

5-1-2016

## 'The Only Thing That Matters': A Critique of the Editorial Practices in The Garden of Eden

Jesse Lee Cook  
*University of Nevada, Las Vegas*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#)

---

### Repository Citation

Cook, Jesse Lee, "'The Only Thing That Matters': A Critique of the Editorial Practices in The Garden of Eden" (2016). *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. 2656.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.34917/9112051>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact [digitalscholarship@unlv.edu](mailto:digitalscholarship@unlv.edu).

‘THE ONLY THING THAT MATTERS:’ A CRITIQUE OF THE EDITORIAL PRACTICES  
IN THE GARDEN OF EDEN

By

Jesse Cook

Bachelor of Science – English  
Dixie State University  
2013

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the

Master of Arts – English

Department of English  
College of Liberal Arts  
The Graduate College

University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
May 2016

**Thesis Approval**

The Graduate College  
The University of Nevada, Las Vegas

April 8, 2016

This thesis prepared by

Jesse Cook

entitled

‘The Only Thing That Matters:’ A Critique of the Editorial Practices in the Garden of Eden

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts – English  
Department of English

John Hay, Ph.D.  
*Examination Committee Chair*

Kathryn Hausbeck Korgan, Ph.D.  
*Graduate College Interim Dean*

Vincent Perez, Ph.D.  
*Examination Committee Member*

Christopher Decker, Ph.D.  
*Examination Committee Member*

Deidre Clemente, Ph.D.  
*Graduate College Faculty Representative*

## Abstract

This essay will conduct a comparative analysis of the editing practices of Tom Jenks during his work on Ernest Hemingway's posthumously novel *The Garden of Eden*, and Hemingway and Maxwell Perkins editorial work on *A Farewell to Arms*. Considering the severity of Tom Jenks' alterations to the novel and the seemingly intentional scarcity of information related to Jenks' engagement with the text, a consideration for how Hemingway's style of editing compares to Jenks' is necessary in order to determine the accuracy of the published version of *The Garden of Eden* in relation to Hemingway's larger body of work. In order to accomplish this, I will analyze the existing material available related to Hemingway's editorial practices to evaluate the changes made by Jenks to *The Garden of Eden* manuscript. What this research shows is that while Hemingway performed revisions throughout the process of publication, most of his editorial work occurred during the initial writing stage. By evaluating *Garden* through a comparison in the editing process performed on both texts, it is clear that while Jenks attests to an adherence to what he describes as the "law of an ancient god," his version of the text is ultimately insufficient in presenting *The Garden of Eden* as Hemingway intended. Following a number of other scholars' opinions, such as John Leonard, K.J. Peters, and even Tom Jenks, I propose the text be restored to its manuscript form to provide readers with an authentic draft of the novel, expanding upon the new avenues *The Garden of Eden* provides for Hemingway scholarship.

## Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank Dr. John Hay, Dr. Christopher Decker, Dr. Vincent Perez, and Dr. Deirdre Clemente for taking the time to participate in my committee and for providing me with invaluable feedback on my thesis. I hope that my writing demonstrates their excellent guidance in creating this essay. Specifically, I would like to thank Dr. Hay for chairing my committee. His willingness to discuss the numerous concerns, and there were many, that I had regarding my thesis throughout its creation is greatly appreciated, and the enthusiasm he expressed toward my project helped to bolster my own dedication throughout the semester. Additionally, I would like to thank both Dr. Decker and Dr. Perez for the wonderful courses they provided me during my time at UNLV, each showing me a new avenue of literature that I had never considered before. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Dr. Clemente for participating in my thesis, supplying a unique and helpful historical evaluation of my work. Lastly, I must thank the John F. Kennedy library for the opportunity to work in their Hemingway archives, and the graduate and professional student association for aiding me in funding my trip to Boston to conduct my research. Without that opportunity, this thesis would not have been possible.

## **Table of Contents**

Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Scribner’s Publisher’s Note and Preface.....	4
Contextualizing the Publication of <i>The Garden of Eden</i> .....	6
Jenks’ Editing Principles.....	15
Drafting <i>A Farewell to Arms</i> .....	20
Jenks Emendations to <i>The Garden of Eden</i> .....	38
Proposal for an Unabridged <i>Garden</i> .....	51
Conclusion.....	54
Works Cited.....	55
Curriculum Vitae.....	59

## Introduction

Published posthumously in 1986, *The Garden of Eden* is a complicated novel for many scholars interested in the Hemingway canon. The narrative chronicles the dissolution of David and Catherine Bourne's relationship during their honeymoon in the French Riviera and the coastal towns of Spain. Throughout the novel Catherine struggles with her gender and sexual identity, while David cloisters himself in his writing in response to his fear that his talent is being consumed by the comfort of his wife's wealth. Catherine's gender fluidity is expressed by an act of gender re-labeling during intercourse, which defines her as male and David female. All of this is played out under the rising tension created by the ménage a trois between the Bournes and a young woman named Marita, whom the couple meets and invites to live with them during their stay. As Catherine and David become more intimate with Marita, both slip further into their fixations—for Catherine, the gender fluidity; for David, the stories he writes about his father. Ultimately, the marriage dissolves after Catherine destroys the stories and leaves Marita and David to begin their own romance at the novel's conclusion. The text is in provocative compared to Hemingway's other works, and yet staunchly adherent to many of the traditional Hemingway tropes, providing a unique experience for any reader willing to pick it up, considering it finds itself squarely placed thematically, morally, and stylistically between the old and the new. In the novel, Hemingway confronts changing cultural paradigms and new artistic modes of expression, though he is in many ways inhibited by his conservative, male-centric, understanding of gender dynamics when representing Catherine's gender and sexual exploration (Varsava 118). And while the novel serves as an intriguing new lens through which to analyze Hemingway and his writing, the mystery surrounding the editing process involved in publishing the novel twenty-five

years after Hemingway's death becomes a point of contention for many scholars when discussing the novel.

While the published version of *The Garden of Eden* contains 247 pages, which represents approximately 70,000 words, the manuscript copy consists of a voluminous 1,500 pages of material, constituting 200,000 words, which includes an unpublished subplot involving another married couple—Nick and Barbara Sheldon—who are used as foils for the Bournes throughout the narrative. According to K.J. Peters, seventy percent of the 1,500 page manuscript material consists of “heavily edited holography” while the “remaining thirty percent are typescripts of various chapters also found in holograph and edited by Hemingway and some other unknown person (probably a typist)” (17). While these emendations constitute dramatic revisions to the novel, the editor Tom Jenks and Hemingway's publisher Scribner provide sparse details regarding the principles behind the decisions made to make such drastic cuts. As a result of the major excisions performed on the novel, the entirety of the Sheldons' narrative was removed, and numerous reductions and revisions to the novel were performed. Though the manuscript for the novel was made available to the public at the John F. Kennedy Library in Boston in conjunction with the novel's release, little information was provided publically regarding the level of emendation performed on the text.

Considering the severity of Tom Jenks' alterations to the novel and the seemingly intentional scarcity of information related to Jenks engagement with the text, a consideration for how Hemingway's style of editing compares to Jenks' is necessary in order to determine the authority of the published version of *The Garden of Eden* in relation to Hemingway's larger body of work. In order to accomplish this, I will analyze the existing material available related to Hemingway's editorial practices to evaluate the changes made by Jenks to *The Garden of Eden*

manuscript. While there is currently very little research available to understand why Jenks made the changes he did to the text aside from a few scant articles written by and featuring Jenks, and research conducted by Chris L Nesmith on the emended manuscript, there is a vast amount of information related to Hemingway's preferred editing style based upon primary material and scholarly research. The standard that I am following for comparison with Jenks' work is based upon Hemingway's editing process for *A Farewell to Arms*, which has been chosen based upon both letter writing between Hemingway and his editor Max Perkins, as well as comparisons between the published version of *A Farewell to Arms* and the manuscript material available at the John F. Kennedy Library. What this research shows is that while Hemingway performed revisions throughout the publication process, most of his editorial work occurred during the initial writing stage. What this means is that Hemingway's novels were often polished drafts prior to their being sent to his publisher, which is reaffirmed by manuscript evidence found in this essay. By evaluating *Garden* through a comparison in the editing process performed on both texts, it is clear that while Jenks claims to adhere to what he describes as the "law of an ancient god," his version of the text is ultimately insufficient in presenting *The Garden of Eden* as Hemingway intended. Restoring the text to its manuscript form would provide readers with an authentic draft of the novel, expanding upon the new avenues *The Garden of Eden* provides for Hemingway scholarship.

## Scribner's "Publisher's Note" and "Preface"

While I would like to believe that Jenks and Charles Scribner Jr. were not intentionally opaque in their presentation of the novel upon its publication, there is clearly a level of ambiguity in how the novel was pitched to the public, and the extent of editorial involvement. This is most obvious in Scribner Jr.'s "Publisher's Note" and "Preface" to the novel, both consisting of less than two full pages of text. Utilizing carefully chosen phrases to downplay the level of editorial power Jenks had over the text, Scribner Jr. explains that only "some cuts" and "some routine copy editing corrections" were made to the original material, which amounts to "a very small number of minor interpolations for clarity of consistency" (vii). Yet there is no clarity in what exactly these changes amount to considering Scribner Jr. provides no elaborating details. Scribner Jr. also attempts to comfort the reader with the notion that nothing was added to the text, suggesting that the publisher was conscientious of the author's "original intent" when devising the published *Garden*—the note even goes so far as to state that "in every significant respect the work is all the author's" (vi). A bold and mostly true statement regarding the literal content that rests between the sleeves of the text published under the title *The Garden of Eden*, but questionable if one considers the larger meaning of accurately representing an author's writing when posthumously publishing his or her work.

This problem regarding Scribner Jr.'s portrayal of *Garden* becomes even more apparent when reading the Preface to the novel, which was added in later paperback versions of the text. Consisting of a terse page-and-a-half of additional content, Scribner Jr. explains that editorial decisions were based on the opinion that only the first half of the novel, essentially the Bournes' section, though it is never explicitly stated, was fit for publication; while what he describes as the latter portion, which consists of the Sheldons' narrative (a companion narrative to the Bournes

that provides context for the couple's fall in the novel) was incomplete, and thus unfit for integration into the text. Here Scribner Jr. provides questionable statements regarding the practices carried out, explaining that the text needed only "a modest amount of pruning" in order to become "wholly harmonious and coherent" (vii). From here, Scribner Jr. provides some personal anecdotes related to his experience engaging with the spry and robust Hemingway, who turned down the proposal to publish the serial version of *The Old Man and the Sea* due to what Scribner Jr. describes as an understanding of the difference between "the basis for a good yarn" and the complex inner workings of the novella in its final, refined form (viii). This is an ironic close to a preface meant to soothe the concerns of an audience worried about the ethics of posthumously publishing an author's work. Even Scribner Jr. cannot avoid the conviction that a text, once finished—whether by the author or by death—is meant to exist as it is, and should not be reconstituted into another form.

