Economic Power and the Female Expatriate Consumer Artist in *The Garden of Eden*

Catherine R. Mintler

The Hemingway myth has remained engrained in the cultural narrative of the American male writer, despite nearly three decades of critical insights that have revealed this iconic, hyperbolic masculine image to be a façade constructed by Hemingway and encouraged by generations of readers and critics. Readers familiar with outdated readings of Hemingway's work might be surprised to find *The Garden of Eden* on a Gender and Women's Studies syllabus. Recent Hemingway criticism, influenced by previously unpublished letters and the unpublished manuscript of *Garden,* has uncovered beneath the myth a male writer who constructed complex women characters, who was interested in gender fluidity, and whose public identity obscured unconventional views about gender and sexuality. How we teach Hemingway must catch up with these critical insights.

Courses that once included Hemingway as the misogynistic male writer his female contemporaries were writing *against*, might instead read him as an unanticipated ally, since he tackles issues addressed by women writers commonly read in Gender and Women's Studies classes. *The Garden of Eden,* which I teach in advanced Women's Studies seminars, echoes concerns shared by women writers who challenged gender essentialism and documented the struggles of women artists. *Garden's* female protagonist, Catherine Bourne, represents the precarious position of women who resisted object status in masculine exchange economies like marriage; its plot interrogates her treatment as an expatriate woman artist. The narrative giving her husband's perspective shows how misogyny, fear of the feminine, and repression of women's desire and artistic production—recurrent subjects in women's literature—oppress women. The novel also provides examples of terminology and theories commonly introduced in

Gender and Women's Studies, such as gender role reversal, sartorial fetishism, and non-binary gender identity. As a male writer addressing these concerns, Hemingway offers an insider's critical insight into why and how male-dominated institutions, represented by male authority figures like husbands, oppressed women as sexual objects and thwarted their artistic ambitions. The feminist reading that follows, which performs the close reading, contextual framing, and analysis we invite students to practice in class discussions and essays, argues that, in *The Garden of Eden,* Hemingway further examines the conflict between masculine and feminine exchange economies first hinted at in *The Sun Also Rises*, exposing the insincerity and hypocrisy of men and male-dominated social institutions that purported to offer women financial empowerment and creative opportunities, only to turn against and oppress them as women and as artists. That complex women like Catherine fail or die is not evidence of Hemingway's misogyny—a reading common in second wave feminism—but of misogyny endemic in western culture and society.

The greatest innovation of Hemingway's late work was his creation of a complex woman protagonist: the economically empowered expatriate consumer artist Catherine Bourne in *The Garden of Eden* (1986). Upon its publication, both critics and novelists regarded Catherine as a "…major achievement," noting that "There ha[d] not before been a female character who so dominates a Hemingway narrative. Catherine in fact may be the most impressive of any woman character in Hemingway's work."[i] Recent scholarship about Hemingway's fetishism and interest in androgyny contend that the hyper-masculinity responsible for the Hemingway myth masked a more complex view of gender, and that his later work, *Garden* in particular, worked out his gender anxieties.[ii] Reading Catherine as an economically empowered expatriate woman artist supports arguments that Hemingway admired strong women, and concurs with scholarship identifying feminist modes of thinking indebted to feminine influence in his life and work.[iii]

Hemingway's experience as a male writer privileged by the male-dominated literary marketplace, and his knowledge of how economics differently affected men and women, help cast Catherine as a sympathetic woman artist who uses economic empowerment, sartorial and tonsorial fetishism, and experiments in gender role reversal to produce art. Her artwork is a form of what feminist criticism calls writing on the body: she refashions commoditized femininity and the commodified body, and then stages gender experiments in public and private. Her subversive performance art unhinges the connection between sexual dimorphism and the gender binary, and further disrupts gender and sexuality in the role reversals she orchestrates during lovemaking, where she performs as a boy and David becomes her girl. Her artistic authority extends to the honeymoon story, which she narrates and David transcribes. Catherine is the heroine of a female *kunstlerroman* buried in the published novel beneath the male *kuntstlerroman*.[iv] Perhaps as a result of its heavy editing, the published novel undermines the female *kunstleroman*, showing how "the male *kunstlerroman* does not tell the woman artist's story," and instead silences it.[v] Catherine's endeavors to become an artist are thwarted by the male-dominated literary marketplace—the fictional literary marketplace that encourages and rewards David's writing and the real one responsible for *Garden's* posthumous publication. Making Catherine an artist who struggles to create suggests that Hemingway recognized the importance of feminine artistic production and criticized economic exchange systems that undermined women's art.

