HEMINGWAY: NEVER A KEPT MAN

by

Samantha Ehlinger

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for Departmental Honors in

the Department of English

Texas Christian University

Fort Worth, Texas

May 4, 2015

HEMINGWAY: NEVER A KEPT MAN

Project Approved:

Supervising Professor: David Colón

Department of English

A. Layne Craig, Ph.D.

Department of English

John Tisdale, Ph.D.

Department of Journalism

ABSTRACT

What do Ernest Hemingway's characters and their relationships signify about their author's romantic life? This thesis will explain how several of his works return to the beginnings and endings of his first three marriages to Hadley Richardson, Pauline Pfeiffer, and Martha Gellhorn. Through his novels, he interrogates his ideas on marriage, particularly on power-dynamics in a marriage, and on female control. Throughout Hemingway's works, he examines what makes relationships appealing at first, and then their dissolution inevitable. And while his pieces are not direct biographical, one-to-one comparisons, many of his characters treat questions he himself had yet to answer before his death. The works treated in this research are: *The Sun Also Rises*, "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber," "Hills like White Elephants," "The Snows of Kilimanjaro," "Nobody Ever Dies," *Garden of Eden* and *A Moveable Feast*. Hemingway attempts to justify and understand why his relationships fall apart—particularly his romantic ones—through his novels. He uses his fictional characters to interrogate how one partner can "keep," the other, or hold them back from reaching his or her potential. He also uses his novels as a way to examine his own fear of the woman holding or maintaining power in a relationship, through pregnancy, money or unintentionally through marriage itself as an institution.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere thanks to each member of my committee, who took time to mentor me and provide feedback on this research: David Colón, Layne Craig, and John Tisdale. I am also very grateful to David Vanderwerken, a mentor, and the first advisor to this project. Thank you for encouraging me to pursue this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

HEMINGWAY'S FIRST MARRIAGE AND THE TOLL OF MARRIED LIFE.............4

EMERGING RELATIONSHIP PATTERNS, AND POWER DYNAMICS

IN HEMINGWAY'S SECOND MARRIAGE..28

HEMINGWAY'S THIRD WIFE, AND BREAKING (OR NOT)

MARITAL HABITS...43

EPILOGUE..57

REFERENCES 59

INTRODUCTION

There is a danger of looking at a writer's body of work as autobiographical if it is not explicitly named a "memoir." But when one reads Ernest Hemingway's work, how can comparisons not be drawn? From the nurse he fell in love with, to *A Farewell to Arms,* from his safaris in Africa, to "The Snows of Kilimanjaro" or "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber." Of course, he was not present for all of the battles in *A Farewell to Arms*, and he did not know a woman who killed her husband like in "Short Happy Life," but the general sentiments of his work, the themes, the places, or the time, cannot be dismissed as a mere "coincidence." And while the subject of "how much biography is in it" has been talked to death, very few biographers seem to use Hemingway's view of women in his personal life to inform his depictions of women in his literary life in any real way. And while a direct, one-to-one comparison of characters in the text to characters in his life would serve no purpose, one can use his relationships to inform and potentially add context to the relationships of the characters in his works.

This thesis will focus primarily on Hemingway's relationship with his first three wives, and how his conceptualization of women informs his works. One of the most telling remarks to this end was Paul Hendrickson's comment in *Hemingway's Boat,* "In my view, Hemingway's staid, Protestant, suburban, Midwestern roots—which he fought against all his life—could never allow him to reconcile his various adulteries and marriages past his first marriage, to Hadley, who was his truest love, or at least his truest marriage. In that sense, his subsequent marriages were doomed from the start" (44). So while his literature might not be memoir, and should not be argued as such, it is logical to argue that certain events in his life had an effect on his career. And as Hemingway's

work tends to be a way for him to explore many of his opinions on life—like writing, for example—why couldn't his work reflect his philosophy on marriage? Especially, when considering everything he has ever published explores marriage or relationships in some way, large or small.

What do Hemingway's characters and their relationships signify about their author's romantic life? This thesis will explain how several of his works return to the beginnings and endings of his first three marriages to Hadley Richardson, Pauline Pfeiffer, and Martha Gellhorn. Hemingway's fourth wife is not included in this research. While he produced work during that relationship, the work seemed to reflect more on his past relationships. For example, *A Moveable Feast* is clearly focused on Hadley, and then briefly on Pauline. So, the work written during Hemingway's marriage to Mary Hemingway is used in this research to inform the other three chapters.

Throughout Hemingway's works, he examines what makes relationships appealing at first, and then their dissolution inevitable. And while his pieces are not direct biographical, one-to-one comparisons, many of his characters treat questions he himself had yet to answer before his death. [1] The works I plan to treat are: *The Sun Also Rises*, "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber," "Hills like White Elephants," "The Snows

---

[1] Some, like Michael Reynolds, argue Hemingway's work is not autobiographical. Reynolds emphasizes throughout *Hemingway: The Paris Years* that, "After he wrote The Sun Also Rises, most of his readers and more than one biographer assumed that all of his fiction was thinly veiled biography, which it almost never was" (61). This, however, is in its own way another generalization. While he may not have directly written memoirs and called it "fiction," several of his novels and short stories draw on experiences from his own life, particularly his experiences with Hadley. This essay will make connections between Hemingway's work and his ideas on the male/female power dynamic, but it will also qualify the limitations of using fiction as memoir. Other critics, like Debra Moddlemog (writer of "Reconstructing Hemingway's Identity: Sexual Politics, the Author, and the Multicultural Classroom") say that Hemingway "constantly uses his experiences in creating his fiction" (188).

of Kilimanjaro," "Nobody Ever Dies," *Garden of Eden* and *A Moveable Feast*. Hemingway attempts to justify and understand why his relationships fall apart—particularly his romantic ones—through his novels. He uses his fictional characters to interrogate how one partner can "keep," the other, or hold them back from reaching his or her potential. He also uses his novels as a way to examine his own fear of the woman holding or maintaining power in a relationship, through pregnancy, money or unintentionally through marriage itself as an institution.

HEMINGWAY'S FIRST MARRIAGE AND THE TOLL OF MARRIED LIFE

While some critics, like Michael Reynolds, seem to understate Hadley Richardson's influence in Hemingway's life, Hemingway's biography seems to suggest that it cannot be overstated.[2] Hadley was there for the most important period of Hemingway's life—when he was forming his writing style, making connections, and learning how to handle the world of the artist. As Hemingway once wrote: "'When I saw my wife standing by the tracks as the train came in by the piled logs of the station, I wished I had died before I ever loved anyone but her" (*A Moveable Feast* 46). After their divorce, Hemingway would continue to try and understand what had happened through his novels and short stories, ending with *A Moveable Feast*, published posthumously, and considered the closest to a memoir he would ever write. Hemingway even acknowledges his need to assess how his relationship dissolved—what caused him to cheat all those years ago:

> Any blame in that was mine to take and possess and understand. The only one, Hadley, who had no possible blame, ever, came well out of it finally and married a much finer man than I ever was or could hope to be and is happy and deserves it and that was one good and lasting thing that came out of that year. (*A Moveable Feast* 124)

As Hemingway's grandson, Seán Hemingway, said, "The most difficult part of writing *A Moveable Feast* for Ernest Hemingway was coming to terms with his betrayal of Hadley with Pauline and the end of that first marriage" (9). Hemingway dwelled on the

---

[2] Others agree with this take, though with slightly different foci in their criticism. For more, see Miriam B. Mandel's contribution to, *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice.*

dissolution of his first relationship for years—he and Hadley's initial friendship with the fashionable Pauline Pfeiffer, and his and Pauline's eventual exclusion of Hadley in pursuit of their own growing attraction for one another. One could only surmise that after decades of trying to understand this subconsciously or consciously through his work, he was finally able to write the piece he needed to write—a dedication to what he had with her, and an apology for what they lost. Critic Edmund Wilson wrote that Hemingway "had a high sense of honor, which he was always violating; he evidently had a permanent bad conscience" (qtd. in Hendrickson 20). Losing Hadley was one of the biggest mistakes he ever made, and he tried to defend it and justify it subconsciously in his literature after the divorce. Through a critical lens, one can see how Hemingway's characterization in several of his works serves as a way for him to examine his own flaws as a man and a husband.

Hadley can easily be characterized as the most docile, the most blindly supportive of the writer's wives. As she said to him in a letter while they were apart before their marriage:

> "I really value your ambition so much . . . I couldn't help you to throw it aside even for a short while to hasten the good time. I want to be your helper—not your hinderer . . . So anything you suggest that means putting the work in secondary place has no backing from me" (qtd. in Sokoloff 21-22).

And when the two finally parted, Hadley hardly complained, according to several biographers. Hadley played the role of the supportive wife of the writer to near-perfection. In a *New York Times* article called "A Farewell to Macho," Maureen Dowd interviews writer Gioia Diliberto, author of *Paris Without End: The True Story of*

Hemingway's First Wife on the subject of Hemingway's women. As Diliberto so aptly puts it:

> No woman wants to be a Hemingway heroine who totally submerges her identity to her lover. As Catherine Barkley said in *A Farewell To Arms,* "I want you so much I want to be you too." We'd much rather be dressed in floaty silk, sipping Champagne on Jay Gatsby's terrace.

But while Diliberto said women don't want to be a Hemingway heroine, she concedes that some of Hemingway's work can be enjoyed by women: "'much of Hemingway's work, particularly the stories he wrote during his marriage to Hadley...brilliantly chart the emotional nuances in relationships between men and women'" (qtd. in Dowd).

One obvious example of Hemingway using his own experiences from his relationships is *The Sun Also Rises*. Many of the main characters in the novel seem to have personality traits taken from both Hemingway and his friends, and the first draft used actual names (Harold Loeb becomes Robert Cohn in later drafts, for example).[3] Whether intentionally or not, the characters Jake Barnes and Lady Brett Ashley especially seem to purport ideas of Hemingway's outlook on heterosexual love, and particularly, how it relates to his relationship with Hadley. *The Sun Also Rises* was published in 1926, the year before Hadley and Hemingway divorced. While he was writing it, his work undoubtedly represented the mind of a man cheating on his wife with another woman—Pauline. In fact, according to Reynold's article, "The Courtship and Marriage of Pauline Pfeiffer," Hemingway was editing the galley proofs of the novel as

---

[3] In *Hemingway: The Paris Years,* Reynolds discusses Hemingway's early drafts of the novel (307-310), when Hemingway used real names. Cohn, he remarks, represents Loeb, which is clear after Reynolds details Loeb's clinging devotion to Duff Twysden even after she rejected him (302).

he waited out his Hadley -imposed "100 days of separation" from Pauline before Hadley would divorce him.[4]

Jake and Hemingway share many personality traits, among them a fear of people and instances that reminded them of their personal flaws. The main flaw: letting the woman control the relationship. Hemingway seems to acknowledge his internal conflict on this point through his development of the minor character of Robert Cohn in the novel. Cohn's significance as a relatively minor character, and his function in the novel can largely be explained through the book *One Versus the Many.* This book interrogates the importance of developing minor characters to the structure of a novel. Alex Woloch argues that even the positions of minor characters within the narrative structure are significant—and a writer's devotion of time and space to them can lend them more importance than one would typically attribute to a minor character. While Woloch primarily deals with authors whose works are brimming with minor characters—like Charles Dickens—this evaluation is all the more significant for Hemingway, who does not often devote a lot of space to minor characters. According to Woloch in *One Versus the Many,* "A full analysis of minor characters must examine not simply the specific descriptions of particular characters but also how these characters are inflected into a complex narrative system" (251). So with this analysis in mind, one must examine how Cohn functions within the narrative structure and themes of the novel, outside of merely his personality traits that make him a foil to Jake. Cohn functions as more than just a foil

---

[4] Donaldson talks about the situation thus: "When Ernest broke off his marriage in 1926 to marry Pauline Pfeiffer, he and Pauline agreed at Hadley's insistence to stay apart for one hundred days as a step preliminary to divorce" (291). For more on their days of separation, see Donaldson's article "Hemingway and Suicide."

to Jake—he also serves the larger narrative system as another projection of Hemingway's fears about female control in a relationship.

