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The stripped-down, Tom Jenks-edited version of Ernest Hemingway's *The Garden of Eden*, published posthumously by Scribner's in 1986, contained fewer than 70,000 of the original manuscript's more than 200,000 words and deleted several characters, numerous scenes, and portions of significant dialogue. Hemingway scholars and literary critics, in dealing with these discrepancies, approach the published novel and the manuscript from different positions. Most, however, focus primarily on the androgynous issues in the text, the exposure of a more sensitive side of Hemingway's persona, and the value of the novel as an instrument illuminating the psychological and historical development of one of America's premier authors.

While I believe the text is flawed and shows a marked deterioration in Hemingway's writing skills over the course of the manuscript's roughly 1,600 pages, I see courageous artistic experimentation and growth as well. Much more than merely venturing into the risqué territory of sexual taboos, it describes a philosophical journey and a search for growth. *The Garden of Eden*, particularly the manuscript, while exposing private aspects of Hemingway's marital relationships, is a map, a recipe, and a travel narrative sketching the dynamic process of artistic creation. The estuary, which figures prominently in the opening scene of the book, is a physical embodiment of this process, and its structure is valuable in illuminating the form of the novel.

My thesis examines *The Garden of Eden's* estuarial motif, drawing on the manuscript as well as the Scribner's edition, as a pattern unifying the many dualities operating in the book. It probes Catherine and David Bourne as estuarial figures drawn to dichotomous interfaces. Finally, the thesis examines the way estuarial settings engender and stimulate David Bourne's writing. Recent findings involving brain physiology, high-order brain functions, and creativity reinforce this reading and shed fascinating light on Hemingway's *The Garden of Eden*. 
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INTRODUCTION

In a 1948 letter to General Buck Lanham, Ernest Hemingway stated that the theme of his new novel, *The Garden of Eden*, concerned "the happiness of the Garden that a man must lose" (Baker 460). It was "a strange new novel" according to Carlos Baker--"an experimental compound of past and present, filled with astonishing ineptitudes and based in part upon memories of his marriages to Hadley and Pauline, with some excursions behind the scenes of his current life with Mary" (454-55). Experimental it certainly was and humorous as well with an abundance of wordplay and puns (most of which were excised from the 1986 Scribner's edition edited by Tom Jenks).

The novel's original inspiration stemmed largely from the relationship of F. Scott Fitzgerald and his wife Zelda. Hemingway took an immediate dislike to Zelda from their first introduction. He felt she was jealous of Scott's writing and did anything she could to interfere, including seeing that he drank too much, socialized until late at night, and was distracted by her attractions to other people. Initially critical of Fitzgerald's *Tender is the Night*, Hemingway penned a strong letter to Scott on May 28, 1934 from Key West. "... [Y]ou're not a tragic character," Hemingway wrote. "Neither am I."

All we are is writers and what we should do is write. Of all people on earth you needed discipline in your work and instead you marry someone who is jealous of your work, wants to compete with you and ruins you. It's not as simple as that and I thought Zelda was crazy the first time I met her and you complicated it even more by
being in love with her and, of course you're a rummy. But you're no more a rummy than Joyce is and most good writers are. But Scott, good writers always come back. Always. (Selected Letters 408)

Hemingway later reversed his opinion of Tender is the Night, but he never changed his mind about Zelda or about Scott's drinking. And Zelda did, eventually, spend time institutionalized for schizophrenic disorders.

*The Garden of Eden* is, ultimately, not about Scott and Zelda, however. While they are clearly the source for the characters David and Catherine Bourne, the novel actually comes closer to detailing the events in Hemingway's own life in 1925 and 1926 which resulted in his divorce from Hadley Richardson Hemingway, his first wife. Pauline Pfeiffer, a *Vogue* fashion editor originally from Arkansas, became romantically involved with Ernest while living with the Hemingways on the French Mediterranean and helping Hadley care for the Hemingway's young son, Bumby. When Hadley finally became aware of the relationship, she insisted that, if Ernest and Pauline agreed to stay apart for 100 days and still felt the same way about each other, then she would grant Ernest a divorce. Pauline left by train and later returned to the United States, but the separation actually worked against Hadley, and the divorce became finalized in January 1927. Ernest felt like a real heel about the whole thing. He accepted full responsibility for the divorce and battled remorse for the next three years (Baker 355). But the affair, marital split, and subsequent remarriage constituted a pattern he was bound to repeat, as he later divorced Pauline and married Martha Gellhorn.

Hemingway began *The Garden of Eden* in January 1946 under quite the same circumstances once again—he was living with Mary Welsh at the Finca estate in Cuba and had just received his official divorce from Martha in late December. As had happened with each earlier divorce, the remorse Hemingway felt was
directed back to the breakup of his first marriage. The Garden of Eden is, indeed, set on the French Mediterranean. In the novel, a young American writer (David Bourne) and his bride of three weeks (Catherine) come to the fishing village at le Grau du Roi near Aigues Mortes. Here they enjoy the sun, the sea, and the cuisine. Catherine Bourne soon creates a stir, however, with the attire she wears around the village and the short, bobbed haircut she gets. Her experimentation carries over into the bedroom as she coaxes her husband David into participating in androgynous sexual practices. The couple later travels to Hendaye, on the Atlantic coast near Spain, then on to Madrid, where Catherine spends innumerable hours viewing the paintings and sculptures in the Prado museum. The androgyny, now something Catherine can no longer maintain privately, becomes problematic in Spain, so the Bournes return to the French Mediterranean. They stay at la Napoule, near Cannes, where they meet a beautiful young woman named Marita. Marita is attracted to both Catherine and David and comes to stay with the American couple. Her lesbian affair with Catherine and her heterosexual affair with David results, ultimately, in Catherine's departure from la Napoule. As the novel ends, David, having achieved a creative breakthrough, reaches the artistic levels to which he has aspired, and Marita effectively takes over Catherine's role as David's new mate.

There are many problems with taking The Garden of Eden at face value, however. First and foremost, one has to consider the bastardized nature of the Scribner's text. The Garden of Eden, first begun in 1946, was never completed. Hemingway worked on the novel sporadically until his death in 1961, including a major round of editing and rewriting in 1958. He never finished, however. Hemingway vowed that he would leave a steamer trunk full of material to be
published after he died. (It was to be his insurance policy.) While many books have appeared since Hemingway's death, most of these are compilations of previously published material.\(^2\) Several unfinished or unedited projects did find their way into published form, though, through the partnership of Mary Welsh Hemingway and Charles Scribner's Sons Publishing Company. These include *A Moveable Feast* (1964), Hemingway's memoirs of his early years in Paris with Hadley, and *Islands in the Stream* (1970), originally intended as a trilogy focused on air, land, and sea.

Gerry Brenner elaborates the editorial liberties taken by Mary Welsh Hemingway and Scribner's editor L. H. Brague in bringing the "finished" *A Moveable Feast* manuscript to publication in 1964. Brenner's research on the *Feast* manuscripts ("Are We Going to Hemingway's Feast?"") indicates that not only was the book not finished prior to Hemingway's suicide as the book's introductory note claims, but that Mary Hemingway as executor "altered, cut and added significant material."

Those changes affect emphases Hemingway had sought and modify his discernible intentions in shaping the book and in trying to guide an understanding of them. As might be expected, the drafts not only disclose problems Hemingway had in writing and revising various sections, but also allow glimpses into personal concerns simmering deep in the work. (528-29)

Similar editorial liberties and misrepresentations affect *Islands in the Stream* and Hemingway's final posthumous work, *The Garden of Eden*.

*The Garden of Eden* appeared in 1986, twenty-five years after Ernest Hemingway took his life in Ketchum, Idaho. At his death in 1961, the *Garden* manuscript stood at over 200,000 words in 48 chapters which included a provisional ending Hemingway had devised years earlier out of an overwhelming
fear he was going to die before the novel was completed. Mary Hemingway, Malcolm Cowley, and Charles Scribner's Sons editors tried numerous times to deal with the voluminous work, but each try failed. Finally, in 1985, Scribner's gave the manuscript materials to a successful, young editor they had recently hired. His name: Tom Jenks. "Jenks chipped away at the mountain of words for four months and ultimately uncovered a 247-page novel" claimed *Sports Illustrated* in their 1986 introduction to an excerpt from the novel entitled "An African Betrayal" (58). In "uncovering" a novel, Jenks reduced the text to fewer than 70,000 words. The end result was a highly marketable "Hemingway" product but not, it turns out, the novel that Hemingway intended. In its pages, the 1986 Scribner's edition deletes numerous characters, important scenes, and significant portions of dialogue.

As is the case with *A Moveable Feast*, access to *The Garden of Eden* manuscript shows a different picture than the Jenks' edition paints. While I have only found one sentence totally (and inconsistently) fabricated in the Jenks' version, the sheer quantity of material removed, as well as the frequent and significant cutting-and-pasting, hinders one's appreciation and deep, clear understanding of the characters, their relationships, the conflicts and issues they confront, and the artistic framework that holds the novel together. For that reason, as I discuss the novel in the following pages, I will draw heavily on the *Garden* manuscript, using the typescript version where available and the holograph (handwritten) version where necessary.

The manuscript is composed of three books, contrary to Jenks' four divisions. The first takes place at le Grau du Roi. The second, set in an apartment in Paris, concerns David Bourne's friends, Nick and Barbara Sheldon who are both painters. Book Three opens at Hendaye on the Atlantic coast of France where the
Bournes chance upon the Sheldons, then follows the Bournes to Madrid (where they cross paths with writer Andy Murray as well as David's compatriot, Colonel Boyle), before returning with the Bournes to the French Mediterranean and la Napoule. Thus, all references to the manuscript will designate the book, chapter, and page in the following form: (3/29/14). References to the published Scribner's (Jenks) edition will simply list the page number. In all cases, where quotations are taken from the manuscript it will be understood that significant material was either deleted or altered by Tom Jenks and therefore not available in the published book. Additionally, any errors in spelling or punctuation in passages taken from any Hemingway work will be retained as is (without correction or notation).

One final note warrants mentioning before I proceed. The man who began writing The Garden of Eden in 1946 was not the same man who was editing and rewriting the manuscript in 1958. Ernest Hemingway had his ups and downs with critical success. The decade of the 1940's, following For Whom the Bell Tolls (1940), was a low point in his career. His only major novel, Across the River and Into the Trees (1950), was not well received by the critics. Then, as he put the finishing touches on The Old Man and the Sea in 1952, he worried about the book's brevity. He wondered if Scribner's might be unable to publish it as a novel, or if he might be considered a bum for publishing something so short, even though he felt it was his best work (Baker 499). Instead, the book contributed to his winning of the Nobel Prize in 1954.

But the years, the alcohol, and the numerous concussions he suffered in car and airplane accidents left Hemingway with severe headaches and bouts of depression by the late 1950's. A marked deterioration in his abilities becomes clearly visible in the course of reading the manuscript. The artistic and experi-
mental nature of *The Garden of Eden*, which I believe is responsible for the repetitive and indeterminate qualities of the novel, may in many ways be confused or complicated by the impaired skills Hemingway wielded in his last years. Truly, *The Garden of Eden* was one of his greatest artistic undertakings. The fact that he undertook that challenge, the fact that he took artistic and personal risk by approaching the subject material and the perspectives evident in *The Garden of Eden*, proves to me he lost neither his artistic vision nor his courage.
1 In *Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story*, Carlos Baker writes: "As he had done on leaving Pauline for Martha, he often allowed sentimental memories of his first marriage to fill his mind. On the night of the day following his forty-third birthday he lay awake for a long time, remembering such matters as the battered old *Leopoldina* on which he and Hadley had crossed to Vigo, the races at Enghien, the first Pamplona fiesta, the summer in the Schwarzwald, and (not least) the out-of-season fishing at Cortina d'Ampezzo" (375).

2 Hemingway's posthumously published work includes *The Wild Years; By-Line: Ernest Hemingway; The Fifth Column and Four Stories of the Spanish Civil War; Ernest Hemingway, Cub Reporter; Ernest Hemingway's Apprenticeship; The Nick Adams Stories; 88 Poems; Selected Letters; and The Dangerous Summer. The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway* contains some previously unpublished stories.
THE GARDEN OF EDEN AND THE ESTUARY AT LE GRAU DU ROI

And a river went out of Eden to water the garden. . . .
Genesis 2:10

THE RIVER OUT OF EDEN

A. Backcast--Along the River's Upper Reaches

Ernest Hemingway began writing The Garden of Eden in January of 1946. By July of that year he had completed 1,000 handwritten pages and, according to Carlos Baker, Hemingway's plans for the novel remained "singularly inchoate."

"[Hemingway] confessed to [General Buck] Lanham that he could never stick to a preconceived pattern, but invented as he went from minute to minute without knowing what was going to happen next" (455). Hemingway continued to work on the book sporadically in the years that followed, including a major round of editing in 1958, and by the time he died in 1961 the manuscript stood at more than 200,000 words in 48 chapters and was as yet unfinished.

The Scribner's edition, published in 1986 and edited by Tom Jenks to fewer than 70,000 words in thirty chapters and 247 pages, turned what was considered a loose, lengthy, and repetitive narrative into a marketable Hemingway book. Prior to its publication, only a few persons had ever had the opportunity to read The Garden of Eden manuscript. Most literary scholars and Hemingway buffs had to be satisfied with the sketchy plot descriptions and literary appraisals that were available, such as those offered by noted Hemingway biographer Carlos Baker. In Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story, Baker called it "a strange new novel":

9
It had none of the taut nervousness of Ernest's best fiction, and was so repetitious that it seemed interminable. Apart from the landscape and the food and wine, he was trying to embody certain secret phases of his sexual life with Mary and to insert, as flashbacks, some of the material from the second African safari. Much of the narrative proceeded by dialogue, though it was notably lacking in the wit and concision of the passages of talk in his sketches of Paris [i.e. A Moveable Feast].

With the appearance of Scribner's greatly excised version in 1986, many reviewers welcomed Garden as a work which exposed the vulnerable and sensitive side of Hemingway's character, even if it was slightly odd and uncharacteristic. Others contended that, considering the personal and sexual nature of the book and its obviously loose construction, it was never intended for publication--or at any rate it should never have been published given the fact that Hemingway himself never completed it, never successfully edited it, and, so, never finally approved it for publication. Early reviewers and literary critics focused on the androgynous relationship established between the writer David Bourne and his wife Catherine, touching also on Hemingway's sensitive treatment of animals. Subsequent literary explorations have extensively researched the many androgynous aspects of Hemingway's life, from the marital relationship of his parents Grace and Clarence and Grace's dressing Ernest and his sister Marcelline as twins to the sexual roles and relationships established in Hemingway's marriages. In this, Mark Spilka's Hemingway's Quarrel With Androgyny is a most extensive and enlightening text, probing the historical, psychological, and literary bases of the novel.¹
B. *Forecast--At the River's Mouth*

Androgynous change is certainly a pivotal issue in the text. Hemingway once wrote, however, that the "dignity of movement of an ice-berg is due to only one-eighth of it being above water" (*Death in the Afternoon* 192). Preoccupation with androgyny likewise leads one to ignore the inherent artistic framework which I believe is discernible in *The Garden of Eden* (and in Hemingway's professed inability to stick to any preconceived pattern as well).

In both the manuscript and the published novel, the boundaries between feminine and masculine, sane and insane, present and past, and imagination and reality all blur and become indistinct. Hemingway, rather than simply portray the many dualities that Western society identifies as discontinuous and statically opposed polarities, instead presents them as pairs that interpenetrate in transitional zones where aspects coexist dynamically with their opposites. These polarities thus become indistinguishable in these interfaces—coexisting transiently and fluidly. Indeed, the estuary in the book's opening scene physically depicts this relationship.

Hemingway often focuses on topographical features and landscapes in his construction of a short story or novel. Quite often a physical feature subsequently plays an integral role in understanding the story. For instance, "Hills Like White Elephants" opens with a description of the long, white hills across the Ebro valley then proceeds to play the metaphor in the title (a white elephant being something of little value to its owner) off the conversation of a young couple sitting in a train station obliquely discussing a proposed abortion (which the man clearly favors). And the onset of autumn rain in the opening chapter of *A Farewell to Arms* signals impending tragedy and death, as is frequently the case in Hemingway's work.
following the tragic avalanches he witnessed in the Alps that resulted from disastrous rain.

Such is the case with *The Garden of Eden* as well. Physical setting is a critical element. The first two paragraphs of the novel describe the estuary at le Grau du Roi—the canal running down through the town of Aigues Mortes, the jetty bordering the canal out to where it empties into the bay, the salt marsh and sea meadows, and the Gulf of Lions stretching beyond the bay. In this estuary are patterns, philosophical perspectives, and an artistic framework that supports and carries the novel—indeed, that drives the novel—and my reading of it.

