original version of his "Big Two-Hearted River" story; although Hemingway suppressed the nine-page "On Writing" fragment before Liveright accepted the manuscript for publication, Hemingway's concern for its New York reception is registered in his desperate November 1924 letter to McAlmon: "I've got to send [Don Stewart] the change in the Big Two Hearted River story now. Wouldn't it be funny if some publisher had accepted it because of the stuff that I've got to cut? I've got a hunch they've all given it the raz" (SL 134).

With the experience fresh in mind, Hemingway has Bill quickly cover up his confession with an intentionally outrageous monologue lest his admission of male affection be construed as homosexual. "That was what the Civil War was about," Bill exclaims, "Abraham Lincoln was a faggot. He was in love with General Grant. So was Jefferson Davis. Lincoln just freed the slaves on a bet. The Dred Scott case was framed by the Anti-Saloon League. Sex explains it all. The Colonel's Lady and Judy O'Grady are Lesbians under their skin" (121). The topical allusion to

the Anti-Saloon League is especially instructive; Michael Kimmel has observed how drinking at the turn of the century was a well-integrated practice that “cemented manly solidarity” until temperance campaigns like the Anti-Saloon League effectively argued that it “expressed a psychologically unhealthy need for relations with other men,” thereby linking a variety of homosocial bonding practices to sexual deviance (125). Indeed, as James Mellow has shown, an early draft of the scene directly addressed the implications of homosocial bonding and male homosexuality as Jake mentally responds to Bill’s emotional declaration. “It is funny,” Jake thinks, “that a thing that ninety nine times out of a hundred you yourself never even think about, other people should mind so. It is imagination I suppose” (qtd. in Mellow 312). But Jake thinks about it plenty, as does Bill, who in the early draft shows an equally anxious awareness: “And every literary bastard in New York never goes to bed at night not knowing but that he’ll wake up in the morning and find himself a fairy. There are plenty of real ones too” (qtd in Mellow 312-313).

Probing questions concerning the nature and varieties of passion and love, as well as a critique of the limitations of acceptable social expression between men, figure prominently in both the early draft and the completed text of Hemingway’s first novel. In view of Hemingway’s as-yet-unpublished correspondence during the eight weeks he composed his manuscript, the remainder of this chapter will explore what the author might have been thinking about as he wrote The Sun Also Rises and how his unresolved questions regarding homosocial intimacy inform the development of the novel.

Frederic Svoboda has shown how much of the material Hemingway wrote in the manuscript draft was later altered in style, expanded on or moved to other locations within the novel, or omitted completely. What Hemingway presented in an early notebook, Svoboda shows,

was closer to journalism than novel writing as he presented a semi-factual account of his 1925 trip to Spain. The narrator is thus addressed as “Hem” or “Ernest” rather than Jake, and other “characters” are called by their real names: Pat [Guthrie], Don [Ogden Stewart], Duff [Lady Twysden], Harold [Loeb], Bill [Smith], Hadley, and a favorite young matador that season, Cayetano Ordoñez. Soon, the novel’s cast of characters was changed; Hadley disappeared from the manuscript completely and Pat Guthrie was changed to Mike Campbell, Harold Loeb to Robert Cohn, and Hem to Jake Barnes; the character Bill Gorton became Bill Smith. Hemingway began the novel on about 21 July, on his twenty-sixth birthday, and completed the first draft, entitled Fiesta, on 21 September.

The suppressed fragment “On Writing” a year earlier had foregrounded the consciousness of a radical, necessary choice between heterosexual desire and male intimacy, a decision largely imposed by the shifting codes that defined modern masculinity; similarly, in The Sun Also Rises, Hemingway considers those experiences that had shaped his generation, including those masculine values worth upholding and those that must be rejected as useless. The week-long fishing excursion between Paris and Pamplona, for one, signals an exploration of the value of male friendship, yet “the taint of homosexuality, whether actual, or latent, or imagined by others,” infuses the two-chapter interlude (Mellow 121).

The draft of Jake and Bill’s trip to the Irati River is partially contained in a manuscript notebook Hemingway wrote in Hendaye and Paris the week of August 12-19.⁶ Six weeks earlier, Hemingway, Bill Smith, and Hadley had stopped over in Burguete to fish and hike on their way to Pamplona. About the real trip, Hemingway told Gertrude Stein on 15 July, the fishing that summer was terrible compared to the previous year. “We found our best stream which was full of trout last year,” he writes, “ruined by logging and running logs down – all the pools cleaned

out – trout killed” (SL 167). But unlike the real experience, Hemingway’s fiction portrays ideal conditions: the fishing is good and Jake and Bill are on their “old friendly basis” (Mellow 311).

Once Jake and Bill leave Paris they become more intimate; Sibbie O’Sullivan notes how the “Spanish setting invokes an even more private speech which allows them to discuss religion, literature, and personal problems such as Jake’s impotency” (71). Their physical closeness, moreover, “is established by the freedom of movement between each other’s rooms and by Jake watching Bill shave and dress” (O’Sullivan 71). This intense male interaction, Mellow observes, “is reminiscent of Bill and Nick Adams in ‘The Three-Day Blow,’ and of Hemingway and Bill Smith in the long summers in upper Michigan” (311); as such, Jake and Bill’s relationship – based so closely on the author’s bond to Bill Smith – is one of the few successful relationships (male or female) portrayed in the novel.

This fact makes all the more curious a previously unpublished 15 August letter in which Hemingway informs Howell Jenkins that “Bill Smith came over and I tried to show him a good time but he’s only a shell of himself. Has bad fits of depression about nothing. Cant [sic] concentrate on a job. He’s a male that’s finished unless he pulls out of this.” Smith’s deteriorated emotional state so adversely affects him, he tells Jenkins, “I’m staying down here [in Hendaye] to finish this book because I dont [sic] want to see him in Paris and have him make me feel low and put me off before I get it done.” While “it was damn good to have seen him,” he confesses, “I’d rather he would have bumped himself off when he first began to get that way because he certainly was, (and he still has flashes of it) a wonderful guy.” When one considers that Hemingway’s letter to Jenkins exactly coincides with his writing of Jake and Bill’s idyllic escape, the inconsistency between the letter’s callous dismissal of Smith and the poignant scenes

of the manuscript is startling. The disproportionate response to Smith's emotional affliction suggests, to some extent, the violent ambivalence of Hemingway's own feelings for Smith.

Tellingly, this aggressive-defensive position is followed up on 23 August by the only appearance in the manuscript of Wilson-Harris, a reticent war veteran reminiscent of Hemingway's friend Chink Dorman-Smith. Though not nearly as demonstrative as Bill, after a few drinks Wilson-Harris is very candid about his fondness for his new companions; the sheer joy of buying them a drink almost overwhelms him, as he tries to explain to Jake: "I say, Barnes. You don't know what this all means to me. [...] Really, Barnes, you can't know. That's all" (SAR 134). When Jake and Bill leave for Pamplona, Wilson-Harris gives them each a present, a valentine of hand-tied fishing flies. Interestingly, Hemingway's last-minute decision to introduce the English angler among the few people with whom Jake and Bill interact with on the Irati serves to offset the exclusiveness and intensity of their homosocial interaction.

Because Wilson-Harris does not appear in a sketch of the novel's chapters that Hemingway had penned only three days earlier, his inclusion in the final scenes of the fishing chapters, according to William Balassi, "may have been a recent choice, perhaps within the previous day" (76). Indeed, an as-yet-unpublished letter from Hemingway to Jane Heap written circa 20 August may provide some insight. Informing Heap that he's working on "a hell of a fine novel" that is "[w]ritten very simply and full of things happening and people and places and exciting as hell," the letter is both boastful and defensive as he begins already to imagine hostile critical responses. Addressing no one in particular, he tells Heap, "it is fun to write a hell of a really swell big book and know that you are definitely through with a hell of a lot of disappointed gents who instead of trying to push you because they think you were going to be one of them will now commence to knock you and hate you." Noting this cryptic reference, Reynolds has

read the letter as an example of Hemingway arguing more with himself than relating anything newsworthy to Heap, but who are these “disappointed gents” who once believed “you were going to be one of them” but would now turn on him? As Reynolds notes, the list of his backers was impressive, so why would this novel make any of them reject him (314)?