Using *One Versus the Many* as a lens by which to view Hemingway leads the reader to ask: What can be more telling than the description of a minor character opening the novel? Jake's lengthy description of Cohn at the opening of *The Sun Also Rises* serves as a great frame of reference, or example of Jake's personality--both in our perception of Cohn mediated by the first person point of view, and by the emphasis on the character of Cohn in itself. Jake expounds on the character of his friend Cohn, whom he believes to be a weak man "kept" by his women: first, Frances Clyne, and then, Brett. According to Jake, Cohn was nice enough, but had a controlling woman who "led him quite a life" (15). Similarly, Jake also condemns Cohn's behavior when he refuses to get over Brett and follows her around like a lovesick puppy, letting her control his emotions.

Cohn's relationship with Frances forms out of the deterioration of his relationship with his first wife, a rich woman who ends up supporting him after he spends away his family money. The reader does not know much about why the first relationship does not work out, except that Cohn "hardened into a rather unattractive mould under domestic unhappiness with a rich wife" (12), insinuating that her money eventually drove a wedge between them. Cohn's relationship with Frances begins when he runs out of money to edit a literary magazine, and is then "taken in hand by a lady who hoped to rise with the magazine" (13). Their relationship seems to be doomed from the start, as it is rooted in financial dependence and the shame of being indebted. Cohn at last refuses to marry her after he finally becomes successful and makes money from his writing.

When Cohn decides to break up with Frances, he says that he is going to send her to visit friends with a budget, ultimately subverting the prior relationship dynamic by using money to control Frances, instead of letting her money control him. This scene seems similar to Hemingway's tight control over Hadley's money, and how much she is allowed to use. Kitty Cannell, a writer who knew Hemingway and Hadley, "never did like Ernest, particularly did not like the way he left Hadley alone while he was free on the boulevards, nor the way he kept her so poorly dressed" (qtd. in Reynolds 179). In fact, Cannell used to give Hadley hand-me-downs.[5] Much like Cohn forces Frances to impose on her friends, Hemingway forced Hadley to use handouts from others to dress herself, because he would not give her enough money to buy new clothes. He later realizes he was at fault, and even writes in *A Moveable Feast,* "I had been stupid when she needed a grey lamb jacket and had loved it once she had bought it. I had been stupid about other things too" (43). Interestingly enough, in both cases (Hemingway and Hadley, and Cohn and Frances), the women were the ones who had the money in the beginning of the relationship.

As mentioned earlier, the reader learns in *The Sun Also Rises* that many of the problems Jake has with Cohn are in fact problems he has with himself. Women control both Jake and Cohn, but they choose to handle it differently. Cohn eventually frees himself from the entrapments of women, while Jake is left at the novel's close coming to Brett's rescue once again. Much like the character Jake Barnes, Hemingway seemed to be simultaneously attracted and repelled by people who reminded him of his personal

---

[5] In Reynolds' *Hemingway: The Paris Years* he mentions that Cannell and others used to give Hadley handouts, particularly during her pregnancy, when money was a particular issue as they planned for the future (128, 179).

flaws.[6] Initially he would be attracted to similarities in personality, much like Jake and Cohn are friends in the novel. Then, as the friendship progressed, the other person's faults would become intolerable to Hemingway. As Hemingway was his own harshest critic, this impossible standard extended to the people he knew who made similar, if not the same, mistakes.

One friendship similar to that of Jake and Cohn was Hemingway's association with George Antheil, an avant-garde composer. Hemingway published terrible insults in *The Transatlantic Review* directly challenging Antheil. As Reynolds suggests in *Hemingway: The Paris Years*, it seems very plausible that Hemingway did not like that "George took money from women" (227). Apparently, Antheil borrowed money from Sylvia Beach and Mary Louise Curtis Bok, his patron. The irony is that Hemingway lived off of Hadley's money throughout their marriage. Much the way Jake dislikes Cohn for letting himself be controlled by women, Hemingway reflects a similar hypocrisy concerning money and Antheil. And while Hadley did not control him, it seems that Hemingway feared the potential money had to upset the power dynamic in his relationship with her. This is just one example of a pervasive theme in *The Sun Also Rises:* rejecting female control in a relationship.[7] And one way for women to control a relationship, according to Hemingway, is through money.

Earlier, Hemingway even writes about men who depend on women's money in "American Bohemians in Paris," an article he wrote for the Toronto *Star:*

---

[6] This was an issue many times in his life, according to Reynolds: "Sometimes he reached too hard. Sometimes he reacted too violently against others in whose mirror he saw his own reflection" (186). In this particular instance, Reynolds is discussing Hemingway's relationship with Lewis Galantière, a friend of the Hemingways.

[7] For more, see Todd Onderdonk's article, "'Bitched': Feminization, Identity, and the Hemingwayesque in *The Sun Also Rises*."

> His Rotonde broadside, the product of more than one evening's observations, also satirized a large, rich woman "making jokes and laughing hysterically. The Three young men laugh whenever she does. The waiter brings the bill, the big woman pays it . . . she and the three young men go out together." . . . Hemingway resents men who live off older rich women, but when he wrote these words, he was paying his bar tab at the Rotonde and the pension bill at Chamby with his older wife's money. Contradictions, always contradictions and always the ability to see in others what he most disliked, feared or resented in himself. (qtd. in Reynolds 24)

In this scathing commentary Hemingway critiques others who remind him of himself, particularly when it came to issues involving finances with Hadley. It is probable that the eventual dissolution of their relationship can be attributed, therefore, in part to his fear of what he perceived to be an imbalanced relationship, much like Cohn's or Jake's relationships with Frances or Brett in *The Sun Also Rises.* The irony, which will be discussed in the following chapter, is that Hemingway turned from one woman with financial control to another who could almost wield more financial power through her extensive trust fund.

After discussing Cohn's relationship dynamic in *The Sun Also Rises*, and how this could have related to Hadley, it might seem inappropriate to relate Brett to Hemingway. But discussing autobiographical elements in Hemingway's work is more nuanced than just deciding whether the novel is a complete representation of some event in his life. Therefore, it would be a simplistic, and incorrect to read Jake as a direct manifestation of Hemingway, and Jake's experiences as direct correlations to Hemingway's own life

experiences. So, while it seems that Jake and Hemingway share obvious parallels, it is also interesting to note the way Brett interacts with Jake, and how that could be connected to Hemingway.

For Brett, her social life is her essence—where she derives her power. In the novel, she would be nothing, and there would be no story if she was not as desirable as she was, and if she did not use that to her advantage. But, again, there would be no story if she did not have Jake standing in the way of her complete control and orchestration of the men around her. Jake represents love—a romance for Brett that is grounded in real affection. Jake holds her back from being "free," or from actually moving on to another relationship in the novel. Her lasting love of Jake, in a more callous way, also stands in the way of her complete freedom through mastery of the people around her. If she was able to move on from the guilt and pain of not staying with Jake, she would be able to do anything, be with anyone, or truly go anywhere. Brett's obsession with freedom, and her stress about relationship power dynamics are two of many things she shares in common with Hemingway.

Throughout *A Moveable Feast*, Hemingway remarks that left-bankers such as Gertrude Stein (in fact, mostly Stein) said that his love was holding him back from reaching his full potential as a writer. The first time he and Hadley visited the Stein and Toklas in fact, Hemingway wrote that, "I felt that they forgave us for being in love and being married—time would fix that" (24). He mentions many other pointed comments that Stein made about his relationship with Hadley, that, "then all I had to be cured of, I believe Miss Stein felt, was youth and loving my wife" (30). From the talk of left-bankers during Hemingway's time, one seemed to get the idea that true love would hold back an

artist, and that eventually, monogamy would be impossible. According to the societal pressures of his time, therefore, eventually he would not be able to remain faithful. And later, he succumbs and cheats on Hadley even though he loves her, much like Brett in *The Sun Also Rises*, who loves Jake but cannot stay with him:

> "Couldn't we live together Brett? Couldn't we just live together?"
>
> "I don't think so. I'd just tromper you with everybody. You couldn't stand it." (62)

Brett feels the need to employ her sexuality in spite of her love for Jake, because she thinks it is the only way she can feel powerful, or free. Later, she continues, "'It's my fault, Jake. It's the way I'm made'" (62). Ultimately, Hemingway seemed to feel that his first marriage with Hadley was holding him back, much like Brett feels like Jake is holding her back. It is evident that both Hemingway and Brett felt weakened by their love. Other critics argue that she employs her sexuality because she is searching for meaning in the wake of Jake's injury. Lori Watkins Fulton provides a largely sympathetic view of Brett in "Reading Around Jake's Narration: Brett Ashley and *The Sun Also Rises."* She says Brett engages in multiple affairs for reassurance, but "the types of men she chooses as lovers suggest that she also uses her sexuality to search vicariously for meaning" (70). It is evident, too, that Hemingway searches for meaning through his affairs.

Of course, it would be simplistic to analyze Brett's point of view without mentioning Jake's war injury, rendering him impotent. This, of course, contributes to the main reason why the two can't be together. The injury, a physical barrier between the two, separating them and creating a distance, could be compared to Hemingway's

reaction to Hadley's pregnancy. It seems Hemingway's texts often interrogate where a relationship loses its luster, its sexiness. Jake's injury can be likened to Hadley's pregnancy, in that both distance the two people in the relationship from one another. Jake's injury is not the same as Hadley's pregnancy, as it is ultimately a permanent impediment to sex, and much more traumatic. But, both are physical things that create distance and anxiety around intimacy, and sex. Hemingway's love for Hadley is tempered by the fear of her getting pregnant. For Hemingway, writing always came first, and starting a family would get in the way of his work; therefore, a relationship was only appealing insofar as it didn't intrude upon his life outside of it:

> One problem, to which Hemingway's writings turn to again and again, is lodged in the gap between manhood and paternity. The problem has two dimensions. One is that Hemingway often sees male pleasure as confined to that space between the end of childhood and the beginning of fatherhood. The other is that the birth of a son, in particular, figures in the Hemingway text as a sign of the death of the father (Scholes and Comley 9).

For Hemingway, Bumby[8] created a distance, and made him feel trapped, much like Brett feels about being with Jake. It was common knowledge that Hemingway was not enthused about Hadley being pregnant, and that he even documented her periods[9] to make sure that there was no possibility she could be pregnant. At one point after

---

[8] John Hadley Nicanor, or "Bumby" as he was nicknamed, was born Oct. 10, 1923. According to *Hadley: The First Mrs. Hemingway*, by Alice Hunt Sokoloff, "Ernest had worried that having the baby would limit his freedom, that for at least the first year of the baby's life he would have to have a regular job and income" (67). For more details on how parenthood changed their relationship, and other tidbits gleaned from interviews with Hadley herself, see Sokoloff's book *Hadley: The First Mrs. Hemingway.*

[9] Reynolds discusses this in his book *Hemingway: The Paris Years.*

Bumby's birth, when he thought Hadley was pregnant again, he made her feel so poorly for it that even their friends they were traveling with noticed. [10]

Once Hadley had the child, according to Reynolds, it not only created somewhat of a distance between them, but also made it more difficult for Hemingway to write: "Between Hadley's pregnancy and their new puppy, the small rooms closed in on him as he tried to find the center of his 'unwritten stories'" (123). Much the way Hemingway felt trapped by the permanence of a baby, Brett feels trapped by the permanence of Jake's injury. She even implies that it takes the joy out of being in love. Jake says that love is fun:

> "I don't mean fun that way. In a way it's an enjoyable feeling."
>
> "No," she said. "I think it's hell on earth." (35)

For Jake and Brett's relationship, it is clear that it is not necessarily the injury itself, but Brett's issues with it that create the distance. Brett cannot cope with the finality of the injury, so she turns to other men for comfort, to try to move past her love of Jake. Both Brett and Hemingway have anxiety around intimacy as a result of permanent circumstances they cannot control.