## Contextualizing the Publication of *The Garden of Eden*

While other Hemingway texts were published prior to *Garden*, none of them sparked the same level of controversy. This is due almost entirely to the editorial practices used to bring the book to store shelves. Considering that Jenks performed such an elaborate reconstruction of the novel in order to produce what he and Scribner Jr.'s claim is a working narrative, many scholars question the ethics of *Garden*'s release. These concerns arise from the belief that the manuscript of the novel serves as evidence of Hemingway's attempt at developing his style. J.A. Varsava notes that Hemingway's use of extended stream-of-consciousness is "fairly tame by the high-modernist standards," yet it no less represents a "collectively . . . praiseworthy effort by Hemingway to extend the mimetic range of his writing" (130). His stylistic experimentation is shown further in his extended dialogue sequences and an attempt at Faulknerian shifts in temporality (130). Varsava adds that in addition to these stylistic choices, Hemingway also addressed a number of thematic taboos such as divergent sexual identities and an author's affinity for escapism in the face of troubling existential issues (130-1). Comingling old ruminations regarding a writer's responsibility to himself and his art with some revelatory notions concerning gender identity and fluidity, the corruption of the manuscript becomes a source of frustration amongst scholars like John Leonard who believe that the work represents a "late flowering period" for the author (80).

This consternation has produced a multitude of responses from critics spanning the entirety of *Garden*'s publication. At the time of release, the critical reception of the novel was appreciative at best, mostly tepid, and at times outright dismissive. John Updike lauded the work in his review for *The New Yorker*, praising both the text and Tom Jenks' editorial work as "something of a miracle," noting that the published version of the novel is a "fresh slant on the

old magic,” just falling short “of the satisfaction that a fully intended and achieved work gives.” This is an impassioned statement, though not one without a caveat in the form of an acknowledgment that an “edition with a scholarly conscience” would have provided valuable insight into the author’s machinations as he assembled the text. Yet, it appears that while Updike found the text to be a revelation in appreciation for the writer, most critics were inclined to note the weak delivery of a text infamous for its length and scope.

While E.L. Doctorow, often cited in scholarly work on *Garden*, praises Hemingway’s depiction of Catherine Bourne, noting that she alone is cause to pick up the novel, he recognizes the problems in publishing a posthumous text with such heavy emendations. Specifically, Doctorow takes issue with the idea that the text that was found in manuscript is an attempt by the author to break away from the themes and style that had so frequently informed his work. In perhaps one of his most famous statements regarding the publication of the novel, Doctorow posits:

The truth about editing the work of a dead writer in such circumstances is that you can only cut to affirm his strengths, to reiterate the strategies of style for which he is known; whereas he himself may have been writing to transcend them. This cannot have been the book Hemingway envisioned at the most ambitious moments of his struggle to realize it, a struggle that occupied him intermittently for perhaps 15 years.

Doctorow makes this point based on the remnants left from the revisions performed by Jenks, artifacts of the novel that were left behind, which suggest something “exciting,” and perhaps point “toward a less defensive construal of reality.” And yet, there were still those critics who found the text to be as fundamentally Hemingwayesque as any other work by the author, and

resolutely lambasted *Garden* for its adherence to the dated and troubling gender norms of the past.

Francis Spufford's evaluation of the text found the themes and characters of *Garden* to constitute a "narrow sexual fable of the most embarrassing kind" resulting from Hemingway's dated gender norms—what he describes as its "central maleness." Spufford is severe in his analysis of the gender fluidity presented in the published version of the novel, pointing out that "a mind less muscle-bound than Hemingway's would not have seen making love with a woman on top as revolutionary." Furthermore, Spufford found the relationship between David and Catherine, and Marita, troubling due to what he found to be a relationship based upon "an institution in which a man is made happy (or not) *by* a woman." This leads Spufford to the conclusion that Hemingway's novel rests on a central disparity between what Hemingway presents as acceptable for a man and a woman: While David's father, depicted in flashbacks written by David in the novel, is allowed to philander with the African women he encounters during a hunting trip, Catherine's experimentation with Marita is condemned.

However, the conversation regarding *The Garden of Eden* has shifted radically since its initial release, with many scholars returning to the manuscript as the definitive version of the text, valuing the richness of the text for analyzing relatively unheard of Hemingway themes, only addressing the published version in passing unless the scholar is directly critiquing Jenks' work. Scholars like Carl Eby, writing about Hemingway's fixation on race, acknowledges that the discussion of race in the published novel was "skillfully and radically" emended, but spends much of his time focusing on the manuscript's very emphatic discussion of David and Catherine's tanning to appear African (101). Similarly, in Meryl Altman's critique of the queer elements of the novel, she finds Jenks' work an attempt to "preserve Papa's memory" by

removing the blatant lesbianism in favor of a “happier, more smug, more American-bourgeois” novel (132). Steven C. Roe finds comparable changes in the depiction of the Bourne relationship and the undertones of aggression that accompany David’s writing in regards to Catherine. Roe’s analysis focuses on the excised references to Bluebeard’s closet that were in the manuscript, arguing that “David remains an oppressive and violent figure’ obtusely prone to self-delusion” (53).

Though all these scholars address Jenks’ editing in their research, it is scholars such as K.J. Peters and Chris L Nesmith, whose work with the manuscript materials in conjunction with the published edition has provided the most insight into Jenks’ editing process by critically evaluating the various thematic and mechanical alterations made to *The Garden of Eden*. Peters’ critique of the thematic changes made to the published version of the novel focuses on Jenks’ alterations to key thematic elements of the novel that were either completely removed or extensively cut back. These themes mostly comprise biblical elements emphasizing David and Catherine’s fall from paradise. Of particular interest to Peters is Jenks’ removal of Rodin’s *The Metamorphosis of Ovid*, and how its removal diminishes the biblical elements of the novel by essentially removing the forbidden fruit from the garden:

The dissatisfaction Catherine and Barbara feel about their lives . . . and their innocence lead them to emulate the fascinating image of the statue because it represents self-initiated rebirth . . . It suggests that one can remake oneself in the same way that the serpent suggested that Eve would become a god and recreate herself with the knowledge provided by the fruit. (19)

For Peters, the statue is essential to the larger theme Hemingway was utilizing for his novel.

Peters also addresses the mystification of the sex acts by Jenks through his excisions; (20) along

with the truncation of events in the novel, such as David's reclamation of the narratives that Catherine destroys before leaving for France. David's attempt to rewrite his work spanned five chapters in the manuscript, but is cut to two in the published version (25).

Nesmith utilizes the Cooper Library's copy of Jenks' typescript and galley proofs to determine the level of specificity of Jenks' alterations to the text, providing numerous comparisons between the Hemingway manuscript and the Jenks text. Not only does Nesmith provide some detail related to the events that transpired during the editing process, he also includes a chart of minute changes Jenks made to the text, noting that "while most Hemingway scholars and enthusiasts know by now that Jenks cut characters and plot-lines, they may not understand that many words, phrases, and sentences . . . were also cut, transposed, and altered extensively" (24). Nesmith's chart, while not representative of all the changes made to the novel, shows a number of emendations that range from single word swaps to removal of entire sentences. And while this may not appear dramatic considering the size of the text, one must always contextualize these changes against Hemingway's insistence that each word of his novels was labored over meticulously, and placed with specificity and meaning.

Yet, in spite of this mixed critical reception, the novel produced a wave of new interest for the author and a needed boon to book sales for Scribner. Unsurprisingly, as scholars moved away from the morose and often bleak elements of the Modernist era, Hemingway novels began to lose popularity, especially considering their emphasis on the early Modernist style. Jane P. Tompkins, in 1977, characterizes Hemingway as the authorial embodiment of the New Critical approach to literature, seeing strong comparisons between *The Sun Also Rises'* Jake Barnes, who narrates the novel, and the colonizing critic who "must wrest the work from" any reader who disagrees with his perspective "by force" (173). Tompkins finds this behavior both intra- and

extra-textually unsound, noting that any theory (and by extension reader) that attempts to break away from such restrictive interpretations of the text would be shunned and punished as severely as Robert Cohn:

Hemingway's repressive technique allows feeling no legitimate expression within the text. Heightening pain by not articulating it, the mode is both masochistic and sadistic . . . Jake is not allowed to react to what he sees, and consequently the reader has no one to voice his feelings for him. (175)

This overbearing critical and authorial force became counter-intuitive to the more dynamically interpretive practices of 1980s academia.

As feminist criticism made a stronger presence within scholarship, and gender theory began to gain wider acceptance throughout literary criticism, Hemingway became a figure antithetical to popular literary ideologies. As Nancy R. Comley notes, feminist criticism in the sixties and seventies "evolved from resistance and an emphasis on critique of male writers' treatment of women in literature" (206). Writers like Judith Fetterley in 1978 found Hemingway's depiction of relationships between men and women to be juvenile and evasive, commenting on texts like *A Farewell to Arms* that while in previous stories Hemingway had approached a true sense of contemplation regarding romance and masculinity, Frederic Henry simply projected his desires onto Catherine Barkley in an attempt to avoid the responsibilities of adulthood embodied in his military service—something that is ultimately fulfilled in the novel's conclusion (47). Fetterley's argument resonates with the general consensus held toward Hemingway's depiction of women by many feminist critics: a perpetual double-bind where female characters are either plagued with ineptitude or vilified due to a snobbish sense of authority and superiority (55). This evaluation was further problematized by Hemingway's

emphasis on the masculine—both in regard to his austere writing style, and his characters’ notion of “holding tight” against expressing excess emotion and feeling—and frequent use of the macho persona both in his writing and in his personal life, which serves as a target for critics when discussing the overbearing presence of white hetero-males in the literary canon.

Couple this with the poor reception of other posthumous novels released prior to *Garden*, and the incentive to find a compelling Hemingway novel is made more apparent. Public reception of novels like *Islands in the Stream* in 1970 suggests that while Hemingway still made headlines, and gave fans a sense of excitement at the opportunity to read something from the deceased author, his posthumous works were not winning over a new audience. Christopher Lehmann-Haupt, in his *New York Times* review of *Islands* explains “despite all inclinations to believe in miracles . . . it is hard to approach ‘Islands in the Stream’ with serious expectations” (440). Lehmann-Haupt goes on to assert that while the novel does capture some of the old charm of “Hemingway hum-bug,” it inevitably moves “from fair to bad to worse to horrible” (440). Timothy Foote carries this sentiment in his review for *Time*, noting that *Islands* is a “stunningly bad book” (442) that is “filled with self-indulgent garrulity” (443). While there were of course charmed reviewers who saw Hemingway as he was in his fittest form, the pervading sentiment appears to have leaned toward an extinguished fire with the embers just hot enough to pull something serviceable out of them.