An editorial comment Hemingway jotted down in his first manuscript notebook may shed some light on this puzzling claim. Hemingway notes: “Now when my friends read this they will say it is awful; ~~it is not what they had hoped or expected from me~~. Gertrude Stein once told me that remarks are not literature. All right, let it go at that. Only this time all the remarks are going in and if it is not literature who claimed it was anyway” (qtd. in Svoboda 38). Although such “remarks” eventually were deleted from the revised novel, Svoboda observes, passages like this one perhaps helped Hemingway “discharge some of the tension of writing for an audience that very definitely hoped for and expected great things from him” (38). But his specific reference to Stein – and to their conversation that had alarmed him enough to suppress from “Big Two-Hearted River” the fragment known as “On Writing” – appears here to signal a similar anxiety over the sense that, for some readers, the care and attention he devotes to male bonding in the novel might drift into gay meaning. Eric Haralson has observed that by the mid-1920s, Stein shifted her critical politics from defending homosexuals in the arts to insisting that “Homosexuals do all the good things in the arts” (Stein 56), a popular idea much in currency within intellectual circles of New York and Paris (Haralson 184). Of Stein, Hemingway would later recall that she “opted for fags and fags alone” in her patronage (SL 388); even worse, he adds, “she got the idea that anybody who was queer must be good” (SL 384).

In his correspondence, Hemingway insistently rants about homosexual writers who employ their sexuality in order to advance their careers. Writing to Bill Smith on Valentine’s

Day 1925, for example, he vehemently opines that “the Royal Road to quick Literary success is through the colon,” for “[t]here’s a homosexual [clique] that make a guy overnight. Once in with the b[u]ggaring public he’s made.” A similar letter to Smith two days later observes, “Everything in this world is crooked, all is influence, nothing on a sound, but all on a personal basis” (17 February 1925). From Spain, he writes to Ezra Pound on c. 1 July 1925 that “I come to this country to watch bulls” because, among other things, “[f]ewer bulls are homosexual” and “[n]o bull has ever been at the Café du Dome.” With Stein in mind, he tells Pound that the Spanish bullfights that summer provide “such a goddam relief from all this horseshit about art etc.”⁷

As a number of Hemingway’s letters that summer attest, he was both proud of his novel in progress, calling it a “really swell big book” certain to “crash right through,” as well as overly sensitive about his previous books published in Paris; more than anything, the emerging author of The Sun Also Rises wanted the recognition of a large, mainstream audience (c. 20 August 1925; 5 August 1925; Reynolds 314). About Ernest’s ambition, Stein would later taunt that “the real story of Hemingway, not those that he writes but the confessions of the real Ernest Hemingway,” would have to be written “for another audience than the audience Hemingway now has but it would be very wonderful” (ABT 216). In 1925, Hemingway also “heard her lecture on the perils of the popular artist under mass-market commercialism” (Haralson 179-180). In Everybody’s Autobiography (1937), Stein reflected on her own struggles for recognition and articulates the tensions that she must have stressed to Hemingway when readers were allowed “deeper inside” not only an author’s texts but his or her individual (and sexual) identity:

It is funny about money. And it is funny about identity. You are you because your little dog knows you, but when your public knows you [...] you are not the same you [...] As long as the outside does not put a value on you it remains outside but [...] if the outside puts a value on you then all your inside gets to be outside [...] I used to tell all the men who were being successful young how bad this was for them. (46-48)

Hemingway's response to Stein's pontifications was varied and complex. If Ernest anticipated a conflict with Stein as indicated in his August 1925 letter to Jane Heap, a previously unpublished note to Ezra Pound in November 1925 similarly expresses his response to what he felt was Stein's imperious pronouncements. "I was sore," Hemingway writes, at "the way my so called friends have taken to regarding me as something fairly scabrous through the accident of having a book [In Our Time] published by a so called regular publisher. It seems to have been the very worst way I could have betrayed them all. Referring to G. Stein, McAlmon et al" (c. mid-November 1925). Here, Hemingway explicitly refers to Stein and McAlmon, two homosexual writers, as among those he had told Heap, who "think you were going to be one of them" but "will now commence to knock you and hate you." Stein's exclusive championing of homosexual male authors with whom she cultivated relationships in Paris caused Hemingway to feel at once betrayed and threatened.

Of the many revisions – additions and deletions – made to the novel throughout the winter of 1925-1926, the deletion of the six-page description of the Charles Ledoux-Kid Francis fight underscores the sexual panic with which the author handled fictional scenes involving his relationship to Bill Smith. On 9 June 1925, Hemingway and Smith attended the twelve-round Ledoux-Kid fight at the Cirque de Paris (Reynolds 297). The manuscript account of the fight, at least one critic has argued, rates among "the best that Hemingway ever wrote," leading some readers to believe that Hemingway "should not have cut the fight sequence" from this "key chapter" (Stoneback 140). In the manuscript version, Jake and Bill leave Mike and Brett and take a taxi to the Cirque, where the main bout is already in progress. They take two expensive ringside seats and witness Kid Francis, a "tall, dark youth," batter the old champion Ledoux, who to his credit, never quits, "going forward always, ducking, and swaying his head with the

punches” (qtd. in Stoneback 141). Afterward, as they walk along the Champ de Mars, Bill says, “By God Ledoux is great. Funny how a guy like that can get to you.” Jake agrees, saying that he’d seen Ledoux “when he used to be just a hard hitter before he lost his punch.” Now, Jake claims, “all he’s got is just that he knows everything. Nothing left but his *métier*,” to which Bill adds: “And his guts” (qtd. in Stoneback 142).

While a number of critics have debated the pros and cons of omitting the fight sequence, it is clear that Hemingway intended for Ledoux to be viewed as a powerful exemplar (Svoboda 114; Stoneback 142-144). But the deleted scene also features Jake’s emotional confession that Bill, in his own way, is as good a man as Ledoux is (Balassi, “Writing of the Manuscript,” 75). The editorial excision suggests the author’s uneasiness about his prolonged and intense relationship with Smith. In terms of Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s oft-cited continuum, Hemingway desperately tried to cordon off or isolate male “bonding” or “brotherhood” from male-male desire, so that the “potential unbrokenness” between the homosocial and homosexual would not be suspected (1-2).

If Left Bank readers in 1926 were only too happy to assume that The Sun Also Rises was “a straightforward roman à clef,” as Kenneth Lynn surmises, what readers failed to grasp was the extent of Hemingway’s “imaginative involvement” with a number of the novel’s fictional characters (296). Of these, perhaps the least discussed is the author’s identification with the fictional Bill Gorton, whose sympathetic affiliation to Jake Barnes is noticeably cooler after the drama of Pamplona. Interestingly enough, there also existed a noticeable change in Bill Smith’s attitude toward Hemingway after the summer’s events in Spain. Michael Reynolds writes that Smith and Harold Loeb left for a cycling trip together to the Rhine at about the time Hemingway returned to Paris on August 8; “without ever saying anything,” Reynolds writes, “Bill took sides

with Loeb in Pamplona and remained there in Paris. That hurt Hemingway a little” (321). After a farewell party on September 4, Smith and Loeb set sail for home together the next day.

On 14 September, Hemingway began writing Book III, which opens with Jake’s observation that “it was all over” (SAR 231); ostensibly referring to the fiesta, Jake’s statement is also “an assessment of the condition of the web of relationships woven in the previous two hundred pages. It is in shreds” (O’Sullivan 74-75). In rapid succession, Brett has taken off with Romero, Mike leaves for Saint Jean de Luz, Bill for Paris and points west, and Jake for San Sebastian. By this point, Mike’s company has worn thin, for he has visibly irritated both Jake and Bill for deceiving them into thinking he had enough money to settle his accounts. But as Sibbie O’Sullivan points out, we are less sure on what terms Bill and Jake part; while “their relationship has always been catch-as-catch can, each going his separate way then reuniting in a burst of intimacy,” something is “curiously missing from this final good bye” (75).