In the novel, Hemingway also seems to try to generate some sympathy for Brett on the part of the reader by explaining the "bad luck" she has encountered that has led to her bad behavior. Her poor handling of relationships is attributed to her bad luck with a horrible husband. As *The Sun Also Rises* is an earlier work, the stark contrast between

---

[10] In Summer 1924, Hemingway thought Hadley was pregnant again, and shamed her so much during a vacation that Sally Bird reprimanded him (Reynolds 219). For more, see Reynolds' book *Hemingway: The Paris Years.*

characters faced with difficult choices is evident. It seems that when Jake and Brett are together Brett is so self absorbed by how it is unlucky for her:

> "When I think of all the hell I've put chaps through. I'm paying for it all now."
>
> "Don't talk like a fool," I said. "Besides what happened to me is supposed to be funny. I never think about it." (34)

Brett seems to think Jake's impotence is all about her, her bad luck, her misfortune. Again, it seems Hadley's pregnancy led to Hemingway's "bad luck," which resulted in his needing to move on with someone new. And so Brett tries to do with Romero, in a manner of speaking her version of Hemingway's Pauline.

Nolan, in his essay "Hemingway's Women's Movement" argues that Hemingway shows sympathy for women in his portrayal of Brett by showing trials and tribulations that shaped her identity. Nolan claims the events in Brett's life almost justify some of her actions. His argument is mainly punctuated by Mike Campbell's explanation of her relationship with her husband: "When he came home he wouldn't sleep in a bed. Always made Brett sleep on the floor. Finally, when he got really bad, he used to tell her he'd kill her. Always slept with a loaded service revolver" (*The Sun Also Rises,* Hemingway 207). In this section, too, Nolan mentions other instances of Brett's bad luck—like marrying a man she didn't love. He argues her bad luck incidents justify her predatory nature toward men, and flippant destruction of them when she tires of their affection. Her seemingly uncaring nature toward men, he argues, is a function of her bad luck in love. This is a conscious or unconscious manifestation, again, of Hemingway's idea of his own romantic "bad luck." Hemingway's bad luck: Hadley's pregnancy, and its restriction of the young married life to which he had become accustomed. Brett is

another projection of Hemingway, and his inability to maintain real relationships without hurting those he loves. She becomes a personification of Hemingway's need to justify his actions because of the "bad luck" of Hadley's pregnancy. Hemingway's own reason for his destructive nature would arguably be his artistic needs conflicting with his marriage to Hadley. Nolan describes Brett's situation at the close of the novel:

> Now, cut off by fate from Jake, whom she still loves, and by choice from Romero, whom she will only harm if she continues to live with (241, 243), she will marry Mike Campbell who is, in her own words, "so awful" but "my sort of thing" (243). (18)

Technically, Brett is cut off from Jake by choice. If she really wanted, she could stay with him despite the fact that they cannot have sex. This sounds similar to Hemingway's situation at the end of his relationship with Hadley, because Hemingway tried to make her feel guilty for the bad luck of divorcing her, and having to stay apart from Pauline for 100 days. Brett's reaction to her situation with Romero can only be compared further to Hemingway's actions toward Hadley when Hadley enforces her "100 days of separation." As Donaldson describes the situation:

> During this period the black ass descended, and Hemingway contemplated suicide seriously enough to worry his friends...In this case, his depression was undoubtedly exacerbated by guilt. Hadley Hemingway was by all reports a wonderful woman, and the divorce was, as he acknowledged, entirely his fault. Hence he engaged in an orgy of self-castigation. It was as if the least he could do, by way of justification, was to kill himself--or threaten to. (291-292)

Hemingway eventually makes Hadley feel so guilty that she agrees to end the 100 days early. In Reynolds's piece "The Courtship and Marriage of Pauline Pfeiffer," he mentions specifically Hemingway's demeanor toward Hadley, as he tries to convince her to get a divorce, or let up on the 100 days requirement. This bears a striking resemblance to Brett's actions at the end of *The Sun Also Rises.* She insists that Jake come and rescue her: "That seemed to handle it. That was it. Send a girl off with one man. Introduce her to another to go off with him. Now go and bring her back. And sign the wire with love" (243). Does Hemingway, or Brett's "bad luck" justify their selfish nature toward the people they used to love? When Jake does go to rescue her, all she can do is talk about Romero—the man for whom she left Jake. All Hemingway can do when he separates from Hadley is convince her to let him be with Pauline more quickly. And all Brett can do is talk about the love she lost because she chose to leave Romero.

One concept that is integral to Hemingway's idea of "bad luck" is Hemingway's conceptualization of "paying" for happiness.[11] He seems to imply that any happiness comes as a cost—and great happiness comes at great cost. *The Sun Also Rises* deals thoroughly with "Hemingway's Morality of Compensation" as Donaldson's article is titled: "Hemingway, throughout his fiction but especially in *The Sun Also Rises,* sides with Dickinson in this hypothetical quarrel. The cost of joy, ecstasy, or happiness comes high, yet it must be met" (400). Brett seems to imply that fun, careless times with men

[11] Donaldson describes Hemingway's idea of paying for happiness as manifesting in the mentality of Jake Barnes 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" (Donaldson 402). For more, see Donaldson's article: "Hemingway's Morality of Compensation."

resulted in her being stuck with loving a man that is impotent. Jake's war injury, then, is her "price paid."

It is interesting that Hemingway's reputation as a misogynist is so well-established--when it seems that his female characters, like Brett, mirror expressions of his own personality. Donaldson, in his essay "The Averted Gaze in Hemingway's Fiction," discusses the interesting lack of the patriarchal "male gaze," as often discussed by feminist critics like Laura Mulvey, as an indication of the ever-present patriarchy.[12] Donaldson notes, quite intuitively in fact, that Hemingway's characters often refrain from making eye contact as an indicator of love going wrong. Donaldson says for Brett in particular, her

> averted gaze operates to suggest the sense of loss she feels (it also makes her a more sympathetic character). Nearly always in Hemingway's fiction, avoiding eye contact is associated with similar feelings. It is a device, a concealed stage direction, a form of subtext that Hemingway masterfully employs in those stories—his very best ones—when love is depicted as gone wrong or going wrong. (Donaldson 132)

Donaldson's criticism, beyond an interesting observation of how gaze is masterfully incorporated in Hemingway's work, also points out the sympathy it generates on the part of the reader. If Hemingway is a misogynist who hates his female characters or objectifies them, why then, does the reader feel sympathy even for a character as morally

---

[12] "Performance Art: Jake Barnes and 'Masculine' Signification in *The Sun Also Rises*" could serve as an interesting counter argument to the "lack of a male gaze." Author Ira Elliot argues Jake is obsessed with his lack of a phallus, which leads to his criticism of the gay men he observes.

objectionable as Brett? This sympathy is generated because Hemingway sees himself in the character of Brett, and her actions toward Jake.

Another story with a sympathetic female character is undoubtedly Hemingway's 1927 short story "Hills Like White Elephants." But this story is interesting in that Hemingway's fear of pregnancy is reflected in the male character, and he is able to make the reader sympathetic to the pregnant female. The reader of this short story can do nothing but side with the woman, and detest the man's reaction to the woman's pregnancy. While not explicitly stated, in the short story it is clear that the woman is pregnant, and the man wants her to have an abortion. Through subtext the reader understands that her boyfriend is pressuring her into getting an abortion, and that she is reticent to get the operation. While many argue that masochistic men rule Hemingway's fictitious women, critic Charles Nolan argues that Hemingway sometimes uses these conflicts to sympathize with women and their struggle to retain autonomy in their relationships. In his essay, "Hemingway's Women's Movement." Nolan mentions the short story's "unmerciful exposure of male selfishness and female long-suffering" (19). While Hemingway may have had issues in his own relationships, it seems he is able to interrogate those problems with precision in his short stories.

Through "Hills Like White Elephants" it seems that Hemingway criticizes men who expect women to not get pregnant—and if they do, get an abortion immediately. Hemingway shamed Hadley during a potential pregnancy, and felt trapped by her real pregnancy. In this story the man just expects Jig to get an abortion, while she wants to be able to discuss her options. Through this story, Hemingway shows the pregnant protagonist "Jig's maturity and superiority as he excoriates the selfishness and

insensitivity of her companion” (Nolan 19). Hemingway’s self-critical nature is evident from the story; the man cannot see past how the baby might inconvenience him, much like Hemingway callously treated Hadley when he thought she was pregnant. During this short story the reader is given a glimpse into a relationship between a callous man and a woman who has to decide whether to follow her instincts, or keep her boyfriend and do what he wants. And at the short story’s close, the reader is left feeling sympathetic for the woman’s difficult choice.

In her essay "Re-Reading Women: The Example of Catherine Barkley" Jamie Barlowe-Kayes is obviously talking about Barkley in *A Farewell to Arms*, but her assessment of Hemingway's construction of the character can be applied to some of his other female characters. Barlowe-Kayes speaks specifically about how Hemingway's feeling toward Barkley is ambivalent, "an ambivalence which wavers not between love and loss--or even between immature and mature love--but between the more negative relationships of idealization and objectification" (Barlowe-Kayes 30). This ambivalence finds a cozy home in the representation of Hadley in *A Moveable Feast.* At their relationship's outset she is a beautiful, funny woman. By the end she is the object standing in his way of being with Pauline. But while seeing Hadley in this text is obvious, her also objectified, less obvious parallel can be found in the character of Catherine Bourne in *The Garden of Eden.*

The descriptions of the "honeymoon period" for David Bourne and his wife Catherine are strikingly similar to the imagery used when Hemingway talks about the beginning of his relationship with Hadley in *A Moveable Feast.* In *The Garden of Eden*: "He had many problems when he married but he had thought of none of them here nor of

writing nor of anything but being with this girl whom he loved and was married to and he did not have the sudden clarity that had always come after intercourse" (29). And then *A Moveable Feast:* "Our pleasures, which were those of being in love, were as simple and still as mysterious and complicated as a simple mathematical formula that can mean all happiness or can mean the end of the world" (184). But in both works Hemingway does not discuss either Catherine or Hadley with any particular characterization other than their physical beauty, easygoing nature, and sexual proficiency. This is the idealization phase--the woman who is there when the man needs her, perfect and beautiful, and who disappears to swim, or sleep, or perform a menial quaint task while the man writes. The woman is easily pleased, like Catherine in *The Garden of Eden:* "“I'm excited about the fish,’ she said. ‘Don't we have wonderful simple fun?’” (26), or Hadley in *A Moveable Feast:* "She had a lovely modeled face and her eyes and her smile lighted up at decisions as though they were rich presents" (20).