C. *The Estuary*

In the first chapter of *The Garden of Eden*, David Bourne leaves the hotel and goes out to fish from the jetty. He catches a large sea bass that has come in with the rising tide to feed on mullet. The entire episode takes place in an estuary where a fresh water stream flows into, and mixes with, sea water. Like tidal pools at the land-sea boundary, or like ecotones where forests and grasslands meet, estuaries are environmental interfaces, transitional zones where separate, identifiable biomes come to overlap and coexist. As such, estuaries encompass a great diversity of life forms. In fact, as William Boicourt notes in the scientific journal *Oceanus*, the estuary is the most amazing of all interface zones: "The estuary is nearly a world unto itself, buffered from a strong marine influence by a controlled communication with the ocean, and protected by enclosing coastal boundaries. Within this domain, the estuary's unique water motion retains and recycles nutrients essential to living organisms, *inducing the richest productivity per square kilometer on the earth surface*" (29) (emphasis mine).
The water motion responsible for this fecundity and diversity has to do with the way fresh water mixes with salt water. The fresh water, being less dense, flows out over the surface of the salt water, and sea water counters by flowing in under the fresh water. Horizontal and vertical gradients are established, and turbulence results as the two mix. The resulting outflow, where the estuary discharges into the open sea, becomes a diluted saline mixture that can be as much as ten times the volume of the original fresh water stream (Boicourt 32). Nutrients which would previously have been lost to the sediments deposited in the mud on the bottom are instead continually resuspended and available for organisms to utilize due to the circular movement of the water as it mixes. Freshwater plant and animal species with a tolerance for saline water, tolerant species from the open sea, as well as species specifically adapted to the changing and chaotic environment of an estuary all take advantage of these available nutrients, accounting for both the abundance and the diversity of life forms. Rising and falling tides further facilitate the recycling of nutrients by keeping the area of maximum mixing and turbidity constantly changing as the tide first moves in and later retreats.

These estuarial processes of transition, change, and fluctuation, likewise enrich a reader's understanding of *The Garden of Eden* on at least three levels. First, the characters expand dimensionally. They refuse convenient categories or fixed, anchored positions, constantly mutating instead. Additionally, no blame can be assessed to any one character for the events that transpire in the turbid interfaces of the novel. Second, the book can be viewed holistically, drawing together the many conflicts and themes as well as unifying the various critical approaches that have been, or could be, applied to *The Garden of Eden*. An
estuarial reading supports (and provides context for) diverse critical approaches (Freudian analysis, Marxist interpretation, Feminist critiques, and so on) and the light they shed on the text, yet it undermines any exclusive, authoritative conclusions they might draw due to the fluid and fluctuating nature of the text. And finally, the estuarial framework offers a radical (even subversive) perspective on a variety of issues Hemingway grappled with in *The Garden of Eden*—human sexuality, gender roles, art and commerciality, insanity, and creativity. In the end, viewing the text from an estuarial perspective (especially in the 1990s) raises questions as to the value of our socially-constructed Western norms and whether these constructs inhibit or engender individual growth and creativity. Thus, as I shall show, the blurred boundaries and the transitions and fluctuating changes of *The Garden of Eden* are integral elements in understanding the novel once one recognizes the importance of the vehicle Hemingway placed on the opening page—the estuary at le Grau du Roi.

**TRANSITION, CHANGE, AND FLUCTUATION**

Like the sea bass David catches in the estuary at le Grau du Roi in the first chapter of *The Garden of Eden*, David and Catherine Bourne are also drawn to marginal areas, interfaces, and transitional zones. They come to the south coast of France in late May, between seasons. It is the 1920s, and the Bournes, in the third week of their honeymoon, are Americans and pioneers in opening up the Mediterranean coast to summer tourism. They sunbathe naked on the beach, swim naked in the sea, and dive playfully from the rocks. Their skin grows darker day by day, and Catherine, in a passage omitted from the published novel, informs
David she wants to become as dark as a kanaka (the Hawaiian word for an
Hawaiian person):

"I don't want to be a white girl anymore and I'm half-caste already and I think I can be darker and it still be good. Did you think I could ever be this dark?"
"No, because you're blonde."
"I can because I am lion color and they can go dark. But I want every part of me dark and it's getting that way and you'll be darker than an Indian and that takes us further away from other people. You see why it's important."
"What will we be?"
"We'll see. . . . We'll have to see. I wish I had some Kanaka blood or some Indian blood but then it probably wouldn't mean anything. It's the changeing that is as important as the dark. But I'm going to be so dark you won't be able to stand it and you'll be helpless. White women will always bore you."
"They bore me already." (1/4/2-3)

She goes on to tell David that she's going to go to sleep and dream of a place
where they won't be allowed to enter, or where she will not be seated at the same
table as David, because she is so dark.

It's the changing that's important, and the Bournes undergo many changes.
They cross to the Atlantic coast of France, staying near another estuary at Hendaye
where they can see the mountains across the border in Spain. One evening in their
hotel room at Hendaye, Catherine's desire for trans-racial morphological change is
accompanied by a seemingly trans-species transformational stirring. Stroking her
neck and head, David feels her move beneath his hand "like a cat," and Catherine,
describing her new haircut and how she instructed the coiffeur, comments, "It's
awfully classic, . . . [b]ut it feels like an animal" (3/6/3-4). "In the morning when
[David] woke there was the lovely body that he knew close to him and he looked
and saw the waxed-wood dark shoulders and neck and the fair tawny head close and smooth lying as a small animal. . . ." (47).

The boundaries the Bournes challenge and cross are not only physical or political (or biological) ones. They experiment and toy with sexual taboos as well. At Catherine's insistence their sexuality grows androgynous, and the distinction between masculine and feminine becomes vague. At le Grau du Roi, in the opening chapters, they sport similar haircuts, fisherman's shirts, shorts, and espadrilles. And, after their initial exploration with androgynous lovemaking, Catherine asks, "'You don't mind being brothers, do you?'" David responds, "'No'" (21). Later she tells him, "'I'm trying to be such a good girl. . . . Truly you don't have to worry darling until night. We won't let the night things come in the day'" (22). But they soon violate these restrictions and self-imposed rules, too.

From Hendaye, the Bournes travel to Madrid where they chance to meet Colonel Boyle as well as writer Andy Murray, who is cut from the published book. While Catherine delights in the mountains and the Spanish countryside, after her numerous visits to the Prado the growing androgyny becomes uncomfortable in Spain. "'It's such a formal country'" (55). And the boundaries between night and day, private and public, begin to fall: "'... now she would show the dark things in the light and there would, it seemed to him, be no end to the change'" (67). So the Bournes cross back to the informality of the French Mediterranean. They return to la Napoule near Cannes where they stay in a Provencal house that looks out over a delta where a small river enters a bay. Here, in a third estuarial setting, they meet the young, beautiful, dark, bisexual Marita.
As Peter Hays points out in "'Between Devil and Deep, Blue Sea':
Hemingway's Interjacence," the word bourne means boundary or limit. Hays
notes that, in The Garden of Eden, Catherine and David Bourne continually press
against limits and cross back and forth across boundaries, resulting in a blurring of
the boundaries, part of the "multiple ambivalences [that] are a structural element of
the novel" (1). The movement is not one-directional, as Hays shows. The
Bournes challenge and cross boundaries only to return again. But the Bournes'
journeys are not simple outings. They are drawn to marginal areas. Bourne,
derived from Old French, can additionally denote a goal or destination, or, finally,
it can mean a realm or domain. (In addition there is a bourne derived from Middle
English which signifies a stream or brook and further reinforces the fluid and
aqueous estuarial motif.) The Bournes live at the interfaces and in the interfaces.
They cross into marginal spaces physically and sexually, socially and temporally.
Likewise, they move back and forth in the interfaces between reality and
imagination, sanity and insanity. "'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'' (54). She changes direction,
but the change is never absolute, never final.

None of the interfaces David and Catherine Bourne journey through ever
reaches final stability or stasis in The Garden of Eden. Instead, like an estuary, a
state of dynamic tension exists in the interface where one aspect blends with, and
is transformed into, its complementary opposite. It's not being a kanaka that's
important, Catherine says. It's the changing. Their goal is a life lived in a realm
where impermanence and change are the guiding principles, a life lived in the
margins, the estuarial interfaces. Thus, the Bournes' search for self-definition and
truth, as well as David's quest for creativity, is a constant and unending struggle. Hazardous but heroic, it is a journey into murky, fluctuating environments where the greatest opportunity for growth lies.

In the final scene at le Grau du Roi, as David watches Catherine sleep beside him in the scene which ends Book One, he considers their growth in thoughts excised from the Scribner's edition:

She changes from a girl into a boy and back to a girl carelessly and happily and she enjoys corrupting me and I enjoy being corrupted. But she's not corrupt and who says it is corruption? I withdraw the word. Now we are going to be a special dark race of our own with our own pigmentation growing that way each day as some people would garden or plant and raise crops. The trouble with that is that it will not grow at night too. It can only be made in the sun, in strong sun against the reflection of the sand and the sea. So we must have the sun to make this sea change. The sea change was made in the night and it grows in the night and the darkness that she wants and needs now grows in the sun. (1/4/4)

Later in the novel, as his complicated relationship with Catherine and Marita pulls him in two directions and David moves back and forth between the two women, he, as Catherine had done before, retreats into an interior world, "his own country"--the world of his stories. His writing is stimulated by the complicated tensions arising from the menage a trois, and he takes risks and tackles the hard stories he'd always put off writing: "He was completely detached from everything except the story he was writing and he was living in it as he built it. The difficult parts he had dreaded he now faced one after another..." (128). As he gains confidence and his writing gathers momentum, David is able to incorporate all the pressure that's built up around him and the sorrow he feels. He begins to rise before dawn, writing so intensely across the boundary between night and day that he is oblivious to the sun rising out of the sea.
CREATIVITY

A. Mythology and Science--Explanatory Counterparts

_The Garden of Eden_ ultimately concerns, as does the biblical account in Genesis, the rise of human consciousness. In the Garden, God created man "in his own image." Discrepancies and gender ambiguities, however, confuse whether this initial being was one or two.

And God said, Let us make man in our own image, after our likeness... So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. (Genesis 1:26-27)

Twenty-five verses later, Eve is created from one of Adam's ribs, and later still, after eating from the Tree of Knowledge, Adam and Eve become aware of their nakedness and cover themselves. Myths from many countries, as well as some rabbinical commentaries on the biblical version, depict the unified, preconscious human as an androgynous being (in God's image) who is cleaved into two gendered beings with the loss of innocence that is present in Eden. This cleavage, this fragmentation and disunification, is mirrored in contemporary scientific and psychological theories which link the rise of consciousness to the development of language in humans. With the rise of language, or possibly allowing for the rise of language, a differentiation and specialization of the two hemispheres of the brain occurred. Lateralization resulted in analytical, sequential, and verbal abilities becoming localized in the left lobe with non-verbal and spatial functions located in the right hemisphere.
David and Catherine Bourne, far from being interested in returning to the preconscious state of innocence, docility, and intellectual oblivion that the Garden of Eden represents, nonetheless seek a way to meld the fragmented polarities around them—whether it be physically through androgyny and miscegenation, or psychologically through tribalism and invention (creativity). In *The Courage to Create*, Rollo May defines creativity as "the encounter of the intensively conscious human being with his or her world" (54). It is a process, May asserts, that unites subject (the artist) and object (his/her world), not on "the superficial level of objectified intellectualization, but... on a level that undercuts the subject-object split" (54). Driven by a yearning for immortality, by a rebellion and struggle against death, this encounter is not merely growth or an expansion of awareness. May says it is a battle and a struggle in which the insight one achieves in some way alters and destroys an existing understanding. Something is born, something is destroyed, and feelings of anxiety, joy, and guilt accompany the process. The unconscious plays a key role in this process.7

Carl Jung often made the point that there is a polarity, a kind of opposition, between unconscious experience and consciousness. He believed the relationship was compensatory: consciousness controls the wild, illogical vagaries of the unconscious, while the unconscious keeps consciousness from drying up in banal, empty, arid rationality. (59)

The unconscious, the subconscious, and the preconscious are all terms used to describe thought processes and information that lie outside the domain of one's conscious awareness—an awareness that is constructed with language.8 The unconscious is, therefore, a non-verbal awareness, and creativity results from non-verbal conscious modes of thought meshing with conscious awareness.
This interpenetration of conscious and unconscious awarenesses, like Catherine's living outside herself and making the private world public, is not without its danger. There has long been a popularly held notion that a line exists between creative genius and madness, and it is thin at best. Albert Rothenberg, a clinical psychiatrist and professor at Harvard Medical School, has conducted research into creativity and creative thought processes for over 25 years, interviewing Nobel laureates, Pulitzer Prize winners, and other acclaimed scientists and artists. In *Creativity and Madness: Old Stereotypes and New Findings*, he examines and dispels many of the myths surrounding creative people, the creative process, and the link between creativity and madness. His research findings are particularly pertinent to *The Garden of Eden* where sanity and creativity are key issues. Rothenberg first distinguishes creativity from productivity and originality, identifying creativity as "the production of something that is both new and truly valuable" (4-5). Second, he notes that the processes which result in creative leaps, insights, and revolutionary ideas are not normal mental thought processes. In his creative subjects, however, these processes occur in rational and lucid states of awareness, he argues. They operate differently than the psychological processes at work in demented states (such as the radical, poetic associations produced in the writings of schizophrenics).

B. *The Janusian and Homospatial Creative Processes*

An overpowering need to create was the one ingredient invariably found in the highly creative persons with whom Rothenberg worked. Rothenberg describes, however, two frequently encountered special thought processes involved in creativity. The first he calls the janusian process after the Roman god of doorways
and new beginnings whose doubled faces point in opposite directions at the same time.

In the janusian process, multiple opposites or antitheses are conceived simultaneously, either as existing side by side or as equally operative, valid, or true. In an apparent defiance of logic or of physical possibility, the creative person consciously formulates the simultaneous operation of antithetical elements or factors and develops those formulations into integrated entities and creations. It is, as I said, a leap that transcends ordinary logic. What emerges is no mere combination or blending of elements: the conception contains not only different entities, but also opposing and antagonistic elements that are experienced and understood as coexistent. (15)

This special mental process, whether applied to science or art, allows antagonistic elements to interface and overlap. It explains how a person such as Catherine Bourne can envision and invent herself as a bleached, white-haired Scandinavian and a dark, brown-skinned kanaka at the same time. Functioning in the initial stages of creativity, the actual janusian process itself "seldom appears in the final artistic product, but it occurs at crucial points in the generation and development of the work" (15).

The second process operates in the later stages of creativity, and it often bridges and unifies the janusian formulations. Rothenberg termed it the homospatial process. It consists of "conceiving two or more discrete entities occupying the same space, a conception leading to the articulation of new identities" (25). It superimposes two totally disparate objects or entities to create an essentially new object or entity. Poetic metaphors are created using this mental process. It also is involved in new scientific formulations.
Additionally, the process produces other types of creative unifications. In literature, it is a major factor in the creation and development of literary characters. Novelists, playwrights, and poets actively fuse and superimpose images of persons they have known, images of themselves, and the developing image of the character they are creating. They do not, as is commonly supposed, simply add together or combine various characteristics of themselves and others, either consciously or unconsciously. Also, the homospatial process leads to effective literary double meanings. . . .

For the painter, sculptor, and composer, the process brings foreground and background elements in a visual or auditory image or experience into the same spatial plane, superimposed or fused with one another. (28)

The homospatial process explains how a writer like Ernest Hemingway can superimpose something as complex as the relationship of another writer and his wife, Scott and Zelda Fitzgerald, onto his own marriages to Hadley, Pauline, Martha, and Mary—as well as superimposing this fused image onto the relationship of the conceptualized David and Catherine Bourne, ultimately new and distinct individuals. Furthermore, a totally disparate and physical entity, such as an estuary, can, in addition, be perceived as an all-encompassing image superimposed over the top of this relationship.

C. Creativity, Androgyny, and The Garden of Eden

Albert Rothenberg stresses that the janusian and homospatial thought processes operate in highly creative persons while they are totally rational and conscious. He dispels myths of divine inspiration and the Muse. His descriptions, however, emphasize the importance of non-verbal and non-logical thinking in making the contradictory leaps that result in revolutionary insight. Recent scientific research positions these capabilities in the right hemisphere of the brain.
Works of art are thus products of the creative interface between conscious, rational, and verbal awareness (in the left lobe) and non-conscious, non-verbal, and non-logical functions (in the right lobe) just as they are products of an encounter that connects subject (the artist) and object (the artist's world).

David Bourne, in his search for artistic success, seeks to unite these distinct psychological realms. Likewise, he seeks to unify his inner (subjective) world with his outer (objective) reality. The final chapters of *The Garden of Eden* center around David Bourne's efforts and the creative breakthrough he ultimately achieves. It is at once a journey and a "peak [sic] into that undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler returns who hasn't been there" (3/4/22-23). The final chapter of my thesis discusses this journey, David's creative encounter, as well as the estuarial environment which engenders his success. First, however, it is necessary to examine the androgynous issues in the text--the focus of the early chapters of *The Garden of Eden*--and the roles David and Catherine Bourne play as estuarial figures.
Notes

1 Two essays bear on my discussion. The first is an unpublished paper presented at The Fifth International Hemingway Conference, June 1988, in Schruns, Austria, by Peter L. Hays entitled "Between Devil and Deep, Blue Sea: Hemingway's Interjacence." In it Hays notes the way in which boundaries blur in *Garden* as David and Catherine Bourne cross back and forth across them. The second is Malcolm O. Magaw's "The Fusion of History and Immediacy: Hemingway's Artist-Hero in *The Garden of Eden*" (*CLIO* [Fall 1987]: 21-36). Magaw argues that the history of memory and the immediacy of passion are fused together in the creative process through imagination.