Seeing Bill off at the train station, Jake watches as Bill follows a porter through the gate to the train: “The porter went ahead with the bags. I watched the train pull out. Bill was at one of the windows. The window passed, the rest of the train passed, and the tracks were empty. I went outside to the car” (SAR 235). Clearly, Bill “makes no attempt at intimacy as a departing gesture” and Hemingway “is predictably silent about how Bill’s behavior impresses Jake” (O’Sullivan 75). And yet, the immediacy of Bill’s absence is profound; in San Sebastian, Jake takes long, solitary swims and consciously avoids any form of male friendship, even deciding on a purely monetary basis which waiters he wants for “friends.” Furthermore, in contrast to how easily and eagerly he bonded with Wilson-Harris and Montoya, Jake uncharacteristically discourages any form of friendship with the bicycle team manager, revealing how “not even the

purely masculine comradeship between fellow sportsmen appeals to Jake” (O’Sullivan 76).

Hemingway had not solved the difficulties of his own conflicted relationship to Bill Smith.

Another factor influencing Hemingway’s handling of male friendships in the novel was the memory of a previous 1923 trip to Spain with the expatriate publishers Bill Bird and Robert McAlmon. Eager to witness Spanish bullfighting for himself after hearing about a primitive fiesta at Pamplona from Gertrude Stein and Alice Toklas, Hemingway prevailed upon the well-heeled McAlmon to spring for the trip. Almost immediately, the outspoken personalities of Hemingway and McAlmon clashed, however; tensions between the two began when the Sud Express train from Paris to Madrid stopped alongside a flatcar, upon which lay the maggot-eaten corpse of a dog. McAlmon looked away from the sight while Hemingway, disgusted with his companion’s queasiness, boasted that during the war he had seen maggot-eaten corpses of men stacked up like cordwood. Such things were awful, Hemingway admitted, but members of his generation, he said, “simply had to inure themselves to awfulness” (qtd. in Lynn 205). Later, when McAlmon confessed that he did not care for the brutality of the bullfights, especially the violence inflicted by the bulls upon the picadors’ unprotected horses, Ernest’s contempt for his companion’s negative reactions was “enormous” and “enduring” (Lynn 206). Nine years later, Hemingway would condescendingly describe McAlmon in Death in the Afternoon:

X.Y., 27 years old; American; male, college education; ridden horses on a farm as a boy. Took flask of brandy to his first bull fight – took several drinks at ring – when bull charges picador and hit horse, X.Y. gave sudden screeching intake of breath – took drink of brandy – repeated this on each encounter between bull and horse. Seemed to be in search of strong sensations. Doubted genuineness of my enthusiasm for bullfights. Declared it was a pose. He felt no enthusiasm and declared no one else could. [...] Does not care for sport of any sort. Does not care for games of chance. Amusements and occupation drinking, night life and gossip. Writes. Travels about. (496)

Here Hemingway betrays a deeper enmity for what he perceives as a lack of manliness in McAlmon, for as his 1925 letter to Heap shows, Ernest equated McAlmon with Stein and the establishment of a gay modernism. In A Moveable Feast, Hemingway would savagely evoke McAlmon as “Hal” in the chapter “Birth of a New School.” The episode explains how the author liked to work alone in the Closerie des Lilas but is threatened by the appearance of Hal, whose interruption of his work is “the worst thing that could happen” (AMF 91). In the ensuing exchange with Hal, “Hem” defends his solitude in his favorite café by being as “cruel and heartless and conceited” as necessary (AMF 94). But as Gerry Brenner has remarked, the scene strategically contrasts Hem against “the different sensibilities” and “values” of Hal by derisively alluding to the intruder’s sexual orientation, including “a sneer that Hal belongs at the ‘Petite Chaumiere’” – a reference used to insinuate that “McAlmon was as much at home at that gay bar as at Le Boeuf sur le Toit [The Ox on the Roof], Jean Cocteau’s Right Bank cabaret/café, which avant-garde artists and gays frequented for a period of time” (Companion 267). Unpublished in the original 1964 version of the memoir, an alternative ending makes explicit that Hal’s homosexuality is a contamination, and thus a threat to Hem: “But the Closerie des Lilas was such a fine place to write and so convenient that it was worth the risk of being bothered. You ought to feel clean after you worked instead of dirtied though” (Restored 175).

On one hand, “Birth of a New School” is consistent with a larger strategy in A Moveable Feast in which Hemingway portrays himself as a devoted and successful apprentice to his craft in spite of the myriad distractions of Paris. His eventual success as a writer, he implies, is “a direct result of his ability to insulate himself from those people around him” (Monk 142). As he is represented in the memoir, Craig Monk has observed, “the author is able, ultimately, to rise above his environment, to thrive in spite of Paris while other expatriates hoped desperately only

to succeed because of it” (143). In this, Hemingway’s strategy differs from most autobiographies of expatriate life in Paris in the 1920s. “While many expatriates sought to define themselves by relational autobiographies, implying throughout their works their involvement with others,” Monk observes, “the effect of A Moveable Feast is to develop Hemingway’s reputation in contrast with the demonstrable shortcomings of those people around him” (141). While Hemingway’s remembrances remind us, in the words of Susanna Egan, how “the self is constructed in relation to and in terms of other selves” (81), the “others” portrayed in the memoir erode any sense of collective undertaking (Monk 141). But a closer look at how Hemingway deals with his subjects in A Moveable Feast also reveals an inclination to disassociate himself from those individuals (like McAlmon) who might be identified as synonymous with a gay modernism. At the top of this list, of course, was Gertrude Stein. While the exact nature of the “friendship” between Stein and Alice Toklas is left obscured in her famous 1933 autobiography, in A Moveable Feast Hemingway publicly “outs” Gertrude, thereby “breaking an unwritten taboo against mentioning in print that Stein and Toklas were lesbians” (Adams 24).

Even F. Scott Fitzgerald, who had done so much in 1925 to show Hemingway the error of the overwrought opening chapters of The Sun Also Rises would come under attack. “Scott was a man then who looked like a boy,” Hemingway writes, “with a face between handsome and pretty. He had very fair wavy hair, a high forehead, excited and friendly eyes and a delicate long-lipped Irish mouth that, on a girl, would have been the mouth of a beauty. [...] The mouth worried you until you knew him and then it worried you more” (AMF 149). Here the feminine qualities of Fitzgerald are emphasized in an attempt to deliberately obscure his manliness, allowing Hemingway in the chapters concerning their friendship to assert what Gerry Brenner has called Hemingway’s “overdeveloped masculinity,” a “customary symptom of reaction

formation” (19) used to combat what might be perceived as the “passive” or “feminine” traits associated with his elected avocation as a writer (20). By 1929, the Fitzgerald-Hemingway friendship was strained due to a public rumor that the two men were homosexuals. Fitzgerald believed that “the gossip helped spoil his friendship with Hemingway. He wrote in his Notebooks, without naming Hemingway: “I really loved him, but of course it wore out like a love affair. The fairies have spoiled all that” (qtd. in Tate 317). If A Moveable Feast contains the most explicit attack on both Stein’s sexual orientation and Fitzgerald’s manhood, Hemingway’s sensitivity concerning his own masculinity in 1925 is sublimated in a crucial scene of The Sun Also Rises.

