

Does *The Garden of Eden* overturn Hemingway's canon?

BY JACK NICHOLLS
UNIVERSITY OF EXETER

The question of whether or not *The Garden of Eden* is a novel wherein Hemingway explores new topics and challenging concepts established in his other work is a critically controversial one. Certainly the 1986 text published by Scribner's seems to do so; Hemingway's characteristic realism is pushed to new levels, particularly in detailing the possibilities of both individual sexuality and eroticism. Robert E. Fleming, in an essay entitled "Hemingway's Late Fiction: Breaking New Ground", asserts that the book "adds... new dimensions to the Hemingway canon."¹ The plot of "the published version of *The Garden of Eden*"² (as critic Thomas Strychaz refers to the book, for clarity) centres on the relationship of a newly married couple, David and Catherine Bourne. Catherine begins to experiment sexually with David; in bed, she deems herself a boy and him a girl, "Don't call me girl... I'm Peter. You're my wonderful Catherine.... I'm going to make love to you forever."³ She continues in her experimentation by attempting to make them both appear exactly the same, notably in their hairstyles; they both have their hair bleached and cropped. Her character is the driving force behind this experimentation, as is evidenced in the dialogue where David gets his hair cut:

"Please make it the same as mine," Catherine said.
"But shorter," David said.
"No. Please just the same."
.... "Aren't you going to let him lighten it?"
"No... you really want it that much? ... Go ahead and do it."⁴

Catherine then introduces another woman into their relationship, Marita, beginning a *ménage à trois* that gradually destroys their marriage and ebbs away at Catherine's sanity. Throughout this, David, a writer, is attempting to concentrate on his short fiction. In *A Moveable Feast*, writing about his time spent with two women, (his first wife Hadley Richardson and second Pauline Pfeiffer) Hemingway notes that "to really love two women at the same time, truly love them, is the most destructive and terrible thing that can happen to a man when the unmarried one decides to marry."⁵ Whether it is Marita who decides to marry David is unclear, but *Garden* certainly seems to present an impossible situation in the *ménage à trois*. They cannot exist easefully as a three, and the novel arguably becomes the story of Marita and David struggling to become a couple. Near the close of the novel, with this goal completed, they refer to themselves as being figuratively married, "Are we the Bournes?" asks Marita. "Sure," says David, "we're the Bournes."⁶

This story, the plot of the published *Garden*, may certainly be described as what John Updike in his review, "The Sinister Sex," called "a fresh slant on the old magic," "add[ing] to the canon not merely another volume but a new reading of Hemingway's sensibility."⁷ The editor of the work, Tom Jenks, stated that he saw in the manuscript "Hemingway's desire to take on his own myth without, however, destroying or relinquishing it."⁸ This certainly seems to be what the text, standing alone, presents to the reader; a Hemingway conscious of his own canon, "risk[ing] writing about sexually taboo subjects...because this risk carries the possibility

of breaking into new aesthetic territory and reaching a deeper level of truth."⁹ This corresponds with a statement attributed to Hemingway in Carlos Baker's acclaimed biography, *The Writer as Artist*: "for a true writer each book should be a new beginning where he tries again for something that is beyond attainment. He should always try for something that has never been done or that others have tried or failed."¹⁰ A question seems to be raised, then, of the extent to which *Garden* calls us to revise our understanding of Hemingway's body of work. Exactly how much "new ground" is broken in *Garden*, that necessitates a "new reading of Hemingway's sensibility?" When the novel emerged in 1986, was fresh light shed on the canon, or was it overturned?

The problem critically presented to us, of course, is the extent to which *Garden* may be said to be included in the canon at all. The novel was published 25 years after Hemingway's death, and is edited very heavily by Jenks. The manuscript Jenks worked from is described by various critics as being either "1500"¹¹ to "over two thousand" pages long¹²; regardless, "approximately 130,000 words"¹³ have been cut from the text, as well as the manuscript itself being "patche[d] and rearrange[d]."¹⁴ The quotation of Fleming cited above stating that "new dimensions" are added to the Hemingway canon by *Garden* is, in its original context, qualified by a preceding clause noting that the published book is "incomplete...in relation to the entire manuscript."¹⁵ Three major characters, and their entire storyline, are excised from the novel, as is a roughly drafted "provisional ending". The original—fairly grand in scale—plot apparently "revolved around two sexual triangles composed of three artistic men, the wives of two of these men, and an unattached woman."¹⁶ The 1986 Scribner's *Garden* is, of course, seemingly much more modest in scope than this.