So, it is no surprise that at a time when Hemingway, and Scribner, would profit most from a bolster in both the author’s academic and popular credibility, a novel is published that taps into the current academic ideology, presenting Hemingway in a relevant and intriguing light within the edited construct of a classically Hemingway style. According to Jenks, in 1985 when he was proffered the opportunity to edit *The Garden of Eden* by Scribner Jr., Scribner had been

bought out by Macmillan for Scribner's "reference works and its backlist of famous titles from the time of Maxwell Perkins" (*Eden* at Twenty-Five 2). The company was in a precarious position considering it had no control over how it would be absorbed by its new parent company: Jenks goes on to explain, "In retrospect it's easy to see that on the afternoon I first met [Scribner Jr.] the company needed a success to keep up its spirits and finances" (2). Considering this, Scribner Jr. felt that *Garden* functioned better as a truncated text that was faithful to what Hemingway novels frequently looked like aesthetically, without a deeper consideration for what the text intended to accomplish in its unabridged form. The result was a novel that would induce dialogue between long-time Hemingway scholars and casual readers, who could find a new angle to an author that appeared thematically one-dimensional. As Jenks notes in an interview with Eric Pooley, the novel produces a "'new, sensitive Hemingway,' writing with 'tenderness and vulnerability,'" a new take on an old classic. And ultimately, the novel was a success. As Jenks describes it, "since its publication, *The Garden of Eden* has been a worldwide bestseller and the subject of innumerable articles, reviews, and essays both praising and critical" (*Eden* at twenty-five 1). Scribner sold excerpts of the novel to multiple magazine publishers for \$75,000 upon release, which amounted to \$400,000 in free advertisements, and made a deal with The Book-of-the-Month Club for a six figure sum (Pooley). Additionally, editors Lawrence R. Broer and Gloria Holland cite *The Garden of Eden* as the novel to persuade many female scholars to consider Hemingway a thriving field of study, noting that after *Garden's* release female scholars interested in the author doubled (ix).

Carrying with them the optimism regarding the opportunity the novel would provide them, Scribner Jr. and Jenks conducted several interviews to discuss the novel, emphasizing the way it would revitalize the author's reputation in a new age. In two particularly informative

articles published close to the imminent release of the novel, Jenks and Scribner Jr. spoke as openly as they ever would about their process of adapting the novel for publication. What becomes clear is that while the editor and publisher present their endeavor as one of obedience and respect for an author of talent and prestige—a thankless pursuit to maintain the grandeur of the author through his unfinished work—the underlying truth that, uncomfortably for scholars, begins to surface is that the service was in favor of the publishing house and not the literary achievement of one of its most lucrative writers.

## Jenks' Editing Principles

What are provided in these articles are generalities in the form of tactics; principles instead of practices considering Jenks and Scribner Jr. refrain from ever really addressing their system of excision. Jenks, in a 1985 interview with Edwin McDowell for the *New York Times*, explains that his guiding principle while editing *The Garden of Eden* was to go to work ““under the law established by the writer—in this case, *the law of an ancient god*”” (italics mine). An admirable and apt approach that any editor should follow when working with an author’s posthumous text, and one that resonates throughout much of the dialogue surrounding what drove the editor to establish the text as he did. Additionally, Jenks explains that while the original manuscript contained rough undeveloped material—the Sheldon narrative, presumably—the core of the novel represented something ““*absolutely authentic to Hemingway’s work as a whole*”” (italics mine). All of which emphasizes the genuineness of Jenks’ work on the novel. And yet, nothing clearly defined as editorial action is presented in the article.

Additionally, Jenks provides similar sentiments in a later article by Eric Pooley, published months before the novel’s release in 1986. Again, Jenks provides the standard postulation that ““I did only what I thought Hemingway would have done,”” reinforcing what is stated in the introduction to the novel, that Jenks ““cut and rearranged, but added nothing, rewrote nothing.”” Like the McDowell article, Jenks asserts that what is between the covers of the book is Hemingway’s, and that he served only as a conduit for Hemingway to present his book to the reading public. But, this comment by Jenks glosses over the possibility that emendation in many ways produces addition in the form of thematic meaning, and by cutting and splicing material, Jenks is asserting his editorial influence on the text. This editorial influence

becomes apparent when Jenks begins to describe the process by which he emended the novel when he reads a few passages to Pooley during the interview.

As Jenks reads a passage describing David and Catherine's drive along a French beach in their Bugatti, Jenks pauses to highlight how he stitched the scene together. He points out to Pooley that after the tight descriptive passage read, "there was a bit more dialogue . . . I pulled it out because it was redundant." Additionally, after the couple arrives at a café to eat, Jenks again pauses to explain that "that last part came from another place in the manuscript altogether . . . I had to remove the two characters [David and Catherine] met in the café, so I healed the gap by taking narrative from a different eating scene that I didn't have room to use." Furthermore, Pooley explains that Jenks altered sections of the narration that shifted from David's perspective to Catherine's (although the narration is technically third-person, is focalized heavily on David's perspective) through similar actions of cutting and splicing content in the manuscript. Pooley even goes so far as to explain that Hemingway, though he was too feeble in his writing to produce the work himself, left Jenks some guideposts in the form of "dated notes that Hemingway had jotted in his margins, telling what to cut and how to fix what remained." A fortunate set of hieroglyphs that needed only to be translated by an astute eye.

However, while these anecdotes from the editing room sound nice, and may soothe the wary reader, they appear antithetical to what Jenks actually did as an editor and what Scribner Jr. hoped to obtain when the editing was done. This is due in large part to the fact that although Jenks consistently asserts that his work is in accordance with what Hemingway would have done with the text, comments from Scribner Jr. and Jenks affirm that Jenks was chosen for precisely the opposite reason. In the same Pooley article in which Jenks defends his editorial actions as authentic, Pooley, Scribner Jr. and Jenks establish Jenks' complete detachment from

Hemingway. The reason, as explained by both Pooley and Scribner Jr., that Jenks was chosen for the project was because he had little association with the author. Pooley notes that Jenks had not even “read a Hemingway novel in years” prior to beginning the project, and did not “review the Hemingway canon before he started.” Jenks’ response to the obvious question of why he would avoid such a necessary component of editing a posthumous text was that he feared it would “gum [him] up.” In similar fashion, Scribner Jr. explains that Jenks’ disinterest in what Pooley deems the “Hemingway cult” is what made him such a choice candidate: “coming to the task fresh, without a long personal association with Hemingway, Tom was less inhibited . . . I don’t think someone tied up with Hemingway could have done the job he did.” This is particularly strange when considering the personal relationship that formed between Hemingway and his longtime editor Max Perkins, who worked with editorial restraint throughout much of the production of Hemingway’s most successful novels.

In fact, Jenks’ approach to the text suggests quite the opposite of what Jenks and Scribner Jr. propose in their initial defense of Jenks’ editorial decisions. If the crux of Hemingway’s editing process rested on the relationship between the writer and editor, how could one believe that drafting an editor with little allegiance to the author could produce an authentic text? It was Perkins’ understanding of Hemingway’s habits and principles that made him so effective at guiding the author. More importantly, it was Perkins’ hands-off approach, allowing the author to perform much of his own editing, that seems to have been the fundamental characteristic of the relationship. Thus, it is no surprise that Jenks was concerned with how the public would react to his work, and in response, maintained a clandestine operation as the novel was in development. Providing phony title pages and frequently alternating the staff working under him, Jenks maintained a level of mystery around the novel to avoid any subsequent backlash—this same

secrecy became a shield against the critical outcry toward the novel when it was published, with Jenks arguing that to explain his process would remove the magic of the work (“Editing Hemingway” 32).

Along these same lines, Jenks’ divergence from the Hemingway style of editing also suggests that Jenks was not so much conceding to the “ancient god,” as he stated, but rather imitating Hemingway’s form for his own reward. In interviews both before and after the publication of *Garden*, Jenks often presents the novel as if he were an author, describing his work as a form of creation. Returning to the Pooley article, Jenks states that when he finished editing the novel, he ““felt [he] had a good book,”” which does not immediately jump out as conscripting, and yet it establishes a sense of ownership: to have something in one’s possession. Jenks’ positioning of himself as creator of the novel continues in his 1986 address to the MLA conference, where he explained:

At the time I sat down with pencil in hand to begin, Hemingway, his people, every reviewer, critic, biographer, historian, and potential reader stood peering over my shoulder. Gradually, all fell away except the man himself and, in a way though never really, him too as the book dictated its own edit, as any book that’s worthy will. (31)

These lines prioritize Jenks’ work over Hemingway’s. Based on this view, Jenks is the creative hand conducting the work—after everything else falls away only Jenks and the novel are left. Additionally, in this same address, Jenks explains that he cannot give any more of his life to the work, and asserts that he enjoys the mystery of the work that he has produced, since extrapolating from the process by which he produced the text would remove “the magic, the interest, and delivers very little good about fiction to the people I might want to reach” (31). Here, concern should immediately be raised considering Jenks should not be in a position to

reach out to the reader as editor. Furthermore, Jenks does not possess the authority to determine what “magic” and “mystery” should be imbued in the work.

If he truly served the author then his task would be as transparent as Hemingway and Perkins’ had been, and his support for the author’s work would constitute a resolution to ensure the text was as Hemingway intended, based on the available information known about the text before the author passed. Thus, in order to evaluate the quality of Jenks’ work on *The Garden of Eden*, an exploration of the editorial and publication history of *A Farewell to Arms* is necessary as a way of establishing the Hemingway process of revision and drafting. By setting up the practices of the author first, the problematic processes involved in the editing of *Garden* will become clear, and the apparent flaws in the emendations will be easier to manage.

## Drafting *A Farewell To Arms*

While many know *A Farewell to Arms* as a canonical novel, few consider the laborious and lengthy process by which Hemingway developed this idea from a handwritten narrative entitled “Personal” early in Hemingway’s career. According to Matt Hlinak, *Farewell* began as a text titled “Personal,” later retitled “love,” written some time in 1924, which constituted “a first-person narration about a wounded soldier’s ill-fated love affair with a nurse named Ag while convalescing in Milan” (17). This version of the text consisted of four paragraphs and was significantly more romantic than the version that eventually made it into Hemingway’s 1924 version for *in our time*—not the collection of short stories, but the original vignettes. In this eighteen-page edition of the collection, “Love,” then retitled “chapter 10” was the longest section of the collection, spanning two pages, and was lengthened to seven paragraphs and included a “switch from first-person . . . to a close third-person narration about an unnamed protagonist simply referred to as ‘he’” (18) when placed in the short story collection *In Our Time* in 1925.