In the Café Iruña in Pamplona, Jake invites Pedro Romero to sit at his company’s table, an invitation that ends with his complicit involvement in the rendezvous of Brett and Romero. In this scene, the bond between Jake and Montoya, a bond rooted in their shared love of bullfighting, is broken when Montoya enters the café to find Romero drinking and laughing, seated between the bare-shouldered Brett and Jake. Like the “hard-eyed people” at the bull-fighter table who silently rebuke Jake for facilitating Pedro and Brett’s affair (SAR 191), Montoya publicly snubs Jake, refusing to “even nod” (SAR 181). Jake’s uncharacteristic betrayal of Montoya’s confidence – and the secret bonds of the afición – evokes an autobiographical subtext of Hemingway’s ambivalent and contestatory history with Gertrude Stein. For as Debra Moddelmog has noted, Jake’s “possession of *afición*, which must be confirmed by the touch of other men [SAR 136],” calls attention to “his homosexual desire, a desire that seems about to break through the surface of Jake’s narrative at any time” (96). To quote Arnold and Cathy Davidson, Moddelmog adds, “there is something ‘suspect’ in the aficionados vesting so much of their manhood in a boylike matador who woos a bull to death through ‘girlish flirtation and

enticement.’ As a consequence, ‘the whole ethos of *afición* resembles a sublimation of sexual desire” (Moddelmog 96). Notably, Jake says of Montoya: “He smiled as though bull-fighting was a very special secret between the two of us; a rather shocking but really very deep secret that we knew about. He always smiled as though there was something lewd about the secret to outsiders, but that it was something and we understood. It would not do to expose it to people who would not understand” (SAR 136). In this passage, one hears a parallel between Montoya and Jake’s furtive afición and Stein’s remark that “Homosexuals [...] do all the good things in all the arts, and when I ran down the male ones to Hemingway it was because I thought he was a secret one” (Dear 56). Nancy Comley and Robert Scholes have persuasively shown how Gertrude Stein, homosexuality, and bullfighting form a “linked cluster in the Hemingway Text,” for “it was Stein who introduced Hemingway to [...] bullfighting, and with whom he talked about male and female homosexuality as well. It is perhaps Stein, then, who has blazed this textual trail connecting the arts of [...] bullfighting with homoeroticism” (127).

In the scene at the Café Iruña, Jake’s turning on a tutelary figure in Montoya serves as a coded denial of Stein and her coterie of modernist – and outwardly homosexual – writers and artists. Although this rehearsal of the author’s repudiation of Stein predates the public hostilities between the two writers by several years, the contours of the sexual politics each would engage in were already mapped out. On this score, the book reflects an adversarial attitude toward both Stein’s imperiously gay critical politics as well as a “social order whose systematic suspicion constrained both the expressivity of men [...] and the acceptable range of male-male intimacies” (Haralson 191-192).

Hemingway’s fascination with many types of male-male relationships under various conditions had already surfaced in several stories before The Sun Also Rises; texts such as “The

End of Something,” “The Battler,” “Mr. and Mrs. Elliot,” and “On Writing” register his curiosity about the inner workings of same-sex couples who deviate from standard sex roles. Likewise, his fascination with the theme of men without women would not end with the story collection of 1927; his lifelong preference for masculine activities and for comradeship with men would impel him in almost all his short fiction to feature men engaging in some activity together. The dilemma exposed in The Sun Also Rises – of reconciling male intimacy with a modern heterosexual identity – would prove itself a persistent complication; as Jake Barnes states halfway through the book: “All I wanted was to know how to live in it. Maybe if you found out how to live in it you learned from that what it was all about” (152).

Notes

¹ Ernest Hemingway Collection, John F. Kennedy Library, Item 754.

² Bill Smith’s correspondence to Hemingway is housed at the Ernest Hemingway Collection, John F. Kennedy Library.

³ This theme is further supported in the story by the fact that Bill’s father occupies the Michigan cottage alone. Ostensibly, Bill’s father is able to remain “out with the gun” in an autumn gale and act “a little wild sometimes” because he occupies the Michigan cottage alone with Bill and is therefore free from any heterosexual responsibilities (85, 88).

⁴ The change in Hemingway’s attitude toward homosocial intimacy detailed in this chapter is excerpted from an unpublished conference paper I co-presented with J. Gerald Kennedy at the International Hemingway Society Conference at Lausanne, Switzerland, June 28, 2010.

⁵ In an early draft of “Big-Two Hearted River,” Nick arrives at Seney accompanied by two friends, perhaps recalling Hemingway’s 1919 and 1920 fishing expeditions.

⁶ William Balassi has described this portion of the manuscript as the “Men-Without-Women Notebook,” for not only do these chapters center on the relationship between Jake and Bill, but it was primarily written during the week Ernest was by himself in Hendaye after Hadley had gone onto Paris (70). The dates and descriptions of Hemingway’s daily writing sessions of the manuscript cited in this chapter are from Balassi’s article, “The Writing of the Manuscript of The Sun Also Rises, with a Chart of Its Session-by-Session Development.”

⁷ In a 26 February 1925 letter to Bill Smith, Hemingway writes that Stein is “trying to get at the Mechanics of language. Take it apart and see what makes it go.” His c. 1 July 1925 letter to Pound ridicules her verbal experimentation, or Steinese, using the same language he had earlier used to praise her: “Bulls know how to knock the horseshit out of a horse. They know how to open a horse up and see what makes him go. They are not sorry for the horse after they have killed him.”

CONCLUSION

Writing to F. Scott Fitzgerald about the title of his 1927 story collection, Hemingway joked, “I called the book *Men Without Women* hoping it would have a large sale among the fairies and old Vassar girls” (SL 260). To his editor, Maxwell Perkins, he explained, “in all of these [stories], almost, the softening feminine influence through training, discipline, death or other causes, [is] absent” (SL 245). Although his estimation of the nature of the collection is not entirely accurate – many of the stories involving the failed relationships or marriages of men and women feature a female presence – his caustic remark to Fitzgerald is closer to the mark, for a number of the stories attend to the theme of homosexuality. In the previous chapter, I suggested that the difficulties of Hemingway’s own conflicted masculinity would impel him to inscribe in *The Sun Also Rises* a complex web of homosocial and homosexual behavior and desire. His fascination with male-male intimacies and his own preference for masculine activities and for male camaraderie would inform texts from “A Simple Enquiry” (1927) and “The Mother of a Queen” (1933) to *Death in the Afternoon* (1932) and the posthumously published *Islands in the Stream* (1970) and *The Garden of Eden* (1986). In several texts, the theme of male homosexuality is directly addressed, as in the long unpublished “A Lack of Passion;” in others, like *Death in the Afternoon*, as James Mellow has remarked, “what lies beneath the surface details, nearly unspoken [...] is the worrisome undercurrent of Hemingway’s relationships with men in his life and in his work, and the nagging question of the threat of homosexuality” (409). And yet, over the years Hemingway insistently “pursued the suspicion of homosexuality” (Mellow 410) as well as the “possibilities of changes in sexual orientation or the revelation of repressed inclinations” (Comley and Scholes 131).

In Death in the Afternoon, Hemingway recounts a story told to him while “eating at the Anglo-American Press Association lunch in Paris” (180). A newsman sitting next to the author related an event that had happened the night before in the hotel where he lived. About two o’clock in the morning “some one had knocked on his door and begged to be let in,” he said (180). The newsman opened the door and “a dark-haired young man about twenty” came into the room crying. “It seemed this young man had arrived with his friend in Paris on that day’s boat train. The friend, who was a little older, he had met only recently, but they had become great friends and he had accepted his friend’s invitation to come abroad as his guest. Just then,” the newsman continued, “there was another knock on the door and the friend who was also a fine, clean-cut-looking American youth wearing an equally new and expensive looking dressing gown came into the room” (180-181). When the newsman asked what the row was all about, he said it was nothing, that his friend was just “overwrought” from the long trip. But the first friend “commenced crying again and said nothing on earth would make him go back into that room. He would kill himself, he said” (181). But the young man finally relented and went back to his room. The newsman went back to sleep until he was awakened “by what sounded like fighting in the next room and some one saying ‘I didn’t know it was that! Oh, I didn’t know it was that! I won’t! I won’t!’ followed by what the newspaper man described as a despairing scream” (181). The next morning, reported the newsman, “he saw them at breakfast outside the Café de la Paix, chatting together happily, and reading copies of the Paris New York Herald” (181-182). A day or two after the luncheon, Hemingway writes, the newsman “pointed them out to me [...] riding together in an open taxi and I frequently saw them, after that, sitting on the terrace of the Café des Deux Magots [...] The last time I saw the two they [were] sitting on the terrace [...], wearing well-tailored clothes, looking clean cut as ever, except the younger of the two, the one who had

said he would kill himself rather than go back in that room, had his hair hennaed ” (181-182). In this Paris “tale of recruitment into homosexuality” (Comley and Scholes 126), the younger man’s transformed appearance – from “dark-haired” to a bleached “hennaed” – serves as a public sign of a change in sexuality.