If the published *Garden* were Hemingway's final draft, and not Jenks', then to accept unquestioningly, as Updike does, that the book "add[s] to the canon" as well as challenging and advancing existing, classically Hemingwayan ideas within it, would arguably be the only option available to critics. As it exists, however, the novel is the source of much disagreement, specifically regarding if it fulfils (to use Jenks' term) Hemingway's "vision."¹⁷ Having analysed the original manuscript, Debra A. Modellmog states that "[she] can confirm...that there is a kind of truth behind Jenks' statement that the publisher's note is generally accurate."¹⁸ The publisher's note states, "in every significant respect the work is all the author's." Analysing the same manuscript as Modellmog, however, Robert E. Fleming flatly states, "in handling the ending of the novel, Jenks departed radically from Hemingway's express intentions."¹⁹ Fleming claims that "Jenks altered the novel so that it runs counter to the pattern of tragedy Hemingway had been preparing...Hemingway had very deliberately been constructing a tragic novel."¹⁹ Disregarding whether or not one agrees with Fleming's statement, the stark difference between the two critical opinions demonstrates that not only is there scholarly disagreement over the issue, but confronted with the large, unfinished manuscript contrasting with the novel published in 1986, consensus regarding the fulfilment of authorial intentions (which, when considering a text's place in the canon of the author, must be taken

into account) is arguably unobtainable. The biographer, Michael S. Reynolds, even argues that the manuscript was “nearing its final length” and “had the conclusion in sight,”²⁰ contradictory to the generally shared view that the work was victim to what Updike terms “the Papaesque logorrhoea:” “the fatal dependency upon free-form spillage and some eventual editor,”²⁷ and Fleming’s assertion that there are in fact many endings present in the manuscript.

It is important to assert that there is much of note within the published *Garden*—particularly because, in its extant form, much of the novel seems to demonstrate Hemingway exploring the validity of tropes and ideas that are arguably steadfast and perhaps assumed as certainties in his other works; the active, masculine hero, for example, or the significance of the male being defeated, or even the morality of big game hunting. Upon first consideration *Garden* appears to be an examination of his own canon on Hemingway’s part. The critical conflict regarding the extent that *Garden* may be said to be a Hemingway novel is significant as for the most part, agreement has been reached that it marks a departure for Hemingway—that he evaluates his canon and then goes somewhere new with it. This is significant if it is Hemingway’s doing; not so if it is Jenks, who, in an interview with *New York* magazine, admitted to trying “to take on everything people had pinned on him, his work, and his image,” creating a “new, sensitive Hemingway.”²¹ Modellmog argues, “Jenks’ *Garden* is a reading of Hemingway’s *Garden* based on the popular, commodified Hemingway and his work.”²² This, however, is not necessarily so. A close reading of the published *Garden* seems to suggest more than anything that Hemingway was writing from the same perspective that his other works come from, but that he was presenting it in a new and interesting way: “a fresh slant on the old magic.”²⁷