2 Hemingway visualized his theory of omission as an iceberg. He explains this theory in *Death in the Afternoon*: "If a writer of prose knows enough about what he is writing about he may omit things that he knows and the reader, if the writer is writing truly enough, will have a feeling of those things as strongly as though the writer had stated them" (192).

3 Brenner states that the *Feast* manuscripts "reveal a different thrust" to the final chapter of *A Moveable Feast*, "There Is Never Any End to Paris":

> In them Hemingway stops projecting himself as that responsible young artist or as an innocent victim of the rich. Instead he exposes himself, tries to deal honestly with complex emotions and guilt. (*Feast?* 535)

Reflecting on his breakup with Hadley, Hemingway "explains that he and Hadley were susceptible to infiltration because they were excessively confident in one another and had become too careless in their pride and confidence" (538). He accepts his responsibility for the events, but otherwise refuses to assess blame.
anywhere else. In the same way, in *The Garden of Eden* Hemingway's estuarial motif, with its fluctuations and gradients, represents a focus away from simplistic blaming.

4 The allusions to animal-like qualities are frequent in the text, but Catherine is consistently given feline qualities while David's natural affinity for the sea is the main quality to which the text returns time and again. Near the end of the manuscript, Marita comments on how David appears like a great white sea lion (rhymes with feline interestingly), and a conversation ensues regarding a Kipling story.

5 The tidy ending that Tom Jenks employed in the Scribner's edition is thus, I believe, quite out of character with the events and interactions in Hemingway's manuscript and the novel's overall artistic vision.

6 See Mircea Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, pages 423-25. The myth of a primordial human androgyne is widespread. In some cultures, creation is instead a huge cosmogonic egg which cracks and separates with the initiation of conscious awareness, resulting in the first dualities. This cosmogonic egg is discussed briefly in the next chapter.

7 Rollo May uses the term "unconscious" to generically describe the subconscious, the preconscious, and other dimensions or processes that function below rational awareness.

8 In *Left Brain, Right Brain*, Springer and Deutsch cite numerous studies with split-brain patients which show that each hemisphere of the brain can function and make value judgments independent of the other hemisphere (253-74). However, when information in the right (non-verbal) lobe was inaccessible to the left (verbal) lobe, the patient constructed a reality (in language) which was based on
guesses and assumptions, as a Gazzaniga and LeDoux witnessed in an adolescent patient:

"In trial after trial, we saw this kind of response. The left hemisphere could easily and accurately identify why it had picked the answer, and then subsequently, and without batting an eye, it would incorporate the right hemisphere's response into the framework. While we knew exactly why the right hemisphere had made its choice, the left hemisphere could merely guess. Yet, the left did not offer its suggestion in a guessing vein but rather a statement of fact as to why that card had been picked." (264)

The information in the right lobe, not verbalized and therefore not utilized, does survive: "Mental events in the right hemisphere, however, continue a life of their own and act as a 'Freudian' unconscious, as an 'independent reservoir of inaccessible cognition,' which may create uneasy emotional states in a person" (262).

9 In Creativity and Madness, Albert Rothenberg writes:

Both homospatial and janusian processes are active, intentional operations that are employed for purposes of producing creations. They therefore appear during the course of a creative process after the person has developed a particular creative goal such as writing a novel, constructing a sculpture, or developing a scientific theory. At this point, the truly creative person is oriented toward producing something outside of himself, is rational, and is completely aware of logical distinctions. His emotional energy is not directed toward himself, as in psychosis, and he knowingly formulates unusual conceptions in order to improve on reality and to create. (35)

10 This passage is taken from Chapter 44 of the manuscript. David and Marita are walking on the beach and their discussion turns to the state of Catherine's mental health, her destructive burning of David's stories, and Africa. The conversation highlights the wordplay and multiplicitous meanings associated with the word bourne. Besides the three definitions of the word given earlier, wordplay
on *burn* and *born* are frequent in the manuscript. A longer and more complete version of this conversation between David and Marita is as follows:

"But we've been burned out... Who burned the Bourne's out? Crazy woman burned out the Bourne's."

"Are we the Bourne's?"

"Sure. We're the Bourne's. It may take a while to have the papers. But that's what we are. Do you want me to write it out? I think I could write that."

"You don't need to write it."

"I'll write it in the sand," David said. "That's my new medium. I'm going to be a sand writer. The David Bournes, sand writers, announce their unsuccessful peak into that undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveller returns who hasn't been there. That's from a poem Shakespeare and I wrote together. He was extremely talented and Duff Cooper believes he was a Sergeant. He's going to write a book about it sometime...." (3/44/22-23)

The Shakespeare reference is to a poem about drowned sailors whose features, in their watery graves, become indistinguishable. Hemingway's wordplay is therefore reflected in his use of the word *peak*, too, meaning to grow thin, pale, or sickly.
THE GARDEN, THE ESTUARY, AND THE MARKETPLACE

"It isn't everybody that has someone that's half girl and half boy."
(Catherine Bourne, The Garden of Eden [1/1/18])

INTRODUCTION

A. Dichotomies, Interfaces, and Complexities

The first chapter of The Garden of Eden opens like morning in Paradise. David and Catherine Bourne, honeymooning by the estuary at le Grau du Roi, descend to a corner cafe after a morning of newlywed lovemaking. For three weeks they had been concerned with little more than when they would eat, sleep, make love, and then begin again. "It was a very simple world and [David] had never been truly happy in any other" (14). Even as they finish their breakfast, their conversation turns to what they will eat for lunch, and David speculates that after lunch they will probably "take a nap like good children" (5). The Bournes' peaceful innocence is quickly disrupted, however, as a number of conflicts surface. These conflicts create turbulence in the Bournes' relationship, like eddies forming as river water mixes with sea water, and the Bournes each move first in one direction and then in another.

The conflicts originate in several ways. First, the Bournes are drawn to turbulent and turbid environments--interfaces where polarities merge. Second, they enter these interfaces carrying existing internal conflicts that engender added
friction in their relationship and resist classification and pigeonholing. Consider for a moment the complexity and bivalent nature inherent in one character—Catherine Bourne.

Catherine embodies the fused identities and characteristics of two women, Zelda Fitzgerald and Hadley Richardson Hemingway. Ernest Hemingway never hid his strong dislike for Zelda, and in A Moveable Feast he characterized her as crazy, emasculating, selfish, and decadent. On the other hand, in the same memoirs he fondly portrayed Hadley as stable and supportive, in addition to being a loving wife and an excellent mother to Bumby. Consider, in addition, the fluctuating emotions he experienced just with Hadley. In 1922, she dejectedly and emotionally told Ernest how she had industriously and independently packed all his manuscripts (and carbons) in a valise to bring to him in Lausanne only to have the valise stolen in the Lyon train depot. The anger Hemingway felt, however, was mixed with tenderness and compassion at seeing Hadley in such agony and pain. Then, as their marriage ended four years later, his love for her was undercut by guilt and remorse he never escaped. Catherine Bourne, as a fusion of these two women, is at times more Zelda and at other times more Hadley. The conflicts in the novel carry the same complexity.

Three dichotomies central to The Garden of Eden are woven intricately into the opening chapter at le Grau du Roi—masculine and feminine sexuality, individuality and social conformity, and art and commerce. Androgyny adds excitement and thrill to the Bournes' relationship as they experiment, take risks, and break social and sexual taboos. Catherine, searching for individuality, struggles to define herself apart from marital and socially defined roles. And David, seeking in turn to define himself creatively, grapples with finding economic
and critical success while attaining artistic achievement, too. In the following
pages I will examine these interfacing dichotomies, the way Catherine and David
Bourne as estuarial figures confront them, and how the Bournes' journeys in
fluctuating interfaces lead eventually to a struggle against schizophrenic
fragmentation. Due to the opening scene's significance in unifying these issues,
however, the first chapter warrants a close inspection to locate where the
dichotomies and the estuarial motif first appear.

B. The Opening Scene

_The Garden of Eden_ opens at le Grau du Roi where the Bournes' second-
floor windows look out over the Mediterranean, the salt marsh and sea meadows,
across the walled city of Aigues Mortes, and to the beach at Palavas. Alongside
their hotel is a canal running down from Aigues Mortes, and a jetty borders the
canal out to where it empties into the bay. Mornings and evenings, when the tide
is in, mullet jump frantically to escape sea bass that come in with the tide. It is
late spring and between seasons, and, while tourists are nowhere to be seen, the
sails of the port's mackerel fishing boats are visible far out in the Gulf of Lions
where schools of mackerel have begun a seasonal run. With a sense of fecundity,
the newlyweds descend to the corner cafe to feast on a sumptuous breakfast of
brioche and cafe au lait and big fresh boiled eggs after a night and a morning of
blissful lovemaking. They wear identical shorts, striped fishermen's shirts, and
espadrilles. Their skin is tanned and their hair bleached and lightened by the sun
and salt water. They are close and comfortable together: "Most people thought
they were brother and sister until they said they were married. Some did not
believe that they were married and that pleased the girl very much" (6).
On this particular morning, after their splendid breakfast, David leaves to fish in the canal that empties into the bay. He takes his bamboo pole and his fishing basket and walks out to the jetty. He rigs his line with a cork bobber, baits his hook with a sand worm, and tosses the line into the water of the canal. For some time he waits and watches the port's fishing fleet far out in the Gulf of Lions. Then he sees the bobber disappear and the fishing line angle sharply. His pole bends and nears the breaking point, and his line hisses as the fish makes a run toward the open sea. It is strong, and David is forced to follow, working his way along the jetty until he reaches the end and can go no further. A waiter, hurrying out from the cafe, urges "hold him as softly as you can" (8). But David, at the end of the jetty, feels that the only way to play the fish more softly is to get down into the water, and he can see that the water is very deep. Finally, with the waiter issuing vocal encouragement and the fish tiring, David is able to steer it back into the canal. A procession of well-wishers forms as he guides the fish back along the jetty until they reach the cafe where Andre, the waiter, is able to climb down and lift the fish from the water.

C. The Sea Bass

It is a sea bass, the largest David has ever seen. It had come into the canal on the rising tide to feed on mullet. Andre lifts the heavy fish and holds it high for all to admire. Then he sets it down on the ground. "(It was) laid out on the road silver as a salmon and dark gunmetal shining on his back. He was a handsome beautifully built fish with great live eyes and he breathed slowly and brokenly" (9). The inherent ability bass have to live long after they have been removed from water is a trait that fishermen and scientists alike have long respected. It is the
remarkable trait in a fish that ichthyologists otherwise find quite unremarkable as far as fish go—with one notable exception. *Wondrous World of Fishes*, a book published by the National Geographic Society in 1965, highlights an extraordinary feature of the black sea bass. "Zoological oddities, black sea bass when young are predominantly egg-producing females. But at five years or so many switch sex, becoming functional males" (120).

Later, as David's sea bass lies on a large block of ice, its dark color faded to gray and only its eyes still looking alive, Catherine asks what they will do with the big fish.

"They're going to take him in and sell him," [David] said. "He's too big to cook here and they say it would be wicked to cut him up. Maybe he'll go right up to Paris. He'll end up in some big restaurant. Or somebody very rich will buy him."

"He was so beautiful in the water...," she said.

"We'll get a small one for us to eat. They're really wonderful. A small one ought to be grilled with butter and with herbs. They're like striped bass at home." (10)

However, while the Bournes do eventually lunch on bass in the Scribner's edition, the fish they share in the Hemingway manuscript is *not* bass. Instead the bass they intend to eat is replaced by a mackerel brought in from the open sea by the port's fishing fleet.

This is a subtle but significant difference, this switching a mackerel for a bass, and the subtlety is sadly missing from the Scribner's edition. Its exclusion pales some of the delicate, artistic shading in a novel focused primarily *on* transition and change. The sea bass is a solitary fish that moves easily through the estuary's fluctuating environment as an individual and even carries a sexual duality within itself. Mackerel, on the other hand, are a fish pursued by commercial fishing fleets. They are ferocious predators that swim offshore in swift schools.
and are frequently called "wolves of the sea." Thus, the opening scene of the book, David catching a sea bass which is switched for a mackerel, artfully highlights the dominant issues that shape *The Garden of Eden*—androgyny, the conflict between individuality and social conformity, and the artist's struggle with commerciality. The pattern for how these issues are developed and unified by David and Catherine Bourne is close at hand as well—the estuarine setting.

MASCULINE AND FEMININE SEXUALITY

A. *Male and Female Created He Them*

Mirroring the way black sea bass regender from female to male, after David's fishing feat, Catherine's gender shifting begins. Over their lunch of grilled mackerel, Catherine tells David she has a surprise for him. It is something very simple but very complicated. And it is something dangerous. They make love in their room, then she leaves, riding her bicycle up to Aigues Mortes, and David finds himself drinking alone for the first time since their marriage. When Catherine returns, her hair is "cropped short as a boy's. It was cut with no compromises" (14-5). Going to David's barber, she had asked him to cut hers the same way David's was cut the week before. Now, she tells David, she is a girl and she is a boy, too, "... and I can do anything and anything and anything. ... Why do we have to go by everyone else's rules? We're us" (15). She adds, in a passage cut from the published edition, "'You won't mind about it being dangerous? I've thought about all that. It is but look what we gain. It isn't everybody that has someone that's half girl and half boy'" (1/1/18).
Catherine's metamorphosis is a changing not a change, and David is drawn to the changing as well. But, again, much of the manuscript's subtle artistry is missing from the published novel. The Scribner's edition paints a passive, accepting David who is a rather reluctant participant in the androgynous experimentation. In truth, David is anything but a victim, as the manuscript shows. "'It isn't everybody that has someone that's half girl and half boy.'" Could it be that David truly desires a boy? The excised Rodin sculpture, portions of deleted dialogue, and David's interior monologues in the manuscript reinforce both David's and Catherine's roles as estuarial figures subject to transition, change, and fluctuation. David Bourne is drawn to the gender interface of androgyny, drawn as equally to a submissive and subordinate role as Catherine is to an active and dominant role. But, whereas Catherine shifts genders back and forth, David vacillates emotionally.

David is the passive partner in the Bournes' relationship from the very start. Over breakfast at le Grau du Roi in the opening scene, he maintains an aloofness and a lack of assertiveness.

"What are you thinking?" the girl asked.
"Nothing."
"You have to be thinking something."
"I was just feeling."
"How?"
"Happy."

... [W]e don't have to worry about anything do we?" 
"Nothing."
"What do you think we should do?"
"I don't know," he said. "What do you?" (5)
David accepts the passive role easily and naturally because he is, in fact, comfortable in that role.

Later that night, in the darkness of their room at le Grau du Roi, after David's sea bass and Catherine's haircut, Catherine initiates the changing. She asks David if he remembers the sculpture in the Rodin museum. The Auguste Rodin piece in question, "The Metamorphoses of Ovid" from *The Gates of Hell*, depicts two women in an erotic embrace. A key aspect of the sculpture is the initial sexual ambiguity of the dominating, closely-shorn figure on top who bends over a supine, feminine figure incorporated into the base. Catherine, lying on top of David, asks him to try not to think, only to feel and to change, as in the sculpture. She coaxes and persists, and David lies back and closes his eyes:

He lay there and he felt something and then [something that yielded and entered]! and he helped with his hands and then lay back in the dark and did not think at all and only felt the weight and the strangeness and she said, "Now you can't tell who is who can you...? Will you change and be my girl and let me take you?... You are changeing.... Yes you are and you're my girl Catherine.... I'm Peter. You're my wonderful Catherine. You're my beautiful lovely Catherine...."

(1/1/20-21)

In *Hemingway's Quarrel with Androgyny*, Mark Spilka notes that, while references to the statue were deleted from the Scribner's edition, its presence in the manuscript shows glimpses of the "inner journey, a 'sea change' as seen from inside the iceberg" that marks the depth of Hemingway's vision and the trademark of his writing craft (285). No mere sexual depravity, the androgyny becomes, instead, a natural expression of sexual experimentation and personal growth.

Later, as Catherine sleeps, David considers what they have done. The Rodin sculpture plays into his thoughts as well:
And who are you to judge and who participated and who kept his eyes open and accepted the change and lived it? If that is what she wants who are you not to wish her to have it and how do you know you do not want it just because you never did? You know the statue moved you and why shouldn't it? Did it not move Rodin? You're damned right it did and why be so holy and so puritanical. You're lucky to have a wife that is a wild animal instead of a domestic animal and what is a sin is what you feel bad after and you don't feel bad. Not with the wine you don't feel bad, he told himself and what will you drink when wine won't cover for you? (1/1/23-24)

Although a rigid, puritanical voice resists, David's liberal side rationalizes his actions and allows him to be molded. He soon lets Catherine have her way with his hair and his appearance. He accepts her financial support as well. Then, later, he offers weak resistance to the addition of Marita to their marriage.