The association of hair and the dying of hair with transgressive sexuality (discussed in Chapter One) is further evidenced in a manuscript fragment that is also set in Paris in the twenties in which a young man gets a haircut on the rue de Faubourg St.-Honoré. Before entering the coiffeur’s, the young man regards his deeply tanned face in a mirror in the shop window. Sitting in the chair after requesting a permanent wave, he tries to avoid the glances of a young man sitting beside him, and thinks, “I thought he was a pimp. Just an upsidaisy. Why should I think he wasn’t. Because I’m in here myself. Just like an upsidaisy. He looked at himself humorlessly in the mirror” (qtd. in Comley and Scholes 90). Here the young man’s concern about “contamination by association with homosexuality” (Comley and Scholes 90) confuses a feminine identification (in this case, a permanent wave) “in *other* men with homosexuality” (Eby 129). For Hemingway, Carl Eby observes, “homophobia at bottom seems to have been a fear of turning into the opposite sex, a fear of losing his gender identity. To fear and desire the same thing is a deeply human condition, but this dilemma was undoubtedly intensified in Hemingway [...]. One half craved gender-obliterating merger; one half feared it” (130).

The possibility of a change in sexual orientation is also present in the story “A Simple Enquiry,” about an Italian major who discreetly propositions his younger orderly by asking him questions about girls and love to determine whether or not the young soldier might be receptive to a homosexual advance. When the major asks the boy if he was corrupt, he responds, “I don’t know what you mean, corrupt” (CSS 251). The major dismisses the soldier still wandering

whether or not the orderly is gay: “The little devil, he thought, I wonder if he lied to me” (CSS 252). After the enquiry, the orderly is “flushed” and he “moved differently” from when he had arrived (CSS 252). It is this new walk, noticed by the major from another room, which causes him to doubt whether the orderly lied to him (130). Inflected in the Death in the Afternoon sketch, the manuscript fragment, and “A Simple Enquiry” is the strength of Hemingway’s recurring interest in “the possibilities of changes in sexual orientation or the revelation of repressed inclinations as they are representable by narratives that focus on moments of initiation or discovery” (Comley and Scholes 130). Similarly, the title of the story “The Sea Change” alludes to Ariel’s speech in The Tempest about what happens to the anatomies of drowned men to explore the notion that one’s sexual makeup, too, might change into “something rich and strange.”

In a Paris bar, a couple argues about the woman’s plans to leave the man for her lesbian lover, though she promises the man to come back to him. When he refers to the arrangement as “perversion,” she objects, telling him, “There’s no necessity to use a word like that.”

“What do you want me to call it?”
“You don’t have to call it. You don’t have to put a name to it.”
“That’s the name for it.”
“No,” she said. “We’re made up of all sorts of things. You’ve known that. You’ve used it well enough.”
“You don’t have to say that again.” (CSS 304)

After the man, whose name is Phil, agrees to the woman’s plans and she leaves the bar, he says to the bartender: “I’m a different man, James, [...] You see in me quite a different man” (CSS 305). The last line of the narrative reads: “Looking into the mirror he saw that this was quite true” (CSS 305).

In a manuscript version of “The Sea Change,” the story ends with the young man looking into the bar mirror, asking the bartender to serve him a drink: “What do the punks drink, James.

What can you recommend to a recent convert? [...] Take a look at me and mix whatever you like.” James tells the young man that he looks very good: “You have a fine tan.” His response, and the final words of this fragment are, “I can see in the glass, James,” [...] “I can see in the glass very clearly” (qtd. in Comley and Scholes 88). In Hemingway’s texts, the word “punk” is used to designate male homosexuals; this detail in the manuscript version suggests that the young woman’s “sea change of sexual preference has also changed the young man – or, rather, that he chooses ironically to distance his fear that this may be the case by naming it as he stares at his tanned face in the glass” (Comley and Scholes 88). The mirror motif, of course, represents an act of self-reflection as Phil regards the discovery of an entirely new, or previously repressed, identity. But as Robert Fleming writes in The Face in the Mirror, Hemingway used the motif of the mirror throughout his career as a device that allows his fictional writers to explore their identities “and the sins that necessarily accompany the artist’s obsession with his art” (138). In this view, there is ample evidence to suggest that in “The Sea Change” Phil is a writer who, as the young woman argues, knows human nature well enough to be understanding.

Indeed, Hemingway was acquainted with a remarkable number of lesbians in Paris; a significant body of evidence suggests, moreover, that he was “intrigued by the freedom that lesbians had achieved in their lives during his Paris years” (Burwell 108). By contrast, writes Rose Marie Burwell, as he aged “the hypermasculine identity that Hemingway had eagerly created in his youth became a mask behind which he was trapped” (33). Whereas Hemingway’s early work largely avoided self-inspection through indirection and omission, in the posthumously published novels he worked on from 1946 to 1952, his writing had become a therapeutic form of self-examination; as such, the author’s later works “share a concern with creativity and the creative artist” (Burwell 51) in an attempt to come to terms with his lifelong “quest for a fluid

gender alignment that would cross-fertilize the creative imagination” (Burwell 98). Three of Hemingway’s four unfinished texts – A Moveable Feast, Islands in the Stream, and The Garden of Eden – attempt to register aesthetic growth through sexual metamorphoses. And each text, moreover, organizes the origins of Hemingway’s interest in gender blurring as a way of evading prescribed behavior back to the author’s period of apprenticeship in Paris.

Hemingway began work on the sprawling Islands in the Stream manuscript in the fall of 1945 as a tribute to his experience with Major General Buck Lanham during his ten months as a war correspondent in Europe. But from its inception the text was about the creative impasse of an artist named Thomas Hudson who has abandoned painting to pursue German submarines off the islands of the Caribbean. As the novel opens, Hudson and his friend Roger Davis, both artists, both with a reckless history of drinking, fighting, and troubled relationships with women, are living in Bimini where “they have created a Mt. Athos [...] where even the servants are male” (Burwell 63). From this exclusively masculine world devoid of any female entanglements, the novel follows Hudson’s dissipation as he tries to cope with his grief from the loss of his children and his relentless pursuit of an enemy U-boat. In contrast to the fatalistic final section “At Sea,” the opening section set in Bimini contains several flashbacks to Hudson’s earlier years in Paris, where he assumes an autobiography identical to that of the author. By the end of the novel, as Rose Marie Burwell observes, the resonances of a former life of creativity “are Hemingway’s effort to connect Thomas Hudson’s present life of destruction to some earlier damage to his creativity” (87). The connection is tenuous in the published version, however, because of the manuscript deletions of two long episodes from the final section. The omitted episodes, according to Burwell, suggest that the damage to Hudson’s career as a creative artist

derive from his “attraction to, and fear of, a more fluid gender alignment than the conditioning of his [Oklahoma] childhood could accommodate” (87).

The first omitted episode follows a dream sequence in the novel as Hudson sleeps on a beach at an unnamed cay where a massacre has been discovered. In his dream, he imagines that his oldest son had not been killed in the war and that his first wife, the mother of his oldest son, lays on top of him:

Her hair hung down and lay heavy and silky on his eyes and on his cheeks and he turned his lips away from her searching ones and took the hair in his mouth and held it. Then with one hand he moistened the .357 Magnum [that earlier Hudson had holstered to his belt to come ashore] and slipped it easily and sound asleep where it should be. [...]

“You,” he said. “Who’s going to make love to who?”

“Both of us,” she said. “Unless you want it differently.”

“You make love to me. I’m tired.”

“You’re just lazy. Let me take the pistol off and put it by your leg. The pistol’s in the way of everything.”

Then it was all the way it should be and she said, “Should I be you or you be me?”

“You have first choice.”

“I’ll be you.”

“I can’t be you. But I can try.”

“It’s fun. You try it. Don’t try to save yourself at all. Try to lose everything and take everything too.” (344)

The deleted manuscript scene is a flashback that connects Hudson’s dream of his first wife to a studio apartment in Paris. There, his wife “Jan” and the experiments the couple engage in are identical to Ernest and Hadley’s matching haircuts and erotic gender reversals described in an excised episode of A Moveable Feast (discussed in Chapter One). But as Burwell has remarked, Hudson’s erotic dream serves to underscore an exchange of sex roles “in which the penis does not have to be a weapon, for the penis as a pistol gets in the way of everything – and either lover can give or take, and all distinction between taking and giving disappears” (88).