Also problematic in Modellmog’s argument here is that the sensibilities of the ‘popular’ Hemingway persona are arguably entirely at odds with those of *Garden*. *The Inward Terrain* is a book-length Freudian biography of Hemingway, published in 1968. In the preface, its author offers a critical description of what the Hemingway persona signified in the late sixties (the purpose being to then try to “debunk... [this] publicized image”²³ where Hemingway has not, in the ensuing psychoanalysis of the book): “the bronzed god of the moderns, the big, strong, romping fighter, soldier, sportsman, lover, drinker”²⁴—it goes on. He also notes that the persona itself is seemingly of Hemingway’s creation, “[he] himself invited us to believe it... the relentless publicity, and those countless news photos he permitted ... suggests a straining to keep [the image] alive.”²³ A 1996 essay by Rena Sanderson, “Hemingway and Gender History,” contextualises this view of the author’s persona: “public displays’ of Hemingway’s led to ‘Papa Hemingway’ [being] synonymous with a stereotypical notion of masculinity.”²⁵ Since the rise of feminist criticism and Hemingway’s canon being attacked, and then, subsequently re-evaluated, “sensitivity to gender issues” and possible “unresolved androgynous inclinations”²⁶ have been found in Hemingway’s work. The ‘popular’ Hemingway persona Modellmog argues for is irreconcilable with the androgyne themes in *Garden*. In fact, Sanderson argues that criticism has somewhat destroyed the “bronzed god” Hovey decries and replaced it with a “new Hemingway.” (However disparate the “new Hemingway” may be from the writer’s “fame as a man [that]...hangs over...his work”²⁵ still in the public eye.)

A line from the story-within-a-story that David writes in *Garden*, “fuck elephant hunting,”²⁷ arguably epitomises this “fresh slant on the old magic.”²⁷ Updike saw fit to comment in his review that “an uncharacteristic ambivalence is... expressed about hunting.”²⁸ It certainly seems that “ambivalence” is expressed toward

hunting in *Garden*, yet, arguably, this is not the case, as a consideration of the philosophies expressed regarding hunting in this text alongside others in Hemingway’s body of work prove.

The story details his experiences as a young boy on an elephant hunt with his father; his father’s African hunting guide, Juma; and his dog, Kibo. Throughout the work, David becomes disillusioned with his father and finds an affinity with the elephant, feeling incredibly guilty that he has aided his father and Juma in killing the elephant. “David thought... [that] Juma would not have found him if I had not seen him... why didn’t you help the elephant while you could?”²⁷ At this point David flatly says, “fuck elephant hunting” to his father; his father replies with “Be careful you don’t fuck it up,” and David reflects that “he will never trust [him] again.”²⁹

The fact that the African episodes are part of a text within a text is especially significant because it marked considerable progression in the use of metafictional devices in Hemingway’s work, giving further example of *Garden* being a text wherein Hemingway advances his canon.³⁰ Stories regarding Nick Adams’ later life show him to be a writer, and the protagonist of “The Snows of Kilimanjaro” is one, too. *Green Hills of Africa*, though a nonfiction work, discusses fiction theory at length; no work prior to *Garden*, however, makes use of metafictional conceits to so great an extent.

The particular significance comes from this narrative device placing further distance between the reader and the story; they perceive not only the events of the hunting expedition, but also the writer creating them, and are therefore being reminded that they are reading a text that is being written and constructed. The reader is therefore placed in a position where they are forced to be more critically aware. It is here that Hemingway makes a very bold and at first perplexing (as Updike found it) statement of theme, “fuck elephant hunting.”²⁷ Hunting may be argued to a defining trope of Hemingway’s: it is widely known that he enjoyed big game hunting himself, and it is treated with respect, perhaps reverence, in *Green Hills of Africa*, and short stories, “The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber” and “The Snows of Kilimanjaro.” The young son’s loss of respect for his father is also seemingly at odds with the sentiments of the Nick Adams stories Hemingway was acclaimed for, such as “Indian Camp,” “Ten Indians,” or “Fathers and Sons.” In the latter, Nick realizes his father’s infallibility, but his respect for the man is still unquestionable. Within its meta-textual context, the act itself of writing “fuck elephant hunting” seems to be a bold move on Hemingway’s part. The reader is not only aware of David Bourne writing the statement, but is sufficiently distanced from the main narrative so that they are aware of Hemingway writing it too; and for Hemingway to write “fuck... hunting” appears on its surface to the reader as Hemingway seemingly refuting what he once celebrated. One could also argue that in writing this bold statement and then attributing it to one of his fictional characters, that Hemingway was able to simultaneously write things that were interesting and expectation-defying, and also be able to distance himself from it personally; his image therefore easily separated from his works.