Again, the title of the story was changed, now becoming what it is most well known by, “A Very Short Story,” and the locale and the name of the nurse were changed to Padua and Luz respectively to provide, according to Hlinak’s account of Scott Donaldson’s argument, a layer of fictitiousness to a story that resonates with Hemingway’s own experiences in Milan during the war (18). There is no doubting that the short, two-page narrative resonates, at least on a base level, with *Farewell*’s narrative structure—specifically, Frederic Henry’s convalescence, and the late night rendezvous that constitute much of the narrative beats of the Milan section of the novel. Yet, it is clear that the short story was far more malicious than what was inevitably crafted into *Farewell*. In “A Very Short Story” the narrator is sent back home, and loses Luz to an Italian major who promises to marry her. The story concludes bitterly:

The major did not marry her in the spring, or any other time. Luz never got an answer to the letter to Chicago about it. A short time after he contracted gonorrhoea from a sales girl in the loop department store while riding in a taxicab through Lincoln Park. (66)

Unlike the conclusion to *A Farewell to Arms*, the close of “A Very Short Story,” bites with frustration and anger in a comparatively puerile way. Hlinak contributes this to the fact that if one takes “A Very Short Story” as the genesis of *Farewell*, then by the time Hemingway is actually writing the novel in 1928, he has exorcised his consternation, and is essentially writing “about writing about a painful event” (22). Considering that the novel is focalized through Henry’s narration, Hemingway has a narrative buffer to provide him distance from the text—what Hlinak sees as a form of self-induced therapy (23).

And yet, for all of the cycles of creation that went into *A Farewell to Arms*, once Hemingway began on the manuscripts and typescripts, there is very little major revision to the body of the novel. Aside from extensive editing to the beginning and ending of the text, the bulk of the content is tediously constructed and revised fluidly so that the manuscript reads almost identically to the published version. As Robert E. Fleming notes in his analysis of “The African Book,” Hemingway treated his daily writing as both creation and emendation, working on his manuscript as if it were a proof (“The Editing Process” 91). A writing process that is included in *Garden*: “David wrote steadily and well and the sentences that he had made before came to him complete and entire and he put them down, corrected them, and cut them as if he were going over proof” (247). What this style of writing establishes is a manuscript text that is essentially polished as it is created, requiring little additional revision once Hemingway brought it to Scribner for publication. As indicated in the 1948 introduction to *A Farewell to Arms*, Hemingway read through his novels repeatedly as he worked through them, making adjustments

and revisions as he went. And what this amounts to, as Bernard Oldsey describes it, is a “free-flowing and finished quality” that provides an “insight into the author’s method and meaning” (213). More importantly, this catalogue of his writing process shows that Hemingway was not only “a great natural writer, possessed of verve and linguistic flow, but also a fine editor of his own fiction” (213). Looking at *A Farewell to Arms*, it becomes clear that Hemingway shaped his narrative carefully as he went, stripping away and building up in order to produce a finished novel prior to any editorial involvement.

The Hemingway writing process is marked by a repeated cycle of emendation, excision, and creation during the initial writing of the novel. Starting with *A Farewell to Arms*, Hemingway developed an orthodox system of production that relied upon a deep familiarity with his material—not simply in regards to lived experience, but more specifically with the printed text. The 1948 introduction to *Farewell* provides an acute description of the daily process Hemingway followed during the year and a half he spent working on the book: “Each day I read the book through from the beginning to the point where I went on writing and each day I stopped when I was still going good and when I knew what would happen next” (vii). Hemingway compares this experience, which he described as a time when he was “happier than [he] had ever been,” (vii) compared to his time writing *The Sun Also Rises*. This novel, which he wrote three years earlier, was created in what appears to be a state of reckless fervor. Hemingway recalls that at the time of his writing *Sun*, he “knew nothing about writing a novel,” and so he “wrote too fast and each day to the point of complete exhaustion. So the first draft was very bad. I wrote it in six weeks and I had to rewrite it completely. But in rewriting I learned much” (viii). This revised and careful practice became the Hemingway standard, as affirmed in a 1958 interview with George Plimpton for the *Paris Review*. When asked if he rewrote as he read, Hemingway

answered in the affirmative, stating “I always rewrite each day up to the point where I stopped. When it is all finished, naturally you go over it” (222). This process is repeated again during the typescript phase, and again during inspection of the proofs.

And yet, this style of creation should not be surprising for any reader familiar with Hemingway’s life and work, for he often places an emphasis on the writer’s responsibility to stand by his words, and thus to be sure that he knows what it is he wrote in the first place. Returning to the 1948 *Farewell* introduction, when asked to consider his feelings on an illustrator reproducing his work, Hemingway found it rather bleak to see one’s ideas depicted by another’s hand:

Unless the artist is as good or better a painter or draftsman than the writer is a writer, there can be no more disappointing thing than for the writer to see the things and the places and the people that he remembers making drawn and put on paper by someone else who was not there. (viii)

This sentiment is echoed throughout much of Hemingway’s musings on writing and what is expected of a good writer to succeed. In his 1954 Nobel Prize speech he asserts, “writing, at its best, is a lonely life,” and while “organizations for writers palliate the writer’s loneliness . . . I doubt if they improve his writing.” He goes on to explain that the writer stands on his own merits, and cannot afford, or rely upon, the benefits of others to accommodate his lack of ability. This belief comes from Hemingway’s stern philosophy regarding the power of writing, and the reality that while “the fun of talk is to explore . . . Once written you have to stand by it” (Cowley 224). Reaffirming what his Nobel Prize speech plainly said, the author is solely responsible for the art created, which bears his or her name, and thus it is the author who should have and want full control and accountability for what is produced.

What these convictions ultimately translated into is a strong resistance to outside criticism, and an emphasis on emendation throughout the writing process. Fleming asserts “Hemingway . . . rewrote his previous day’s work before starting a new session and then revised three more times” (“The Editing Process” 91). From a novel’s initial conception to its final proof, Hemingway rebuked those who attempted to revise or alter his original work, especially for what Hemingway believed to be monetary gains—which he considered a hindrance to art. *A Farewell to Arms* is a valuable book for considering these behaviors since the novel was published at a time when laws surrounding appropriate material for the public often ran counter to what many authors initially produced, and thus the composition history of this novel provides a variety of examples detailing the tension between Hemingway and Scribner as they worked out a way to publish the novel. According to Robert W. Trogdon, this tension often grew out of Hemingway’s emphasis on authenticity. The writer always wanted to “present things as they were,” specifically in the way language was reproduced as it was spoken (5). While this is apparent in Hemingway’s use of colloquialisms throughout his works and inconsequential in the eyes of the publisher, it became problematic when he insisted on using profane language in scenes of war where soldiers were expected to speak with little concern for censorship.

The confrontation was initially rooted in the serial publication of *A Farewell to Arms* prior to its novelization. As Scribner prepared the text for publication in its literary magazine, it became clear that certain key words and several risqué scenes would need to be cut or edited in order to meet the standards held by the United States Postal Service. These words—“fucking,” “shit,” and “cocksucker”—were considered widely inappropriate for the general public, and would surely accrue the ire of a government decency organization. As explained by Trogdon, the Postal Service had the power to “strip a magazine of its second-class postage rate if it judged that

the magazine was publishing obscene materials” (64). This increase in price would alienate the average buyer, who would not be able to afford the magazine at the inflated cost. Even with this reality in mind, Hemingway was opposed to making the changes. After receiving word that Scribner was planning to omit certain sections of the novel to fit the ambiguous guidelines of the USPS, Hemingway responded in a letter to Maxwell Perkins that: “[omissions] can only be discussed in the concrete examples . . . almost every part of the book depends on almost every other part” (91). Hemingway goes on to describe omission in masculine terms, noting that emendation is a tiny emasculation, whether on men, animals or books; and while it is easy and simple to perform, it greatly impacts the quality of the thing it affects (91). While this statement sounds juvenile from young Hemingway, the sentiment stays true to what Hemingway always believed was central to writing: that the writer is enmeshed with the text that he produces, and the little cuts and incisions only serve to weaken what was molded with careful attention to detail. This is something Hemingway took very seriously, as James B. Meriwether asserts: “As a writer Hemingway was concerned with the problem of artistic fidelity to the American vernacular, and it must have been highly irritating to him to be confronted again and again with the Comstockery . . . of various publishers” (455). An assertion that is seemingly accurate considering Hemingway’s devotion to the value of the ideal word. Hemingway even offered several alternatives to outright removing the words, suggesting that editors at Scribner simply insert “part of the word, such as b—ls for balls and c—s—r, or c—ks—r for cocksucker,” (Trogon 78) but Scribner would not give in.

Similar problems arose when *A Farewell to Arms* was purchased by Paramount for a cinematic adaptation. While in this case, both format limitations as well as cultural taboos necessitated the alterations to Hemingway’s text, the inevitable reaction was the same:

Hemingway found the outcome appalling and saw no reason for revisions to be made to his work. In the case of the film revisions, most concerned standard fears of the time related to intercourse out of wedlock, and the depiction of lovemaking. Jamie Barlowe states: “the film adaptation was subjected to intense scrutiny and the Code’s rules, just as Hemingway’s novel had suffered at the hands of various censors before and during its 1928 serialization in *Scribner’s* magazine, its 1929 publication as a book, and its 1930 stage adaptation,” which forced the filmmakers at Paramount to institute sexual innuendo and misdirection to appease the MPPDA (28). These alterations came in the form of altered scenes and added characters to build Catherine’s moral fortitude by offsetting her impropriety onto other more licentious women (29). And while Hemingway accepted these changes, as there was little recourse he could take against the various moral agencies involved in the film industry at the time, he made no attempt to hide his consternation at the idea of emending his material for the silver screen. Frequently, Hemingway voiced his frustration with a cinematic recreation of his work, proclaiming after watching *The Sun Also Rises* that changes made constituted “pissing in your father’s beer” (25). In like fashion, Hemingway described producers and directors as saboteurs and bastards, and believed that film should be constructed as a documentary to the book, producing no additions, emendations, or excisions (25).

This level of apprehension toward the incursion of ideology into his work made Hemingway incredibly resistant to outside opinion, even from longtime friends like F. Scott Fitzgerald. Infamously, during the writing process for *A Farewell to Arms*, Fitzgerald sent Hemingway an extensive critique of the novel based on a manuscript that Hemingway had sent him. These comments focus primarily on issues with pacing and interest, Fitzgerald often commenting that a section was too slow “+ needs cutting – it hasn’t the incisiveness of other

short portraits in this book or in yr. other books” (MS09 Item 77). Additionally, Fitzgerald recommends excisions of certain scenes where he finds Hemingway’s repetition of words overbearing:

This is a comedy scene that really becomes offensive for you’ve trained everyone to read every word—now you make them read the word cook (+fucked would be as bad) one dozen times. It has ceased to become amusing by the 5<sup>th</sup>, for they’re too packed, + yet the scene has possibilities. Reduced to five or six cooked it might have rhythm like the word “wops” in one of your early sketches. You’re a little hypnotized by yourself here. (MS09 Item 77)

Hemingway’s response to the feedback is unsurprising, considering his reactions to previously mentioned attempts at asserting changes into his work. Hemingway, at the end of Fitzgerald’s letter, scribbled in “Kiss my ass EH,” and appears to have used none of the feedback in the editing process for the novel. This level of vitriol toward any suggestions for alteration made an editor’s work incredibly difficult, and required Hemingway’s long time editor at Scribner Maxwell Perkins to abide by a very strict code when it came to handling the temperamental author: allow the author the space he needs to craft his narrative, and interject only when absolutely necessary.