In the second excised episode, Hudson is back on the boat and his smooth wet hair reminds him of another memory of his first wife and a winter in Switzerland when he would paint Alpine glaciers during the day and at night they would keep themselves warm with erotic games. The excised episodes help to establish a time in Thomas Hudson's past when "some mediation between the masculine and feminine was still possible, and when Hudson was painting well but dangerously" (Burwell 91). Hudson associates the literal high altitude of the Alps with his painting during a time when the blurring of prescribed gender roles was producing "a perilous creativity" (Burwell 91); similarly, Hemingway in A Moveable Feast associates his "newly acquired knowledge" about lesbianism that he has learned from Stein with "the other knowledge" that he and Hadley "already had and other new knowledge we had acquired in the mountains" (AMF 20-21).

The second deleted flashback culminates in the couple's return to Paris, from where they travel south to continue to experiment in cross-dressing by obsessively tanning themselves and lightening in the sea water their identically matching hairstyles. At this point in the manuscript, the Hudsons "metamorphose into David Bourne and Catherine Bourne and Nick and Barbara Sheldon of [The Garden of Eden]," for Hudson's "willingness to participate in the transformative adventures of haircutting and bleaching that make him and Jan appear to be brother and sister in the daytime and in the exchange of sexual positions" at night links him to the cross-dressing and identical haircuts central to the plot of Eden (Burwell 90). Three years after Hemingway began working on the manuscript of Islands, the sexual experimentation material in the manuscript led him to begin work on The Garden of Eden (Burwell 95). The metafictional strategy of Eden involves an androgynous honeymoon narrative framing the masculine African stories of David Bourne's childhood. His wife, Catherine, insists on aiding her husband as he struggles to get

started on his third novel by participating in the creative process and demanding that he write the narrative of their honeymoon. Although excised from the published novel, David's first attempts at writing the honeymoon narrative is a flashback to the meeting of Nick and Barbara Sheldon at the Deux Magots in Paris and their conversation about the gender constraints that David and Catherine have begun testing. The experiments in androgyny, Catherine reasons, are natural because "We had no voice in making the rules" (qtd. in Burwell 104). Describing the attraction to androgyny in the fuller manuscript versions of Garden and Eden, Burwell has shown how Thomas Hudson and David Bourne attempt to use the creative cross-fertilization of gender blurring to transcend the cultural stasis of prescribed gender roles, "a constraint" that Hemingway "was striving to overcome in the posthumous novels" (89).

In a recently published additional sketch of A Moveable Feast there exists a curious comparison between creative writing and recurrent references to "secrets" that echo the "secret pleasures" of the Eden manuscript and the "secret things" implied in the sexual experiments. Using the sport of alpine skiing as a metaphor for the creative process, Hemingway writes:

They ski much better now, are better taught and the good ones do it beautifully. They come down faster and they drop like birds, strange birds that know many secrets, and it is only the new deep snow that makes the extra danger for those who need the packed tracks. They all know many secrets now as we knew other secrets when we ran the glaciers un-roped and there were no ski patrols. [...] In writing there are many secrets too. [...] They are the secrets that we have that are made by alchemy and much is written about them by people who do not know the secrets or the alchemy. There are many more explainers now than there are good writers. (Restored 221-222)

Compare this passage with a similar one from the manuscript of The Garden of Eden: "no one had ever done what he was working for; what he had already done [...] in the high alpine pictures. Why should he have to explain this? He was not an explainer" (qtd. in Burwell 103).

And yet, Hemingway tried to justify to himself in three unwieldy later texts an erasure of gender identity that he both feared and desired.

The opening of the author's papers at the Kennedy Library in Boston in 1980 has intensified the study of the author's gender identity. And there has been much explaining. Susan Beegel speculates that the archival manuscripts and publication of The Garden of Eden "has forced critics to confront for the first time themes of homosexuality, perversion, and androgyny present throughout Hemingway's career" (11). Given the critical attention to Garden, and that Hemingway's work has always been read as autobiographical, the focus of critics and biographers to examine experiences in the author's life that had previously been neglected has caused considerable reassessment since Charles Fenton's 1954 study The Apprenticeship of Ernest Hemingway. My close reading of the author's 1921-1925 correspondence, especially letters never before printed or cited, reveals the enormous influence that Hemingway's conflicted attachments to his family back home in Oak Park and to his best male buddies from Michigan had on his apprenticeship years in Paris. His relationships with tutelary figures such as Ezra Pound, Gertrude Stein, and Ford Madox Ford constituted a surrogate family in Paris wherein Hemingway explored the margins of his own gendered identity. Whereas traditionally, "placing" an apprentice with a "master" always "reinforced the parental nature of apprenticeship" (Rorabaugh 6), Hemingway's modernist training dramatically redefined this paradigm, bringing to light as it did those intangible psychosexual drives and desires that give shape to identity even as it continually threatens its subversion. His conflicted masculinity thus reveals itself in every facet of his apprenticeship – in his personal and professional associations, in his attraction to sports, in his journalism, in his marriage and fatherhood, in his several trips to Spain to watch bullfights. "In a very real sense," Fenton's evaluation concludes, "Hemingway's apprenticeship

has never ended” (x). Given the matter of this chapter, and the evidence of the gender-haunted posthumous texts Hemingway left behind, it seems that Fenton still has the last word – but in a way he could have neither anticipated nor imagined.

WORKS CITED

- Adams, Timothy Dow. Telling Lies in Modern American Autobiography. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1990.
- Baker, Carlos. Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story. 1969. New York: Collier, 1988.
- Balassi, William. "The Writing of the Manuscript of The Sun Also Rises, with a Chart of Its Session-by-Session Development." The Hemingway Review 6.1 (Fall 1986): 65-78.
- Barton, Edwin J. "The Story As It Should Be: Epistemological Uncertainty in Hemingway's 'Cat in the Rain.'" Hemingway Review 14.1 (Fall 1994): 72-78.
- Beegel, Susan F. Hemingway's Craft of Omission: Four Manuscript Examples. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1988.
- . "Introduction." Hemingway's Neglected Short Fiction: New Perspectives. Ed. Susan Beegel. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1989.
- Benson, Peter. Battling Siki: A Tale of Ring Fixes, Race, and Murder in the 1920s. Fayetteville: U of Arkansas P, 2006.
- Benstock, Shari. Women of the Left Bank: Paris 1900-1940. Austin: U of Texas P, 1986.
- Bloom, Harold. The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry. New York: Oxford UP, 1973.
- Blower, Brooke L. Becoming Americans in Paris: Transatlantic Politics and Culture between the World Wars. New York: Oxford UP, 2011.
- Boker, Pamela A. The Grief Taboo in American Literature: Loss and Prolonged Adolescence in Twain, Melville, and Hemingway. New York: New York UP, 1996.
- Boone, Joseph Allen. Libidinal Currents: Sexuality and the Shaping of Modernism. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998.
- Brenner, Gerry. A Comprehensive Companion to Hemingway's A Moveable Feast: Annotation to Interpretation. Volume 1. Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2000.
- . Concealments in Hemingway's Works. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1983.
- . "'Enough of a Bad Gamble': Correcting the Misinformation on Hemingway's Captain James Gamble." The Hemingway Review 20.1 (Fall 2000): 90-96.
- Brian, Denis. The True Gen: An Intimate Portrait of Hemingway by Those Who Knew Him. New York: Dell, 1988.