The concerns of *Garden's* female *kunstlerroman* narrative echo twentieth-century feminist writing about the plight of women writers. Without economic means to finance artistic production, Catherine couldn't benefit from the financial independence that Hemingway's contemporary, Virginia Woolf, claimed women needed to produce art. In giving Catherine an inheritance, Hemingway seems to agree with Woolf's claim in *A Room of One's Own* (1929) that,

"a woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write."[vi] As was Woolf's experience, Catherine's inheritance frees her to produce art; Catherine's economic autonomy ensures that neither she nor David need earn their living from regular paid work. Unlike Woolf and her protagonist in *Room*, Catherine never has a room of her own.[vii] As if to compensate, Hemingway transforms private and public settings—bedrooms, museums, bars, barber shops—into temporary studio space for the production, exhibition and performance of Catherine's art. A Rodin sculpture in a museum provides her with the artistic inspiration that ignites her desire to transgress gender roles.[viii] She then purchases fashionable commodities and services that assist her gender transgressive writing on the body and performance art. Hemingway only differs from Woolf in adding feminine consumer identity and fashionable consumption to the financial independence required for female artistic production.

Similar to the woman writers Woolf examines in *Room*, Catherine discovers her art isn't valued in a literary marketplace governed by exchange economies where men control women's circulation. Hemingway complicates Woolf's economically empowered woman artist by having Catherine's marriage to a male writer echo the competition between early twentieth-century men and women writers. The silenced female *kunstleroman* in *Garden* anticipates the critique of misogyny, sexism, and fear of the feminine Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar explore in *No Man's Land: The Place of the Woman Writer in the Twentieth Century.* In *Volume II: Sexchanges,* they argue that for Hemingway—as for other early twentieth-century male writers—gender subversions like transvestism were "evoked to maintain or reassert a fixed social order."[ix] However, *Garden's* female *kunstleroman* narrative opposes the published novel's silencing of the female artist, revealing Hemingway's critique of a fixed social order that undermines women's art. In Catherine, Hemingway unwittingly creates a twentieth-century heir for Gilbert

and Gubar's madwoman writer. In *Garden*, Hemingway takes the metaphorical madwoman artist out of her domestic attic prison, relocates her in circumstances where she temporarily influences male writing and produces art, and shows the consequences she pays for being a woman artist in a world that supports male artistic production. Much like their nineteenth-century madwoman writer, repressed artistic production drives Catherine mad.[x] This narrative strategy demonstrates how women denied access to benefits conferred upon male writers pay for attempting to create art outside of exchange systems that privilege men. Like Woolf, Hemingway champions an economically empowered, androgynous woman artist who, despite the advantage of not being male, produces art; like Gilbert and Gubar, he impugns the treatment women artists received in a male-dominated literary marketplace that thwarted their artistic endeavors.

Both the unpublished manuscript of *Garden* and the novel posthumously published in 1986 contain evidence of Hemingway's interest in feminine influence upon male artistic production, and its importance in disrupting master narratives that govern artistic production and modern gender identity. The specific issues he explores that pertain to Gender and Women's Studies—gender role reversal, feminine influence upon masculine writing, and female artistic production—occur within masculine economies of exchange that suppress female empowerment and thwart subversive gender performance. Even though the published novel excluded material from the manuscript that support a reading of the plight of the economically empowered female consumer artist, the radically truncated, published version still echoes Hemingway's critique of the institutionalized sexism and misogyny that undermines female artistic production.