David has been moved by the Rodin and by the androgyny, and he does own up to his responsibility in the events that transpire, as the following monologue indicates:

"So that's how it is," he said to himself. "You've done that to your hair and had it cut the same as your girl's and how do you feel?" He asked the mirror. "How do you feel? Say it."
"You like it," he said.
He looked at the mirror and it was someone else he saw but it was less strange now.
"All right. You like it," he said. "Now go through with the rest of it whatever it is and don't ever say anyone tempted you or that anyone bitched you." (84)

He confesses his complicity, but his convictions are shaky and uncertain. It is a complicated issue for David. The androgyny, on one hand, is stimulating and opens up new horizons and new experiences. He feels danger for himself and for Catherine, and that is part of what makes it exciting, too. Additionally, the submissive role he takes seems to be one to which he is genuinely drawn.
However, his passive acceptance of Catherine's changes and his active acceptance of complicity are accompanied and undercut by feelings of doubt, fear, and self-reproach—"and what will you drink when wine won't cover for you?"

A battle rages inside David. The rigid, conservative, and puritanical sentiments that surface bring David to rationalize his actions with another voice, a more liberal and uninhibited voice, that says, "It can't be bad if it feels good. I can't be bad if I don't feel bad... so I mustn't allow myself to feel bad." Each new twist Catherine throws out is like a freshet bringing new eddies to the estuary. It forces David to confront these alternating and conflicting voices inside himself. And then there is this other issue—homosexuality. It adds nervous tension to the androgynous changes.

B. Boys for Pleasure and Melons for Delight

In Hemingway's Quarrel with Androgyny, Mark Spilka details the role androgyny played in Hemingway's life and art—from Grace Hemingway dressing Ernest and his sister Marcelline as twins to androgynous factors in Hemingway's four marriages. There is no reason to elaborate further on that background here other than to register Spilka's assertion that Hemingway related closely to women's positions, sexually and socially. This aspect figures prominently in The Garden of Eden where David Bourne bonds primarily with women. Nick Sheldon, Andy Murray, and Colonel Boyle are, more or less, associates with whom he discusses art and past adventures. With women--Catherine, Marita, Barbara Sheldon, and Madame Aurol--however, David displays much more openness, intimacy, humor, and spontaneity. In addition, Catherine, Marita, and Barbara Sheldon all openly
share a common experience with lesbian sexuality while the male characters in the Hemingway text overtly reject any form of homosexuality.

Hemingway's hypersensitivity to any suggestion he was less than a virile, "man's man" is well documented. Max Eastman's "Bull in the Afternoon," a 1933 critique of Hemingway's lengthy guide to the sport of bullfighting, *Death in the Afternoon,* threw barbs at Hemingway's overt masculine posturing, attacking both his writing and his personality and claiming Hemingway had developed "a literary style, you might say, of wearing false hair on the chest" (Myers 232). Hemingway was outraged, but not by Eastman's criticism of the book. He assumed that Eastman's "assertion (false hair on the chest) . . . meant Hemingway was either impotent or queer" (Myers 232-33). Hemingway responded quickly and repeatedly in writing. Four years later, Hemingway's chance encounter with Eastman in Max Perkins' office at Scribner's even resulted in a well publicized wrestling match. This posturing, hypersensitivity, and overreaction has led some to suspect covert homosexuality in Hemingway. Gertrude Stein wrote that his posturing covered up some of his greatest talent: "He had compensated for his incredibly acute shyness and sensitivity by adopting a shield of brutality. When this happened he lost touch with his true genius" (Myers 241).

In this respect *The Garden of Eden* allows homosexuality greater presence and exposure than do Hemingway's previous works. Lying on the beach the day after their initial foray into the waters of androgynous lovemaking, Catherine asks David, "You don't mind being brothers, do you?" David replies, "'No!'" (21). The Jenks edition politely attempts to skirt this controversy thereafter by deleting many scenes that reflect David's ambivalence to participation in androgynous homosexuality in addition to the androgynous role reversals. In doing so, the Jenks edition subsequently ignores David's fluctuating positions and fails to
illuminate fully the turbulent internal conflict between his puritanical social mores and his desire for liberated, uninhibited sexual experimentation. The manuscript, however, evinces this internal struggle and the estuarial ebb and flow in his vacillating emotions.

In one heavily edited scene from the Bournes' sojourn in Madrid, while they drink beer and eat shrimp in the shade outside the Cervezeria Alvarez, David spies his good friend Andy Murray, a writer as well, who is excised totally from the published novel. Andy joins the Bournes, and David introduces him to Catherine. Soon the discussion turns to art and literature, and Catherine asks Andy about ordering some melon:

"Can we have melon, Andy...? Andy, do you believe it about women for breeding, boys for pleasure, and melons for delight?"

"I only eat them."

"But isn't it a lovely proverb even if it isn't true...? I always thought of it as everything that Kipling left out," Catherine said. "Imagine how he would have been with all that in. Sometimes it's almost there but then it moves away. He knew it for a while and then he was ashamed of it. That's what I want David not to leave out."

"What if the proverb isn't true?"

"It must have been for someone. Or maybe it was a joke. Anyway things you don't approve of you should understand..."

"Let's eat the melon," David said.

"It's delicious," Catherine said. "It's sensational," Andrew said. "In the finest sense. I'd like to have known Catherine when she was being sensational."

"It was only four weeks ago," Catherine said. "I think maybe I will be again."

"This afternoon?" David said.

"Yes. Why not?" (3/9/14-15)
David avoids uncomfortable situations, and Catherine's androgynous changes stir up the dichotomous conflict that simmers inside. He copes with her changing at night—but in daylight and in public?

The next morning Catherine visits the Prado as a boy, violating her own restrictions and bringing the night things out into the day. The Jenks edition retains the subsequent encounter in which she later finds David at the Cervezeria Alvarez chatting with Colonel Boyle who had witnessed her boyish excursion. But Jenks edited away the Bournes' luncheon with the Colonel and Andy Murray the next day as well as critical portions of the events that follow. After the luncheon outing, on the bed in their shuttered hotel room, Catherine asks David to kiss her. He answers, "Not if you're a boy and I'm a boy" (67). A few minutes later Catherine tries again.

"Think about me when I came in yesterday and you kissed me and I said it. Remember? How will you ever know unless we try?"
"If you have to try let's wait until it's dark. . . ."
"It's dark enough."
"No it's not."
"Why do we have to wait?"
"You go too fast." (3/14/15)

David doesn't say he doesn't want to participate. It's just that he's not ready yet—it's not dark enough.

In the night, David wakes and feels Catherine's head "stroking against him like a small smooth animal." He tells her he loves her, and she says she loves him, too, but she's a boy. "You don't feel like a boy," David says. Then, before they make love, he tells her again he loves her, and she asks him once more.

"Please say it. Hold me tight and say it."
"I love you --" and he said it.
"Say my name."
"I love you --," and he said the name [Peter]. (3/14/17)
In the darkness, Catherine celebrates the boundary they've crossed, and David lies there pondering how everything had changed—"changed for him as it had been for her since the day before and since she had waked and gone to the Prado" (3/14/insert19). In a portion of monologue Hemingway crossed out, David continues, telling himself he can't believe he could do happily what he never imagined he could do at all. David can handle Catherine's changes, and he actually enjoys where the changes lead. But David can only cope under cover of darkness. He can't handle the ramifications in public or even in the shuttered privacy of a dim hotel room where his conservative, puritanical side holds sway.

Finally, in a third Madrid scene that develops the next day, the Bournes wake, and they are both very happy. It is another beautiful, sunny day. But remorse settles over David as they stroll through the Buen Retiro. The exciting thrill of androgyny and the exhilaration of crossing a homosexual threshold (even if it is with an androgynous female) doesn't sit well with David in the daylight and in public. The liberated sensual growth he experienced at night, he now pays dearly for as his rigid self-reproaching internal voice takes its turn.

Late in the novel, David's tone even becomes homophobic and antagonistic as he seems unable to resolve these emotional swings and appears to give in to the prudish, conservative, daytime voice. In a conversation regarding Marita's earlier lesbian experiences, he disparages male homosexuality:

"Let's not be jealous," David said. "I'm glad you went through that nonsense and know it's worthless."
"It's only for those people," Marita said. "It's not for us. Anymore than queers would be for you."
"I always tried to understand and to be fair," David said. "We've always had them and I'm never rude unless I have to be. But they give me the creeps." (3/46/40)
In many ways Marita understands the emotional swings, the internal tug of war taking place inside David. In the prior chapter, returning to la Napoule with her hair cropped close to her skull, she told David she wanted to be exactly like the African fiancee he'd had as a boy. "You're better," David responds.

"I don't want to be better. I want to be worse and I want to be your boy too."
"No."
"Yes I will be and you'll love it and never have remorse. I am now and you don't have remorse."
"You're not."
"All right. But I will be in the dark. I won't ask permission either. I think I'll be now."
"No."

"I love us together," Marita said. "Don't you think it's nice I can be a boy and a girl both at the same time? I always knew I could."
"You can?"
"Of course. You'll never have remorse because I'm your girl really and it never happened. It's not perversion. It's variety."

"I like our variety," David said. "Your infinite variety."
"We'll wait until the dark because you're shy," Marita said. "Do you remember when I couldn't do anything or say anything without blushing?" (3/45/5-6)

Marita teases and cajoles because she understands the situation: David experiences the necessary variety and the uninhibited thrill of homosexuality but only through flirting with androgynous lovenaking with a woman—and only, then, in the safety of darkness.

Thus, from the outset, Catherine actively leads the Bournes from conventional heterosexuality to mistaken public identification as brother and sister ("most people thought they were brother and sister until they said they were
married") to an androgynous brotherhood with dark, tanned bodies and bleached, look-alike haircuts. Through it all David hesitates and vacillates. He is an equal partner in Catherine's inventions, but doubts, fears, and self-reproach undercut his actions. His alternating emotions, his dueling internal voices, lead Catherine to the frustration she expresses following David's serious bout with remorse in the Buen Retiro: "'Do you want me to wrench myself around and tear myself in two because you can't make up your mind? Because you won't stay with anything?'" (70)

Another dichotomy brings turbulence to the Bournes' relationship. David needs both a mother and a nubile virgin. Catherine becomes an assertive mother over time. She chooses David's attire, styles his hair, and supports him monetarily and emotionally. As she pulls away from David, she even provides for his future financial needs and arranges his marital future with Marita. The result, for David, is an ambivalence that gradually estranges him emotionally from Catherine and fosters a new commitment to Marita.

Marita, in the end then, seems to serve as an ideal solution for David's conflicting needs. First, she maintains his masculine composure in facing the exciting, but dangerous, world of androgyny. She is, it turns out, a virgin (in heterosexual terms), and her conversion to heterosexuality both bolsters and upholds David's masculinity. In addition, Marita claims to be naturally both a boy and a girl (bisexual?) without the need to invent and change herself as Catherine must. This would seemingly allow a safe (and sane?) androgyny to continue. Finally, Marita provides for David's needs while she subordinates herself to David's writing, his real mistress and love. Thus, while Catherine
remains the heroic and courageous female lead, Marita appears to take a place with the other selfless women that form the Hemingway literary ideal of womanhood.5

The Bournes' gender shifting has a counterpart in Nick and Barbara Sheldon, who appear at the beginning of Book Two of the manuscript but are totally excised from the Scribner's edition. They are both painters. Book Two of the manuscript opens with the Sheldons in their Paris apartment, living a poor, struggling lifestyle little different from that which Ernest and Hadley lived in their early days in Paris. Similar to the Bournes in Book One, haircuts and Rodin's "The Metamorphoses of Ovid" are both implicated in the Sheldons' changing sexuality in Book Two.

With the other two it had started at the end of February . . . [when] they had first turned in off the rue de Varennes to the Hotel Biron with the beautiful gardens and gone into the museum where the changings had started. One girl had forgotten that it had started there and, for her perhaps, it had not, but she too had seen the bronze long before.

"Let's think of something fun to do that we've never done that will be secret and wicked," the girl had said. (2/1/1)

In the cold of their Paris apartment, Barbara Sheldon coaxes Nick into experimenting with androgynous sexuality and, ultimately, into letting his thick dark hair grow until it reaches his shoulders and curls under like hers--the circumstances the Bournes find when they meet the Sheldons at Hendaye in Book Three of the manuscript.

The Sheldons' presence in The Garden of Eden is brief but important. Without their inclusion, several issues become etiolated. For one, with the
Sheldons' androgyny, Catherine's gender shifts appear less like aberrant and isolated acts. Second, Nick Sheldon's acceptance of his wife's androgynous piloting counterpoints David's—including Nick's very strong reaction to homosexuality that Andy Murray reveals near the end of the *Garden* manuscript. Nick, with his long, shoulder-length hair, self-consciously asks Andy, "Do you think I look like some bloody sodomite?" (3/47/7) Finally, in addition to the androgynous issues, the scenes with the Sheldons supply critical dialogue relating to art and money that is sorely missing from the published novel. This missing dialogue adds insight to David's artistic struggle with commerciality and Catherine's struggle to define herself.

**INDIVIDUALITY AND SOCIAL CONFORMITY**

David Bourne knows who he is. He's a writer. He knows what he wants to do—write. He wants his writing to bring him prominence, to create and define his individuality. With two published books to his credit and the latter going into a second printing, his career already provides social prestige and some individual satisfaction even if it doesn't supply the income necessary to live the comfortable lifestyle Catherine's inheritance affords them. The same cannot be said for Catherine, however. Her androgynous experimentation, while a search for identity and self-knowledge, is equally a bid for self-definition and self-creation. As David labors with the artistic implications that money (including Catherine's) has on his writing, Catherine struggles with the threat David's writing poses on her identity. In their struggles, David focused on a public realm and Catherine on a private,
each threatens the identity the other pursues, and each generates a current, an undertow, that adds to the fluctuation and turbulence in the relationship.

The androgynous "sea change," made in the night, stirs up the Bournes' world, but the first out-and-out rift becomes visible the following day. Returning from the beach, they collect their mail, and David opens a letter from his publisher containing press clippings and sales figures for his second novel. He immediately sits down and mathematically figures out what his share of the royalties will be. Catherine, reading the clippings, is frightened, as the italicized text, which highlights Jenks' excisions from the manuscript (here and in the following inset quotations), indicates:

They both read the clippings and then the girl put the one she was reading down and said, "They make me feel as though I didn't know you at all and that we aren't us at all. You won't go away now and just live in the clippings will you?"
"No. Why should I?"
"I'm frightened," she said. "I'm frightened by them and all the things they say. How can we be us and have the things we have and do what we do and you be this that's in the clippings?" (24) (1/2/6-7)

The clippings represent the celebrity David Bourne, a publicly perceived and marketed persona. They threaten a personal and private identity that Catherine feels the Bournes should create themselves.

Catherine seeks to define herself in opposition to others, in opposition to society. She wants to be as dark as a kanaka, but she doesn't want to be a kanaka. This is not to say she wants to isolate herself from society; certainly, she is neither a loner nor a hermit choosing an existence outside of society. What she wants is to be different, someone special, someone unique--the darkest white woman ever.
As she takes the active lead in the Bournes' relationship, she attempts to invent and create an identity around them both. It is self-defined and in opposition to, and buffered from, the normality and conformity of the larger society.

"Why do we have to go by everyone else's rules? We're us." (15)

"We're not like other people. We don't have to call each other darling or my dear or my love nor any of that to make a point." (27)

"You know you must never worry about me because I love you and we're us against all the others." (37)

Catherine defines and identifies the Bournes (and herself) as a society of two. (Later this becomes a society of three as Catherine "invents" Marita, too.) As such, this identity depends heavily on David's mutual acceptance, participation, and support.

David, however, is far from being a stable support on which Catherine can lean. The press clippings scene, as it continues, makes this quite clear:

"[The clippings are] bad for you but it doesn't last. Subscribing to them is what's ruinous."

"They're terrible," she said. "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 these clippings do you. . . .? This can't come between us can it? You won't let it will you. . . .? [C]an't we destroy ourselves in our own way or in a true way and not in this niggledy spit falseness? Everybody that is any good destroys themselves but I wouldn't want to die of eating a bunch of dried clippings. . . ."

"The book's made some money already," he told her.

"That's wonderful. I'm so glad. But we know it's good. If the reviewers had said it was worthless and it never made a cent I would have been just as proud and just as happy."

I wouldn't the young man thought. But he did not say it.

(24-25) (1/2/7-8)
"But he did not say it." The clippings can come between them and already have. The separation Catherine fears is already present. The book's success is important to David, as is his own success, and it matters to him what the critics and the public think. He seeks both a public life and a private life, and, writing being a solitary profession, Catherine is excluded from large portions of each realm. She can only partake in his career peripherally. As a result, all of her efforts to create a mutually inclusive identity are stymied. One of the parties has his own agenda. He does not, however, come clean and vocalize it. Catherine is left, essentially, at the mercy of her own creations and of David's vacillating emotions as she seeks to define herself and create for herself a personal identity and, eventually, a public one.

As the novel begins, Catherine Bourne is an independent modern woman in many ways. Physically, she is without family ties, her parents having died in a car accident. An inheritance supplies all her material necessities (and David's), however, and she needs neither a career nor a male to support and take care of her. Likewise, being an American educated at boarding schools in Europe, she is without ties to any community, and she demonstrates no bond to any church or religion. Finally, she is without children, and the text insinuates that she is unable to conceive. Therefore, at the outset of the novel her identity rests solely with her role as David's wife and sexual partner. In other words, she is defined merely by her status as, essentially, a sexual object.