- Burnam, Tom. More Misinformation. New York: Ballantine, 1981.
- Burwell, Rose Marie. Hemingway: The Postwar Years and the Posthumous Novels. New York: Cambridge UP, 1996.
- Carpenter, Humphrey. A Serious Character: The Life of Ezra Pound. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1988.
- Chadwick, Whitney and Tirza True Latimer. The Modern Woman Revisited: Paris Between the Wars. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 2003.
- Cohen, Milton A. Hemingway's Laboratory: The Paris in our time. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 2005.
- Coltrane, Robert. "Hemingway and Turgenev: The Torrents of Spring." In Hemingway's Neglected Short Fiction: New Perspectives. Ed. Susan Beegel. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 1989. 149-161.
- Comley, Nancy R. and Robert Scholes. Hemingway's Genders: Rereading the Hemingway Text. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1994.
- Conklin, Alice L. "Redefining Frenchness: Citizenship, Race Regeneration, and Imperial Motherhood in France and West Africa, 1914-40." In Domesticating the Empire: Race, Gender, and Family Life in French and Dutch Colonialism. Eds. Julia Clancy-Smith and Frances Gouda. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1998. 65-83.
- Coontz, Stephanie. Marriage, a History: From Obedience to Intimacy or, How Love Conquered Marriage. New York: Viking, 2005.
- Curnutt, Kirk. "In the Temps de Gertrude: Hemingway, Stein, and the Scene of Instruction at 27, Rue de Fleurus." In French Connections: Hemingway and Fitzgerald Abroad. Eds. J. Gerald Kennedy and Jackson R. Bryer. New York: St. Martin's, 1998. 121-139.
- Dennis, Helen M. "Pound, Women, and Gender." The Cambridge Companion to Ezra Pound. Ed. Ira B. Nadel. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. 264-283.
- Dewberry, Elizabeth. "Hemingway's Journalism and the Realist Dilemma." In The Cambridge Companion to Ernest Hemingway. Ed. Scott Donaldson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 16-35.
- Diliberto, Gioia. Hadley. New York: Ticknor & Fields, 1992.
- Donaldson, Scott. "The Averted Gaze in Hemingway's Fiction." Sewanee Review 111.1 (Winter 2003): 128-151.
- . By Force of Will: The Life and Art of Ernest Hemingway. New York: Viking,

1977.

Eby, Carl. Hemingway's Fetishism: Psychoanalysis and the Mirror of Manhood. Albany, NY: State U of New York P, 1999.

Egan, Susanna. "Lies, Damned Lies, and Autobiography: Hemingway's Treatment of Fitzgerald in A Moveable Feast." a/b: Auto/Biography Studies 9.1 (Spring 1994): 64-82.

Eliot, T.S. The Letters of T.S. Eliot: Volume I, 1898-1922. Ed. Valerie Eliot. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1988.

---. "Preludes." The Waste Land and Other Poems. New York: Penguin, 2003.

Elliot, Ira. "In Search of Lost Time: Reading Hemingway's Garden." In Modernist Sexualities. Eds. Hugh Stevens and Caroline Howlett. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000. 251-266.

Ellmann, Richard. James Joyce. 1959. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982.

Fass, Paula S. The Damned and the Beautiful: American Youth in the 1920's. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1979.

Fenton, Charles. The Apprenticeship of Ernest Hemingway: The Early Years. New York: Farrar, Straus & Young, 1954.

Fleming, Robert. The Face in the Mirror: Hemingway's Writers. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama, 1994.

Flora, Joseph. Hemingway's Nick Adams. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State P, 1982.

Foucault, Michel. The History of Sexuality: An Introduction. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1980.

Freud, Sigmund. "Family Romances." The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. Volume IX (1906-1908). Trans. James Strachey. London: Hogarth Press, 1959. 235-241.

Garber, Marjorie. Vested Interests: Cross Dressing and Cultural Anxiety. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Gilbert, Sandra M. "Soldier's Heart: Literary Men, Women, and the Great War." In Speaking of Gender. Ed. Elaine Showalter. New York: Routledge, 1989. 282-309.

Gillete, Meg. "Making Modern Parents in Ernest Hemingway's 'Hills Like White Elephants' and Viña Delmar's Bad Girl." Modern Fiction Studies 53.1 (Spring 2007): 50-69.

Gordon, Lyndall. T.S. Eliot: An Imperfect Life. 1998. New York: Norton, 2000.

- Griffin, Peter. Along with Youth: Hemingway, The Early Years. New York: Oxford, 1985.
- . Less Than A Treason: Hemingway in Paris. New York: Oxford UP, 1990.
- Haralson, Eric. Henry James and Queer Modernity. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.
- Hawley, Ellis. The Great War and the Search for a Modern Order: A History of the American People and Their Institutions, 1917-1933. New York: St. Martin's, 1979.
- Hemingway, Ernest. "Big-Two Hearted River" manuscripts. Ernest Hemingway Collection. John F. Kennedy Library, Boston.
- . "Cat in the Rain" manuscripts. Ernest Hemingway Collection. John F. Kennedy Library, Boston.
- . The Complete Poems. Ed. Nicholas Gerogiannis. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1992.
- . The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway. Finca Vigia Ed. New York: Scribner, 2003.
- . "Cross-Country Snow" manuscripts. Ernest Hemingway Collection. John F. Kennedy Library, Boston.
- . Dateline: Toronto, The Complete Toronto Star Dispatches, 1920-1924. Ed. William White. New York: Scribner, 1985.
- . Death in the Afternoon. New York, Scribner, 1932.
- . The Garden of Eden. New York: Scribner, 1986.
- . Green Hills of Africa. New York: Scribner, 1935.
- . in our time. Paris: Three Mountains Press, 1924.
- . In Our Time. New York: Horace Liveright, 1925.
- . Islands in the Stream. New York: Scribner, 1970.
- . A Moveable Feast. 1964. New York: Scribner, 2003.
- . A Moveable Feast: The Restored Edition. New York: Scribner, 2009.
- . A Moveable Feast manuscripts. Items 121-185. Ernest Hemingway Collection. John F. Kennedy Library, Boston.
- . "On Writing." In The Nick Adams Stories. New York: Scribner, 1972. 233-241.

- . The Only Thing That Counts: The Ernest Hemingway-Maxwell Perkins Correspondence. Ed. Matthew J. Bruccoli. New York: Scribner, 1996.
- . Selected Letters, 1917-1961. Ed. Carlos Baker. New York: Scribner, 1981.
- . The Sun Also Rises. 1926. New York: Scribner, 2003.
- . "The Three-Day Blow" manuscripts. Ernest Hemingway Collection. John F. Kennedy Library, Boston.
- . The Torrents of Spring. 1926. New York: Scribner, 1972.
- Hotchner, A.E. "Hemingway's Blessing, Copeland's Collaboration." In Writers on Writing, Volume II: More Collected Essays from the New York Times. Ed. Jane Smiley. New York: Henry Holt, 2003. 105-110.
- . Papa Hemingway: A Personal Memoir. New York: Random House, 1966.
- Joost, Nicholas. Ernest Hemingway: The Little Magazines and the Paris Years. Barre, MA: Barre, 1968.
- Joyce, James. Finnegans Wake. London: Faber and Faber, 1939.
- . A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man. London: Egoist, 1917.
- . Ulysses. Paris: Shakespeare and Company, 1922.
- Kennedy, J. Gerald. Imagining Paris: Exile, Writing, and American Identity. New Haven: Yale UP, 1993.
- ., and Patrick Bonds. "'Married to Fishing: Homosocial Intimacy and Heterosexual Desire in 'On Writing.'" 14th Biennial International Hemingway Society Conference: "Hemingway's Extreme Geographies." Lausanne, Switzerland. 28 June 2010. Conference Presentation.
- ., and Kirk Curnutt. "Out of the Picture: Mrs. Krebs, Mother Stein, and 'Soldiers Home.'" The Hemingway Review 12.1 (Fall 1992): 1-11.
- . "What Hemingway Omitted from 'Cat in the Rain.'" Les Cahiers de la Nouvelle: Journal of the Short Story in English 1 (1983): 75-81.
- Kert, Bernice. The Hemingway Women: Those Who Loved Him – The Wives and Others. New York: Norton, 1983.
- Kimmel, Michael S. Manhood in America: A Cultural History. New York: Free Press, 1996.