Perkins’ role as editor for Hemingway is best defined in terms of an intermediary between the author and the publisher. Scott Donaldson describes him as the “mediator between his old-guard conservative publishers [Scribner] . . . and a young writer who took it as his duty to set down the way people talked, even if that led him into the realm of obscenity” (355). It may, in fact, be more appropriate to define Perkins as a counselor for the author, especially in his early days with Scribner. Considering Hemingway’s resilience to most, if any, attempts to alter his

work, Perkins worked tirelessly to strike a balance between the author and the publishing house, especially in regards to the issue of obscenity that plagued much of the publishing process for *A Farewell to Arms*. And yet, even with this work upon his shoulders, Perkins remained fixed in his beliefs that the author served as the judge of his own work, and that the editor did only what was necessary to get the work complete. As Matthew J. Bruccoli states:

Perkins's editorial technique was advisory and supportive—not collaborative. He did not revise or rewrite. He did not function as a line editor on typescripts and proofs. There is no evidence that he corrected grammar or punctuation; there are no extant Hemingway typescripts or proofs marked by Perkins. (25)

For Perkins, the author was the definitive judge of the text, and no amount of disagreement on the side of the editor allowed him the right to step into the writer's work and insist upon alterations that went against the author's vision for the novel. This often meant that his letters to Hemingway regarding a work in progress amounted to "publishing business, as differentiated from literary matters" (26). And, in like fashion, Hemingway's letters in response contained none of the literary keys to Hemingway's fiction, and consisted mostly of "progress reports" (Bruccoli 26).

Notably, Perkins was a master of praise for his writers, and submitted many letters to Hemingway that provided little in terms of business, and much in the way of benevolence and applause for the author's work. The reason for this, aside from what appears to be the appreciation Perkins had for the author during their time together, is a clear understanding of the author's habits of work, and acceptance of a relationship that was essentially one-sided. The most significant of these praises came in a 1935 letter to Hemingway regarding the *Green Hills of Africa*. Perkins, while informing Hemingway on the process of the ink illustrations for the

book, allots a large portion of the letter to bolstering Hemingway in regards to his work in progress:

I'm glad you're going to write some stories. All you have to do is to follow your own judgment, or instinct, + disregard what is said, + convey the absolute bottom quality of each person, situation + thing . . . the utterly real thing in writing is the only thing that counts, + the whole racket melts down before it. All you have to do is to trust Yourself. That's the truth.—I say all this mostly because I sometimes have thought that You thought I ought to advise You, or keep You advised. I do that for lots of people who write as a trade. With you it seems superfluous + absurd because those things that are important to that kind of writer + affect his fortunes, ought not to have anything to do with You,—+ so far You have not let them. I hope You never will, too. (224-5)

And yet, this is not to say that Perkins was purely subservient to the author. When the issue of obscenity needed to be addressed, Perkins stood his ground in regards to his responsibilities to the publisher, and ensured that the text was changed. Additionally, Perkins offered some advice for the changes to Hemingway's work, but with the acute understanding that the feedback would likely be ignored. “[Hemingway] disregarded Perkins's advice about revising the closing chapter of *A Farewell to Arms*, but he did accept Perkins's advice on dividing the novel into five sections” (Brucoli 26). This understanding between the editor and the author means that Hemingway served primarily as his own editor, and took only the advice that he desired.

Considering this, it is clear that Jenks did not abide by the code of Hemingway, and appears to have worked in complete opposition to his distinct style. In order to gain an understanding of this discrepancy, it is necessary to evaluate the manuscript versions of the novels in comparison to their published forms. First I will address the two sections of *A Farewell*

*to Arms* with the most significant changes made to them, followed by examples of revision made to the body material of the text. I am choosing this system primarily because it demonstrates where Hemingway focused his attention, and gives credence to the belief that Hemingway's texts were written in a constant state of emendation that rendered them finished as they were being produced, something that problematizes later emendations after his death—the emendations executed by Jenks.

During the writing of *A Farewell to Arms*, it appears that Hemingway produced two entirely different beginnings: one constituting what is essentially chapters 13 and 14 in the published version, and one that bears no clear connection to the finalized version of the novel. It is interesting to note that this first beginning is incredibly rough, and lacks much of the Hemingway flow and style that permeates the chapter as it fits into the novel in its published form:

The train came into the station at Milan early in the morning.

The ambulance stopped and they lifted out the stretcher. The jolt at the moment of ~~lifting~~ moving made a ~~sickening pain~~ feeling; ~~it was a feeling like~~ as of dropping in an elevator except that here it was pain.

“Go easy,” said the Lieutenant. “Take it softly, softly.”

They carried the stretcher into the hospital and set it down. From the door of the ambulance to the door of the hospital the Lieutenant ~~passed~~ was in the street. It was early morning and they were watering the street and ~~the~~ he saw the market place and an open wine shop. Then it was hospital. The stretcher would not go in the door of the elevator. There was an elevator man and a smell of hospital. They could carry him upstairs on the

stretcher or they could lift him off the stretcher and carry him up in the elevator.

(Appendix I 285)

This excerpt, while retaining much of the same narrative material that eventually became the later chapters, reads rather crudely and rough in comparison to the bulk of the other content in the novel. This is especially true of the first paragraph, which reads flat and empty, and seems to fumble over itself as it tries to depict the scene. It is surprising to consider this a possible opening for the novel considering it reads so blandly and lacks much of the power that the published beginning provides. The revised and reorganized chapter opening reads:

We got into Milan early in the morning and they unloaded us in the freight yard. An ambulance took me to the American hospital. Riding in the ambulance on a stretcher I could not tell what part of town we were passing through but when they unloaded the stretcher I saw a market-place and an open wine shop with a girl sweeping out. They were watering the street and it smelled of early morning. They put the stretcher down and went in. the porter came out with them. He had gray mustaches, wore a doorman's cap and was in his shirt sleeves. The stretcher would not go into the elevator and they discussed whether it was better to lift me off the stretcher and go up in the elevator or carry the stretcher up the stairs. I listened to them discussing it. They decided on the elevator. They lifted me from the stretcher. "Go easy," I said. "Take it softly." (81)

While this passage is of equal length to the initial beginning (both contain 160 words), it provides a great deal more information in a much more refined and pleasurable way. In this revised form Hemingway provides the location for his arrival in Milan ("the freight yard"), which suggests that the wounded were treated less like passengers and more like cargo or livestock; he includes details for the porter ("in his shirt sleeves") which suggest that the hospital

is not prepared for patients, something that will be explained shortly after this scene; and Hemingway shifts the perspective from third to first-person, and gives Henry a much more active role in the situation (“‘Go easy,’ I said. ‘Take it softly’”): he is speaking with the ambulance drivers, and noticing things that would naturally pique his interests as he visually peruses the shops surrounding the hospital as he waits. All these little pieces that were missing in the original version provide depth for the reader, and demonstrate the level of revision Hemingway undertook as he wrote the initial draft of the novel.

Additionally, the manuscript for *Farewell* includes another beginning that is completely detached from any subsequent material associated with the novel, and may have simply been an exercise in setting up the narrative prior to any heavy writing. The manuscript material, item 67, titled “It was a hot night . . .” has attached a note indicating that Mann and Young “identify this as a draft for the opening of FTA.” The draft begins with only a few terse, incomplete lines, followed by a paragraph of detail related to soldiers sitting together on a hot night (I have indicated where spelling was indiscernible with [indis]):

It was a hot night and dark and the ship was

There ~~were~~ a was a long row of deck chairs

In the hot night the Polish officers sat in their deck chairs and someone played the mandolin.

—II—

It was a hot night and dark and the polish officers sat in their deck chairs and someone was playing the mandolin. The ship was going along and the water swirling and it smelled like [indis] going through the fast water on a hot night. The boats [indis] [indis] out [indis] [indis] of light under the water [long indiscernible passage: struck out]. People

went by around the deck and I ~~looked over the rail~~ leaned against the rail and felt it smooth and thick and [indis] against my stomach and overhead the boats swung out over the water. Some one put ~~an arm~~ their hand on my shoulder. It was [indis] and he said, “come on [indis] take a [indis].” (ms09 Item 67)

It is unclear where Hemingway intended to take this passage, especially considering all the material that he had developed prior to writing this, including his own biographical experience in the war as well as “A Very Short Story.” It seems that perhaps Hemingway intended to craft his narrative with a greater level of fiction in mind, but quickly turned away from this less personal take on an experience that he was intimate with.

Eventually, Hemingway crafted the scenic introduction that provides a blend of idyllic and dreary beauty that sets the tone for the novel, and effectively comingles the conflict between the romantic and the pessimistic. And as with the initial opening, Hemingway worked through the scenic opening diligently, proof writing as he went, changing and shaping the text in the process of roughing out a first draft. Yet what should be noted about this finalized opening is that the revision process consists of tiny alterations to achieve the ideal effect. Major revision ceases for this section, and now Hemingway’s work is minute. Manuscript item 64 contains the first twenty-five pages of the novel, and provides handwritten emendation from Hemingway showing how he whittled out his prose:

In the late summer of that year we lived in a house in a village that looked across the river and the plain to the mountains.

~~The water in the river~~

The river ran in clear channels in the

The river bed was white pebbles and dry white boulders and the water was clean and [indis], moving and [indiscernible line of writing that veers off and vertically down the page]. ~~Bed of white pebbles and white boulders and there were always.~~ Troops went by the house and down the ~~road~~ road and the dust they raised powdered the leaves of the trees. The trunks of the trees too were dusty and the leaves fell early that year and ~~I have seen~~ we saw the troops marching along the road and the dust rising and leaves falling and the soldiers marching and afterwards the road bare and white except for the leaves. (ms 1)

What is interesting about this passage is that while it does begin with some rough sketches that never make it into the published novel (“the river ran in clear channels . . .,” “the river bed was white pebbles . . .”) the majority of what was written is what stayed in the opening:

In the late summer of that year we lived in a house in a village that looked across the river and the plain to the mountains. In the bed of the river there were pebbles and boulders, dry and white in the sun, and the water was clear and swiftly moving and blue in the channels. Troops went by the house and down the road and the dust they raised powdered the leaves of the trees. The trunks of the trees too were dusty and the leaves fell early that year and we saw the troops marching along the road and the dust rising and leaves, stirred by the breeze, falling and the soldiers marching and afterward the road bare and white except for the leaves. (3)

Hemingway is merely licking his prose into shape: making tweaks and adjustments to the description without altering major portions of the text. Most of these come from Hemingway’s diligence to the authenticity of his work, as shown in Michael Reynolds’ research, expressed in these passages by his fixation on the shell size for the cartridges the soldiers carry for their rifles: originally writing “6mm” then switching to “8mm,” only to settle on “6.5mm” in the published

version. Reynolds posits that Hemingway spent a great deal of time researching the areas and battles that Frederic Henry lived and fought in before writing the novel, so much so that “one could follow the novel’s progress on large- and small-scale maps” (110-1).