A statement from Patrick Hemingway in a 1986 *New York* magazine interview (chiefly conducted with Jenks, regarding *Garden*’s publication) elucidates what Hemingway may in actuality be achieving in the passage. “It may come as a surprise, but Hemingway never shot an elephant... he thought it wrong—he felt that elephants are our equals.”²¹ The “ambivalence” expressed toward hunting in the novel, then, is in no way “uncharacteristic”—it in fact corresponds exactly with Hemingway’s own beliefs. However, it crucially *appears to be* uncharacteristic. The “fuck elephant hunting” passage arguably serves as a metaphor for what

Hemingway promulgates throughout the whole of *Garden*: ideas and themes that are present in much of his other works, that on their surface seem to be new and distinct from what critics identify as being typically Hemingwayan, when analysed, correspond with Hemingway's actual beliefs. Updike is fundamentally incorrect, then, when he says that "ambivalence towards hunting" is present in *Garden*; ambivalence toward elephant hunting is, something Hemingway considered entirely different. The philosophy being expressed here is arguably one present since Hemingway's early fiction: that of only taking life responsibly and intelligently, and doing things correctly (one may consider Nick Adams wetting his hands before handling the fish he lets go in "Big Two-Hearted River," for example.) While Jenks' statement, quoted above, that he saw in the *Garden* manuscript Hemingway's "desire to take on his own myth without... destroying... it," may seem to be relatively dubious coming from one who admits "not approach[ing *Garden*...] as a scholar,"¹⁷ who "hadn't read a Hemingway novel in years [and]... didn't review the Hemingway canon before he started."³¹ One is tempted to read Jenks' statement as him hedging his bets in case he had created a novel unrecognisable as Hemingway's. It seems that there is in fact truth in the fact that Hemingway was indeed challenging his own tropes and scrutinising his own philosophies in *Garden*, playing with the expectations of the reader.

Also, perhaps of note when regarding the published *Garden*'s status as a progressive Hemingway text, is the role the word "fuck" plays—in both the statement "fuck elephant hunting," and in its use throughout the novel. The swearwords that Hemingway included in his drafts were edited out of his final, published works, as words such as "fuck" were unpublishable at the time. Memorably, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, is filled with such faintly absurd lines as "go and obscenity thyself."³² Due to the more relaxed publishing environment afforded by 1986, *Garden* is able to fulfill Hemingway's original drafts to a fuller extent, allowing a level of realism his works had not been able to achieve up until that point. While it cannot be argued that this new device has been added to the canon because of a stylistic choice of Hemingway's, its presence in the published novel perhaps demonstrates effort on the part of Jenks to advance Hemingway's body of work in a direction the author wished. The authorial intention of "trying again"¹⁰ is also fulfilled.

Notably, the novel utilizes a preconception of Hemingway's canon that he protested in his lifetime, but persists even in modern perceptions—that of equating Hemingway's heroes as being a thinly veiled version of Hemingway himself.

There is strong evidence for the persistence of this myth with particular relation to *Garden* in the aforementioned *New York* article; it suggests that "like all Hemingway heroes, David Bourne resembles his creator."³³ *Garden*'s 2008 film adaptation, *Hemingway's Garden of Eden*, goes to great effort to make the David character clearly resemble Hemingway—the hair and moustache are particularly alike. Also in the film, David writes standing, which sources claim Hemingway did, but which the published *Garden* makes no mention of.³⁴ A book of criticism published in 1969, Delbert E. Wylder's *Hemingway's Heroes*, shows that the criticism of his works that was being published while Hemingway was still alive followed very closely the "attitude expressed by Granville Hicks in 1935—that from Hemingway's [work]... there emerges... the Hemingway hero, whose story is... the story of Hemingway's life."³⁵ "Linking Hemingway with his fictional heroes has been part of Hemingway criticism for many years,"³⁶ writes Wylder (he provides many examples apart from Hicks in his introduction), despite Hemingway's "objection to biographical criticism." Biog-