- . "Masculinity as Homophobia: Fear, Shame, and Silence in the Construction of Gender Identity." In Theorizing Masculinities. Eds. Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 1994. 119-41.
- Lamb, Robert Paul. Art Matters: Hemingway, Craft, and the Creation of the Modern Short Story. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 2010.
- Lamberti, Elena. "Ford Madox Ford and Ernest Hemingway in the Literary Arena of Paris, 1924." Ford Madox Ford's Modernity. Eds. Robert Hampson and Max Saunders. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2003. 239-256.
- Leider, Emily W. Dark Lover: The Life and Death of Rudolph Valentino. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2003.
- Lupton, Marylyn A. "The Seduction of Jim Gilmore." The Hemingway Review 15.1 (Fall 1995): 1-8.
- Lyford, Amy. Surrealist Masculinities: Gender Anxiety and the Aesthetics of Post-World War I Reconstruction in France. Berkeley: U of California P, 2007.
- Lynn, Kenneth. Hemingway. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987.
- Maloney, Ian. "Ernest Hemingway's Miltonic Twist in 'Up in Michigan.'" The Hemingway Review 27.2 (Spring 2008): 123-130.
- Mandel, Miriam B. "A Lifetime of Flower Narratives." In Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice. Eds. Lawrence R. Broer and Gloria Holland. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 2002. 239-255.
- May, Elaine Tyler. Great Expectations: Marriage and Divorce in Post-Victorian America. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.
- Mellow, James R. Hemingway: A Life Without Consequences. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1992.
- Meyers, Jeffrey. Hemingway: A Biography. New York: Da Capo Press, 1985.
- Mizener, Arthur. The Saddest Story: A Biography of Ford Madox Ford. New York: World, 1971.
- Moddelmog, Debra A. Reading Desire: In Pursuit of Ernest Hemingway. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1999.
- Monk, Craig. Writing the Lost Generation: Expatriate Autobiography and American Modernism. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 2008.
- Nakjavani, Erik. "The Fantasies of Omnipotence and Powerlessness: Commemoration in

- Hemingway's 'Fathers and Sons.'" In Hemingway: Up in Michigan Perspectives. Eds. Frederic J. Svoboda and Joseph J. Waldmeir. East Lansing: Michigan State UP, 1995. 91-101.
- Nicholls, Peter. Modernisms: A Literary Guide. Berkeley: U of California P, 1995.
- O'Sullivan, Sibbie. "Love and Friendship/Man and Woman in The Sun Also Rises." In Ernest Hemingway: Seven Decades of Criticism. Ed. Linda Wagner-Martin. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State UP, 1998. 61-79.
- Perloff, Marjorie. "'Ninety Percent Rotarian': Gertrude Stein's Hemingway." American Literature 62.4 (December 1990): 668-683.
- Pizer, Donald. American Expatriate Writing and the Paris Moment: Modernism and Place. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1996.
- Poli, Bernard J. Ford Madox Ford and the Transatlantic Review. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1967.
- Pound, Ezra. "Imagisme." Early Writings: Poems and Prose. New York: Penguin, 2005. 209-210.
- Raeburn, John. Fame Became of Him: Hemingway as Public Writer. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984.
- Reynolds, Michael. Hemingway: The Paris Years. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.
- . Hemingway's First War: The Making of A Farewell to Arms. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1976.
- . Hemingway's Reading, 1910-1940, An Inventory. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1981.
- . The Young Hemingway. 1986. New York: Norton, 1998.
- Roberts, Mary Louise. Civilization Without Sexes: Reconstructing Gender in Postwar France, 1917-1927. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1994.
- . "Samson and Delilah Revisited: The Politics of Fashion in 1920s France." In The Modern Woman Revisited: Paris Between the Wars. Eds. Whitney Chadwick and Tirza True Latimer. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 2003.
- Rorabaugh, W.J. The Craft Apprentice: From Franklin to the Machine Age in America. New York: Oxford UP, 1986.
- Sanderson, Rena. "Hemingway and Gender History." The Cambridge Companion to Ernest Hemingway. Ed. Scott Donaldson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 170-196.

- Seidler, Victor J. Rediscovering Masculinity: Reason, Language, and Sexuality. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Shaffner, Randolph P. The Apprenticeship Novel: A Study of the Bildungroman as a Regulative Type in Western Literature with a Focus on Three Classic Representatives by Goethe, Maugham, and Mann. New York: Peter Lang, 1984.
- Smith, Paul. "From the Waste Land to the Garden with the Elliots." In Ernest Hemingway: Seven Decades of Criticism. Ed. Linda Wagner-Martin. East Lansing: Michigan State U, 1998. 21-28.
- . A Reader's Guide to the Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1989.
- . "Three Versions of 'Up in Michigan,' 1921-1930." Resources for American Literary Study XV (Autumn 1985): 163-77.
- Smith, Paul. The Book of Nasty Legends. New York: Routledge, 1984.
- Snitnow, Ann, Christine Stansell, and Sharon Thompson, eds. "Introduction." In Powers of Desire: The Politics of Sexuality. New York: Monthly Review, 1983. 9-47.
- Sokoloff, Alice Hunt. Hadley: The First Mrs. Hemingway. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1973.
- Spilka, Mark. Hemingway's Quarrel with Androgyny. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1990.
- Stein, Gertrude. The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas. 1933. New York: Vintage, 1990.
- . Dear Sammy: Letters from Gertrude Stein and Alice B. Toklas. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1977.
- . Everybody's Autobiography. New York: Random House, 1937.
- Stephens, Robert O. Hemingway's Nonfiction: The Public Voice. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P., 1968.
- Stewart, Matthew. Modernism and Tradition in Ernest Hemingway's In Our Time: A Guide for Students and Readers. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2001.
- Stoneback, H.R. Reading Hemingway's The Sun Also Rises: Glossary and Commentary. Kent, OH: Kent State UP, 2007.
- Strychacz, Thomas. Dangerous Masculinities: Conrad, Hemingway, and Lawrence. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2008.

- Svoboda, Frederic Joseph. Hemingway and "The Sun Also Rises:" The Crafting of a Style. Lawrence: UP of Kansas, 1983.
- Tate, Mary Jo. Critical Companion to F. Scott Fitzgerald: A Literary Reference to His Life and Work. New York: Facts on File, 1998.
- Taylor, Welford Dunaway. "A Shelter from The Torrents of Spring." In French Connections: Hemingway and Fitzgerald Abroad. Eds. J. Gerald Kennedy and Jackson R. Bryer. New York: St. Martin's, 1998. 101-119.
- Tyler, Lisa. "Ernest Hemingway's Date Rape Story: Sexual Trauma in 'Up in Michigan.'" The Hemingway Review 13.2 (Spring 1994): 1-11.
- Valente, Joseph. "Joyce's (Sexual) Choices: An Historical Overview." In Quare Joyce. Ed. Joseph Valente. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1998. 1-16.
- Van Boheemen, Christine. The Novel as Family Romance: Language, Gender, and Authority from Fielding to Joyce. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1987.
- Vos, Gail de. Tales, Rumors, and Gossip. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited, 1996.
- Wagner-Martin, Linda. "The Intertextual Hemingway." A Historical Guide to Ernest Hemingway. Ed. Linda Martin-Wagner. New York: Oxford UP, 2000. 173-194.
- . "The Romance of Desire in Hemingway's Fiction." In Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice. Eds. Lawrence R. Broer and Gloria Holland. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 2002. 54-69.
- Warner, Michael. "Homo-Narcissicism; or, Heterosexuality." In Engendering Men: The Question of Male Feminist Criticism. Eds. Joseph A. Boone and Michael Cadden. New York: Routledge, 1990: 109-21.
- Weber, Ronald. Hemingway's Art of Nonfiction. New York: St. Martin's, 1990.
- . News of Paris: American Journalists in the City of Light Between the Wars. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2006.

VITA

Patrick Bonds grew up in Denton, Texas. In 1994, he graduated from Baylor University with a Bachelor of Arts in English. After completing his Master of Arts in English in 2000 at the University of New Orleans and a Master of Philosophy in Anglo-Irish literature at the University of Dublin, Trinity College, in 2001, Patrick began his doctoral studies at Louisiana State University in 2006. In 2007-2008, he was awarded the Ernest Hemingway Society's Smith-Reynolds Founders Fellowship and a John. F. Kennedy Library Foundation Ernest Hemingway Research Grant. His scholarly interests include modernism, expatriate and exile writing, Anglo-Irish literature, and twentieth-century American literature. Patrick earned his doctorate in May, 2011.