Hemingway also spent a long time finding an appropriate conclusion, drafting 47 unique endings based on both feedback from Scribner, Fitzgerald, and Perkins. The length of some of them ranges from multiple paragraphs like the “Fitzgerald Ending” to single lines like “But in the nights you know. In the nights they do not fool you” (Appendix II 318). There is even the angst driven “nada” ending which reads like a teenage Hemingway’s private complaint against the world: “That is all there is to the story. Catherine died and you will die and I will die and that is all I can promise you” (303). The extensiveness of this process again shows that Hemingway crafted and revised in a circuitous motion, laying down text only to rip it up again the next day in order to lay more for tearing up again later. It also suggests a level of control and fixation on his writing that serves as a warning against someone interjecting into his process. For, the only other drastic revisions that were made to the text revolve around the emotional weight and authenticity of Frederic and Catherine’s relationship.

In addition to these types of alterations, Hemingway made minor cuts that refined Henry’s persona, excising juvenile dialogue in favor of a more controlled figure. This is particularly clear in the excerpts from the original beginning’s chapters of the book that were eventually moved to chapter 13 and 14. In the “chapter two” manuscript section provided in the Library Edition of *Farewell*, readers can see the giddy and arguably more capricious Henry that may have seemed out of place in the world Hemingway crafted. Breaking away from the typically calm and controlled Henry that is shown throughout the novel, in these early drafts Henry is embarrassed and awkward when the nurse helps him to use the bedpan:

“The temperature is normal,” she said. “Would you like the bed pan?”

All right,” he said. He could not move and she helped him. He was ~~very~~ embarrassed but enjoyed it.

“I’m afraid it isn’t any use,” he said. “I don’t have control of that muscle.” (289)

In the revision process, Hemingway toned down the length and awkwardness of this scene, removing a seemingly unnecessary episode where Henry defecates in the bed after the nurses try to help him relieve his bowels. Hemingway deleted that passage, and created a scene that is nonchalant in the published version:

“Would you like to use the bedpan?”

“I might try.”

They helped me and held me up but it was not any use. Afterward I lay and looked out the open doors onto the balcony. (86)

While both versions are almost exactly the same, aside from the explicit bed episode, the slight tweaks that Hemingway made remove the awkward juvenile tension of Henry’s behavior in front of a woman without creating any major alterations to the larger story of the novel. This same type of revision is made to the bed bath scene where Henry becomes uncontrollably excited when the nurses wash him. Again, Henry can not help but twinge with a sense of embarrassment, considering that “no woman, except his mother, the nurse they had had when they were children, and his sisters when they were all little had ever seen him naked before” (289). In the revised version, Henry simply notes the act in passing, writing “she washed me with a cloth and soap and warm water” (90). The behaviors in this scene of the early version of Henry seems incongruous with the harsh world that he would have to navigate, and it also puts him in an equally virginal state with Catherine; which is imbalanced in the published novel, providing

some tension between Frederic and Catherine regarding past sexual partners and the inconsistency between male and female sexual expectations. It would be hard to believe that this was the same character that forces himself on Catherine early in the published novel, and receives a well-deserved slap for his aggression. Likewise, it would be hard to imagine this Henry associating with the bawdy Rinaldi, who frequently talks about his sexual exploits and venereal diseases throughout the novel.

While certain passages are excised, the core narrative of the novel is crafted and retained throughout the writing and editing process. At best, the passages excised represent unfinished versions of the ideas Hemingway initially intended for the novel, and at worst, are simply extraneous material that serves no purpose in the overall value of the text. Additionally, it is important to acknowledge that these emendations were conducted during the writing process. The minutiae of the editing process, Hemingway's surgical cuts and insertions, deletions and additions, are the fine-tuning. These are expected revisions that would have come about during the writing process and do not appear to be attributed to any outside influence. Furthermore, these editorial choices that Hemingway made, though relatively miniscule, produced powerful elaborations on details and import for the reader. This same process is not followed in *The Garden of Eden*. The revisions made by Jenks to this novel go against the primary tenets of Hemingway's editorial code, and disrupt rather than cohere to the creativity of the writer.

## Jenks' Emendations to *The Garden of Eden*

As Hemingway developed his scenes to enhance the qualities of Frederic and Catherine in *Farewell*, Jenks excises to whittle away the core motivations and emotional response of David and Catherine to events in the novel. The first scene to discuss is the opening love scene when Catherine switches her and David's gender for the first time. Comparing the published opening to the manuscript version highlights the failings that the published version contains regarding the emotional import of the event that catalyzes the central conflict throughout the rest of the text. Specifically, this tension comes in the form of contrast between the doomed quality of the Bournes' relationship and the enduring love that compels them to remain together even in their disparity.

While the skeletal structure of the opening passage remains, many of the nuanced character elements of this section are removed in favor of an aesthetically recognizable Hemingway narrative—scenes and dialogue are truncated in an attempt to recreate a typical Hemingway novel. While the initial few pages of *Garden* appear to remain relatively true to what Hemingway wrote, on page 17 of the published version Jenks begins to revise dramatically to cut away valuable portions of the story. Excised entirely from the novel, starting in this scene is the reference to Rodin's *The Metamorphosis*; a sculpture that carries narrative weight considering it is the primary inspiration for Catherine to explore the possibilities of gender fluidity. It is, according to Hemingway's manuscript, the catalyzing event of the entire narrative, and provides context for what appears to be an unexpected change of character for Catherine. The sculpture is intriguing for this story as it depicts two lovers, Daphnis and Chloe, both with female breasts, short hair, and obscured genitals. The statue presents an androgynous couple uniform in appearance, which clearly serves as the basis for Catherine's various decisions to

change her and David's appearance to mimic each other throughout the novel, and can certainly be linked to her envy of and anger with David as he moves away from her and into his writing—a disconnecting of the androgynous whole that becomes deeply personal when considering what it means in the context of the bonded lovers of Rodin's sculpture.

Jenks completely removes this connection in the novel. This is particularly strange considering the levels of meaning that the sculpture can serve in understanding the motivations of the characters. Peters argues that the statue serves as a guide for Catherine to “self-initiated rebirth” fueled by her dissatisfaction and innocence (19). Drawing context from the Genesis narrative, Peters further argues that the statue provides the devilish element necessary to provoke Eve to believe that she “would become a god and recreate herself with the knowledge provided by the fruit” as represented by the statue (19). Considering that the novel is obviously tied to this biblical story, even with Jenks' revisions the narrative retains connections to the parable, it makes little sense to remove this element from the text. Arguably, one could say that Jenks cut these lines from this section of the novel as he worked to remove the Sheldons from the story. But, the reality is that while Barbara and Catherine are drawn toward each other over their interest in the statue, there is nothing in this section of the novel that references the second couple in any way. In fact, the nods to the statue by David and Catherine are relatively innocuous.

As Catherine initiates the gender transformation during intercourse, she asks David if he remembers the Rodin sculpture at the museum, and then later asks if he is changing like the figures in the sculpture. However, none of the references fall into excessive detail. Rather, Hemingway is fairly utilitarian with his use of the reference, placing it in the story when David is groping Catherine's breasts, an act of pure object-fondling on his part, which is diminished when

Catherine initiates the powers of the sculpture to de-womanize herself and draw David away from her female parts, emphasizing Peters' comment that the change stems from Catherine's personal dissatisfaction. Additionally, even David finds satisfaction in the idea of the sculpture, adding a level of culpability to David regarding the destruction of the relationship through the statue; and during a prolonged contemplation over the act of gender fluidity, he acknowledges his interest in what the sculpture represents: "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" (MS45 422.1). What is interesting here is that David finds pleasure, or perhaps acceptance, in the feelings the sculpture produces in him because of its connection to Rodin. What is valuable about this comment from David is that it differentiates him from Catherine, especially in relation to what they value. For David, the sculpture and the act stem from some artistic merit or acceptability. What Catherine finds as liberating, David finds as conforming—comforting—reinforcing further the conflict that is brewing between the newlywed couple. These excised sections of the first chapter show the deeper consternation that David feels when he realizes he and Catherine are not united in their view of the relationship; a frustration that stems less from a point of contention, and more from a place of love, as David is keen to realize that this gender fluidity is the beginning of the end of their relationship.

In the published version of the novel, the reader is given a fairly abrupt conclusion to the first love scene, with David and Catherine falling asleep almost simultaneously after the awkward internal comment by David that the relationship is already over though they have only just been married: "He held her close and hard and inside himself he said goodbye and then goodbye and goodbye . . . and his heart said goodbye Catherine goodbye my lovely girl goodbye and good luck and goodbye" (18). While this line is certainly in the manuscript version, and it

fits roughly into the same place, Hemingway's construction of the scene provides more context for why David would feel the way he does at its conclusion, presenting the first night as a deeply traumatic experience for David as he struggles with the knowledge of his wife's desires. These contextual cues give these lines more weight for the character, for in Hemingway's version the reader is able to see David's burgeoning anxiety that arises from his fear of and pleasure in the new dynamic of his marriage.

This scene is broken into two separate nights and is heavily emended in the published version, but constitutes a single night of contemplation in the manuscript that presents David as a contemplative and deeply concerned husband who finds himself at a loss after the first, arguably genuine, sexual experience with his wife: something that deserves emphasis in a novel driven by the notion of destruction through sexual knowledge. This is also an interesting scene considering Catherine's change allows her to sexually dominate David, which is not a conventional feature of Hemingway's protagonist. After the lovemaking concludes, David and Catherine discuss Catherine's ability to change both her gender and David's. It is clear from David's way of speaking about the event that he is fighting against his own discomfort. In his position as passive participant, David lays inactive as Catherine runs her hand across his body, and when the couple begins to speak about what happened, David finds his voice "thick," which is repeated as David continues speaking (MS45 522.1).

While the simple description may appear to represent little, the frustration David feels about the change suggests that the thickness noted by the narrator stems from David's emotional reaction to what occurred, and his act of consuming additional wine a way of quailing the flush of emotion coming to the surface. Examining the two versions of the text shows that the

manuscript scene works to build David's trepidation regarding the events of the night while also displaying the couple's intimacy through dialogue and subtle action:

She ran her hand exploringly down over his belly without looking and said, "isn't that wonderful. I'm so glad. But what will become of us?"

"I don't know."

"You don't think I'm wicked?"

"Of course not. But how long have you thought about that?"

"Ever since we ~~saw the metamorphosis~~ were there that day in the Rodin."

"I remember."

"It's all true too. I don't understand it. But it works. I didn't know if it would happen. But it did."

"Yes," he said. His voice felt thick when he spoke.

"In a little while-"

"Yes," he said and his voice was thicker. He took a swallow of wine.