raphies by Carlos Baker and, more recently, Michael S. Reynolds, have well established the legitimacy of the distinction between Hemingway's life and his fiction.³⁷ *Hemingway's Heroes* exists as an early critical reaction in this vein, and therefore provides a useful tool in seeing what was perceived as needing to be overthrown in early Hemingway criticism—"unfortunate"³⁶ perceptions of his canon from near the time of its creation. What Wylder saw fit to challenge gives us an insight into what Hemingway may be challenging in *Garden*. One of the things Wylder reiterates having tried to achieve in the book is "[trying] to demonstrate... that the protagonists are distinctly different characters,"³⁸ an original critical standpoint at the time (but one that firmly embedded in the critical consciousness, a reaction against the equally persistent public perception of the Hemingway hero). In *Papa Hemingway*, Hotchner recounts Hemingway's reaction to his protagonists being not commonly perceived as being "distinctly different." The author supposedly rhetorically asked himself, "Mr. Hemingway, do you give credence to the theory of a recurring hero in all of your works? Answer: Does Yogi Berra have a grooved swing?"³⁹

The idea that the protagonist of a Hemingway novel must be both a Hemingway stand-in and the same as in all of his other works is *deliberately overturned* in *Garden*, in the character of David Bourne. There is no ambiguity regarding whether or not David is one of a long line of recurring heroes—he is noticeably different, something new entirely in outlook. Updike notes in his review that usually he finds Hemingway to be "hobbled by his need to have a hero in the obsolete sense, a central male figure who always acts right and looks good.... David Bourne, as initially presented, is an oddity, an inwardly vulnerable Hemingway hero."⁷ Updike's assertion that Hemingway's heroes always act right and look good is inaccurate, as a consideration of the latter's earlier fiction may prove: stories such as "Cat in the Rain," "Hills Like White Elephants," or in particular, "Soldier's Home" are notably lacking in the "obsolete" heroics of a Robert Jordan or Frederick Henry. In terms of being inwardly vulnerable, David Bourne is not an oddity; this is one aspect in which he shares some commonality with other Hemingway heroes. Jake Barnes' injuries are both physical and psychological, to give an example; it is also arguable that Robert Jordan's falling in love with Maria serves to make him vulnerable, possibly hindering him in performing his work correctly. In contrast with the protagonists of many of Hemingway's previous long-form works, however, David has not literally performed acts of heroism in war, which serves as the most obvious break from tradition in terms of protagonist choice. *Garden* uses this difference to explore another recurring element in Hemingwayan protagonists and further expand upon a theme already present in the canon: that of being undefeated.

Hotchner relates that at the heart of *The Old Man and the Sea*, Hemingway thought there to be "the oldest *double dicho*"⁴⁰ he knew. A *double dicho* is explained as a "saying that makes a statement forward or backward," however, it is clarified in the text that he only accepted one half of the statement, and not its inversion. Hemingway's *dicho* is, "man can be destroyed but not defeated." *The Old Man and the Sea* does in fact seem to be a fable of man struggling against defeat, and tragically meeting it at the end, "it is easy when you are beaten, he thought... 'They beat me, Manolin,' he said. 'They truly beat me.'"⁴¹ Whether Santiago is in fact defeated or just destroyed as a man, is debatable. He perfectly followed the "codes," as Wylder terms them, of masculinity—his particular codes arguably being managing his skiff and fighting the marlin intelligently, but the equation of a tragic end being met when the tropes of manhood the character perceives as making up their

own identities as men is destroyed, is seemingly part of the philosophy of Hemingway's novels. This theme is present in *A Farewell to Arms* when Frederick Henry's masculinity is useless against the "dirty trick"⁴² of death, leaving him hopeless in the rain, and in *For Whom The Bell Tolls*, in which Robert Jordan meets death, but follows his instinct throughout the novel and fulfills what he set out to do (thereby making him undefeated). Perhaps the reason that Updike saw *Garden* as not being "hobbled" by an "obsolete" heroic protagonist is that David Bourne seems to be the continuation of this part of Hemingway's ideology—a natural, logical advance, in accordance with previous novels. David is both destroyed (sexually as a man, as Catherine demands he become a girl) and defeated at the end of the book's first chapter. The tropes that make up his masculinity are defeated, and so he destructs—to Catherine, he no longer exists as a man. This is not a subversion of a theme Hemingway thought valid to explore in his other canonical works; rather, it seems an extension of it.