Hemingway's first examination of the plight of strong, economically empowered women in masculine economies of exchange occurred in *The Sun Also Rises* (1926), which foreshadows issues involving gender and sexuality he explicates in *The Garden of Eden*. Though Catherine

has been read as a composite of wealthy expatriate women Hemingway knew with varying degrees of intimacy— Lady Duff Twysden, Zelda Fitzgerald, and his wives Pauline Pfeiffer and Martha Gellhorn—she is more the heir of fictional expatriates in *Sun*.[xi] She is not Hemingway's first character to be strongly connected with money and consumerism. One precursor is the financially preoccupied expatriate writer, Jake Barnes. Jacob Michael Leland suggests that using money to construct a façade of masculinity enables consumerism to replace sexual potency: for Jake Barnes in *Sun*, money and the commodities it buys replaces sex, while consumer identity replaces sexual identity. Consuming becomes part of an "expatriate performance" in which Barnes "receives what he sets out to purchase—the appearance, if the not performance, of masculine sexual agency."[xii] Unlike Jake, Catherine doesn't need to work to earn money, she doesn't need to keep track of expenses, and she doesn't need to consume to compensate for sexual lack. Catherine consumes and dresses in menswear and gets men's haircuts to blur and transgress gender norms that govern masculine and feminine appearance—the very same gender norms that enable Jake to *appear* as a sexually functional, virile, and masculine man. Catherine doesn't create a façade of gender or sexual normalness, but challenges sex and gender norms that prevent women from controlling their sexuality and creating art. Her economic independence and transgressive gender performances also connect her to Brett Ashley. Unlike Brett, Catherine uses economic power to produce art. Both are economically empowered female expatriates who blur gender boundaries in ways that challenge norms governing feminine appearance, female sexual desire and expression, and traditional women's roles. They also both pay for these sexual and sartorial transgressions. Brett's financial independence, androgynous dress, rebellious sexual behavior, and promiscuity, when combined with Jake's use of spending to construct a façade of

sexual virility, provide the genesis of Hemingway's inspiration for constructing Catherine Bourne as an economically empowered expatriate female artist in *Garden.*

When interpreted through a feminist lens and connected to its literary precursors, *The Garden of Eden* recounts the tragic fate of the economically empowered woman artist. In the novel's female *kunstleroman* narrative, Catherine's consumption, sartorial transvestism, and gender role reversal experiments merge to challenge masculine economies of exchange in marriage and the literary marketplace. Where they merge—and perhaps why they do—is rooted in the differing systems of exchange within which and outside of which Catherine tries to work. I agree with feminist readings of *Garden* that interpret Catherine's art as a form of *l'ecriture feminine* that rejects "male economies involve exchange, repayment, return, and debt," while espousing instead female economies that include "unrestricted, unlimited expenditure, expecting nothing in return.[xiii] In *Garden*, Hemingway exemplifies the feminine gift economy of exchange in which women's art flourishes. Catherine constructs a feminine gift economy in which she "…gives more, with no assurance that she'll get back even some unexpected profit from what she puts out."[xiv] She frequently gives in excess without seeking remuneration for her expenditure; moreover, her expenditures are motivated by generosity, not return. Her sartorial and sexual experiments are intended to please David, and she strongly desires that her artistic endeavors involve mutual collaboration and participation. For example, she envisions their collaboration on the honeymoon narrative as a gift they share, not a saleable commodity, when she exclaims, "I'm so proud of it already and we won't have any copies for sale and none for reviewers and then there'll never be clippings and you'll never be self-conscious and we'll have it just for us."[xv] However, Catherine's participation in an economy that, as Cixous explains, "dispenses gifts

freely," only temporarily subverts masculine exchange economies that control her circulation as woman and wife and fail to recognize her as an artist.[xvi]

The existence of both exchange economies in *Garden* suggest that what critics have labeled as Catherine and David's artistic competition is, in fact, conflict between two different systems of exchange. Jacqueline Vaughn Brogan suggests that, as male and female artist figures in *Garden*, Catherine and David develop competing artistic and economically-motivated jealousies, explaining further that "if Catherine is jealous of David's writing (and particularly of the good reviews his writing receives) and utterly indifferent of his writing's making money, David is completely jealous of Catherine's having the money in their relationship and particularly desires that his writing become commercially successful."[xvii] In Brogan's view, David and Catherine compete over who possesses economic power. However, interpreting their artistic and marital tensions as personal competition produces a reductive understanding of how Hemingway viewed gender and economics at work in the novel. David and Catherine create from within difference exchange systems: David is motivated by a masculine economy of exchange: the market economy that circulates different forms of money, or capital—cultural, symbolic and, most importantly, economic capital. Catherine participates in Cixous's feminine gift economy of exchange motivated by generous expenditure, doesn't seek her gifts returned, and doesn't value artistic production in competitive or pecuniary terms.