Yet, as an educated, independently wealthy, and attractive young American woman in postwar Europe, there are really very few limitations and bounds on Catherine Bourne. She is truly free to set her own boundaries (bournes), to define herself apart from traditional roles. "Things [truly] had changed since the war"
(167), as the Aurols (the hoteliers) were aware, and in this new world there lay the possibility of creating, and indeed for Catherine the necessity to create, her own measure, her own world—to create herself. In this she becomes compelled to compete in the masculine world. She takes on the active, masculine role sexually, but socially as well, acting upon an outside object (David) to shape him into her own image. She learns to drink Pernod and drive the sporty Bugatti roadster. She picks up Marita, initiates a relationship with her, and then passes her on to David. But assuming male roles draws her into conflict with David as well. She fears the press clippings’ impact on their relationship, and, in turn, she becomes jealous of his work, his writing. Soon she seeks to shape, control, and dominate that writing by first encouraging him to write the narrative of their life (which also guarantees her presence in his solitary career) and, later, by insisting upon it.

But is Catherine trying to be "male"? Is her sexual and social behavior an indication that she is less "female"? Or is she expressing valid human drives that society classifies as "masculine" and "feminine"? In Toward A Recognition of Androgyny, Carolyn Heilbrun notes that if we as a society are yet "heirs of the Victorian age, we must also recognize that our definitions of the terms 'masculine' and 'feminine' are themselves little more than unexamined, received ideas." She continues:

According to the conventional view, "masculine" equals forceful, competent, competitive, controlling, vigorous, unsentimental, and occasionally violent; "feminine" equals tender, genteel, intuitive rather than rational, passive, unaggressive, readily given to submission. The "masculine" individual is popularly seen as a maker, the "feminine" as a nourisher. Qualities which the Victorians considered admirable in men they thought perverted in women, an attitude which Freud did much to sanctify. (xiv)

Heilbrun clearly delineates her own position:
My opinion is easily enough expressed: I believe that our future salvation lies in a movement away from sexual polarization and the prison of gender toward a world in which individual roles and the modes of personal behavior can be freely chosen. The ideal toward which I believe we should move is best described by the term "androgyny." This ancient Greek word—from andro (male) and gyn (female)—defines a condition under which the characteristics of the sexes, and the human impulses expressed by men and women, are not rigidly assigned. Androgyny seeks to liberate the individual from the confines of the appropriate. (ix-x)

Catherine Bourne, in defining herself in opposition to society, seeks exactly this—to liberate herself from "the confines of the appropriate."

The ramifications for Catherine are obvious, but androgyny is equally pertinent to David's quest for self-defined individuality as a writer. Heilbrun cites psychological studies done at the University of California at Berkeley and quotes Donald W. MacKinnon, director of the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research, who wrote in 1962:

On a number of tests of masculinity-femininity, creative men score relatively high on femininity, and this despite the fact that, as a group, they do not present an effeminate appearance or give evidence of increased homosexual interests or experiences. Their elevated scores on femininity indicate rather an openness to their feelings and emotions, a sensitive intellect and understanding self-awareness and wide-ranging interests including many which in American culture are thought of as more feminine. . . . (xviii-xix)

Many people feel threatened by androgyny, Heilbrun claims. They fear not only homosexuality, or the appearance of homosexuality, but also impotence and frigidity resulting from less restrictive patterns of sexual behavior. The liberal side of David's personality desires "openness to experience" and "openness to emotions," but his prudish, judgmental side fears the consequences and balks. As
a result, he acts duplicitously, and he reacts ambivalently to Catherine's inventions and self-creations.

Heilbrun says the objective of her book is recognition, not revolution. In this sense, *The Garden of Eden* is a subversive, but not a revolutionary, text as well. In *Androgyny: Toward a New Theory of Sexuality*, psychologist June Singer portrays an ideal androgyny, and this androgyny corresponds closely to the Bournes' gender changes and their quests for individuality:

Men and women function in certain ways; each has masculine and feminine functioning capacities. In the process of living, these qualities, which for want of a better name we call "masculine" and "feminine," are also convertible. The difference is that the conversions may proceed in a single direction as with [an airplane], or the conversions may move backwards and forwards, oscillating so swiftly that it is impossible to discern when "masculine" functioning is in the superior position, and when "feminine." In the case of oscillation, the functioning can be so smooth as to bring into being a personality of unusual grace, adapting itself to every situation out of an inner guiding mechanism that senses what is needed at any particular moment. The guiding mechanism might be said to be operating on the principle of androgyny. Through this dynamism a sense of equilibrium could be achieved. (27)

Catherine and David Bourne seek knowledge and sensual experiences beyond the "confines of the appropriate." In addition, they each seek a self-created identity that is unique and sets each apart from, but not outside of, society. The ideal mixture, this dynamic equilibrium of masculinity and femininity, of individuality and social conformity, is visually portrayed in *The Garden of Eden* as an estuary.
Money generates a strong undertow in the Bourne's relationship. David wants artistic success, but he wants popular and economic success as well. His artistic medium, the novel, with its origins rooted in the development of Western, industrial, middle-class society, is indicative of this duality. David enjoys the sumptuous food and drink of the French Mediterranean as well as the time he devotes to his writing (and to swimming in the sea afterwards to help clear his head). It all takes money--Catherine's money at this point. As he moves back and forth between his desires for artistic purity and commercial success, his emotional swings ultimately have a strong impact on Catherine's quest for individuality and self-definition.

Before androgynous experimentation and the addition of Marita to the Bourne's marriage, David is successful but stagnant as a writer. He is proud of his work, but, artistically and commercially, he desires something more. In this, Nick Sheldon and Andy Murray serve as yardsticks against which David's artistic efforts are measured. However, Tom Jenks' deletion of these characters from the Scribner's text severely limits a reader's understanding of David's aspirations and conflicts. To perceive his situation fully, and its subsequent impact on Catherine, it is necessary to examine the Bourne's conversations with the Sheldons at Hendaye and with Andy Murray in Madrid, as well as a scene from Andy's monograph on Nick and Barbara Sheldon that appears at the end of the manuscript.

At Hendaye, upon first meeting the Sheldons, Catherine is quite taken with one of Nick's paintings--a painting of Barbara on the sand with the wind in her
hair. She tells Nick it's not like his other paintings, and Nick responds, "'Sure it is.'" David explains: "'He means that other people could have done that. But it was easy for him. It is doing what people haven't done that is hard'" (3/3/7).

Catherine then asks Nick if she can buy the painting, but Nick tells her that it's Barbara's.

"Would you sell it Barb?"
"No," Barbara said.
"Look," David said. "It works like this, Nick has a dealer. The dealer takes the pictures and pays Nick a certain amount. It's hard to get a good dealer. A really good one in Paris. Nick doesn't sell pictures. The dealer sells them. He can paint a picture for a present. I'm trying to make it simple and not use painting terms nor slang."

"Thank you. I understand it," Catherine said coldly.
"Dave helped me to get the dealer," Nick said. "He and another man [Andy] you don't know. I owe him a lot. Them both." (3/7/7-8)

Nick is an artist, pure and simple. He doesn't handle money, and he doesn't have to sell his paintings. His lifestyle is impoverished by comparison to the Bournes, but his art remains idyllically pure and untainted. To paraphrase Catherine, if the critics said Nick's paintings were worthless and they never made a cent, he would still be just as proud and just as happy. Interestingly enough, though, it is David who lines up an art dealer and handles the financial details for Nick. Moreover, the conversation at Hendaye ends when Catherine snidely berates David for the way he dotes over his press clippings, and David storms out of the restaurant leaving Catherine with Nick and Barbara.

For a time at Hendaye, David gets sidetracked, writing about the Sheldons and Nick's painting. The writing comes easy, too easy, and that bothers him.

Then walking through the village one afternoon, enjoying the view across the
estuary to the mountains in Spain, he ruminates on his recent output (and again I have italicized the portions deleted from the Scribner's edition):

You didn't work at all really. Sure you did. But do you really give a damn about it? No. Let someone else write it. Andy knows it better than you do and he is in love with the girl and always has been. He told you the story about the time at the Deux Magots and he told it so well you thought it happened to you. You were taking it from him today. You cheap crook. It's his story. Let Andy write it and let him do the painting part... If you're a writer write about your own damned girl. If you have to write then write that.

And you better write it soon because it is going too fast and you are going with it so you might as well write it. How well do you see it you stupid bastard that can't even remember what's Andy's and what's yours? You'll never know unless you try to write it. You'll be through as a writer and anything else before you ever know it's gone. Maybe you're through now. All right. Don't start it now. At least you remember that much. Not after you used up your writing juice this morning on that writing you did that's no better than jerking off. Next you'll be writing letters and telling yourself you worked. Next you'll be an homme des lettres the way you signed in on the fiche at the hotel. Tomorrow morning start to bite on the nail and write it... (44-45) (3/5/9-10)

David struggles to be the artist Nick is. He is not happy just being a published writer. He wants to make the rare artistic leap and achieve his own vision. He wants to write his own stories, transcend his mundane existence, and achieve some piece of immortality—and he wants critical success and fame to follow.

David holds Nick in the highest regard. When he and Andy Murray cross paths later at the Cervezeria Alvarez in Madrid, they speak with respect and admiration for the purity of Nick's art:

"You know Nick." [David said]
"Nobody knows him. There's only the painting and that wonderful soundness. It's like saying you know a great horse."
"He's human. He's not a horse."
"Oh sure. He's human like a horse... I mean that he's so fine at what he does that everything goes into it. His dross is goodness where ours is just something skim-able."

"What's the market on dross now? I could unload." (3/9/5)

Nick is an artistic exemplar for them. Both respect Nick's devotion to his painting, and they admire his reaching for something that is difficult, maybe even impossible, to achieve. They contrast his artistic purity and brilliance to their own deficiencies. But while Andy clearly puts Nick on a pedestal, David does not. He admires, and aspires to, Nick's artistic brilliance, but he also desires worldly, commercial success.

Andy's monograph, his prose sketch of Nick and Barbara Sheldon, shows a glimpse of this brilliance to which David aspires. The monograph is the next-to-the-last chapter of The Garden of Eden manuscript, and, together with the last chapter, it is the provisional ending Hemingway devised at one point, fearing he was going to die before he could conclude the novel. In the sketch, Andy Murray describes what transpires when he visits the Sheldons at Hendaye after parting company with David and Catherine in Madrid. Andy relates how, one day, after a successful morning spent writing, he was sitting in the cafe reading the papers when Nick returned from painting seascapes at high tide on the sandbar in the estuary.

He was burned black, his shorts were salt stained and had paint on them and his blue striped shirt was shrunk by the sea and the sun so there was a gap above the shorts where his hard belly muscles showed. He sat down, his head soaked with salt water, his hair close to his skull, tangled and drying in the sun.

"I'm getting it, Andy," he said. "The change in the current in the sandbar when the flood comes. With just the land breeze. Have you ever seen the sand out there when it's wet?"

"No."
"I know. You have your own problems. But come out though sometime on this tide if you're finished. You could fish. I see lots of fish working."
"Can you paint that?"
"I don't know. If I'm good enough. It's another movement and I'm getting the movements. . . . But I'd like to stop the movement to see what I see. Though that isn't what you see. Sorry to talk balls."
"It's not."
"I was making sketches. You see I'm trying to get something that I can't get probably. But I think I can. Today I lay down and tried to see it from underneath. . . . That was just an idea. It didn't work at all. I saw something though. The fish passing that make the bulge. They came by in a boil of sand. They were mullet I think. Maybe not."
"You're trying for something awfully difficult."
"All the easy things have been done Andy. And most of the possible things." (3/47/26-28)

Nick is so absorbed in his art that he totally immerses himself in it, in the estuary and the rising tide, and in the movements and changes around him.

David desires the same artistic devotion and immersion. He wants to stake out his own terrain and reach for something that may be beyond his grasp. He wants to achieve, in his writing, what has not been achieved before--to capture a story so well in words that the reader is right there, sees the people and places, and lives the action (what Hemingway called the fourth and fifth dimensions). When David finally encounters the right situation, he does take risks and tackles the hard stories he'd always put off writing. It is not an easy task though, because, whereas Nick lives an artistically pure (and idyllically innocent) existence, commercial success--both critically and economically--infiltrates David's domain. The conflict between the two complicates his life and his art--and, in turn, impacts Catherine's life as well.
Catherine educates herself during their stay in Madrid, studying Spanish and reading Proust. She spends hours in front of the paintings at the Prado. All of this leads to a discussion of Proust, art, and writing in the scene at the Cervezeria Alvarez from which Andy Murray was deleted:

"It's terrible to have such a wonderful country and no good painters ever paint it," Catherine said. "All the way we came I saw wonderful things to paint and I can't even paint at all and never could. I know wonderful things to write and I can't even write a letter that isn't stupid. I can't even read most of the time because most writing is so worthless." (3/9/8)

Catherine, however, spending all her time with writers and painters, really becomes somewhat of an artist herself:

"I'm reading now and looking at outside things and trying not to think about myself," Catherine said. "I was thinking so much about myself that I was getting impossible. I was like a painter and I was my own picture. It was awful." (3/9/4)

Catherine is her own canvas, and her motivation to create is tied directly to her desire for knowledge, self-definition, and individuality. After viewing the Rodin sculpture, she creates her sculpted, boyish head. After viewing the paintings of Hieronymous Bosch and other masters at the Prado, she essentially feels as though she were painting herself. And, of course, Catherine is also well aware of the role she plays in engendering the narrative of their life that David writes.

Commerce and the marketplace intrude on Catherine and her artistic creations, however, just as they do with David. The morning following Catherine's introduction to Andy Murray, David leaves the hotel early after setting an alarm for Catherine so she can make it to the Prado when it opens--this time to
look at the paintings as a boy. Walking up the hill to the Santa Ana Plaza, David pictures Catherine:

He thought of her sleeping as he had covered her carefully with the sheet, the beautiful rumpled head that looked like an ancient coin lying against the under sheet, the pillow pushed away, the upper sheet showing the curves of her body. . . . I must tell her about the coin. She makes all the surprises. But I saw this when she was asleep. It is like making a drawing or a painting using a person as she said only this is making a head for a coin. (3/13/5-6)

Money and commerce (and David's focus on commercial success) undermine Catherine's artistic creations, and this subversion of artistic self-creation carries over into her role in David's narrative as well.

At le Grau du Roi, Catherine had been frightened when David read the clippings his editor sent. At Hendaye, she needled him about the clippings in front of Barbara and Nick Sheldon. But David's patronizing explanation of Nick's financial arrangement with an art dealer provides a new avenue for Catherine to explore in her search for self-definition and her quest for an inclusive role in David's career. By late summer, with David involved with Marita and his writing focused on the African stories, Catherine changes roles, moving from creator of the events shaping the narrative to her new role as the book's publisher. Methodically and business-like, she arranges to have the manuscript typed, lines up artists to do illustrations, and sets about organizing both the manuscript and David's business affairs. "I can't help it if I'm practical and sensible," she tells Marita. And Marita tells David later, "She's become a very great publisher now. She's given up sex. It doesn't interest her anymore. It's childish really, she says" (190).
David, caught himself between artistic purity and commerciality, vacillates emotionally, and these vacillations magnify in Catherine as she swings to extremes. As publisher now, she determines to promote and market David, the narrative of their life, and, thus, her own life and personality. Seeing the African stories as an obstacle, Catherine burns them, then offers to make financial restitution. "'Weren't the stories worth a lot...? I'll have their value determined and I'll have twice that paid into your bank'" (226). Catherine finally departs via train, her mental health in considerable doubt, and Marita is left as "Heiress," a title David has bestowed upon her.\textsuperscript{8} Already receiving a wealthy inheritance herself, Marita now inherits David and Catherine's position and roles as well.

**SANITY AND INSANITY**

Much as androgyny takes center stage in the opening pages of *The Garden of Eden*, David's creative breakthrough (discussed in my next chapter) and Catherine's unstable mental condition are the focus of the final pages. Searching for individuality, Catherine comes into conflict with both David and society, and the turbulence created by these conflicts profoundly affects her mental stability. The societal conflict is two-headed. First, today's Western technological society, in its zeal to dissect, analyze, and compartmentalize knowledge and experience, is increasingly schizophrenic itself. It emphasizes linear and analytical thought processes and temporal and quantitative factors at the expense of holistic, inductive, non-verbal, and qualitative methods. In addition, mass consumerism being the lifeblood of a market economy, Western society breeds conformity--even
exploiting countercultures and renegades and turning their artifacts and emblems into fads and fashions. Catherine defines herself in opposition to society yet finds that society's schizophrenic polarization impacts her identity and its marketplace economy thwarts her creations. Finally, David Bourne, in addition to his emotional vacillation and his career that excludes Catherine, further aggravates the divisions generated in her world by virtue of the duplicitous and conflicting messages he conveys. It leads one to question his mental stability as well.