"I'll take some too," she said.

Then after a while she said, "If you think it is too wicked or too dangerous-"

"It's too late for that now." (MS45 422.1)

This scene continues in the manuscript, further developing the tension between Catherine's newly found freedom and David's anxiety. However, in the published form, the scene ends abruptly, and seemingly unnaturally considering the weight of the event for the Bournes' marriage:

She ran her hand exploringly down over his belly without looking and said, "You don't think I'm wicked?"

“Of course not. But how long have you thought about that?”

“Not all the time. But quite a lot. You were so wonderful to let it happen.” (17)

At this point, the chapter ends with David’s “goodbyes” to Catherine. Jenks’ excisions have dramatically changed a dialogue charged with insecurity and anxiety into a relatively flat scene that foregoes emotional development for the characters. For both Catherine and David, the event appears to be exciting and also somewhat alarming considering Catherine’s insistence that David refer to her as Peter while she calls him Catherine during sex, but in the published version this event is treated casually. While these emendations may appear to reflect similar trimming practices Hemingway conducted in *Farewell* to the Milan scene with the bedpan, in this instance the alterations fail to retain or build the tension that is established in the manuscript version. In the manuscript, David’s limited responses juxtaposed to Catherine’s probing questions combined with David’s husky voice and reliance upon wine shows the awkward aftereffects of the night. Jenks truncates all of this into a few lines of dialogue and a brief passage of introspection on the part of David, which diffuses the scene.

Additionally, the latter portion of the scene, which is edited in the published version into another night later in the novel, contains emendations that are again in opposition with what Hemingway would have performed due to their effect on the reader’s understanding of the characters. While the obvious alteration of the text due to the separation of the single night into two events is problematic on its own, even in small ways Jenks diminishes passages by unnecessarily removing descriptions from the scene and inserting different ones—presumably from another section of the novel. After the second round of love making, David looks at Catherine’s sleeping body and provides the reader with an introspective litmus for David’s feelings toward Catherine after the gender swapping:

the moonlight showed all her *dear* body and the beautiful new line of her head as she slept on her side he *reached for the wine that was no longer cool and sat with his back against the pillow and took a drink of the wine and watched the girl sleeping.* (italics mine, MS45 422.1)

Compare this to Jenks' version, which alters the lines above in italics:

the moonlight that showed *the beautiful new strange* line of her head as she slept on her side he *leaned over and said to her but not aloud, "I'm with you. No matter what else you have in your head I'm with you and I love you.* (italics mine, 20)

While the two passages are essentially the same, the meaning behind David's behavior is altered based upon his actions, characterized by the choice of adjectives used to describe his observations of Catherine. Where Hemingway had David look upon Catherine with endearment (her "dear body"), Jenks creates a sense of estrangement (her "strange line"). This context shifts David's perspective from a place of love to a place of unfamiliarity—his view of Catherine sets her apart from him. Additionally, the closing line of the passage again shifts the meaning. Initially, David moves away from Catherine in order to pick up the wine—suggestive of the inevitable escape David will continually seek as their relationship becomes strained—and continues drinking alone, which leads him to further contemplation of the sex act just committed; while Jenks' version has David moving in toward her.

Considering that the meaning behind the actions in the scene informs the reader of David's feelings toward Catherine, the shift in the actions, though slight, creates a different atmosphere in which to analyze the behavior. In the original construct, David actively views his wife with love, but unconsciously recoils from what he fears in her; Jenks' version creates only conscious action since David both actively identifies his wife as strange, and then moves in to

reaffirm his loyalty. This action breaks the underlying tension that is meant to exist in David—the insecurities that torment him. This is lost in the Jenks version, which leads to a seemingly disconnected character. These lines and other similar emendations, as Peters asserts, have “led many reviewers to see David as an amoral, ineffective cipher, unconcerned with the events that surround him” (23). Additionally, Doctorow posits, “in David’s character resides the ultimate deadness of the piece. His incapability in dealing with the crisis of his relationship does not mesh with his consummate self-assurance.” These inconsistencies come from the excisions Jenks performed on the manuscript, which seem to attempt to develop a traditional Hemingway hero at the cost of the character’s humanity.

Similar emendations and editorial decisions were made to the conclusion of the novel. As with *A Farewell to Arms*, Hemingway produced multiple endings for *Garden*: the published ending, a relatively happy ending for David and Marita, who live in peace after Catherine’s departure to Paris; and the provisional ending, which finds David and Catherine reunited on the beach in dire psychological straits. The published ending stays relatively true to the original manuscript ending, except that Jenks removes any acknowledgment of Catherine’s admittance to a Swiss sanitarium and some suggestive behavior by Marita that implies that she may also be slipping into some form of madness associated with the gender-swapping sexual activity she took part in. None of the material from the provisional ending is kept in the published version of *Garden*. What is perplexing about Jenks’ decision in this instance is that while his general practice when editing the novel appears to be an attempt to create a simulacrum of Hemingway’s style, his choice of ending represents an aberrant element in the Hemingway oeuvre. While both the provisional and the original ending are technically Hemingway’s, the published version bears little relation to any other Hemingway novel written. While it does appear that Hemingway was

working to expand or evolve his writer's craft during the creation of this novel, the "happy ending" chosen by Jenks seems completely disconnected from the rest of the novel, and serves to diminish the quality of the narrative's overarching themes and meaning.

The published ending resolves with David waking up in Marita's room, which had been made up by the staff of the hotel for both of them—signifying their union after Catherine's departure. As David wakes, he looks at Marita's "fresh brown body" lovingly, and proceeds to shower and prepare for a morning of writing (246). This ending, which smacks of sentimentality and romance, finds David "carrying the image of how [Marita] looked" with him as he leaves to work, which is so inviting that he has to stop and look in on her as he passes back toward his writing room (246). After this uncharacteristic set of actions, David goes to his writing room and sits down to begin again the stories that Catherine had destroyed in the previous chapter. With trepidation, David begins, and while his past attempt to start over failed miserably—he only managed one line over a span of several hours—he finds that he is capable of producing the words quite easily, easier than he had before:

He found he knew much more about his father than when he had first written this story and he knew he could measure his progress by the small things which made his father more tactile and to have more dimensions than he had in the story before. He was fortunate, just now, that his father was not a simple man. (247)

In this state of paradise that comes from the exile of Catherine, David is able to write a far greater narrative than before. The passage, and novel, concludes idyllically as David scribbles away "the sentences that he had made before," finding after several hours of work that he had recaptured all that was lost (five days of work), and the narrative promise that "there was no sign that any of it would ever cease returning to him intact" (247).

A lovely enough conclusion, but problematic, and frankly uninspired, in that it resolves itself too easily—too painlessly—especially considering the lack of any “fall” due to David’s, and Catherine’s, succumbing to the knowledge of sexual truth characterized by the gender change. While Hemingway is certainly wistful, melancholic, even romantic within the construct of a masculine appreciation for fine drink and sport, he is never so disarmingly pleasant, especially in his conclusions. Whether it is Jake Barnes’ cryptic closing line to Brett Ashley in *The Sun Also Rises*, Catherine Barkley’s death in *A Farewell to Arms*, or Robert Jordan’s death in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, no character in a Hemingway novel makes it out with such optimism and success. *Garden’s* published ending is tantamount to Frederic Henry receiving a telegram after leaving the hospital informing him that there had been a mistake and both Catherine and their child are healthy and happy, and can be discharged from the hospital for a sunny holiday on the French coast. Even his short fiction provides little hope for the published ending to *Garden*: Harry from “The Snows of Kilimanjaro,” Nick Adams in “The Big Two-Hearted River,” Krebs in “Soldier’s Home.” Hemingway protagonists are doomed to suffer in some capacity, to ache with some physical or psychological scar. So, it makes little sense thematically and generally to conclude the novel with the Jenks’ version. In its place should be the provisional ending that Hemingway wrote as he prepared to leave Cuba. This ending functions much more appropriately within the context of the novel’s themes of love, dissolution, and biblical fall.

The provisional ending finds Catherine and David reunited on a beach just as they were in the novel’s beginning, though as would be expected from a novel guided by the biblical Eden, the natural world that originally fueled the couples fierce lovemaking now leaves them lethargic and listless. Marita has presumably left, though there is no actual mention of her in the provisional ending. Both Catherine and David lie prone with their bodies partially exposed,

unlike their earlier fully-nude sun baths, with David's head covered in the shade and Catherine's body covered: "a scarf across her breasts and a towel over her waist" (MS47 422.2). It is clear that the scene is meant to draw the reader back to the beginning, but with a sense of tilt, or disarray. Things are different, but only subtly at first. Catherine and David's dialogue focuses on the past, while the pre-fall conversations were optimistically forward-looking. Where Catherine used to speculate on where they could travel for their next adventure, she now continuously recalls previous events with a sense of opacity, questioning David about where they had been and what they had done. The precocious behavior of the idyllic young couple is now replaced by a crude and stilted dysfunction and amnesia.

This dissolution is taken to its lowest point by the almost certain inevitability that Catherine and David will eventually commit suicide as a result of their fallen state. Initially brought to the surface of the story in the Sheldons' section that was completely excised from the published version when Barbara drowns herself after Nick's death, it is carried into the Bournes narrative by David as he swims out into the ocean to cool himself before returning to sunbathe. He dives down into the "deepening cold" and spars with the idea of "taking a full breath of the water," hesitating momentarily before turning back toward shore (MS47 422.2). This moment of contemplation draws out the underlying tension of the ending, and when David returns to the beach, he and Catherine speak openly about their future and about her condition. As David tries to coax Catherine into the shade of the cove to take a break from tanning, their conversation moves onto Catherine's mental health. When David suggests that she wait to swim, Catherine explains that she won't try anything funny, and begins to recall her ability to catalyze change (referencing the ability to transition genders on a whim): "'Remember? Change me change you change us both change the seasons change everything for my delight. And then it speeded up and

speeded up and speeded up and then it went away and then I went away” (MS47 422.2). This of course, draws the reader back to the concepts of Adam and Eve and their divine status within the garden, and reinforces the pain of the fall that Catherine has suffered. A fall David is equally a part of, and equally unable to fully acknowledge.

Following these comments, David tries to assert that after Catherine’s time in the sanitarium she came back to him as she was before all the changes, but she refuses to accept his resolution. Catherine dismisses David’s attempt to reconstruct their relationship by explaining that the doctors in Switzerland where the sanitarium was located don’t truly know what they are doing, and that she is and will always be plagued by her psychosis. After changing the subject to avoid any further discussion on the topic, Catherine concludes the provisional ending with a final pact with David. This pact David accepts without hesitation. In a conversation reminiscent of the many dialogues shared between the two throughout the novel, Catherine asks David if she can have a “surprise like in the old days” (MS47 422.2). David assents, and the novel ends:

“Do you promise?”

“Yes.”