"Don't call me girl,"⁴³ says David near the end of the first chapter, when Catherine first imposes her will on him. However, by the end of the chapter he has capitulated in forsaking his masculinity—at least as it has previously been understood in Hemingway's novels. Throughout the novel there are moments where David seems utterly dominated by Catherine, and not only in a sexual sense. "The hell with you too,"⁴³ David says in an argument with Catherine about Marita in the novel's 17th chapter—a classically stoic, masculine Hemingwayan outburst when considered as an individual statement. Catherine's reaction, however, throws the efficacy and validity of not only the outburst in itself, but also the mindset that could produce such an outburst into question: "That's good. Now you're reacting better. I like you when you are more careless. Kiss me goodbye."⁴³ Catherine appears to critically analyse his statement and then dismiss it. After three sentences, the mood shifts from declarative to imperative. Shortly afterwards in the conversation, she makes David admit that he likes her, and then cuts him with a line far more penetrating than "the hell with you too": "you aren't very hard to corrupt and you're an awful lot of fun to corrupt." In Fleming's "The Endings of Hemingway's *The Garden of Eden*," he compares "Jake Barnes's bitterly ironic reply... Frederic Henry's solitary walk... Robert Jordan's preparations for death"⁴⁴ and so on, to the "optimism" of *Garden's* ending. Fleming does not take into account that what is recognisable as a particularly Hemingwayan tragic ending, especially to the perceptions of his canon at the time Hemingway was writing *Garden*, is present at the end of the first chapter: "At the end they were both dead and empty... 'Let's lie very still and quiet and hold each other and not think at all,' he said and his heart said goodbye Catherine goodbye my lovely girl goodbye and good luck and goodbye."⁴³ The similarity to Henry saying goodbye to Catherine Barkley as if she were a "statue,"⁴⁵ with Catherine being tragically unaware of the goodbye, does not seem insignificant. *Garden* addresses Hemingway's canonical themes, but pushes further ahead, trying for "something that is beyond attainment." A man is destroyed and defeated, but what happens to him then? This seems to be, to quote the tricky publisher's note, "in every significant respect... the author's."⁴⁶ That Hemingway makes David a writer, and uses this to explore the process of writing throughout the novel, seems to be a further level of the challenge Hemingway proffers to those reading the text with the protagonist as a consistent author-insert. In an almost hyperbolic fashion, Hemingway provides what may be lazily identified as the closest character to himself (in terms of profession) that he had yet written, while juxtaposing this with the novel that

its editor describes in an interview (and Sanderson describes separately in an essay⁴⁷) as displaying "a new... Hemingway."²¹ Updike's description might be the most accurate, "a fresh slant on the old magic,"⁴⁷ or the use of new methods to make alien what readers may mistakenly identify as classically Hemingwayan statements; a coarse dismissal of elephant hunting being one of them.

Debra A. Modellmog interestingly notes that since *Garden's* publication in 1986, an "extensive reevaluation, perhaps the most extensive ever undertaken in the world of literary scholarship"⁴⁸ has been undertaken regarding the construction of Hemingway's identity—*Garden* being generally seen as a "departure...in his writing...from traditional codes of masculinity and heterosexuality." However, the very fact that this is a "reevaluation" (her essay is titled "Reconstructing Hemingway") denotes that *Garden* is not an overturning of the Hemingway canon, but rather, the expression of themes already present in other works. She cites Susan F. Beegel's "Introduction" to *Hemingway's Neglected Short Fiction: New Perspectives*, reiterating Beegel's point that "the weight of a novel"⁴⁹ was necessary in order for attention to be drawn to otherwise neglected themes in Hemingway. The "themes of... perversion, and androgyny [are] present throughout Hemingway's career in short stories like 'Mr. and Mrs. Elliot'...[and] 'The Sea Change'...widely available for at least 50 years."⁵⁰ The *ménage à trois* was not new ground for Hemingway, neither was lesbianism.