The symbols of the masculine exchange economy in which David circulates are royalty checks and newspaper clippings from his publisher. Catherine recognizes their negative effect upon David's self-worth as a writer and their marriage when she asks, "'How can we be us and have the things we have and do what we do and you be this that's [sic] in the clippings?.... They're terrible…they could destroy you if you thought about them or believed them…you don't

think I married you because you are what they say you are in those clippings, do you?'"[xviii] This scene reveals David's economic competitiveness and artistic insecurity and Catherine's worry about his obsession with economic value; it warns writers working within masculine exchange economies about the consequences of obsessive overreliance on symbolic capital, like book reviews. When the conversation turns to *her* mail, which contains inheritance checks, Catherine insists they live off of her money, which she calls *their* money. Her wish to participate in a gift economy isn't premised upon competition or pecuniary investment and return, but by her desire that David value artistic production rather than art as commodity. Her wish for them to collaboratively write the honeymoon narrative shows that her artistic endeavors aren't in competition with David's identity as a writer.

Unfortunately, Catherine needs to remind David that participation in a feminine gift economy makes his writing possible, when she asks, "'Isn't it lucky Heiress and I are rich so you'll never have anything to worry about?'"[xix] When he abandons their collaborate honeymoon narrative to write his Africa stories—a metaphorical returning her check un-cashed that rejects her artistic identity—Catherine again reminds him where the money that allows him to write full time comes from. She seeks recognition—*credit*, if you will—for financially supporting his artistic production. As she explains to Marita, "'I've only tried to make it economically possible for him to do the best work of which he is capable,' " to which she adds, " 'I knew it would be so humiliating if the money ran out and [David] had to borrow and I hadn't fixed up anything nor signed anything."[xx] When she burns his clippings and the notebooks containing his Africa stories, the only symbols of his economic value as a writer, Catherine destroys his commodified writing identity and value in the literary marketplace. While this might be interpreted as competitive vengeance, it is her attempt to prevent David from becoming reabsorbed into a masculine

economy of exchange that makes him paranoid about his work's exchange value.[xxi] In economically empowering Catherine, Hemingway enabled her to opt out of masculine exchange economies and choose a system that invited both collaborative *and* female artistic production. She can afford to enter the feminine gift economy, and for a short time her participation and generous expenditure invites David to join and collaborate with her. However, like fictional Hemingway heroines before her, Catherine must *pay*. When participating in a gift economy that allows her to *pay* with generous expenditure fails to sustain the conditions Catherine needs to produce art, she *pays* in consequences instead.

Much of Hemingway's fiction illustrates the different ways that men and women pay. In *The Sun Also Rises,* Jake Barnes, acting as Hemingway's spokesperson, shares his observation of how women like Brett Ashley pay for gender and sexual transgression. Barnes's epiphany is that women pay differently than men pay: "I thought I had paid for everything. Not like the woman pays and pays and pays. No idea of retributions or punishments. Just exchange of values. You gave up something and got something else."[xxii] Jake contrasts men's paying in terms of *costs and benefits* with women's paying in *costs and consequences*. How a woman "pays and pays and pays" as a form of "retribution or punishment" is quite different from how men pay through suffering, but are compensated by an "exchange of values" that involves the "giv[ing] up something and [getting] something."[xxiii] In *The Garden of Eden*, Hemingway unveils how masculine exchange economies that take advantage of female generosity make women pay for attempting to create art, revealing *how* women pay and *who* makes them pay. Catherine has already paid by being born a woman denied the same access men have to artistic production. She pays when provides economic support so David can write and consumes to produce art. However, she also *pays in consequences*. Catherine first pays financially, and then pays in consequences

for that generous expenditure. To revise Barnes' epiphany: the woman artist "pays and pays and *pays*" (emphasis mine). A superficial reading of *Garden* might misconstrue Catherine's paying as simply mirroring the subordinate female position in marriage hierarchy that casts women in subordinate roles deferential to men. This is certainly a traditional way that a woman *pays* for becoming a wife; however, in *Garden* Catherine *pays* for rejecting this role.