Hemingway realizes his own shortcomings again—and is more honest about what he as a man expects from a wife. For example, it is evident that Hemingway acknowledges Hadley’s growing understanding of her role as his wife in *A Moveable Feast.* Hemingway notices when she says something about it, and takes the time to mention it in *A Moveable Feast* when Hadley remarks about a trip with Chink: "'When you and Chink talked I was included. It wasn't like being a wife at Miss Stein's'" (46). Catherine, similarly, understands her growing role as the wife of a writer, and begins to resent it. She tries to convince him to continue a work about their marriage, because she knows that is the only way she will be relevant in his work—that it is the only way she can have a voice. At first she quietly accepts her role as the writer’s wife, but as David

continues to be absorbed by his work it is evident that she learns to want more from her marriage. And wanting more, in David's eyes, it what causes the relationship to unravel. As Burwell says in "Hemingway's Garden of Eden: Resistance of Things Past and Protecting the Masculine Text": "Hemingway told a friend in 1947 that the narrative that became *The Garden of Eden* was about 'the happiness of the garden that a man must lose'" (198). This happiness lost can only be the ideal wife who stands by her man and supports him. In Catherine's dawning awareness of the limitations of her role as wife, David loses his Eden. When the ideal wife for either Hemingway or David becomes a realistic wife with desires and needs, both men discard the women—like objects—for a better model.

In *A Moveable Feast* Hemingway vacillates between taking the blame for their separation, and attributing some of the blame to Hadley. But toward the end he somewhat acknowledges that the relationship ended because of his actions:

> Hadley and I had become too confident in each other and careless in our confidence and pride. In the mechanics of how this was penetrated I have never tried to apportion the blame, except my own part, and that was clearer all my life. (124)

It is clear that through both novels, Hemingway is still trying to answer the question: what went wrong? Why was it not enough for me? Both Hemingway and David hunger for something more out of their relationships. And both turn to a woman who is not their wife to get it. Throughout both *A Moveable Feast*, and *The Garden of Eden* Hemingway focuses with intention on this type of hunger—and on what can satisfy it. In *A Moveable Feast* he discusses the emptiness left by sex:

> By then I knew that everything good and bad left an emptiness when it stopped. But if it was bad, the emptiness filled up by itself. If it was good you could only fill it by finding something better. (52)

J. Gerald Kennedy discusses the parallels in the two novels of dissatisfaction, of never having enough in "Hemingway's Gender Trouble," which manifests itself in the continued focus on hunger:

> So too does the theme of hunger—for food, drink, or sex—which pervades both narratives and discloses an underlying, insatiable longing, always for something or someone else. This hollow feeling, experienced most intensely after writing or intercourse, leads Hem and David into erotic adventures which shatter the Edenic happiness that both have known. (189)

Unfortunately for Hemingway, it is clear that at the end of his life he still couldn't figure out what exactly led to the shattering of his happiness, in a continual pattern, with wife after wife. Was it the influence of the rich? Was it his writing? Was it the women? Was it him?

But where the similarities between Hadley and Catherine end is when Catherine really attempts to subvert David's ideals of her. This hearkens more to Martha Gellhorn, Hemingway's third wife.[13] As Barlowe-Kayes asserts about Hadley, "those who were abandoned, but who did not complain, like Hadley, generated life-long guilt, but still they were better than outspoken women of power and ambition" (27). Rose Marie Burwell even likens Hemingway's guilt over abandoning Hadley to David's guilt over the elephant's death: "David's guilt in the death of the elephant contains resonances of

---

[13] This will be discussed further in Chapter 3.

Hemingway's abandonment of Hadley for Pauline—an action by which in later years he marked the end of his innocence as David's betrayal of the elephant marks his..." (210). This comparison seems to fall in line with this image of Hadley as a silent, innocent bearer of betrayal—much like the elephant.

But perhaps it is harsh--or limited to take such a narrow view of Hemingway and Hadley's separation. Clearly Hemingway cared enough about their relationship to be contemplating what went wrong with it at the end of his life. And not just in *A Moveable Feast* but also in *The Garden of Eden.* In both works, which again, he worked on at the same time, Hemingway acknowledges and explores the destructiveness of triangulation. In the version of *A Moveable Feast* that the average reader sees, it seems that Hemingway blames this triangulation on being seduced by the rich—an obvious escape from acknowledging his own fault. He maintains an almost innocence at the time—an innocence that is seduced by money and a different lifestyle, or a lifestyle more specifically associated with Pauline. But in Gerry Brenner's "Are We Going to Hemingway's Feast?" a different perspective emerges for this specific section. Brenner talks about other drafts of this section, which revealed it to be "the most painful section he wrote" (535).[14] These drafts, Brenner claims, also change the way the reader would perceive Hemingway's understanding of the breakup: "In them Hemingway stops projecting himself as that responsible young artist or as an innocent victim of the rich.

---

[14] There has been much controversy surrounding the published version of *A Moveable Feast,* which was a result of Mary Hemingway's somewhat extensive editing. Through this essay, Brenner attempts to use various drafts of the work to provide some new readings of both the text itself, and Hemingway's process of writing it. For more, see Brenner's essay, "Are We Going to Hemingway's Feast?"

Instead he exposes himself, tries to deal honestly with complex emotions and guilt" (535).

Again, as *The Garden of Eden* and *A Moveable Feast* were written at the same time in his life, Hemingway attempts to understand the perils of triangulation: how it happens, who it hurts, and how to handle it. David is caught between his love for Marita and Catherine, just as Hemingway is caught between his love for Pauline and Hadley. In *The Garden of Eden,* David narrates: “That’s all you need, he thought. That’s all you need to make things really perfect. Be in love with both of them” (*The Garden of Eden,* Hemingway 170). At first, David tries to live day-by-day, without overanalyzing his feelings or what is happening between him and the two women. And in earlier drafts of *A Moveable Feast* Hemingway also discusses the dangers of triangulation at length. Brenner, who had access to the earlier drafts, narrates the missing material from Hemingway’s final, published *A Moveable Feast.* In particular, Brenner writes that Hemingway:

> says that in the beginning he tries to live each day as it comes, not worrying, but trying to enjoy what he has. Yet he admits that this triangle is destroying him, that he hates it, that each day becomes more dangerous and impossible, and that it is like a war-time existence, living for one day at a time. While the two women are happy, or so he believes, he wakes at night and realizes his deep internal strife. Still he cannot get over the strange fact that he truly loves both women whether he is with one or the other or both, and that he, too, is happy. Then he realizes that the new woman is unhappy because she wants his love all to herself and is unwilling to believe that he can love both her and the other woman at the same time. (537)

David and the projection of Hemingway in *A Moveable Feast* both seem to be attempting to process what leads a relationship astray. But as both of them try to deal with the situation they realize they need to choose—either the old love or the new. Both move forward with the new—with various excuses as to why the new lover is a better model of the old. As Reynolds puts it: “As much as he loved his wife, Ernest was beginning to resent her dependence upon him, lose patience with her female friends, and wish for more intellectual support than she gave him”.

And while marriage with Hadley had become a reality of a child, small apartment, and the life that came with it, Pauline was an unknown. Reynolds wrote that Pauline, much like Hadley, was ready to devote her life to being Hemingway’s wife—but she had editorial experience to make herself even more useful. She was someone who could “manage his career,” Reynolds said.[15] In both novels, "a growing awareness of complication parallels the protagonist's fall from apparent innocence into sexual experimentation and duplicity" (Kennedy 190). And as both were written at the end of his career, they are likely a reflection of the pattern that continued throughout his life as he married, cheated, and remarried.

[15] For more, see Reynolds’ article, “The Courtship and Marriage of Pauline Pfeiffer.”

EMERGING RELATIONSHIP PATTERNS, AND POWER DYNAMICS IN HEMINGWAY'S SECOND MARRIAGE

Hemingway and Pauline's relationship began in the excitement and secrecy of his first affair. Pauline was hopelessly in love, though some biographers have argued that she set out to ruthlessly steal Hemingway away from Hadley. As Hawkins points out: "if that were the case, Hemingway certainly would not have been a likely prospect. He was a struggling, yet-unknown writer with a wife and child. She was a wealthy, well-educated woman with a good job, a trust fund, and a Catholic conscience." Regardless of her original motives, the affair eventually escalated, and Hemingway and Hadley decided to separate. Eventually, Pauline's relationship ends in much the same way—by Hemingway moving on with a new woman while he is still married to the former. Brenner says Hemingway, in draft of a section of *A Moveable Feast,* "finishes by declaring that the new woman made one serious error when she decided to get him to marry her. She failed to appreciate the power of remorse that would haunt him and eventually spoil their own relationship" (537). Perhaps this was the reason for the two to finally separate—though Hemingway doesn't seem to really learn from his mistakes, as he was cheating on Pauline with Martha. Some biographers question whether Hemingway really loved her—biographers like Hawkins:

> It is questionable, however, whether Ernest every truly loved her, though a strong sexual chemistry existed for a time. More likely, he loved everything she brought to the marriage—her family money, her editorial skills, her strong belief in him, and her devotion to his every need. (Hawkins 10)

Eventually Martha, her polar opposite in personality, replaces Pauline. Martha is strong, independent, and more sexually experienced. She doesn't plan to give everything up for Hemingway, and at first that strength and independence is very attractive.

In "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber," a man named Francis injures, but fails to kill a lion while on a safari in Africa. Too cowardly to face the wounded lion hiding in the brush, he runs away from it, and lets other people deal with the mess. Through the short story's subtext, one can surmise that Francis comes to blame his failure to kill the lion on the culmination of years of feeling emasculated by his controlling wife. And when he is put in a position where he needs to take charge and act, he is unable to do so. This short story is a manifestation of Hemingway's fear of emasculation by female control.

After the incident with the lion, Francis's domineering wife is not happy about his cowardice, and she lets it be known. Like many of Hemingway's characters, a woman controls Francis Macomber. As much as Hemingway continued to be fearful of the consequences of female control, so his male characters continued to be dominated by the women who surrounded them. Wilson, the guide for Francis and his wife's safari, says that American women are "the hardest in the world; the hardest, the cruelest, the most predatory and the most attractive and their men have softened or gone to pieces nervously as they have hardened" (9). Francis is not only a representation of Hemingway's fears, but a representation of his perception of Pauline's influence. By the end of Hemingway's relationship with Pauline, Hemingway comes to view her help and influence as controlling and manipulative. For example, Hawkins explains that Hemingway comes to blame her for his first divorce:

> As to Pauline's hurt and humiliation over being abandoned for Martha, Ernest contended that Pauline had gotten what she deserved. After all, she had done exactly the same thing to Hadley, Ernest rationalized, and he took no responsibility for either split. He saw himself as an innocent bystander watching other women parade into his happy home life and break up his marriages. According to Ernest, Pauline had deliberately set out to steal him away from her good friend Hadley. (Hawkins 225)

Hemingway's suspicion of female manipulation wasn't uniquely attributed to Pauline. Much like Wilson, Hemingway is forever fearful of the way women are able to dominate men. In the words of Gioia Diliberto, writer of *Paris Without End: The True Story of Hemingway's First Wife*, "That Ernest all his life feared domination by women and that this fear was a powerful motivation have long been recognized by Hemingway readers. Ernest was determined not to marry a woman like his mother, Grace, that 'bitch who had to rule everything, have it all her own way,' as he put it" (17).

But how does the manipulation or control justify an affair? Hemingway likely worried that monogamy—enforced by a controlling wife—was inhibiting his writing. This idea, fostered out of advice from his other, cheating, married writer friends likely influenced him. And while Hemingway loved Hadley, and loved being with her, eventually he started to feel as trapped as the artists around him said he was. Not only did Stein comment continuously on their relationship, but Ezra Pound linked monogamy to creative stagnation: "One idea that Hemingway heard from Pound was the connection between sex and writing" (Reynolds 100). According to Reynolds, Pound was known for saying that genius and creativity flowed from extramarital affairs. And as a young man

wanting to be accepted into the literary circle, Hemingway did what it took to be accepted, even if that meant ruining his relationship with Hadley.