A. A Tin of Maquereau Vin Blanc Capitaine Cook

In *The Garden and the Map: Schizophrenia in Twentieth-Century Literature and Culture*, John Vernon examines the way Western culture separates and isolates experience into tidy, discontinuous, and mutually exclusive categories. In particular, he looks at the role that fantasy and reality play in literature and culture. Quite closely related to this duality is the sanity-insanity dichotomy. In Western culture with its tradition of scientific thought processes, these domains of sanity and insanity are defined by the exclusion of one or the other. Drawing on Greek philosophy, the physics of Newton and Einstein, modern psychology, and the essays of Michel Foucault, Vernon writes:

A culture is the most pervading organization of experience for each of us; it is what, after childhood, makes the perceptions of a few accessible to the many, and also what enslaves us to those perceptions. This enslavement is so strongly rooted in our culture that those who escape it are usually called "insane," a term that is therefore more a political or social label (as R. D. Laing asserts) than a medical one . . . . This is the defining characteristic of Western culture: it is schizophrenic, in that it chooses to fragment its experience and seal certain areas off from each other. (x-xi)
Western culture, in creating exclusive categories such as fantasy and madness which can then be antiseptically isolated and removed from the more easily managed realms of reality and sanity, is itself mad. It is not madness or insanity in a psycho-motor sense, but rather an "alteration which tears one's being out of the world, which alienates the self by fragmenting it," Vernon states, paraphrasing Heidegger (xi).

Other cultures deal with these dualities, as well as overall wholeness and unity, in a variety of ways. The problem is part of the human process begun with the rise of consciousness and the development of ego. Vernon's argument, however, is that Western thought remains unique in the way it detemporalizes experience and thus the "parts become discrete, atomized, and the whole becomes a sum, not a unity, of its parts" (4). Subject becomes separated and isolated from object, light from dark, real from unreal, and sane from insane. The ties between them, then, are easily broken as they come to lie in mutually exclusive domains. In such a cultural consciousness, there can be no unity, no wholeness, no perception of any inclusive domain. Catherine Bourne attempts to define herself in opposition to this society, yet she remains subject to its dichotomous and schizophrenic rifts and her inventions unravel or are thwarted by conservative social forces (including David).

The seeds of a transition, from the happy unity the Bournes feel that first morning at le Grau du Roi to the fragmentation that leads ultimately to loneliness and separation, become symbolically visible quite early in the novel with the first hints of impending metamorphosis. After David pulls the sea bass from the estuary and it lies on a block of ice, its dark color fading to gray, Catherine asks what they will do with the big fish.
"They're going to take him in and sell him," [David] said. "He's too big to cook here and they say it would be wicked to cut him up. Maybe he'll go right up to Paris. He'll end up in some big restaurant. Or somebody very rich will buy him." (10)

It would be wicked to cut up the bass, not because of any sacred, aesthetic, or culinary quality inherent in the bass, but because they have changed the bass from a fish—a food, an animal, and a thing "so beautiful in the water" as Catherine says—something with intrinsic value—into a commodity to be bought and sold. Because of its size, the fish is worth more in a fine restaurant in Paris where it will be eaten by a rich person who has no connection to it other than as an article to be purchased and consumed. The Bournes, in turn, will purchase their dinner as well.

They have accepted the commercial and cultural values of capitalism held by the people of Aigues Mortes and by the larger society. Moreover, in the Garden manuscript, the grilled fish the Bournes do share is a mackerel, and mackerel represent conformity and market-minded consumerism.10 Later in the novel then, at la Napoule, after working till late in the afternoon on the story he had always put off writing, David, in a sort of natural progression, eats a late breakfast of canned, processed mackerel.

He sat and ate the maquereau vin blanc and drank the whiskey and mineral water. . . . He read the morning paper while he ate.

We always ate fresh fish at le Grau du Roi, he thought, but that was a long time ago. He started to remember Grau du Roi and then he heard the car coming up the hill. (109)

Interestingly, when David opens a can later he even mentions the brand name—Maquereau Vin Blanc Capitaine Cook. (Captain Cook, the first white man to visit Hawaii and introduce Western culture, was subsequently killed by kanakas and buried there.) In similar fashion, as the novel progresses and food becomes
cuisine, the big, whole, fresh boiled eggs, eaten at the cafe in the opening scene, change to fried eggs, then omelets, and finally a tin of caviar for breakfast along with a glass of champagne (130).¹¹

This focus on food and its transition to cuisine is integral to the novel and the sexual theme in the book. In many languages, eating and sexuality are linked etymologically.¹² Both words connote consuming something. According to John Vernon, seventeenth-century German mystic Jacob Boehme argued that this eating-sexuality-consumption connection also ties in directly to the biblical Garden of Eden in Genesis. It relates to the first fracture between subject and object:

In fact, as Boehme asserts, it was the carrying of eating into the body that constitutes what we normally consider the Fall. The Fall consists not in what was eaten but in the act of eating. The apple was the first commodity, in the sense that it embodied the pure act of being a commodity, of existing to be wanted; and Satan was the first salesman. The apple was the first object divested of human significance, the first object pushed into the furthest extreme of its definition, as something separate, objective. It could thus be approached only by the furthest extreme of human gestures toward the world: ownership and consumption. (8)

Further, Joseph Campbell focuses on the role the serpent plays in Man's fall from innocence, a role which is repeated in creation myths from Africa and Asia as well, when he states that "the serpent represents the primary function of life, mainly eating. . . . [It] is a traveling alimentary canal, that's about all it is" (45).
B. *Madness Can Be Fashionable*

Consumption is not limited merely to food items, however, as we certainly all recognize in the United States. With capitalism almost anything can become a marketable item—fishermen's clothing, a haircut, a lifestyle, or a life. The Bournes establish the trends that others are to follow. Catherine, with her flair for originality, creates these styles.

In those years only a very few people had ever come to the Mediterranean in the summer time. . . . People did not wear fishermen's shirts then and this girl that he was married to was the first girl he had ever seen wearing one. She had bought the shirts for them and then had washed them in the basin in their room at the hotel to take the stiffness out of them and now they were worn and softened enough so that when he looked at the girl now her breasts showed beautifully against the worn cloth.

No one wore shorts either around the village. . . . But . . . it did not matter because the people were very friendly and only the local priest disapproved. (6)

The Bournes' matching boy's haircut, which coiffeur Monsieur Jean calls "very conservative" but "sportif" as well, is another style Catherine creates. Barbara Sheldon finds it quite attractive, and Marita first approaches the Bournes to inquire where she can get the same haircut.

Catherine is not unaware of the effect these styles have on other people or of their market value to consumers. She points this out to David in regard to the long, androgynous hairstyle which Barbara Sheldon has convinced Nick to wear. "Mine was a real invention. You'll see. Everybody will do mine and nobody will do hers but queers" (3/2/6). With her rising self-awareness and her need to define herself in her own terms and by her own measure, Catherine becomes her own canvas, her own block of marble, and her own physical and creative expression of
individuality. She becomes in addition, as David notes, a sculpted head on an ancient coin—her drive for individuality transformed into an economic resource. Essentially, it was this danger of which she spoke to Andy Murray in Madrid:

"But when you start to live outside yourself, ourselves, it is all dangerous except in books. . . .
"Maybe I'd better go back into our world, . . . David's and my world that I made up, we made up I mean. I was a great success in that world Andy. I was really sensational. Of course I never realized what that word meant. It was all sensation in the practical not the scandalous meaning." (3/9/12-13)

Opening her private and sensual inner world to a commercial and rational society is an act fraught with danger.

Early on, at Hendaye, Barbara Sheldon had voiced similar fears to David and had warned him to look after Catherine. She reflected on her own situation and her own fragile mental state, and David had tried to reassure her.

"It was just a simple delight or ecstasy. It was private but I made it public. That's the danger. The necessary danger. And I didn't know things took possession of you. Then's when you've gone wrong of course."
"Don't worry about it. . . . Anything that's fun and doesn't hurt other people is good."
"It was. It really was. But now I don't know. Now it owns me. . . ." (3/5/14)

Catherine's individuality, expressed publicly, becomes an objectified, possessed commodity. Just as she had feared David's press clippings would divide the two of them if they believed who the clippings said he was, Catherine's threat now is that her outside, public world will be riven from, and no longer unified with, her inside, private world.
Becoming the narrative's publisher, then, while it is an expression of self-creation and experimentation for Catherine, is the ultimate step down this road of commerciality, the ultimate swing toward self-aggrandizement. She is, essentially, marketing and commercially exploiting her greatest creation and invention--the Bournes' relationship. Catherine creates it, David writes it, and Catherine publishes and markets it. It sounds insane, but "madness can be fashionable," David thinks to himself after a conversation with Madame Aurol. "So long as it pays and is not violent there is nothing wrong with it" (emphasis mine) (3/29/17). It seems David can always find a silver lining.

C. Better Than Anybody's Yes

The Scribner's text, by nature of its numerous and extensive edits, tends to depict a victimized David who ultimately achieves literary success through a sort of suffering and hardship. In truth, as the manuscript shows, David is clearly complicitous in drawing a schizophrenic response from Catherine with his vacillating behaviors, solitary career, and his duplicitous and evasive communications. Not only that--his actions, evasions, and silences infer his own schizophrenic nature.

David's emotional reversals or internal denials over androgynous and homosexual matters create turmoil for Catherine. So do his conflicting desires for artistic devotion and commercial success in a career that excludes her from both public and private areas of his life. But ultimately his evasive and duplicitous communications fracture any real hope Catherine has to restore unity in her world.
David never directly or overtly commits himself one way or the other. He is the same with Marita. Both women declare David malleable, that he will do whatever they wish. Catherine tells him that he's fun to corrupt and it isn't really very hard at all (150). And Marita notes that when he says "no" it really means "yes". "It's such a non-definite word the way you say it. It's better than anybody's yes" (3/45/5).

An explanation for this behavior is revealed in one of David's African stories. The young boy, Davey, feeling a brotherhood with the elephant they stalk, comes away from the hunt with "the beginning of the knowledge of loneliness" and vows never to trust anyone and "never to tell anybody anything again" (182) (201). But David, in truth, cannot hide his feelings or desires from Catherine and Marita--or maybe he doesn't really try. Maybe his boyhood vow is only a child's defense mechanism, and he communicates in other ways. Both women clearly do understand his unspoken wishes--"better than anybody's yes."

Recent clinical and medical research in the area of brain physiology and function sheds interesting light on this aspect of the novel. Left hemisphere and right hemisphere specialization was noted in the first chapter of this thesis. Language and linear functions are located in the left lobe while spatial and non-verbal functions originate in the right lobe. Additionally, clinical and medical research indicates that there are sexual differences in brain physiology and function as well. Controversy surrounds any findings related to gender differences (as one might expect), but considerable evidence "suggests that females are superior to males in a wide range of skills that require the use of language" while males are "superior in tasks that are spatial in nature" (Springer and Deutsch 175).

In *Sex and the Brain*, Jo Durden-Smith and Diane deSimone explore biological gender differences in interviews with numerous medical and clinical
researchers. Their book shows that many statistically observed differences between males and females are not culturally based:

"Some of these differences," [research psychologist Diane McGuinness] says, "appear extremely early in life. And others are more obvious after puberty. But the fascinating thing is that they seem to be independent of culture--as true in Ghana, Scotland and New Zealand as they are in America. First, women are more sensitive to touch. And they have better fine-motor coordination and finger dexterity. . . . Second, there are differences in the way information is gathered and problems are solved. Men are more rule-bound, and they seem to be less sensitive to situational variables: more single-minded, more narrowly focused and more persevering. Women, by contrast, are very sensitive to context. They're less hidebound by the demands of a particular task. They're good at picking up peripheral information. And they process the information faster."

"Put in general terms, women are communicators and men are takers of action." (59)

McGuinness pinpoints the hypothalamus as the part of the brain governing sexual behavior; it controls the body's flow of hormones. She likewise implicates the hypothalamus in the gender differences observed in the human brain.

In interviews with Durden-Smith and deSimone, University of Chicago bio-psychologist Jerre Levy speculates that female orientation to people and communication (in contrast to male focus on tasks and objects) has an evolutionary connection and makes "perfect sense in the context of a hunting and gathering way of life" (72). She summarizes studies that repeatedly show females demonstrate superior abilities in fine-motor coordination and verbal skills, sensitivity to odors and extreme sensitivity to "the presence and variation of sound," and an ability to "pick up and respond to peripheral information and to read the emotional content of faces" (72). Female superiority in language skills
and increased emotional and social sophistication would certainly enhance their roles as social mediators, caretakers, and protectors of the children, Levy argues.

These observed gender differences are further substantiated by research with patients whose left and right hemispheres have been surgically separated. The corpus callosum, a large band of nerve fibers which connects the two lobes of the brain, allows the hemispheres to communicate and transfer information. Split-brain research (with patients whose corpora callosa are severed) reveals that brain functions are highly specialized and lateralized in males. For example, language functions are limited to the left brain in males while females demonstrate some language ability in the right hemisphere as well. This bilateralization in females, combined with the fact that the posterior portion of the corpus callosum is larger and wider in females (even in human fetuses), may explain why females are more adept at verbalizing the emotional content of their right hemispheres. It also supports neuropsychologist Sandra Witelson's suggestion "that men appear better at doing two cognitive jobs at the same time, if the jobs depend mainly on different hemispheres, like talking and route-finding while driving, and that women appear better at single cognitive jobs which require cooperation and communication between the two hemispheres, like reading or assessing a person on the basis of both verbal and visual cues: tones of voice, facial expressions, body language and so on" (Durden-Smith and deSimone 78).

David Bourne does communicate wishes and needs. Both Catherine and Marita read his messages even if he doesn't voice them—or voice them honestly. Catherine reads his vacillating emotions, his body language and facial expressions, his behaviors, and his silences. What she gets are mixed messages that result in the frustration she expresses after David's bout with remorse in the Buen Retiro in Madrid: "Do you want me to wrench myself around and tear myself in two
because you can't make up your mind? Because you won't stay with anything?"
Research with schizophrenic patients indicates that schizophrenia is a left lobe
disorder but that it may result from "a defect in communication between the two
sides" (Springer and Deutsch 230). David's verbal messages are certainly in
conflict with his non-verbal ones. This correlates closely with Albert Rothenberg's
observance in *Creativity and Madness* regarding family environments that nurture
the unusual thought processes associated with both creativity and psychosis:

Both types of family emphasize unusual modes of thinking, and in
both there are often remarkable discrepancies between what family
members say they feel and what they actually feel, thereby forcing a
child within such an environment to become unusually sensitive to
implicit messages. But, whereas in the case of a psychotic person
both parents are commonly disturbed, the creative person almost
invariably has at least one parent who is rather healthy
psychologically. (12-13)

Catherine, though certainly not a child, has no family other than David. And how
healthy is David?

The *Garden* manuscript portrays a caring David who wishes he could make
Catherine whole and healthy again, as the excised portions of this passage, in
which Catherine and the elephant in his African story merge, illustrates:

In the story he had tried to make the elephant alive again as he
and Kibo had seen him in the night when the moon had risen.
Maybe I can, he said, maybe I can make Catherine whole again and
happy too. No you can't he told himself as he locked up the day's
work and went out of the room and shut the door. The elephant was
old and if it had not been your father it would have been some one
else. *There is nothing you can do for Catherine except to try to
write her in the narrative the way that she was. You can do that and
a few other things too.* (166) (3/29/7-8)
While David comes to see Catherine as a foe after she burns the notebooks with the African stories, he never stops loving and caring for her. It's just that there is something there between them—David's writing.

David is committed to his writing. No matter what happens, he won't let anyone get in the way of that. David chooses to immerse himself in his art just as Nick does. "Nobody knows Nick," Andy declared in Madrid. "There's only the painting and that wonderful soundness." Nick's devotion to art is associated with his soundness, Andy implies, and David is in agreement. At Hendaye earlier, he had concernedly asked Nick if Barbara was painting, and Nick indicated she was not. In Madrid then, Andy inquires the same of David:

"He's painting as well as ever, maybe better, but she's not in very good shape Andy."
"Isn't she painting?"
"Not when we were there." (3/9/5)

David loves Catherine, but his commitment is to his writing. It has been that way all along, "but he did not say it."

The Jenks edition reports Catherine's wavering mental stability and her schizophrenic uttering: "Any way I am you and her. That's what I did it for. I'm everybody" (196). It deletes David's subtle echo, however, in the final scene of Chapter 46 when David and Marita sit in the bar at la Napoule discussing David's writing:

"You're not very simple."
"No," said David. "But I try to write simply because the reading must be done by others. I want people who move their lips when they read to find something they would never have known . . . to go where they couldn't ever go and see and feel what they would never have seen nor felt."
"I would think you would write for an elite."
"I do," David said. "I write for you and me."

"Who do you write for really?"
"Me."
"That's good. And after that?"
"Nobody."
"Don't you write to please anyone."
"No. I have to try to be everyone." (3/46/29-31)

Clinical research indicates that mental disorders are gender related, too, and schizophrenia, as a left brain disorder likely resulting from miscommunication between the left and right hemispheres, is most frequently associated with males. David's narrow focus on his writing, his dueling inner voices and vacillating emotions, his struggle to find artistic and commercial success--all the signs point to David's own wavering stability at the interface between sanity and insanity. His evasive and duplicitous communication and his ambivalent reactions to Catherine's inventions are repeated--even to the manuscript's final scene.