Economic empowerment enables Catherine to *pay* so she and David can produce art. She begins *paying in consequences* when David becomes obsessed with his economic value and jealous of her generous expenditure and her trespass into the male world of artistic production. Catherine engages in generous expenditures that free them from work and financial worry and opportunities for collaborate artistic production, while David engages in competitive accounting to increase his economic status and value in their marriage. David obsessively tallies his earnings, establishing a pecuniary competition intended to undermine the gift economy of Catherine's generosity. His clippings represent bills of paper money, and the envelope that contains them becomes his metaphorical wallet. He resents that Catherine's inheritance checks, earned by participating in a masculine exchange economy that usually subordinates women to men, designate her the economic provider in their marriage. David produces art to make money; Catherine shares her independent income so they can *both* produce art. After Catherine burns his clippings, David acknowledges how Catherine will pay in consequences financially when he tells Marita: "You just stay around and help me not kill her….She's going to pay me for the stories so that I won't lose anything…She's going to pay me double the appraisal price.'"[xxiv] Hemingway shows here a male artist deciding how a woman must *pay in consequences* when the gift economy she creates from within competes with exchange economies that privilege male artistic production and value male writing as publishable commodity.

David makes Catherine pay with other consequences as well; as a result, her efforts to transform marriage by participating in a feminine gift economy that balances gender and power relations and by writing a collaborative honeymoon narrative that establishes egalitarian spaces where male and female artists can co-create and live as equals, ultimately fail. Her anticipation of this failure may be the reason she "strongly advocates using her money to perpetuate the honeymoon, for its end will halt the narrative which she is creating," and finds David a substitute wife. Additionally, Catherine "not only wishes to support David, but also lavishes him with gifts such as the 'Dent edition' of the Hudson text he so desires."[xxv] He is not capable of similar generosity. While he initially *buys into* the androgynous sartorial gender experiments and sexual role-reversals that Catherine uses to transform their bodies into sculptural and performance art, he ultimately rejects them. Initially allowing Catherine to support him financially and enjoying the sartorial and sexual artistic experiments that sexually excite him, he feels threatened when she refashions herself as his androgynous double, stages theatrical scenarios that cast him in a subordinate sexual role, and assigns him the role of amanuensis to transcribe the honeymoon narrative. David makes Catherine pay in consequences for becoming a woman artist.

We don't know whether Hemingway intended to cast the female artist as rebel against or victim of masculine economies of exchange. In both published and manuscript versions of *The Garden of Eden*, Catherine pays in consequences only after disrupting the masculine exchange economy and male *kunstleroman* narrative. David's refusal to further participate in and write the honeymoon narrative thwarts her artistic production. Being denied the transgressive sartorial and collaborative gender experiments that inspire her art drives her mad, as "…it is the women who pay the price of madness for transgression, and as we have seen, transgression consists not only of sexual acts, but also of the women's attempts at creativity."[xxvi] Like her mad women in the

attic ancestor, the modern madwoman is sexually and artistically repressed. David exchanges one heiress wife for another, negating the gift economy his first wife's generous expenditure created to support his writing, and returns to the masculine code represented by the Africa stories.