But the need to have the excitement of an affair didn't stop with Pauline, and his feeling of being trapped only intensified as his relationship with Pauline continued. At first Pauline is helpful and intelligent—she reads his work, providing feedback, and meaningful edits. But Hemingway was never satisfied with routine, and as Hawkins notes:

> Ernest no longer saw her devotion to him as an asset. In fact, he told Enda Gellhorn, his prospective mother-in-law, that he especially valued Martha's independence and the fact that she would never be "a dull wife who just forms herself on me like Pauline and Hadley." (qtd. in Hawkins 225)

Eventually Hemingway realized, or thought he realized that he didn't need Pauline, much like Francis realizes at the end of the story that he doesn't need his wife. As Hemingway wrote in "The Short Happy Life," "Fear gone like an operation. Something else grew in its place. Main thing a man had. Made him into a man. Women knew it too. No bloody fear," (25). Hemingway no longer needed Pauline and her care because he no longer had fear of professional failure. He was succeeding as a writer and was also in his most productive writing period. That meant he no longer needed his wife, and her edits.[16] And Francis no longer needed his wife because he overcame fear.

But again, reading Francis *as* Hemingway would be shallow, mainly because the conclusion to the story contradicts this notion—Madame Macomber ends up being the promiscuous character, not Francis. Moreover, Madame Macomber kills Francis—the

---

[16] For more, see Ruth Hawkins's article, "Pauline Pfeiffer: Hemingway's Behind-the-Scenes Editor."

woman dominates the man. Much like both Jake and Brett seem to reflect on aspects of Hemingway's understanding of love, it seems that Madame Macomber's killing of the weak Francis could also be the logical conclusion to Hemingway's internal battle with marriage and conforming to expectations. Madame Macomber she defeats him because he did not "conquer" her first. In Hemingway's view, Francis had already let Madame Macomber upset the power dynamic and assume too much control over the relationship—much like Pauline did when their affair began (according to Hemingway). But in this short story Francis didn't leave his woman (Hemingway's course of action), or rein her in and make her respect him, and so she kills him. As Wilson points out toward the end of the story, "They govern, of course, and to govern one has to be cruel sometimes" (10).

In a sense, it seems that this conclusion is a drastic representation of one of Hemingway's great fears: self-destruction. And one way to self-destruct was letting others control him. According to Hendrickson, "there was so much more fear inside Hemingway than he ever let on, that it was almost always present, by day and more so by night, and that his living with it for so long was ennobling. The thought of self-destruction trailed Hemingway for nearly his entire life" (19-20). And for Francis, he lets his fear destroy him, much like Hemingway lets his fear over women inhibiting his professional growth destroy his relationships with both Hadley, and Pauline. For Hemingway, art came first—no matter the woman:

> Pauline, who had everything she wanted in her husband, sacrificed all else for love. She loved him after seven years of marriage as much as when they first fell

> in love in Paris. For Ernest, however, both love and truth seemed secondary to his art, and he often appeared to need neither. (Hawkins 173)

Hemingway eventually felt like Pauline was “keeping him”—both in money, and with emotional suffocation. And eventually, “he needed a new muse for inspiration” (Hawkins 193).

While there are numerous ways to interpret “The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber,” another interpretation is within the context of Pauline as Hemingway’s editor—another way of “keeping him.” There are clear parallels between Pauline editing Hemingway’s work and pushing him, and Madame Macomber’s role in passive-aggressively pushing Francis to face his next kill. Throughout their relationship, Pauline served as one of Hemingway’s editors, and “even after casting her aside as a wife, Hemingway lamented that he missed her editing skills” (Hawkins ix). As their relationship soured, Pauline stayed with him because of her love for him. Perhaps he stayed because of her editing skills. Francis constantly makes statements about why he and Madame Macomber are still together—he stays because of her looks, she stays because of his money. And much like Madame Macomber involves herself in the actions of hunting, and asks pointed questions about technique, Pauline was similarly involved in Hemingway’s work:

> Perhaps the most telling indication of her involvement with Hemingway's writing career comes from the fact that she was in touch with Maxwell Perkins, Hemingway's editor at Scribner's, and discussed Ernest's writing with him. It is highly unlikely that any already established writer, confident of his skills, would tolerate a wife interceding with his editor. (Hawkins)

At first, both Hemingway and Francis share at least one similarity—insecurity about their ability to complete the tasks at hand (Hemingway, writing, and Francis, hunting). When Hemingway met Pauline he was on his way to being a writer with a reputation, but he did not actually publish his first novel until a year before he and Hadley divorced. Hemingway's insecurity at the beginning of his relationship with Pauline, therefore, is expected. Hemingway uses Francis's fear of hunting as an analogy, probably because hunting was important in Hemingway's life as well. Pauline actually talks about hunting in her diary, as it was something Hemingway was passionate about. The two of them went on a safari together that actually resulted in this short story. Pauline equates hunting in this diary to "the pursuit of happiness," according to Cushman, and she "hints at the strain she and others felt as her husband pursued his version of happiness" (qtd. in Cushman 475).

Both men—Hemingway and Francis—are encouraged, pushed and eventually driven to success in their endeavors by their wives. Though in markedly different ways, Pauline pushed Hemingway into his most productive period of writing, and Madame Macomber pushed Francis to overcome his fear of the animal he is trying to kill. Both are incredibly frank with their men when they don't satisfy them. For example, Pauline comments on Hemingway's writing:

> In several letters she lets him know that the poem he wrote about Dorothy Parker was not to her liking: "I didn't like the Dotty poem much Ernest--about twelve tents [tenths] out of water maybe" on 26 November 1926 (Hemingway Papers). Later (3 December 1926) she pronounces it shrill--like ordering a lot of clothes for an elephant and putting them on a mouse (Hemingway Papers). (qtd. in Hawkins)

Pauline's attention to Hemingway's work and frankness was somewhat different from Hadley's commentaries on his work, which can really be described as blind devotion.[17] Pauline took a more active role in providing opinions on Hemingway's work—and this position both helped and hurt her. In one respect, she became more valuable to Hemingway as a wife, yet in another Hemingway resented his dependence on her opinion and approval. Francis, in the beginning of the short story, seems dependent on his wife's approval. How important should a wife's approval be, especially of actions unrelated to their relationship? Hemingway seems to ask this question throughout his short stories, but especially in this one. When Francis fails to kill the lion, Madame Macomber makes her feelings clear:

> Macomber's wife had not looked at him nor he at her and he had sat by her in the back seat with Wilson sitting in the front seat. Once he had reached over and taken his wife's hand without looking at her and she had removed her hand from his. (17)

The constant dwelling on Madame Macomber's reaction implies that Francis is troubled by this, and embarrassed by his wife's perception of him. But should he be? Hemingway seems to ask—should his wife hold that kind of power in the relationship? When Francis begins to find his confidence through later kills, and Madame Macomber sees it, she becomes frightened that he might leave her. So before he gets the chance to do so, she kills him. Wilson sees her intentions: "'That was a pretty thing to do,' he said in a toneless voice. 'He would have left you too'" (28). As discussed earlier, sometimes

---

[17] In *Hadley: The First Mrs. Hemingway,* Sokoloff discusses Hadley's doting reactions to Hemingway's work: "She was 'absolutely wild' about a poem he sent her about Corona and simply 'worships' another poem he called 'Desire'" (34). For more, see Sokoloff's novel *Hadley: The First Mrs. Hemingway*.

Hemingway's works reflect his deep-rooted fears about what could happen in his relationships if he loses the power, or control.[18] And with Pauline playing such a prominent role in the success of his work, he started to feel his control slipping. As he became more famous, "there was an obvious attempt to begin playing down her role" (Hawkins). In "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber," Francis meets the end Hemingway consciously or unconsciously fears: death by a wife who worries about her eventual irrelevance. Perhaps he thought he no longer needed Pauline, as he became more famous. Hawkins at least certainly seems to think so.[19] And in this short story Hemingway entertains his greatest fears about what happens when a wife no longer feels wanted or needed—because the man finally gets strong enough not to need her.

Furthering her close reading of Barkley in *A Farewell to Arms,* Barlowe-Kayes reads Hemingway's general tone and idolization of Barkley as a way to understand how the writer views and idolizes his wives: "As a metaphor, Barkley also iterates Hemingway's praise for acquiescent, self-sacrificing, fully supportive women (like Hadley and Mary)" (32). While Barlowe-Kayes may be talking about Barkley, this idea of the "acquiescent, self-sacrificing" woman can be applied to several of Hemingway's other works, like "The Snows of Kilimanjaro." It is evident that the woman in the story, Helen, supports her husband, Harry, financially while he writes, and stands by his side

---

[18] One good example of Hemingway's need to control his marital life would be his decision to come home to the Key West for the holidays, even after cheating on Pauline with Martha. He tries to make this decision without consulting Pauline, because he knows he is losing her due to his affair. But Pauline, as Amy Schmidt notes in her article "Forty Plus Coats of Paint," is not the passive victim, as she is sometimes painted. Pauline takes the family and leaves to stay with family. It is clear, then, that Hemingway has already lost control of the relationship.

[19] For more, see Hawkins's article "Pauline Pfeiffer: Hemingway's Behind-the-Scenes Editor," and her book*, Unbelievable Happiness and Final Sorrow: The Hemingway-Pfeiffer Marriage.*

throughout their relationship. The supporting-the-great-artist-trope can obviously be read as an idolization of any of his wives. But this story represents when the supportive wife goes sour—when the man, no matter how much self-sacrificing she does—is ready to discard her, like an object. Pauline's "docility" drove Hemingway crazy, according to Hawkins, as Pauline "shaped her life around making Ernest comfortable and happy as best she could" (Hawkins 189).

Barlowe-Kayes's further reading of Barkley's supposed self-sacrifice can be linked to fights in "Snows of Kilimanjaro" between Helen and Harry. During one such fight, right at the beginning of the story, she says "I left everything and I went wherever you wanted to go and I've done what you wanted to do." Hemingway's phrasing of this particular argument implies she has a choice on a basic level. But the cultural context of the relationship tells us that this wasn't a choice for her, much like Barlowe-Kayes reads Barkley's self-sacrifice at the end of *A Farewell to Arms.* Barlowe-Kayes reminds us that "to see Barkley's supposed 'intentional' choice of self-sacrifice as an indicator of her subject-position is to deny a cultural history which gives her no other choice" (32). So not only does Hemingway value self-sacrificing women—he values their silent acceptance of the self-sacrifice that he naturally expects. Hemingway expected his wife to give up her professional life in lieu of his. But then later Harry seems to resent the silent acceptance of his wife, much like Hemingway seems to later resent Pauline's devotion to him.

Another important aspect of "The Snows of Kilimanjaro" is the tension created by Helen's financial support. Once again, Hemingway has projected his fear of "what the rich can do" onto his characters. Helen is very wealthy, and Harry blames his unproductivity, in part, on her financial support. Hemingway's obsession with financial

independence will follow him throughout his life—as will his fear of the influence of money. This short story was published while he was married to Pauline, another woman who, like Hadley, kept him. So, it could be argued that this character represents Hemingway feeling trapped by Pauline, but it seems rather that the woman in “The Snows of Kilimanjaro” represents all of Hemingway’s relationships thus far, as he tries to make sense of what power women really hold over his work, and more specifically, what power their money holds over his work. Simply put, “he’s amalgamating two wives, one a former, one a current, both older than himself, both of whom, in one way or another, in lesser or greater ways, had kept him” (Hendrickson 103). Hemingway even admits to writing about his views on money in “The Snows of Kilimanjaro” in a letter written on January 1, 1947: “I put what I thought about the very rich (on a very limited scale) into The Snows of Kilimanjaro” (qtd. in Hendrickson 101).