In Modellmog's book, *Reading Desire: In Pursuit of Ernest Hemingway*, Modellmog argues that Jenks "organized his version of Hemingway's story in accord with the popular image of Hemingway, thus creating a book that the public could imagine Hemingway would write."⁵¹ There is evidence to the contrary, however. It seems that Jenks is in actuality the editor of a novel that makes Hemingway seem entirely different to his "popular image," regardless of all evidence discrediting this image that had existed for 50 years. In Jenks' *New York* interview, where he is not attempting to defend the scholarly validity of the work, as he is in other published interviews and is simply trying to sell the book to the public, Jenks makes bold claims regarding *Garden*. In editing it, he tried "to take on everything people had pinned on him, his work, and his image."²¹ It is explicitly stated that "he hadn't read a Hemingway novel in years. He didn't review the Hemingway canon before he started... 'I thought it'd gum me up,' said Jenks."⁵³ Jenks describes the fluid sexuality of the novel as being distinctly "modern," "not Michael Jackson, but almost."³³ The journalist who authors the piece gives some hint as to why this may be the case—Scribner's were apparently becoming increasingly reliant on their back catalogue of Hemingway classics, their new fiction being less popular. A "modern," "new, sensitive"²¹ Hemingway novel was, as the article emphasises, "highly saleable.... a good read and an even better business proposition."⁵²

The published *Garden*, it seems, arguably had much to gain from overturning the Hemingway canon. And yet, this is not what is presented in the novel at all. Even when edited to accentuate features that one would not readily identify with a Hemingway text in accordance with common understanding, (the experimental androgyny, for example) the ideology behind the writing and themes explored firmly cement the work in the canon. What is in fact overturned in *Garden* is Hemingway's other great work: the "Papa Hemingway" persona, product of "performance and... public displays."²⁵ The published *Garden* arguably marks the first time that the "new Hemingway"⁴⁹ that many critics have accepted since his "extensive reevaluation,"⁵⁰ has been exposed to the public, and the old "bronzed god" of chauvinism and masculinity that makes

up Hemingway's public image has been fully challenged in a non-academic setting. The newness of this allows the reader to perceive deep, essential themes in an entirely new way. Updike's "old magic"²⁷ is reconsidered. While what is original in the piece gives it the ability to surprise, the inclusion of Hemingway's recurrent ideologies and themes then remind the reader of *Garden's* place in Hemingway's body of works as a whole. The sentence may shock on the first read—but Hemingway never shot an elephant.