When Tom Jenks edited *The Garden of Eden* to end with the male *kunstleroman* narrative*,* he banished Hemingway's Lilith, the female artist, from Eden, and replaced her with a more conventional and submissive Eve, thereby preserving both the patriarchal prelapsarian Eden myth and the Hemingway myth constructed by "the popular, commodified Hemingway and his work."[xxvii] He unwittingly modeled how masculine exchange systems prohibit feminine writing from entering public circulation, enacting the very gendered politics Hemingway interrogates in the manuscript and that come through in the published novel. The female *kunstleroman* sections of the novel show that Hemingway's "treatment of Catherine provides insights into the struggles of the female artist....[whose] suffering and assumed decent into madness relate directly to her debilitating insecurities in the face of the patriarchal dominance of the arts."[xxviii] Teaching such readings of *The Garden of* Eden, which has contributed greatly to my own evolving understanding of Hemingway's views of gender and economics, will help students understand Hemingway's complex views about the construction and expression of gender and sexuality, and illuminate the misogyny and fear male authors directed at their female contemporaries—whom they viewed as competition rather than coconspirators. Similar to his women contemporaries and feminist critics writing after *Garden's* posthumous publication, Hemingway championed the woman artist in a society that denigrated female artistic production. His work shouldn't be read or taught as complicit with, but rather as critical of, social and sexual prohibitions that repressed and silenced women and women artists.

[i] Mark Spilka quotes from E.L. Doctorow's review of *The Garden of Eden*. "Hemingway's Barbershop Quintet: The Garden of Eden Manuscript," *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, (Fall 1987): 31.

[ii] See Carl Eby's important and groundbreaking analysis of gender identity and gender politics in Hemingway's major works: *Hemingway's Fetishism: Psychoanalysis and the Mirror of Manhood* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1999). Eby's analysis reads Hemingway filtered through personal correspondence describing his tonsorial fetishes and desire to perform gendered role reversal.

[iii] Spilka, 8. Spilka notes that "the great change, the important and startling change, was in Hemingway himself, in his late attempt to come to terms once more with his own androgynous nature" (2). Specifically in relation to feminine influence upon the male writer, which Spilka views as an important theme in *The Garden of Eden,* he adds that "what seems instructive is the degree to which he listened to and learned from the devilish and adoring muses within himself--learned, that is, about what a woman is and suffers and, less consistently, about his own severe dependencies and evasive strengths--and so left us with this lumbering elephant of a book for future hunting" (13). In terms of understanding how Hemingway viewed women, Spilka reveals the following "self-revelation…that his emotional dependency on his wives and mistresses, his androgynous complicity with their several obsessions with hair, skin, dress, gender, and lesbian attachments, is what makes for his strength as a creative writer" (294).

[iv] A *Kuenstleroman* is a subgenre of fiction or poetry that chronicles an artist's development. While mostly thought to follow the artistic development of male protagonists, as in James Joyce's *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, the *Kuenstleroman* traces the artistic development of women as well, such as in Kate Chopin's *The Awakening* and Radclyffe Hall's

The Well of Loneliness. The development of the female artist in the *Kuenstleroman* narratives of *Awakening* and *Well*, much like that in *Garden*, illustrate the importance of being liberated from the restrictive gender and sexual norms to female artistic production.

[v] Sharon O'Brien, "*Women and Death: Linkages in Western Thought and Literature*, and: *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Woman: The Writer as Heroine in American Literature*, and: *Insatiable Appetites: Twentieth-Century American Women's Bestsellers*, and: *Fantasy and Reconciliation: Contemporary Formulas of Women's Romance Fiction*, and: *Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy, and Popular Literature* (review)," *Modern Fiction Studies* 32, no. 2 (Summer 1985): 354.

[vi] Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own* (Toronto: Broadview Press, 2001), 6.

[vii] Both parts of this equation are important: Woolf argues that women must possess both an independent income and a room of their own in order to write. Catherine Bourne's inheritance provides financial freedom; however, she never has her own space. After marrying her, David has access to both money and a private, usually locked, room in each hotel they live in.

[viii] Catherine experiments with tonsorial and sartorial appearance and persuades David to engage in role-reversals during sex are inspired by the famous Rodin statue, "The Damned Woman," which draws on a story from Ovid's *Metamorphoses.* Rodin's sculpture captures the moment when, as a man and a woman embrace during lovemaking, the man changes into a woman. This gender transformation is reflected in the androgynous rendering of the figure that is male. (See Spilka). Eby points out in *Hemingway's Fetishism* that Hemingway preferred his wives and lovers to wear their hair boyishly short; he would recommend to his wife, Mary, what color she should dye her hair, and, on occasion, dyed it for her. Hemingway even dyed his own hair and, in a letter to Mary, describes his new hair color: "red as a French polished copper pot, or a newly

minted penny" (qtd. in Eby, 203). In the same letter, Hemingway continues, "So now I am just as red headed as you would like your girl Catherine to be and don't give a damn about it at all." The letter continues to discuss hair as a fetish object.