Hendrickson writes that Helen of “The Snows of Kilimanjaro” is a combination of Hemingway’s relationships: “There are clearly disquieting messages for Pauline Hemingway, but there’s no question that Hadley is a rearranged presence, too, and so also Agnes von Kurowsky, the red cross nurse for whom the young volunteer ambulance driver had fallen” (103). Helen is described as leaving everything behind for her husband—much like Hadley left America behind so Hemingway could pursue his career in Paris. Or like how Pauline forsook her relationship with Hadley, and potentially some of her pride or reputation, to conspire to be with Hemingway. Moreover, Helen is described as having the money that made it happen, much like how the young couple lived off Pauline's money. Harry and Helen are fighting, when Harry finally gets to the point and attributes his anger to her “bloody money” (41). Hemingway depended heavily

on the Pfeiffer's for money, and this dependence likely made him uncomfortable. The references in "The Snows of Kilimanjaro," Hawkins said, are no accident: "Despite his acceptance of Pfeiffer largesse over the years, the author seemed especially to resent Pauline's family wealth" (Hawkins 187). Hemingway seemed to think that financial dependence, if it wasn't already, would eventually sour a relationship.

This theme follows him throughout his career, and is even prominent in *A Moveable Feast,* which he wrote at the end of his life. In the final draft of the novel it seems that Hemingway blamed his separation with Hadley on the rich, but Brenner argues that this disdain for the rich is more nuanced in some of his earlier drafts:

> he reiterates that they [his wealthy friends] had supported him only after he had made his decisions, that his life with Pauline had been as good for quite a few years as his life with Hadley had been in their early years in Paris. Even more, he owns that the rich could not know all of the circumstances that lay behind his decisions, that they had no way of knowing that his decisions would be wrong and would go sour. Then he acknowledges that nothing was their fault except for involving themselves in other people's lives. And while they brought bad luck to those people whose lives they did enter, their own lives suffered even worse luck and they ended up having the worst luck imaginable (541).

Harry, the character in the short story, is Hemingway's mouthpiece to interrogate his conflicting viewpoints on wealth and how it can damage a professional or emotional relationship. Hawkins argues that this story " should have been a clear signal to Pauline that Ernest no longer needed her, now that he was an established writer with a good income" (Hawkins 188). But I would argue that Harry alternates between blaming Helen

for his failures as a writer, and acknowledging that the fault is only his own. The short story begins with Harry's evident bitterness at what his wife has done to his craft, but he later seems to realize that being successful has nothing to do with whether or not a woman keeps you, but with how you use the talent you've been given. He says:

> He had destroyed his talent himself. Why should he blame this woman because she kept him well? He had destroyed his talent by not using it, by betrayals of himself and what he believed in, by drinking so much that he blunted the edge of his perceptions, by laziness, by sloth, and by snobbery, by pride and by prejudice, by hook and by crook. (45)

From this, one can see that Hemingway fears being destroyed by the women around him, not because of their actions, but because of his relationship with them. But later, he realizes that only he has real control over his destiny, and that using "female control" as a reason for his infidelity is just a crutch to justify his actions that he abhors.

Hemingway's fear of Pauline's supposed control dates back to the genesis of their affair. Some biographers assume that Pauline set out to separate Hemingway and Hadley, and manipulated the situation into securing Hemingway for a husband. And if one is going to accept this characterization of Hemingway's second wife, *The Garden of Eden* could be a pointed fictional representation of how Hemingway represents Pauline's control, even from the beginning of the relationship. Rather than seeing Catherine or Marita as a direct analogy for Pauline, I would argue that rather than biographical truth, this book represents Hemingway's fears, once again, of money and control. If the female characters are viewed as possible parallels to Pauline, the natural assumption is that Pauline came to Paris with the intention of ensnaring a husband. But when questioning

the motives for Hemingway's interpretation of her actions, it is evident that blaming Pauline for his infidelity to Hadley is a way of coping with what he knows is a personal, moral failing. Further portraying Pauline as the one who ruthlessly led him away from Hadley with her money furthers this aim—his self-justification. Burwell explains the Marita-to-Pauline analogy thus:

> the women from whom Catherine and Marita have been invented can be perceived by their relationship to the writer and his writing. Marita, the wife-to-be at the end of the novel, has her origins in a conflation of Pauline and Mary Hemingway. She shares Pauline's calculated use of her wealth... to secure Hemingway via her friendship with Hadley. (201)

One of Hemingway's most depressed times was after he separated from Hadley, and had to wait before seeing Pauline. Two of the reasons? "Hemingway suddenly had no income (the pending divorce disconnected him from Hadley's family funds, which had financed his residence there) and he was forced to live alone for the first time" (Herlihy-Mera 55). Hemingway seems to blame his dependence on money, and company, on the women who provide it, instead of acknowledging his own responsibilities in affairs. Burwell connects this point to David's reaction writing even when his relationship is going sour with Catherine. David grumbles about doing "what you hired out to do," which is clearly a jibe at Pauline for supposedly stealing him away from Hadley. And as Burwell notes in her essay "Hemingway's Garden of Eden: Resistance of Things Past and Protecting the Masculine Text": "A few pages later, David becomes a first-person narrator in discussing three-way sleeping arrangements identical to those that occurred with Hadley, Pauline, and Hemingway at Juan-les-Pins in the summer of 1926." (201) Hemingway comes to

resent Pauline, clearly, for what he perceives as an attempt to seduce him with money. This relationship is reflected in *The Garden of Eden*, especially as the two women scurry around to "take care of him": similar to what both Hadley and Pauline did at the beginnings of their respective relationships. "'Isn't it lucky Heiress and I are rich so you'll never have anything to worry about?" Catherine says to David about she and Marita—"'We'll take good care of him won't we Heiress?'" Much like Pauline comes to attend to Hemingway's every need, the woman says: "'I'm trying to study his needs. This was all we could find for today.'" (164) Eventually Hemingway tries to, once again, assume independence by moving on from both Hadley and Pauline. Little does he know that Martha will not satisfy his needs because of this exact attempt to find a different sort of relationship.

HEMINGWAY'S THIRD WIFE, AND BREAKING (OR NOT) MARITAL HABITS

Henrichon, the author of "Ernest Hemingway's Mistresses and Wives: Exploring Their Impact on His Female Characters," largely attributes the growth of characterization of female characters to Hemingway's relationship with Martha Gellhorn. And this assessment is supported throughout Hemingway's work. Martha was a new wife for Hemingway entirely—not just in name, but in personality. According to Terry Mort, writer of *The Hemingway Patrols*, Hemingway "wanted his wife to be a junior partner in the Hemingway firm, someone who would look after things and leave him alone while he traveled and wrote and relaxed" (31). And as Mort later asserts, Martha did not fit this mold. The main cause of friction in their relationship was not that she was a strong, independent woman, but that she would not relinquish her own crusades and causes[20] to fully support his. As Mort said in *The Hemingway Patrols*, "Fitzgerald knew Martha and recognized that she would only go so far before rebelling against being molded into a shape that didn't suit her—which was any shape other than the one she chose to adopt at the moment" (86).

Martha soon became bored with being the caring, supportive, home-bound wife.[21] And for Hemingway, Martha's career aspirations were threatening, and inconvenient. At first Martha was someone new, and exciting for Hemingway. But as Mort addresses in

[20] Martha did extensive reporting on the attempts of New Deal programs to combat poverty. For more, see Mort's book *The Hemingway Patrols: Ernest Hemingway and His Hunt for U-Boats.*

[21] According to Mort, Martha grew tired of the expectation that she stay home and support Hemingway's endeavors to the point of sacrificing her own. (85, 141-144). For more, see Mort's book *The Hemingway Patrols: Ernest Hemingway and His Hunt for U-Boats.*

The Hemingway Patrols: "In Hemingway's case, marriage was never the solution, for the dream vision can never successfully morph into a wife" (Mort 138).

Stephen Henrichon uses Maria of "Nobody Ever Dies" to draw similarities between Martha and some of Hemingway's later female characters. He said Maria's bravery sets her apart from Hemingway's fictional females that came before her, and he attributes this to Martha's influence. Henrichon describes Maria thus:

> "Molded in the image of Martha, Maria is far from a silly girl and when she is trapped, she does not cower waiting to be found. Maria understands the consequences of being taken alive and instead she leaps to her feet and charges toward the searchlight, unafraid to die" (42).

Maria's cause in this short story is The Spanish Civil War—a war Hemingway and Martha covered at the beginning of their affair. Through his relationship with Martha, Hemingway was able to have greater diversity of women after which to model his female characters. But while Henrichon focuses mainly on Martha's bravery, I find it more intriguing to note Maria and Martha's mutual efforts in crusading for a cause. Martha supported causes sometimes to a fault, or to at least a less-than-objective truth in her articles.[22] Similarly, Maria wants to support her cause for the cause's sake too—even when Enrique wants her to give up:

> "No you go," she said. "Please, I will stay here to shoot and they will think you're inside."
>
> "Come on," he said. "We'll both go. There's nothing to defend here. This stuff is useless. It's better to get away."

---

[22] For more, see Amy Shearn's article "A Goofy State of Mind: My Grandmother's Letters from Martha Gellhorn."

"I want to stay," she said. "I want to protect you."

She reached for the pistol in the holster under his arm and he slapped her face.

"Come on. Don't be a silly girl. Come on!" (Hemingway 477)

While Henrichon mentions bravery, it may be better to take it one step further and say that it is more that both characters value a specific cause above all. Both Maria and Martha share bravery, yes, but it seems that more than that they share an emotional attachment to a cause in a way that transcends their relationships. Martha was not going to give up her journalism—a version of journalism that Mort reports is more like advocacy.[23] Maria did not want to give up the guns in the house, because that meant those who had fought had died in vain. She talks about the significance of some of the losses in battle in a way that transcends her own familial relations:

"But it is not only that Vicente is my brother. I can give up my brother. It is the flower of our party."

"Yes. The flower of the party."

"It is not worth it. It has destroyed the best."

"Yes. It is worth it."

"How can you say that? That is criminal." (Hemingway 474).

Hemingway takes the specific time, in the confined space of the short story, to allow her to say that it is about more than her brother—it is about the cause. Wagner, author of "The Marinating of 'For Whom the Bell Tolls," asserts Hemingway's elevation of Maria to the archetype of a Jeanne de Arc isn't realistic because "we have seen her only as a girl

---

[23] In Mort's *The Hemingway Patrols,* he discusses Martha's lack of objectivity in her reporting, and her crusading nature for the downtrodden in her material (24-26). For more, see Mort's book *The Hemingway Patrols: Ernest Hemingway and His Hunt for U-Boats.*

grieving for a brother" (542). But this assessment is disproven when Maria claims that she could "'give up my brother. It is the flower of our party'" (474). Hemingway's specific choice to include that statement shows that she is more than just a woman grieving for her dead brother. She seems to have a sophisticated understanding of what constitutes a cause worthy of death—and to her, when the cause is failed by the death of its advocates, it logically becomes irrelevant. Through this dialogue, her brother's death becomes emblematic of a larger struggle to which Maria is undoubtedly attempting to make a meaningful contribution.