DICHOTOMOUS ENDINGS

It seems only fitting that a book so concerned with dichotomies and dualities should itself have two endings. Hemingway, at one point fearing he was soon to die, devised a provisional ending for the book. Then he continued to work on the novel sporadically for years, leading the unfinished manuscript seemingly in quite a different direction. The disjointed conclusion, therefore, is obviously problematic, as it proved to be for Tom Jenks. Jenks solved his problems by terminating the story neatly with Catherine departing conveniently via train and
David restoring the incinerated stories dramatically and quite conclusively in a matter of a few intense hours. Jenks' ending, however, is not at all consistent with the estuarial nature of *The Garden of Eden*.

None of the dichotomous arenas in *The Garden of Eden* ever reaches a stable equilibrium, anymore than do river water and sea water in the estuary at le Grau du Roi. Indeed, Catherine's madness is never a terminal condition either. It is subject to the same transition, change, and fluctuation as every other facet of the book. Her mental well-being fluctuates, but she never crosses some imaginary line into insanity and remains there. Rather, she wavers, is lost, then returns again:

> Catherine . . . lifted her mouth from his and said, "Are you glad to have me back?"
> "You," he said. "You did come back." (169)

> He kissed her and it was Catherine as she had been before when she had seemed to come back to him for a while. (195)

This repetitive and indeterminate quality, like the estuary's fluctuating environment that never reaches a stable equilibrium, is fundamental to *The Garden of Eden*, and the tidy ending Tom Jenks devised for the published novel stands in stark contrast to it.

Hemingway's provisional ending, while disjointed from the action which precedes it, does maintain the novel's estuarial qualities to the very end. Following Andy Murray's monograph (in which Nick is killed and Barbara commits suicide), the final chapter finds David and Catherine lying on the beach some years later. They talk about the first time they came to the French coast, and, of course, Catherine does most of the talking as always:
"You don't have to talk. I'm a great talker. Remember when I used to talk about anything and everything and we owned the world? All we had to do was see it and we owned it. And I was so proud and made everything in my image. I could change everything. Remember? Change me change you change us both change the seasons change everything for my delight and then it speeded up and speed up and then it went away and then I went away." (3/48/4-5)

As the chapter closes, Catherine vows never to return to the Swiss psychiatric hospital again. She vows never to die in a dirty and shabby room as Barbara had in Venice. And she asks David a favor.

"All right now," she said. "I love you. Now can I have a surprise like in the old days. . . . Do you promise. . . . ? Without knowing. . . . ?"
"Yes," he promised knowing.
"If it goes bad again so I'd have to go back to the place can I, may I, do it the way Barbara did? I don't mean in a dirty place like Venice."
"I couldn't let you."
"Would you do it with me?"
"Sure."
"I knew you would," she said. "That's why I didn't like to ask."
"Probably it would never happen."
"Probably. Who knows? Now should we have the nice swim before lunch?" (3/48/6-7)

Tom Jenks avoided dealing with many of the central issues of the text. But, no matter how problematic the Garden manuscript is, it remains true to the estuarial flow and integrity of the novel to the very end.
Notes

1 This is crossed out and replaced with "her hand holding him and searching."

2 Spilka writes that "hair was for Hemingway the public expression of his own private obsession with androgyny, his easy access to a woman's manipulative, talkative, stylistically inventive powers, his secret envy of her breasts and womb, his confessed desire to rest confident in her supine passivity, and his honest awareness of her oppression by men much like himself. Beyond that he obviously liked women, liked having them around as adoring wives or "daughters": indeed, he desperately needed their attentive presence. . ." (39).

3 The incestuous overtones are fantastic when one views Catherine variously as sister, brother, mother, and, eventually, as child.

4 Before they first make love, Marita tells David that she has never really made love with a man before, that she once was married but that it could have been annulled, and that it will likely be obvious to David. He agrees that it would (3/22/21). Rose Marie Burwell examines this aspect of the novel, and the direction literary critics run with it, in "Hemingway's Garden of Eden: Resistance to Things Past and Protecting the Masculine Text" (Texas Studies in Literature and Language [Summer 1993]: 198-225).

5 This issue will be discussed further in the final chapter in connection with David's writing.

6 Discussion of the narcissistic elements at play here (the matching haircuts, Catherine calling David "my lovely Catherine," the mirror Catherine buys for the Aurols' bar, and so on) can be found in Spilka's Hemingway's Quarrel with Androgyny.
An affair Andy has with Barbara is included in this story. Counterpointing the Bournes' *menage a trois*, while everyone is aware of Andy's feelings for Barbara, this affair is conducted behind Nick's back.

The emphasis with wordplay and puns in *The Garden of Eden* is in line with Man (Adam) giving names to things in the biblical account of the Garden. It is David who names people in the novel, calling Catherine "Devil" and Marita "Heiress". Until David makes the shift in allegiance, he refers to her simply as "Heiress" or "the girl."

Late in the novel, David leaves Marita's room to spend the night with Catherine. David notes that she is "Catherine as she had been before," and Catherine asks why he had come, that he didn't need to have come.

"This is where I belong."
"No other reason?"
"I thought you might be lonely."
"I was."
"Everybody's lonely," David said. "It's terrible to be in bed together and be lonely." (195-96)

H. R. Stoneback notes that, in urban street slang, mackerel (or mack) is used to identify a pimp. "Memorable Eggs 'in danger of getting cold' and Mackerel 'perilous with edge-level juice'" (Hemingway Review [Spring 89]: 22-29).

Barbara Probst Solomon, in her *Garden* review "Where's Papa?" in *New Republic*, writes that "The Garden of Eden has got to be the 'eggiest' novel ever written--there is no end to egg references and egg jokes in the longer version--but like the rest of Hemingway's wacky but meaningful humor, most of the eggs have been removed in the published book" (33). The constant references to food, hunger, eating, and eggs may seem excessive to some, but it is an essential aspect in a book which deals with "the Garden a man must lose." Mircea Eliade,
examining the creation myths of Northern Europe, Polynesia, Oceania, Indonesia, and the Indian subcontinent, says belief in a cosmogonic egg plays a major role in many of these cultures. Subsequently, eggs become important in rituals. Eliade writes that "the ritual power of the egg cannot be explained by any empirical or rationalist interpretation of the egg looked upon as a see: it is founded on the symbol embodied in the egg, which bears not so much upon birth as upon a rebirth modeled on the creation of the world" (414). In many myths, it is a crack in this cosmogonic egg which allows the first dualities (earth/sky or light/dark) to appear.

Eating and sexual intercourse are also closely related in primitive mythology. In *The Raw and the Cooked*, Claude Levi-Strauss cites one native South American society which speaks of copulation as, literally, "eating the vagina" and another culture which uses one word to denote both "eating" and "copulation." In the latter society it is often necessary to add "by the penis" when speaking of sexual intercourse (269). Levi-Strauss continues this connection in *The Savage Mind*, identifying numerous cultures worldwide in which eating and copulation are equated by use of the same word or words, cultures where "to eat" and "to marry" use the same verb, and cases where "incest" and "cannibalism" are likewise equated. One of his examples comes from the French language "where the verb 'consommer' applies to marriage and to meal" (105).

David seems to contradict his self-imposed commandment with Marita as they read his story of Davey and Kibo: "He could not help wanting to read it with her and he could not help sharing what he had never shared and what he had believed could not and should not be shared" (203). I take up this issue in the next chapter.
Nick Sheldon is the model and measure of artistic devotion for David Bourne. In Andy Murray’s monograph, Nick reveals himself on a sandbar in the estuary at Hendaye, entering the water as the tide rolls in. He lies down, totally immerses himself in the water, and witnesses the motion of the fish, the sand, and the surf. He studies every detail from beneath the water’s surface, trying to understand the movements so he can create their sum and substance in his seascapes. Nick is the consummate artist, focused purely and completely on his art. David Bourne, in contrast, struggles with what he should write about and how he can make his stories come to life. His art is less pure, his world less focused, and his ambitions unrealized. In the opening pages of *The Garden of Eden*, in the estuary at le Grau du Roi, David hooks a sea bass that has entered the canal on a rising tide. The fish takes him out to the end of the jetty where Andre, the waiter, urges David, "Softly does it. . . . Softly for us all!" (8). But David feels the only way he can play the fish more softly is to get down into the water—and he hesitates because he can see the water is deep. *The Garden of Eden* chronicles David’s eventual entrance into the estuary, the movements he discovers, and the artistic breakthrough he achieves.

The estuary at le Grau du Roi, the framework over which Hemingway superimposed and integrated the marital relationship of Scott and Zelda Fitzgerald,
the break up of his first marriage to Hadley, and a number of androgynous factors from his four marriages, is also the physical representation of the environment and creative processes which spawn David Bourne's creative breakthrough. This chapter examines David's writing in light of the estuarial motif and Hemingway's many statements about the aesthetics of writing. It concentrates on three estuarial aspects: complementary and interpenetrating dichotomies David encounters and employs in his writing; fluctuating, repetitive, and indeterminate processes which impact his life and his writing; and the way Hemingway incorporates some of these same processes and dichotomous interfaces into *The Garden of Eden* text.

Indeed, Hemingway's novel is itself, ultimately, an estuary-like interface—the literary embodiment of the interfacing dichotomies and processes of transition, change, and fluctuation on which the novel is framed.

RIVER WATER, SEA WATER

In the pages of *The Garden of Eden*, David and Catherine Bourne explore transitional zones where dichotomous opposites interpenetrate and coexist. David, in his quest for success as a writer, finds interfaces also stimulate and engender his writing. Caught between two women, Catherine and Marita, and caught between two worlds, his life with Catherine on the French Mediterranean and a boyhood spent with his father in Africa, David Bourne finally uses these oppositional conflicts as catalysts to stimulate his writing. Then he incorporates the tensions they generate, along with other interpenetrating dichotomies (simplicity/complexity, past/present, and imagination/reality) to bring his stories to life.
Before Catherine leads the Bournes into androgynous brotherhood and a menage a trois, David is successful as a writer, having written a novel about East Africa and a book about flyers during the Great War. But, artistically, he remains stagnant and unrealized. An authorial intrusion in the manuscript makes this quite clear in the scene where Catherine and Andy Murray meet for the first time, and Catherine inspects Andy closely: "She wondered if [Andy] was as good a writer as David. Actually at the time one was about as good as the other" (3/9/1). David labors to find a key to unlock the door to artistic creativity throughout the Bournes' stays at le Grau du Roi, Hendaye, and Madrid. At Hendaye, his writing gets sidetracked temporarily, but in due time David returns to the narrative. He shouldn't write somebody else's story, he tells himself. He should write about his own girl.

Then the Bournes arrive at la Napoule, where they stay in a long, low Provencal house overlooking a small river delta, and they meet Marita. Caught between the two women, moving back and forth both physically and emotionally, David soon sets the narrative aside:

It was the second day of the wind and it had not slackened. He left the ongoing narrative of their journey where it was to write a story that had come to him four or five days before and had been developing, probably, he thought, in the last two nights while he had slept. (93)

The third day of the mistral he continues working on this new story, "living in it and nowhere else," and by noon it is finished. He puts away his notebook and closes up the room. Coming out of the story, however, he remembers how troubled his "reality" has become:
This was the first writing he had finished since they were married. . . .

As soon as he started to think beyond his work, everything that he had locked out by the work came back to him. He thought of the night before and of Catherine and the girl today on the road that he and Catherine had driven two days before and he felt sick. . . .

So you worked and now you worry. You'd better write another story. Write the hardest one there is to write that you know. Go ahead and do that. You have to do that. You have to last yourself if you're to be any good to her. . . . (108)

Writing is David's life raft to weather the storms and "sea changes." So he takes out his key, unlocks the door, and steps into another story.

As the tension builds around him and everything begins to feel quite "unreal," David retreats into these stories. He ventures deeper and deeper--farther than he ever has. He wakes in the dim light before dawn, when it is "barely just light enough to see the pine trunks," and walks to his room to write (138). He tackles the hard stories, the ones he'd always put off writing. He begins to live in this interior world--a world he's been avoiding.

He was completely detached from everything except the story he was writing and he was living in it as he built it. The difficult parts he had dreaded he now faced one after another and as he did the people, the country, the days and the nights, and the weather were all there as he wrote. He went on working and he felt as tired as if he had spent the night crossing the broken volcanic desert and the sun had caught him and the others with the dry gray lakes still ahead. He could feel the weight of the heavy double-barreled rifle. . . . (128)

He captures "all the pressure that had built while he was writing" and uses it to bring the scenes on the African plains to life (153). His stories become a very real world--his world. Engaged with Catherine and Marita in friendly conversation one evening, he anticipates his return to "his own country":


... [David] tried not to think but talked and listened in the unreality that reality had become. ... He enjoyed their company too but tonight he'd had enough of it.

Tomorrow he must go back into his own country, the one that Catherine was jealous of and that Marita loved and respected. ... (193)

Morning finds him back in that hot, dry country, trailing the elephant with his father and Juma.

A new tension now works on David as well. When he finishes writing for the day, the inner world of his stories starts to intrude on his outer, daily reality.

[David] said, "I'll go in and get a shower and put a shirt on."
"You don't have to."
"I'm dopy," he said. "And I've been in a hot country."
He did not add that he could still smell baboon shit and rolled figs and that his eyes ached and ... there was a swelling in his right groin. (3/24/4-5)

David lives at the interface of these two worlds--his male-dominated memories of boyhood with his father in Africa and his female-oriented existence with Catherine and Marita at la Napoule.¹ He floats back and forth in this estuarial interface on the life raft that is his writing, and, through the creative process, eventually unites these two disparate worlds. No longer do the stories primarily concern flyers or his father or Catherine. Now, in his own country, he writes his own stories.

The world of David's stories is a world based on memories of boyhood in Africa, and, every day as David enters his room to write, that past comes to life around him, too. As his inner world begins to merge with his outer reality, the past reaches out and likewise intrudes into the present:

Now that he left that country his father still was with him as he locked the door and walked back to the big room and the bar. ...
He stood at the bar because that's where he would have found his father at that hour and, having just come down from the high country, he missed him. The sky outside was very much the sky that he had left. It was high blue and the clouds white cumulus and he welcomed his father's presence at the bar until he glanced in the mirror and saw he was alone. (147)

At the same time, however, the present mingles with, and influences, David's memories. He tries hard to remember exactly how he had felt as a boy and not taint it with the way he felt later. Yet, as he writes of his father and the elephant hunt he witnessed as a boy, he comes to a deeper understanding of those events that is only possible with the maturity, concentration, and effort David is able to sustain with the passage of time:

It had been necessary to think what his father would have thought sitting that evening with his back against the green-yellow trunk of the fig tree with the enameled cup of whiskey and water in his hand... Finally he knew what his father had thought and knowing it, he did not put it in the story. He only wrote what his father did and how he felt and in all this he became his father and what his father said to Molo was what he said. (146-47)

The feelings of the boy and the understanding of the adult merge in the stories of the writer.

Nathan Rosen, a close friend of Albert Einstein, in a memoir included in Albert Einstein: Historical and Cultural Perspectives, wrote that "in building a theory, (Einstein) would ask himself whether a certain assumption was reasonable before he would adopt it. Sometimes, when he was considering different possibilities, he would say, 'Let me see, if I were God, which one of these would I choose?' And, as I said, he usually chose the simplest one" (406). The writing
style Ernest Hemingway developed in Paris in the 1920s centered on simplicity as well: "If I started to write elaborately, or like someone introducing or presenting something, I found that I could cut that scrollwork or ornament out and throw it away and start with the first true simple declarative sentence I had written" (A Moveable Feast 12). In this simplicity, Hemingway incorporated quite a few oppositional pairs. But his simplicity avoided falling into the trap of superficiality and stereotyping by nature of the interrelationship established between the pairs, as David Bourne enunciates in The Garden of Eden: "Be careful, he said to himself, it is all very well for you to write simply and the simpler the better. But do not start to think so damned simple. Know how complicated it is and then state it simply" (37).

David Bourne recognizes and states this aesthetic goal at Hendaye, but it remains unrealized until, in the turbulence of the menage a trois at la Napoule, he grows artistically and truly hones his skills writing the African stories. Reflecting on his previous book about the war, David comprehends how far he's come:

That was a book to get over with. He wished it had been better. It would be if he wrote it now but thank God he did not have to. The weaknesses were his limitations that he was breaking through now on the stories. . . . He had, really, only to remember accurately and the form came by the eliminating. Now he knew he could measure how his ceiling was raised and his range extended by the measure of what he could understand and convey about his father. Then, of course, he could close it like the diaphragm of a camera and intensify it so it could be concentrated to the point where the heat shone bright and smoke began to rise. He knew that he was getting this now and the standard of growth was his understanding of his father and his ability to project it and make it real. It was fortunate, just now that his father was not a simple man. (3/39/3)

As David comes to understand more and more about his father, recognizing his father's depth and complexity, he is able, in turn, to simplify, eliminate portions,
and so concentrate his father's image that the visible portion shines intensely while the entire character moves with the power and dignity of an iceberg—Hemingway's art of omission.

Yet, while emotions and understanding drive the stories, and while his focus remains firmly fixed on the facts, David wants the scenes that elicited his boyhood feelings to live and breathe for anyone who reads the story. Facts by themselves cannot accomplish this. Imagination plays an important part, too—imagination wed to reality.²

It was not [David], of course, who stood there that morning; nor had he even worn the patched corduroy jacket faded almost white now, the armpits rotted through by sweat. . . .