[ix] Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar, *No Man's Land: The Place of the Woman Writer in the Twentieth Century, Volume II: Sexchanges* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 363.

[x] Gilbert and Gubar discuss a genealogy of repressed women artists in the nineteenth century in *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1979).

[xi] Spilka, 51. Spilka offers his account of the women Hemingway used to construct Catherine's character: "she most obviously combines Pauline's possessive and controlling use of money, Mary's resentment of her own infertility and perhaps also of her gender, Zelda's artistic rivalry with Scott and her ultimately vengeful hostility, and Jane Mason's suicidal recklessness and emotional stability. Like Hadley, who once lost a suitcase containing her husband's early manuscripts, and who may have resented them, as Jeffrey Meyer asserts, for keeping her and Ernest apart, Catherine is jealous and resentful of David's African tales" (51).

[xii] Jacob Michael Leland, "Yes, That is a Roll of Bills in My Pocket: The Economy of Masculinity in *The Sun Also Rises*," *The Hemingway Review* 23, no. 2 (Spring 2004), 42.

[xiii] Quoted in Kathy Willingham, "Hemingway's *The Garden of Eden*: Writing with the Body," *The Hemingway Review* 12, no. 2 (Spring 1993): 56. Willingham notes the significance of Catherine's generous gift expenditure in her development as an artist. She connects Catherine's consumer endeavors with feminine gift economies and her art with poststructuralist theories of feminine writing. Willingham argues that Catherine is a version of the female writer who writes with her body to create art and "prefigures many contemporary theories concerning *l'ecriture*

---

feminine as articulated in particular by Helene Cixous*"* (46). Feminine writing involves expressing the feminine outside of the boundaries of patriarchal structures—logic and language being two examples—and exchange economies through the body. Catherine performs a version of feminine writing when she re-sculpts her gender by dressing in men's clothes, cuts her hair to mirror David's appearance, and assumes the dominant, male role in sex. Cixous' theory of *l'ecriture feminine,* writing on, through, or with the body, which is not necessarily limited to writers or artists who are women is explored in "The Laugh of the Medusa." See n. 14 below.

[xiv] Helene Cixous, "The Laugh of the Medusa," Trans. Keith Cohen and Paul Cohen, *Signs* 1, no. 4 (Summer 1976): 893.

[xv] Hemingway, *The Garden of Eden* (New York: Colliers Books, 1986), 77-78.

[xvi] qtd. in Willingham, 56.

[xvii] Jacqueline Vaughn Brogan, "Strange Fruits in *The Garden of Eden*: 'The Mysticism of Money,' *The Great Gatsby*—and *A Moveable Feast*," in *French Connections: Hemingway and Fitzgerald Abroad*, ed. J. Gerald Kennedy and Jackson R. Bryer (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998), 238.

[xviii] Hemingway, *Garden*, 24.

[xix] Ibid., 122.

[xx] Hemingway, *Garden*, 156 and163.

[xxi] In a brilliant use of foreshadowing, Hemingway forecasts Catherine's destruction of David's clippings and Africa stories when she dyes her hair ash-blonde. In French the term for ashes is *cendre*. *Cendre* also refers to fashionable hair dye color in the early twentieth century that resembled the color of ashes.

[xxii] Ernest Hemingway, *The Sun Also Rises* (New York: Scribners, 1962), 152.

[xxiii] Ibid.

[xxiv] Hemingway, *Garden*, 231.

[xxv] Willingham, 55; Heminway, *Garden*, 14; Willingham 56.

[xxvi] Nancy R. Comely, “Hemingway: The Economics of Survival,” *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 12, no. 3 (Spring 1979), 292.

[xxvii] Moddelmog, 59.

[xxviii] Willingham, 47. Rose Marie Burwell notes in “Hemingway’s Garden of Eden: Resistance of Things Past and Protecting the Masculine” *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 35, no. 2 (Summer 1993) that “Catherine’s actions seem not so much madness as healthy anger” (204-05).