References

- ¹Fleming, R.E. (1996) "Hemingway's Late Fiction: Breaking New Ground." *The Cambridge Companion to Ernest Hemingway*. Donaldson, S., ed. University of Cambridge Press. Pg 128-148
- ²Strychacz, T. (2003) *Hemingway's Theatres of Masculinity*. Louisiana State University Press.
- ³Hemingway, E. (1986) *The Garden of Eden*. Scribner's. Pg 17.
- ⁴*Ibid.* Pg 81-82.
- ⁵Hemingway, E. (1992) *A Moveable Feast*. Paris: Scribner's. Pg 216.
- ⁶Hemingway, E. (1986) Pg 243.
- ⁷Updike, J. (June 1986) "The Sinister Sex." *The New Yorker*. Pg 86.
- ⁸Qtd. in Modellmog, D.A. (1999) *Reading Desire: In Pursuit of Ernest Hemingway*. Cornell. Pg 62.
- ⁹*Ibid.* Pg 3.
- ¹⁰Qtd. in Fleming, R.E. (1996) Pg 128.
- ¹¹Magaw, M.O. (1998) "The Fusion of History and Immediacy: Hemingway's Artist-Hero in *The Garden of Eden*." *Hemingway: Seven Decades of Criticism*. Wagner-Martin, L., ed. Michigan State University Press. Pg 267-283.
- ¹²Reynolds, M.S. (1996) "Hemingway and Gender History." *The Cambridge Companion to Ernest Hemingway*. Donaldson, S., ed. University of Cambridge Press. Pg 219.
- ¹³Modellmog, D.A. (1999) Pg 59.
- ¹⁴Brucoli, M.J. (1986) "Packaging Papa: *The Garden of Eden*." *Dictionary of Literary Biography: Yearbook*. Brook, J.M., ed. Gale. Pg 82.
- ¹⁵Fleming, R.E. (1996) Pg 141.
- ¹⁶*Ibid.* Pg 140.
- ¹⁷Jenks, T. (1986) "An Interview with Tom Jenks." *Dictionary of Literary Biography: Yearbook*. Brook, J.M., ed. Pg 83.
- ¹⁸Fleming, R.E. (1998) "The Endings of Hemingway's *The Garden of Eden*." *Hemingway: Seven Decades of Criticism*. Wagner-Martin, L., ed. Michigan State University Press. Pg 283.
- ¹⁹*Ibid.* Pg 290.
- ²⁰Reynolds, M.S. Pg 319.
- ²¹Pooley, E. (April, 1986) "Papa's New Baby: How Scribner's Crafted a Hemingway Novel." *New York*. Pg 50.
- ²²Modellmog, D.A. (1999) Pg 59.
- ²³Hovey, R.B. (1968) *Hemingway: The Inward Terrain*. University of Washington Press. Pg xii.
- ²⁴*Ibid.* Pg xi.
- ²⁵Sanderson, R. (1996) "Hemingway and Gender History." *The Cambridge Companion to Ernest Hemingway*. Donaldson, S., ed. University of Cambridge Press. Pg 170.
- ²⁶*Ibid.* Pg 171.
- ²⁷Hemingway, E. (1986) Pg 181.
- ²⁸Updike, J. Pg 88.
- ²⁹Hemingway, E. (1986) Pg 182.
- ³⁰Fleming, R.E. (1996) Pg 145.
- ³¹Pooley, E. Pg 56.
- ³²Hemingway, E. (1968) *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Arrow. Pg 224.
- ³³Pooley, E. Pg 53-55.
- ³⁴Hotchner, A.E. (1966) *Papa Hemingway*. Random House. Pg 146.
- ³⁵Wylder, D.E. (1969) *Hemingway's Heroes*. University Of New Mexico Press. Pg 5.
- ³⁶*Ibid.* Pg 4.
- ³⁷Baker, C. (1956) *Ernest Hemingway: The Writer as Artist*. Princeton Press.
- ³⁸Wylder, D.E. Pg 223-224.
- ³⁹Hotchner, A.E. Pg 180.
- ⁴⁰*Ibid.* Pg 73.
- ⁴¹Hemingway, E. (1980) *The Old Man and the Sea*. Scribner's. Pg 120-124.
- ⁴²Hemingway, E. (1950) *A Farewell to Arms*. New York: Scribner's. Pg 331.
- ⁴³Hemingway, E. (1986) Pg 150.
- ⁴⁴Fleming, R.E. (1998) Pg 284.
- ⁴⁵Hemingway, E. (1986) Pg 332.
- ⁴⁶*Ibid.* Pg 1.
- ⁴⁷Sanderson, R. Pg 171.
- ⁴⁸Modellmog, D.A. (1998) "Reconstructing Hemingway's Identity: Sexual Politics, The Author, and the Multicultural Classroom." *Hemingway: Seven Decades of Criticism*. Wagner-Martin, L. Michigan State University Press. Pg 239.
- ⁴⁹Qtd. in Modellmog, D.A. (1998) Pg 240.
- ⁵⁰Beegel, S.F. (1986) "Introduction." *Hemingway's Neglected Short Fiction: New Perspectives*. Beegel, S.F., ed. UMI Research Press. Pg 11.
- ⁵¹Modellmog, D.A. (1999) Pg 61.
- ⁵²Pooley, E. Pg 52.