Hemingway's characterization to a point of this complexity implies a certain maturity compared to some of his earlier work. Hemingway's "iceberg theory," while intriguing, often left some readers confused about characters that were only minimally characterized. In particular, scholars engaged in gender analysis of his texts have criticized them as damaging to women because they claim Hemingway fails to characterize women with any depth of field. An example of an earlier character who is said to lack depth would be Catherine Barkley, of *A Farewell to Arms.*[24] The reader gets a more complete, clear, sense of Maria's character in this short story than Barkley's character in the entire novel. As Henrichon puts it:

> When Hemingway began his writing career he was well versed in the ways of Mother Nature but rather naïve in the ways of women. This led to stories rich in narrative descriptions concerning nature but lacking in development of his female

---

[24] Ernest Lockridge's article "Faithful in Her Fashion: Catherine Barkley, the Invisible Hemingway Heroine" subverts the commonly-held idea that Barkley's character lacks depth through an interesting interpretation of Hemingway's iceberg theory. But the widely stated critical belief is that her character largely lacks depth, or meaningful characterization.

> characters. Over the course of his career, Hemingway's interaction with women strengthens his understanding of them and this can be detected as changes, not just in his female characters, but also in the relationship dynamics between men and women. (7)

It is evident that through his relationship with Martha he is able to conceptualize women in a more complex and thorough way. His other female characters love, and experience loss too, but they also do not love beyond an interpersonal interaction with a man who protects and shields them from the outside world and superfluous things—to their minds—like wars and revolutions. Maria, while she loves and loses, does not need to be taken care of by Enrique. In fact, it seems that often throughout the short story Enrique is holding her back from better supporting the revolution—a cause for which she clearly is willing to sacrifice her own freedom.

But once again, even in this enlightened representation of women, the reader is still reminded of Barlowe-Kayes's idea of idealization and objectification on the part of Enrique. For Enrique, Maria is not a brave woman contributing to the cause, but a beautiful, sexualized woman, characterized by: "the tight-pressed fullness of her lips and the way her body shivered against his" (Hemingway 473). Then, when Maria has emotion about the men who are lost, she becomes complicated for him by expressing feelings outside of their own relationship. She asks about her brother, Vicente, and he responds coldly:

> "And Vicente?" She asked in a flat voice, her two hands folded on his thigh now.
>
> "Dead. At the attack across the road at Celadas."
>
> "Vicente is my brother." She sat stiff and alone now, her hands away from him.

"I know," said Enrique. He went on eating. (Hemingway 473).

Enrique's initial idealization of Maria and her beauty, rendered by the couple's distance from one another, is quickly replaced by objectification as he assesses the problem of escape without taking into account either her feelings, or her own ability to actually contribute to their plan to elude police. If the female perspective in Hemingway's later books is more complex and unique, the male perspective seems to stand out in stark contrast as unwaveringly apathetic, to the point of rendering the woman in the relationship first as an idealized picture, and then as an object to discard when one grows weary of her.

It seems clear that Hemingway represented his tendency to repeat his mistakes through creating characters who employ his same, limited views on women throughout his works. The men of Hemingway can't see beyond idealization, and then objectification. And later in Hemingway's career, his fictional men too cannot fathom the woman's existence outside of their relationship. Enrique cannot imagine that Maria is thinking beyond her happiness at being reunited with him once more. He seems confused by her sadness over her brother's death, and then again by her interest in protecting him or contributing more to the revolutionary cause. Hemingway's relationship with Martha mirrors this perfectly. Both Pauline and Hadley quietly gave up careers, or aspirations to them, to be Hemingway's wife; Martha refused to do so. As Mort says in *The Hemingway Patrols,* Hemingway thought Martha's insistence on writing "insane" (202). Similarly, Enrique seems to be unable to fathom Maria's life and perspective outside of himself, and what the two of them share.

The Garden of Eden's female, Catherine, is an amalgamation of several of the women Hemingway has known in his life, but many of her characteristics bear striking resemblance specifically to Martha. Burwell, in her analysis of the novel, agrees that Hemingway's representation of "Catherine contains more than a soupçon of Martha Gellhorn" (202). Martha and Hemingway's marriage ended after, it seems, Martha realized she could not fulfill Hemingway's expectations of a "proper" wife. Martha later noted dryly that she considered "'marriage the original anti-aphrodisiac'" (Mort 202). Hemingway's other three wives were supportive, doting, and obedient women. Martha, obviously, was not. Her resistance to conforming to the mold of the woman-standing-beside-the-great-writer probably confounded Hemingway at first, especially because of her sheer difference from his other wives he had had by then, and was to have after her. Mort's *The Hemingway Patrols* describes in Martha's words, quite succinctly, what leads to the dissolution of their marriage: "their relationship was straining at the seams, with only a small margin for error on either side: 'He wasn't present except in the flesh. He needed me to run his house and to copulate on (I use the adverb advisedly, not with but on) and to provide exercise in the way of a daily tennis game.'" (169) Martha had greater aspirations than being someone "to copulate on," to borrow her expression. And as the reader comes to find out about Catherine, Martha had her own aspirations as a writer. As Catherine wished, Martha wanted to have her own existence outside of being a support for a successful writer.

David explains Catherine's end to the reader as a flurry of sudden madness. At the end of *The Garden of Eden*, it is clear that from David's readings of events we as the readers are supposed to find Catherine to be insane, or at the least mentally unstable. And

so, ironically Burwell reminds us of Hemingway's remarks about Martha, as Hemingway said her "insistence upon the importance of her own writing he called 'insane'" (202). But the journey to representing Catherine as mad could reflect, once again, Barlowe-Keye's idea of idealization—and then objectification. At first, Catherine is pretty to look at, to sleep with in the comforting setting of beautiful, exotic locations:

> "She slipped out of bed and stood straight with her long brown legs and her beautiful body tanned evenly from the far beach where they swam without suits. She held her shoulders back and her chin up and she shook her head so her heavy tawny hair slapped around her cheeks and then bowed forward so it all fell forward and covered her face" (Hemingway 28).

Descriptions like this dominate the beginning of the novel, as the plot is suspended to take notice of Catherine's beauty. At first, Catherine molds to David's ideal woman, and this seems to parallel Hemingway's conception of an ideal woman. Mort discusses the beginning of Hemingway's relationship with Martha thus: "True, there would be more adventures ahead; a new love affair was beginning, the always exciting and intoxicating time when the woman in the flesh seems almost to merge with the image in your imagination" (225). At first, Catherine is the woman of David's imagination. But when she attempts to foster a more meaningful relationship, David says things like "don't talk," or emphasizes the calming nature of silence. He doesn't want her to have a voice. He merely wants her to be available—and complacent— when she is done with his writing. Toward the beginning of the novel the reader can see Catherine chafing under this role:

'Don't laugh at me, David.'

> 'I wasn't. No. You don't bore me. I'd be happy looking at you if you never said a word.'" (Hemingway 26)

Similarly, at first Martha is a sex symbol, an escape from Pauline. She is idealized in Hemingway's mind as, "an attractive, sexually experienced woman at the peak of her physical perfection, aggressive and ambitious, impressed with Hemingway's work and reputation and willing to tell him so" (Mort 31). But eventually both Catherine and Martha—outspoken, career-oriented women—become too high-spirited, too individualistic, too needy, "too" everything. As soon as Catherine needs more—an identity that fits her own intellectual and sexual growth—David begins to describe this as a sort of madness. Catherine's need to construct her own identity, by the end of the novel, is construed for the reader as insanity. By the end of the story she becomes a sad, crazy, broken object, to be discarded in favor of David's next love—Marita.

As discussed in the previous chapter, David's description of Catherine in the beginning of their marriage hearkens to that of Hadley and Hemingway in Paris in the early years. But it could also relate to the beginning of the affair between Martha and Hemingway. When Catherine and David are having sex, she vacillates between having sex to satisfy his needs, or experimenting to attempt to satisfy her own. Her sexual unavailability is frustrating, clearly, to David, when he tries to reassure himself: "We were happy and I am sure she was happy," (Hemingway 39). Throughout *The Garden of Eden* Catherine's sexuality maintains a certain mystery—the reader is never really sure when Catherine is happy, or satisfied. Mort marks a certain similarity in Martha's sexuality:

> "And there was something else about Martha--a kind of sexual ambivalence... an attitude that must have suggested availability mixed with a paradoxical lack of real interest. Her response to attempts at seduction seemed to be 'well, all right, if it means that much to you but don't expect me to get all that involved.' Many men would consider this a challenge; that suggestion of indifference would only enhance her allure" (Mort 22).

The Garden of Eden, then, can be seen as Hemingway's attempt to understand a sort of female sexual mystery. What satisfies a man may not satisfy a woman. His dawning conscience leads to him questioning: what makes a woman satisfied in bed? And at the end of *The Garden of Eden* it is clear that he still does not have an answer.

The abrupt shift in their power dynamic for Martha and Hemingway as they married and settled into their life in Cuba is effectively mirrored in the immediate conflict of Catherine and David when Catherine wants to gain more power in their relationship after "the honeymoon period." At first Catherine is content to satisfy David, but then she starts to explore sexually to attempt to discover what satisfies her. Similarly, at first Martha is content merely satisfying Hemingway (both sexually and emotionally) but soon she needs more for herself than being Hemingway's wife. By the end of their relationship, Martha was fed up with living in Hemingway's shadow, and would not give interviews about him, according to Heather McRobie, author of "Martha without Ernest." Martha wanted to be remembered for her own writing and worth, which seems similar to Catherine's need to have her own identity by the end of *The Garden of Eden.* The introduction to *The Garden of Eden* claims the novel "presents an intensive study of the mental state of an intelligent woman uncontrollably envious of her husband's success as a

writer and yearning to change her gender" (12). But while the discussion of androgyny has been explored at length in the novel, it seems that there are other potential readings that could be gleaned from the work. For example, Catherine's attempt to make herself a man could also be read as using "manliness" as an entrée into what David has made a "masculine activity." Catherine seems to recognize that becoming a man will give her agency and power. Similarly, Martha tries to gain more power in her relationship with Hemingway, which results in competition and animosity. *The Garden of Eden* is about both Catherine's sexual preference or gender identity, and her awareness of what being a man would offer her: emotionally, professionally and yes, sexually. Critics focus so intently on the androgyny of the female character in *The Garden of Eden*: Burwell, Ira Elliot, and Susan Beegel. Elliot argues that, in the case of *The Garden of Eden,* "certainly the unexpected reemergence of the theme of androgyny in *The Garden of Eden,* striking with such force and urgency, supports Mark Spilka's assertion that questions of gender play a major and often-overlooked role in Hemingway's fiction" (78). Androgyny aside, Catherine is also trying to challenge gender constructs and understand why actions are typically associated with being feminine, or masculine. The focus on Catherine's androgyny limits her characterization to sexual exploration, instead of addressing the possibility that her attempt at androgyny could be a way too for her to overthrow the patriarchy, and gain more control in her relationship. Catherine's sexual ambivalence and attempts to "make it better," can only be likened to Martha's general apathy toward sexual activity. Perhaps both realized this sexual activity didn't have much to offer them personally. Burwell later adds that David "makes his writing an exclusively masculine activity" (203). Catherine tries to involve herself in David's masculine activity, much in

the same way perhaps Hemingway could have seen Martha's attempts to write. I would argue that in addition to the discussion of androgyny, Hemingway uses the character of Catherine to interrogate Martha's attempts to subvert his idea of an "ideal woman." Perhaps, to take it one step further, Catherine's exploration of her sexual preferences could be used as a red herring to distance the characters from Hemingway's own life. After reading this novel, the reader is left with the impression that Catherine is trying to construct an identity that will give her agency, and individuality within her relationship with David.