It was not him, but as he wrote it was and when someone read it, finally, it would be whoever read it and what they found when they should reach the escarpment . . . [they would] have it always.

(129)

With understanding that comes over time, with the sharpening and intensifying that comes with eliminations and omissions, and with the realism created by the marriage of facts and invention, David believes he achieves the added dimensions in his writing at last. His interior realm is a country he dwells in alone, but by striving to bring the experiences to life for the reader, by reaching for the fourth and fifth dimensions in his writing, David feels, finally, able to share that world through the stories he writes.
ON A RISING TIDE

Tides play an essential role in enhancing and maintaining the fertile nature of an estuary. In much the same way, repetition of events and cyclical processes are key ingredients in The Garden of Eden. Nick Sheldon, on the sandbar at Hendaye, enters the water as the tide rolls in. The sea bass David catches at le Grau du Roi enters the canal with the incoming tide. David, in turn, enters his creative estuary on a rising tide as well—the introduction of Marita into the Bournes' relationship. Her role in both stimulating and enhancing David's productive and meaningful growth is unquestionable. What remains to be seen is whether her presence will long remain as the Tom Jenks' ending implies.

George J. Stack, in "Eternal Recurrence Again" (Philosophy Today [Fall 1984]), traces the origin and development of Nietzsche's theory of eternal recurrence, also known as eternal return. Eternal recurrence is not a concept that originates with Nietzsche, as Stack shows, but Nietzsche's examination of the theory in his writings did further expand and expose its tenets in Western thought. Whether linked to reincarnation, Buddhist philosophies of karma and samsara, or nihilism, eternal recurrence denotes a cyclic and recurring pattern that controls humans' spiritual or earthly lives or both.

One of Nietzsche's often repeated points is that everything is interrelated, that if one being or one event is repeated, then an entire, elaborate sequences of events would also have occurred again. Actuality, for him, is a dynamic system of interrelated and interacting relations, a Relations-Welt. (251)
While Stack notes that eternal return lends itself easily to a nihilistic perspective, he sees something greater in Nietzsche's writings. In Nietzsche's *The Joyful Wisdom*, Stack says Nietzsche asks us to consider how we would respond if a demon told us every detail of our lives would be repeated over and over again with nothing added or changed: "By asking--'Do you want this once more, and also for innumerable times?'--Nietzsche forces us to examine the quality of our lives and strongly suggests that we *could* change it in some way" (252-53). Nietzsche's theory, as Stack spells it out, is thus a call to examine, and an opportunity to affirm, our lives.

The theory of eternal recurrence certainly relates to the events that transpire in *The Garden of Eden*. Eternal return is the underlying principle of the estuary's formation—the river endlessly returning to the sea. As fresh water from the river mingles and mixes with saline water, it essentially dies into the sea. Yet the river does not die. It continually flows into the estuary. Thus, the fertile estuarine environment *exists* as an endless process of transition, change, and death focused temporally in a continuous "now"—a process scientists call the hydrological cycle.

Focused on a writer's artistic breakthrough, *The Garden of Eden* is likewise concerned with a repeating pattern of transition, change, and death. "The writer carries death in him and the death is his book," Hemingway once wrote. This death is much like the river emptying into the sea:

The writer himself, if he is a good enough writer, is nothing and the book is everything. The writer should destroy himself with each book. There should be nothing left. If anything is left he has not tried hard enough. . . .

Since they (writers) must die with the book and start life again with the next book everything is forgiven at the end of the book. It may be interesting to know that it is the writer who must forgive himself. Now having done penance I will prepare to write again ("Untitled" 3-5).
Catherine Bourne echoes this sentiment in *Garden* while discussing David's books with Marita: "'The second one is about flying... It's a book you had to die to write and you had to be completely destroyed'" (112). But Catherine's words also foreshadow what is to come.

The Bournes, living in estuarial interfaces as they do, cannot escape the continuous cycle of birth, death, and rebirth. It is even reflected in the opening scene at le Grau du Roi when the Bournes eat breakfast at the corner cafe and David says, "'I have these flashes of intuition... I'm the inventive type.'"

Catherine's response is: "'I'm the destructive type... and I'm going to destroy you'" (5). The ties between creation and destruction are very real and run deep, according to Albert Rothenberg. He emphasizes that "artists' wishes to hurt, maim, humiliate, even to annihilate other persons often provide fuel for the creative process" (69). Such is the case with David. When Catherine later burns his notebooks with the African stories, out of his loss and desire to "kill her" if she wasn't crazy, David instead finds new life as a writer and achieves the aesthetic goals he had previously only espoused. But the "old" Bournes are destroyed in the burned notebooks and in their place the "new" Bournes are born... along with the feelings of anxiety, joy, and guilt that accompany the process (May 59).

David Bourne, as I said earlier, needs both a mothering caretaker and a nubile virgin. The caretaker allows him to pursue his writing while a young beauty keeps the "writing juices" flowing. As Marita inherits Catherine's role, her competitive nature effectively deals with her jealousies regarding David's past. She repeatedly attempts to prove that anything Catherine can do she can do better. Then, after Catherine has withdrawn, Marita competes head-to-head with David's
African past. Nurturing and incorporating the African stories into their relationship, she even alters her hair from Catherine's bob to a radical, super short imitation of David's African fiancee. She knows that this does not solve her problems, however. While Marita can love, respect, and compete with David's past by incorporating these elements into their relationship, she cannot be comfortable with the future:

"Will we have friends? Good friends...?
"Will they take you away because they know more than I do...?
"Will they come along young and new and fresh with new things and you be tired of me...?
"I'll kill them if they do. I'm not going to give you away to anyone the way she did... .
"I want you to have men friends and friends from the war and to shoot with and to play cards at the club. But we don't have to have you have women friends do we? Fresh, new ones who will fall in love and really understand you and all that?” (3/45/24-25)

Marita senses that one day another beautiful young woman will come along in the same way she has.

She is justified in her fears. Sexual attraction and fresh erotic stimulation get a writer's "juices" flowing, and writing is David's life. But, for David, there is even more at stake in the menage a trois than just writer's juices. Hemingway, in speaking of the breakup of his first marriage in A Moveable Feast, wrote that being in love with two women at one time was rather like facing death:

First it is stimulating and fun and it goes on that way for a while. All things truly wicked start from an innocence. So you live day by day and enjoy what you have and do not worry. You lie and hate it and it destroys you and every day is more dangerous, but you live day to day as in a war. (210)

Living in the moment, facing death each day, trivial everyday matters cease to be important. A person is forced to face the essential nature of existence and
survival. This intensity of experience is one of the necessary ingredients in David's creative estuary, one of the catalysts in David's artistic breakthrough. There is every reason to believe that it will be just as important in the future, as John Killinger stresses in *Hemingway and the Dead Gods*:

> There is just one catch to the fact that life receives its real meaning when set over against death: for life to continue to have meaning, the death experience must be repeated again and again. The tension must be maintained, or the protagonist ceases to be an individual and becomes part of the mass. (25)

The writer destroys himself in writing his book, and then he or she is reborn to begin a new one. Facing death is a prerequisite for David's writing. Dying into the book is the goal and objective. Therefore, finding a new life afterwards is part of the game.

Visible clues in the manuscript indicate the pattern of the Bournes' marital relationship will repeat. After David and Marita make love at the cove, after Catherine burns the notebooks and David's writing "takes off," David transfers his allegiance to Marita. He feels whole again once he kisses her. They go to the beach one afternoon after David has finished writing, and they take a lunch which includes whole, hard-boiled eggs Madame Aurol packs for them. Soon, David is calling the two of them "the David Bournes, sand writers," and then Marita returns from Cannes with her hair cut in the very short African imitation. It isn't long before she, too, is speaking of "dangerous" things:

> "Isn't it fun to be so scandalous. . . .
> "I don't want to be better (than your African girl). I want to be worse and I want to be your boy too. . . .
> "No."
> "Yes I will be and you'll love it and never have remorse. I am now and you don't have remorse."
"You're not."
"All right. But I will be in the dark. I won't ask permission either. I think I'll be now." (3/45/4)

Then, too, Marita vows to become David's caretaker, putting order back in his life and his affairs.

The Hemingway text turns like a wheel, returns like water to the sea, and the new Bournes' relationship gets off on the same foot as the old one did. Such is the nature of the hydrological cycle and Nietzsche's theory of eternal recurrence. If David wants to achieve the same literary effects again, he must repeat the pattern:

If we do experience peak moments of joy, freedom, creativity, love or ecstasy, it is probably the case that such experiences were made possible by what went before, even by our most painful experiences. . . . Nietzsche believed that a momentary apogee of experience required an entire series of events leading up to it. If we desired or willed the reoccurrence of this supreme moment, then we would have to accept pain, suffering, and the negativities of life that were conditions for the possibility of that moment. (Stack 253-54)

Writing a new book will mean a new life, a new relationship, and a new death for David Bourne.

Hemingway's provisional ending is consistent with the estuarial ebb and flow of the novel, but it creates problems in the manuscript. It is totally disjointed from the in-depth David-and-Marita relationship which precedes it. Ernest Hemingway was obviously taking the text in a different direction. However, contrary to the conclusive ending Tom Jenks gave the novel, I believe Ernest Hemingway was taking the text back to its beginning, to the Garden a man must surely lose again and again and again. Marita already senses what the future holds.
THE FERTILE INTERFACE

Physically and psychologically, *The Garden of Eden* is itself a literary embodiment of the estuarial motif. In its pages, Catherine's conversive art and David's prose mingle and blend as the book fluctuates between the narrative and the African stories. At the same time, the *Garden* text shows Hemingway's intentions to establish a psychological interface as well. By merging invention with reality like David Bourne, by reaching for the fourth and fifth dimensions in his fiction, Hemingway attempts a psychological interface between his inner "country" and the reader's consciousness. Further, if his art of omission is successful, he engages the reader's unconscious awareness as well.

Writing is David Bourne's area of expertise. Marita understands the terrain and fathoms the problems David faces. With her understanding and sympathy, she aids David immeasurably and bonds closely with him. But though she wonders briefly if she might have writing potential herself, she is able to experience writing only through David. Catherine, on the other hand, makes no bones about her abilities and orientation. She is totally oral. David notes that the letter she leaves for him when she departs on the train is the only one she has ever written him.4

After he had finished it he read it through again.

He had never read any other letters from Catherine because from the time they had met at the Crillon bar in Paris until they were married at the American church at Avenue Hoche they had seen each other every day and, reading this first one now for the third time, he found that he still could be, and was, moved by her. (237)
Still, the narrative David writes is essentially Catherine's creation. She lives it, she inspires it, and she engenders it.

Moreover, *The Garden of Eden*, which is this narrative Catherine pushes David to write, is mostly dialogue. Critics initially commented, either negatively or neutrally, on this aspect of the novel when it was published, but I believe the copious dialogue is essential to the text. It is Catherine's presence. Catherine's art is conversation, as Marita tells David when she asks to read the narrative (and David says he would rather she did not).

"How much did [Catherine] tell you?"
"She said she told me everything. She tells things very well you know. *I can't tell them at all.*"
"Didn't it seem extraordinary for her to tell you some things?"
"Of course. I didn't see how she could. But she tells things in the same way you have to write them probably. Maybe that's her master. You know how well she can tell something." (184) (3/33/12)

The spoken word requires the cooperation and coordination of both hemispheres of the brain to turn sound into meaning. In addition, the storyteller communicates with body movement, inflection, and facial expression. Catherine, a sensual being, creates herself through the senses--visually and orally.

David, in contrast to Catherine, communicates through the written word (by manipulating an object spatially), and his African stories are action-filled adventures which chronicle a boy's journey toward, and initiation into, manhood. These stories are the male presence in the *Garden* text, and, as such, they contain little dialogue. Instead, they involve considerable amounts of detailed visual imagery and graphic description of the physical settings through which the characters move. Thus, *The Garden of Eden*, comprised of both the narrative of
Bournes' journeys through androgyny and postwar Europe as well as David's adventurous stories of crossing the African plains, is a fluctuating mixture of feminine and masculine attributes, spoken and written communication, and Catherine's and David's quests for individuality. It represents, in form as well as content, the estuarial motif presented in the opening chapter of the book.

There is another estuary beneath the surface though. To enliven the African stories, David merges imagination with reality, past with present, and simplicity with complexity. By doing this, he establishes an interface between writer and audience. Their separate conscious awarenesses touch and interpenetrate briefly. If the writer is successful and completely pours himself into his book, if he effectively deposits his experiences in its pages, he is destroyed, but part of him achieves immortality. It is not an easy task. But, then, "all the easy things have been done . . . and most of the possible things" (3/47/26-28).

It is interesting to conclude, then, by looking at *The Garden of Eden* text as a psychological estuary, too--an interface between two states of awareness, conscious and unconscious. Medical and psychological research has, over the past twenty-five years, revealed much about brain physiology and function. At the end of the first chapter I discussed the janusian and homospatial processes described by Dr. Albert Rothenberg in *Creativity and Madness*. Creativity is now seen in many circles as an interaction between conscious (verbal) awareness and unconscious (non-verbal) awareness. Dr. Rothenberg's research indicates that artistic and scientific breakthroughs often result from non-normal thought processes which allow leaps or non-rational associations in the mind of the creative individual. Marita and David touch on this, the interpenetration of conscious awareness by the unconscious, when they speak of *mystere*:
"Who knows about writing?"
"Quite a few people. Many that I don't know. Always new ones."
"Can they write themselves?"
"Very well. But they can't invent. Usually that is."
"Do they know what you and I know? About the mystere?"
"They know it's there and they feel it and try to find out how it is done. Sometimes they find things that you had not noticed when you did them."
"Do they know it's a mystere?"
"Some do. But mostly they try to explain it." (3/46/44)

Hemingway implicates the mysterious, transcendental nature of the unconscious realm through David Bourne, but I think he does even more.

Hemingway's art of omission, metaphorically described as an iceberg with only one-eighth of its bulk visible above the water line, indicates what he reaches for in his writing—a text at once consciously-perceived and unconsciously-perceived. Hemingway described his first actualization of this aesthetic principle in "Out of Season." This short story was, interestingly enough, the first writing Hemingway completed after the trauma he experienced when his wife Hadley had a suitcase full of his manuscripts stolen on the railway platform at the Gare de Lyon:

Then I started to think in Lipp's about when I had first been able to write a story after losing everything. It was a very simple story called "Out of Season" and I had omitted the real end of it which was that the old man hanged himself. This was omitted on my new theory that you could omit anything if you knew that you omitted and the omitted part would strengthen the story and make people feel something more than they understood. (A Moveable Feast 75)

In omitting known parts of the story, Hemingway is not only uniting the two functioning spheres of his own brain in the creative process of writing the story,
but he is also engaging both spheres of the person who reads and *re*creates it.

Catherine's art of telling is a bilateral process, and, likewise, David's

(Hemingway's) art of omission seeks the same interface through the written word.
Catherine lives in a world of sensations, in a world of "now." David's African past threatens this world. (Even his war experiences bother her.) She speaks disparagingly of David's African fiancee, harping about how David got a case of clap at fourteen years of age, and voicing her feelings and fears to David after reading the story about his boyhood dog Kibo:

"I'm never jealous of Marita because I'm training her and anyway I practically invented her for you, but I'm jealous of your fiancee."

"She'd be an old woman now."

"Yes. But she had things of you I can never have. Marita can't ever have anything from you that I haven't had better. Really it's like giving her my old clothes." (3/27/27)

Marita, on the other hand, seeks to meld with David's African world. She cherishes the stories. Where she had at first competed with Catherine, cutting her hair in like fashion, she later crops her hair even shorter to become like David's African fiancee.

In a letter to F. Scott Fitzgerald following the publication of Tender is the Night, Hemingway chastised Fitzgerald for taking too many liberties with facts:

Invention is the finest thing but you cannot invent anything that would not actually happen.

That is what we are supposed to do when we are at our best--make it all up--but make it up so truly that later it will happen that way.

Goddamn it you took liberties with peoples' pasts and futures that produced not people but damned marvellously faked case histories.

... [Y]ou ought to write, invent, out of what you know and keep the people's antecedants straight. (Selected Letters 407)

Hemingway later reversed his opinions of Tender is the Night.
Even though Nietzsche claimed the idea came to him suddenly, the concept of eternal return is common to many cultures and traditions. Stack points out sources familiar to Nietzsche, such as Schopenhauer and Wagner, as well as Greek writers. Stack includes these lines from Holderlin's *The Death of Empedocles*:

There will they open the book of destiny for you.
Go! Fear nothing! Everything returns.
And what will happen is already completed. (Stack 243)

Actually, in the manuscript David says she had written several short notes during their courtship in Paris: "Those letters she had written then were short and disorganized and always written David thought as though they were designed to be innocuous if read in court." (3/43/20)

Speech is a bilateral phenomenon in females, and females demonstrate better abilities in verbalizing emotions. Lateralization in males localizes language in the left brain and spatial orientation in the right hemisphere. This seems to correspond to the evolution of skills utilized in hunting--spatial orientation functioning in the right lobe simultaneously paired with specialized right-handed movements that are controlled by the left lobe.
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