By the end of his life, Hemingway gained some awareness of issues of individuality, control, and identity in his relationship with Martha by writing *The Garden of Eden.* In the situation of *The Garden of Eden,* David attempts to approach Catherine's needs with, if not enough, than at least a bit more sensitivity than Hemingway himself did in his relationship with Martha: "Hemingway permits the writer's better self to speak as David recognizes that Catherine is also a facet of himself in her need for creative accomplishment and her fascination with the potential of androgyny to effect it" (Burwell 202). But Mort quotes Martha saying, "'He was never kind to me, even there, because I was the woman he wanted which meant the woman he intended absolutely to own, crush, eat alive'" (141). David approaches the situation with conceivably more insight than Hemingway approached this approximation of a need in Martha Gellhorn. While he ultimately fails, he attempts to satisfy Catherine's needs, and figure out what will help her feel more comfortable in their relationship—what will help her feel more important. Whether it was Martha's bitterness, or piercing accuracy, Terry Mort notes in *The Hemingway Patrols* that:

> "After his death when biographies, revisionist and otherwise, had begun, Martha wrote, 'Well what the hell, I am doomed to go down to posterity as some sort of second rate witch in the Master's life, and the Master himself is probably getting what he deserved, for he did fake things—events, people, emotions—himself'" (Mort 101).

Like Catherine, Martha wanted more than sexual satisfaction—both want to find relevance in a successful writer's world. They want to be their own personalities outside of being attached to the writer.

Catherine sometimes attempts to be David's ideal woman—she tries to be content with being the supportive wife to copulate on and eat silent dinners with, but she normally gets dissatisfied with the role. As she puts it poignantly to David:

> "When you start to live outside yourself," Catherine said, "it's all dangerous. Maybe I'd better go back into our world, your and my world that I made up; we made up I mean. I was a great success in that world. It was only four weeks ago. I think maybe I will again." (Hemingway 79)

Much like Catherine, Martha would take brief hiatuses from her role as Hemingway's wife. But Martha's breaks were her stories, as Mort says in *The Hemingway Patrols.* The separation allowed her to miss Hemingway, and perhaps the simplicity of that life, much like Catherine comes to miss David when she changes their relationship to try to find her own identity. The really interesting part of this is that Hemingway must have been astute enough to make these connections, these subtle nods to emotional power or pull in a relationship. Again, a real possibility could be that he put a thin gloss of androgyny over his non-fiction life to conceal his attempt to process his relationship with Martha. She

was the unexpected wife—the one who wanted to do something different, be someone different. And clearly, he did not figure out a way to maintain a kind of balance in their relationship.

EPILOGUE

And so Hemingway eventually turns to Mary—his last wife. Mary is somewhat a model of her predecessors (sans Martha), in her commitment to devoting her life to Hemingway and his needs. The "Mary" of *The Garden of Eden* is clearly Marita—an obedient, simple woman committed to supporting him in any way possible. As Mort states simply: "Mary, like all of Hemingway's wives, except Martha, made him her number one priority, so that if he liked living in Cuba, she was content to live there, too" (9). And similarly, Marita was willing to go where David wanted to go.

When taken together as a collective body of romantic research, Hemingway's fictional research seems to suggest that man's need for power and control often stands in the way of his happiness. Whether the man should eschew his control in favor of a more symbiotic, tranquil marriage, or whether the woman should sacrifice control for typical masculine pride, doesn't seem to be resolved through Hemingway's narratives. Instead, the reader of Hemingway seems to be perpetually left thinking, again, of Hendrickson's naming of Hadley as Hemingway's original sin, and biggest regret. Though Hemingway's first love—Agnes Von Kurskey—betrayed him, much of his mature relational angst really began when he betrayed Hadley.

Hemingway returns over and over again to what led him to betray her, throughout his life, and through his subsequent marriages. Was it her control? Her money? Her pregnancy? Her lack of independence? He tries to find the solution to a problem he cannot identify in each new wife, and ultimately fails. So, do too, his characters seek the solution to their failing marriages, relationships, or affairs. Jake is left shackled to a woman he knows will never commit to him. Frances is left dead after he finally gains his

confidence. Catherine is left without a husband, after trying to ignite her marriage into something more passionate, complete. Why do Hemingway's literary muses come to such terrible romantic ends? Likely because Hemingway cannot fathom a relationship that functions in the way it should. If his characters were to be true—as he struggled, and sweated, and drank them into being—they could not be happy.

Even Hemingway's characters who are not mired in romantic conflict struggle with power, and loss. Santiago, of Hemingway's *The Old Man and The Sea,* is devastated by the fish-who-got-away. He works to catch the fish and protect it while he returns home, but sharks devour the marlin. The old man tries to examine what he could have done better to alleviate the situation, but nothing can be done—his chance is gone. So too, perhaps, Hemingway struggled with the one who got away. Hadley moved on to a happy marriage with a man who respected and loved her. And Hemingway struggled to recreate her through Pauline, and Martha, and Mary, sans whatever attribute he thought had caused their divorce. But perhaps the author came to realize—through his fictional, tumultuous relationships—that fault lay not with the other woman, but with himself.

REFERENCES

Barlowe-Kayes, Jamie. "Reading Against the Grain: The Powers and Limits of Feminist Criticism of American Narratives." *The Journal of Narrative Technique.* 19.1 (1989): 130-140. *JSTOR.* Web. 15 Jan 2015.

---. "Re-Reading Women: The Example of Catherine Barkley." *Hemingway Review.* 12.2 (1993): 24-35. *EBSCOhost.* Web. 7 January 2015.

Brenner, Gerry. "Are We Going to Hemingway's Feast?" *American Literature.* 54.4 (1982): 528-544. *JSTOR.* Web. 15 January 2015.

Broer, Lawrence R. and Holland, Gloria. and Sanderson, Rena. and Sinclair, Gail. and Barlowe, Jamie. and Willingham, Kathy G. *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice.* Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2002. *ProQuest* Web. 10 Mar. 2015.

Burwell, Rose Marie. "Hemingway's Garden of Eden: Resistance of Things Past and Protecting the Masculine Text." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language.* 35.2 (1993): 198-225. *JSTOR.* Web. 13 January 2015.

Diliberto, Gioia. *Paris Without End: The True Story of Hemingway's First Wife.* New York: Harper Perennial, 2011. Kindle file.

Donaldson, Scott. "Hemingway and Suicide." *The Sewanee Review.* 103.2 (1995): 287-295. *JSTOR.* Web. 15 January 2015.

---. "Hemingway's Morality of Compensation." *American Literature.* 43.3 (1971): 399-420. *JSTOR.* Web. 18 February 2015.

---. "The Averted Gaze in Hemingway's Fiction." *The Sewanee Review.* 11.1 (2003): 128-151. *JSTOR.* Web. 15 January 2015.

Dowd, Maureen. "A Farewell to Macho." *New York Times* (2011): n. pag. 15 Oct. 2011. Web. 10 Jan. 2015.

Elliot, Ira. “Performance Art: Jake Barnes and ‘Masculine Signification’ in *The Sun Also Rises*.” *American Literature.* 67.1 (1995): 77-94. *JSTOR.* Web. 9 March 2015.

Fulton, Lorie Watkins. “Reading Around Jake’s Narration: Brett Ashley and *The Sun Also Rises*.” *Hemingway Review.* 24.1 (2004): 61-80. *MLA International Bibliography.* Web. 3 January 2015.

Hawkins, Ruth A. “Pauline Pfeiffer: Hemingway's Behind-the-Scenes Editor.” *Arkansas Review.* 30.2 (1999): 127-131. *MLA International Bibliography.* Web. 9 January 2015.

---. *Unbelievable Happiness and Final Sorrow: The Hemingway-Pfeiffer Marriage.* Arkansas: The University of Arkansas Press, 2012. E-book.

Hemingway, Ernest. *The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway.* New York: Scribner’s, 1987. Kindle file.

---. *A Farewell to Arms.* 1929. New York: Scribner’s, 2012. Print.

---. *A Moveable Feast: The Restored Edition.* 1962. New York: Scribner’s, 2009. Kindle file.

---. *The Sun Also Rises*. 1926. New York: Scribner’s, 1996. Print.

---. *The Garden of Eden*. New York: Scribner’s, 2002. iBook e-book.

Hendrickson, Paul. *Hemingway’s Boat: Everything He Loved in Life, and Lost.* New York: Random, 2012. Print.

Henrichon, Stephen E. "Ernest Hemingway 's Mistresses and Wives: Exploring Their Impact on His Female Characters." Diss. U of South Florida, 2010. *Scholar Commons*. University of South Florida. Web. 20 Feb. 2015.

Herlihy-Mera, Jeffrey. "When Hemingway Hated Paris: Divorce Proceedings, Contemplations of Suicide, and the Deleted Chapters of *The Sun Also Rises*." *Studies in the Novel, University of North Texas.* 44.1 (2012): 49-61. *JSTOR.* Web. 15 January 2015.

Kennedy, J. Gerald. "Hemingway's Gender Trouble." *American Literature.* 63.2 (1991): 187-207. *JSTOR.* Web. 21 January 2015.

Lockridge, Ernest. "Faithful in Her Fashion: Catherine Barkley, the Invisible Hemingway Heroine." *The Journal of Narrative Technique.* 18.2 (1988): 170-178. *JSTOR.* Web. 1 April 2015.

McRobie, Heather. "Martha without Ernest." *The Times Literary Supplement.* N.p., 16 Jan. 2013. Web. 01 Apr. 2015.

Moddelmog, Debra. "Reconstructing Hemingway's Identity: Sexual Politics, the Author, and the Multicultural Classroom." *Narrative.* 1.3 (1993): 187-206. *JSTOR.* Web. 10 March 2015.

Mort, Terry. *The Hemingway Patrols: Ernest Hemingway and His Hunt for U-boats.* New York: Scribner's, 2009. Print.

Nolan, Jr., Charles J. "Hemingway's Women's Movement." *Hemingway Review.* 3.2 (1984): 14-22. *Academic Search Complete.* Web. 10 January 2015.

Onderdonk, Todd. "'Bitched': Feminization, Identity, And The Hemingwayesque In *The Sun Also Rises*." *Twentieth Century Literature* 52.1 (2006): 61-91. Academic Search Complete. Web. 1 Apr. 2015.

Porter, Carolyn. "What We Know That We Don't Know: Remapping American Literary Studies." *American Literary History.* 6.3 (1994): 467-526. *JSTOR.* Web. 22 January 2015.

Reynolds, Michael. *Hemingway: The Paris Years*. New York: Norton, 1999. Print.

---. "The Courtship and Marriage of Pauline Pfeiffer." *Arkansas Review.* 30.2 (1999): 99-113. *MLA International Bibliography.* Web. 9 January 2015.

Schmidt, Amy. "Forty Plus Coats of Paint: Pauline Pfeiffer-Hemingway as an (Almost) Delta Debutante." *Arkansas Review: A Journal of Delta Studies.* 45.2 (2014): 87-100. *Academic Search Complete.* Web. 1 April 2015.

Shearn, Amy. "A Goofy State of Mind: My Grandmother's Letters from Martha Gellhorn." *The Millions*, 21 May 2012. Web. 01 Apr. 2015.

Sokoloff, Alice Hunt. *Hadley: The First Mrs. Hemingway*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1973. Print.

Villarreal, Raúl and René. *Hemingway's Cuban Son.* Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 2009. Print.

Wagner, Linda W. "The Marinating of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." *Journal of Modern Literature.* 2.1 (1972): 533-546. *JSTOR.* Web. 11 January 2015.

Woloch, Alex. *The One vs. the Many: Minor Characters and the Space of the Protagonist in the Novel.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2003. Kindle file.