“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 the 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?” (MS47 422.2)

This is a far more chilling ending to the novel, and an arguably more fitting one for narrative consistency. This ending provides the punishment that is inherently necessary in a story based upon the Eden parable, and resolves in a fashion familiar to any Hemingway reader. This punishment is completely removed in the published version, which Peters acknowledges finishes without the characters ever “fully realizing the consequences” of their actions (26). This, Peters asserts, renders the Jenks’ ending “incongruous with the sins of the Bournes and the consequences dramatized in the manuscript” (26). Additionally, Robert E. Fleming notes that the Jenks’ version is so distinctly antithetical to Hemingway’s other work that it almost appears to be Jenks own creation (*The Face in the Mirror* 130). The final lines in the provisional ending provide an endearing though tragic resolution to such a damaging relationship, showing that the Bournes will never find happiness in their relentless desire—even in such a fractured and crumbling situation, David pursues a semblance of normality.

## **Proposal for an Unabridged *Garden***

Based upon these discrepancies previously listed between the published version of *The Garden of Eden* and the editing practices established by Hemingway, I propose that an unabridged version of the novel be published consistent with the writing Hemingway produced during his life, with specific consideration for past editorial practices enforced by the author as well as Maxwell Perkins. Additionally, this assertion is based on other scholars' arguments that the manuscript version of the novel represents a completed text, and could be published as without the drastic changes made by Jenks. Based on the research conducted in this essay, along with the work of other scholars critical of the published work, a holistic text should be created, utilizing the manuscript materials located at the John F. Kennedy Library with no consideration for the Jenks edition published in 1986. The revised edition should follow the structure of the 1,500-page manuscript that Hemingway constructed prior to his death, including the Sheldons' subplot.

According to Peters, this manuscript consists of seventy percent holograph, and thirty percent typescript; the typescript constitutes various chapters also produced in holograph (17). Following the logic Peters uses in his analysis of the *Garden* manuscript, the typescript from this manuscript edition should be used over the holograph when available, as the typescript appears to be the final material edited by Hemingway's hand. Additionally, as John Leonard posits, the various other alterations and emendations Hemingway created during the writing of the novel, such as the alternate endings, could be included in an compact appendix at the end of the text, providing a complete representation of the novel which would avoid the pitfalls of editorial choice over authorial production.

Furthermore, I would elect the provisional ending as the appropriate ending for the novel based on its consistency with other Hemingway stories published both during his career and posthumously, though the original ending should be included with the additional material in the appendix. As discussed previously in this essay, the provisional ending fits with the Hemingway canon overall. As Fleming argues in his evaluation of the ending, it produces the Hemingway ambiguity consistent with his iceberg theory of writing: “Like so much of Hemingway’s work, this ending would have had the advantage of leaving many important facts beneath the surface of the story . . . so that the reader must infer their existence and their exact nature” (135). But, more importantly, the provisional ending provides the most cohesive conclusion to the text compared to the arguably “happy” ending found in the Jenks edition. Even when viewing the manuscript version of the “happy” ending, which contains additional interactions between Marita and David that suggest that Marita will fall as Catherine did into some ambiguous insanity related to her gender-swapping, the provisional ending still serves as a superior finale to the story of the Bournes.

Considering the novel was intended as a retelling of the Eden narrative from Genesis, the provisional ending provides the expected punishment for the couple who breaks the law of their own personal Eden in their pursuit of knowledge and self-actualization. Like Peters’ reflection upon the Rodin sculptor from the beginning of the novel, which serves as the Tree of Knowledge to catalyze the actions of the narrative, Fleming finds that the provisional ending satisfies the expectations for a reader assuming the couple will eventually face a “lost Eden” (134). Considering the value the couple places on their sexual relationship throughout the text, the provisional endings expurgation of these elements of their partnership serves as a bleak resolution on the part of David and Catherine:

David rubs oil into Catherine's breasts, a lover's action in the early chapters but a doctor's ministrations in this final chapter. Catherine reflects the same clinical attitude when she looks down at her breasts and observes that while they are still 'good,' it is uncertain what they are good for. (Fleming 134)

With these considerations in mind, I believe the provisional ending will serve as the most effective ending to the novel. Furthermore, although this ending is titled "provisional" and is not the only ending attached to the 1,500-page manuscript, it is important to consider Hemingway's intentions when crafting it. While the term "provisional" points to the temporary nature of the ending, to be altered later, it was written at a time when Hemingway believed that something would occur that would prevent him from completing the text. Thus, it appears that this ending was what Hemingway had in mind and was never able to revise to fit his liking. Much like other novels in the Hemingway canon, especially *A Farewell to Arms*, beginnings and endings were always handled with meticulous care, and went through numerous revisions before being shaped into their final form.

## Conclusion

A restored version of *The Garden of Eden* will provide scholars and general readers with a number of new avenues to analyze Hemingway's entire body of work, and will help to garner a new appreciation for a canonical author. Numerous critics point out the achievement that the novel represents in redefining a writer that many believe refrained from any attempt to develop his ability, resting on his laurels rather than attempting to manifest a new creative representation. Peters praises Hemingway's attempt to experiment "with self-reflexivity" and "expanded uses of dialogue" in the novel, (17) while Jerry A. Varsava lauds the author's endeavors "to construct what is for Hemingway a relatively complex plot involving intersecting stories" and a Faulknarian temporality (130). Additionally, Leonard finds the manuscript to be a strong representation of Hemingway's late blooming creative ability, asserting that the text is "uncommonly long and involved . . . but one that is cohesive and complete" (80). And Doctorow believes that the work represent a narrative with "greater truth . . . it gives evidence, despite his celebrity, despite his Nobel, despite the torments of his own physical self-punishment, of a writer still developing." Even Jenks admits twenty-five years after the novel was published, "the most definitive version exists only in the entirety of the voluminous drafts themselves" (2). Based on this, and the research I have provided in this essay, it seems logical that a manuscript version of *The Garden of Eden* be released in order to pay due respect to an author who strove throughout his career to produce works that were true not only to themselves, but to the author as well. By following the strictures of Hemingway as they were carried out during his life, a more accurate representation of the author's last fictional work may be appreciated and a greater respect can be given to an author who continued to work toward a truer understanding of himself through literature until he died.

## Works Cited

- Altman, Meryl. "Posthumous Queer: Hemingway Among Others." *The Hemingway Review* 30.1 (2010): 129-141. Print.
- Broer, Lawrence R., and Gloria Holland. *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2002. Print.
- Brucoli, Matthew J. *The Only Thing That Matters*. New York: Scribner, 1996. Print.
- Comley, Nancy R. "The Light from Hemingway's Garden: Regendering Papa." *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice*. Ed. Lawrence R. Broer and Gloria Holland. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2002. 204-217. Print.
- Doctorow, E.L. "Braver Than We Thought." *The New York Times*. The New York Times, 18 May 1986. Web. 3 Nov. 2015.
- Donaldson, Scott. *Fitzgerald & Hemingway: Works and Days*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009. Print.
- Eby, Carl. "'Come Back to the Beach Ag'in, David Honey!': Hemingway's Fetishization of Race in in *The Garden of Eden* Manuscript." *The Hemingway Review* 14.2 (1995): 98-117. Print.
- Fetterley, Judith. *The Resisting Reader*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978. Print.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. "MS09 Item 77 Fitzgerald's note." *A Farewell to Arms* Manuscript. John F Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum.
- Fleming, Robert E. "The Editing Process." *The Hemingway Review* 25.2 (2006): 91-94. Print.
- . *The Face in the Mirror*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1994. Print.
- Foote, Timothy. "Papa Watching." *Ernest Hemingway: The Critical Reception*. New York: Burt Franklin & Co., Inc, 1977. 442-443. Print.

Hemingway, Ernest. "Banquet Speech." NoblePrize.org, The Nobel Foundation, 2014. Web. 20 Feb. 2016.

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

---. *A Farewell to Arms: The Hemingway Library Edition*. New York: Scribner, 2012. Print.

---. *The Garden of Eden*. New York: Scribner, 1986. Print.

---. "MS06 Item 64 Manuscript pages 1-25." *A Farewell to Arms* Manuscript. JFKL.

---. "MS09 Item 67 Manuscript Fragment, 'It was a hot night . . .'" *A Farewell to Arms* Manuscript. JFKL.

---. "MS45 422.1 Typescript/Manuscript book 1: chapter 1." *The Garden of Eden* Manuscript. JFKL.

---. "MS47 422.2 *Garden of Eden* Provisional Ending." *The Garden of Eden* Manuscript. JFKL.

Hlinak, Matt. "Hemingway's Very Short Experiment: From 'A Very Short Story' to *A Farewell to Arms*." *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 43.1 (2010): 17-26. Print.

Jenks, Tom. "Editing Hemingway: *The Garden of Eden*." *The Hemingway Review* 7.1 (1987): 31-33. Print.

---. "*The Garden of Eden* at Twenty-Five." *NarrativeMagazine*. NarrativeMagazine.com, n.d., Web. 3 Nov. 2015.

Lehmann-Haupt, Christopher. "The Case of the Missing Annotations." *Ernest Hemingway: The Critical Reception*. New York: Burt Franklin & Co., Inc, 1977. 440. Print.

Leonard, John. "*The Garden of Eden*: A Question of Dates." *The Hemingway Review* 22.2 (2003): 63-81. Print.

- McDowell, Edwin. "New Hemingway Novel to be Published in May." *The New York Times*. The New York Times, 17 Dec. 1985. Web. 3 Nov. 2015.
- Nesmith, Chris L. "'The Law of an Ancient God' and the Editing of Hemingway's *Garden of Eden*: The Final Corrected Typescript and Galleys." *The Hemingway Review* 20.2 (2001): 16-36. Print.
- Oldsey, Bernard. "Hemingway's Beginnings and Endings." *College Literature* 7.3 (1980): 213-238. Print.
- Peters, K.J. "The Thematic Integrity of *The Garden of Eden*." *The Hemingway Review* 10.2 (1991): 17-29. Print.
- Plimpton, George. "Ernest Hemingway." *Writers at Work*. Ed. Malcolm Cowley. New York: The Viking Press, 1963. 217-239. Print.
- Pooley, Eric. "How Scribner's Crafted a Hemingway Novel." *Narrative Magazine*. NarrativeMagazine.com, n.d., Web. 20 Feb. 2016.
- Reynolds, Michael. "*A Farewell to Arms*: Doctors in the house of love." *The Cambridge Companion to Hemingway*. Ed. Scott Donaldson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996. 102-127. Print.
- Roe, Steven C. "Opening Bluebeard's Closet: Writing and Aggression in Hemingway's *The Garden of Eden* Manuscript." *The Hemingway Review* 12.1 (1992): 52-66. Print.
- Spufford, Francis. "Strange Fruit." *London Review of Books* 9.3 (1987): n/a. Web. 20 Feb. 2016.
- Tompkins, Jane P. "Criticism and Feeling." *College English* 39.2 (1977): 169-178. Print.
- Trogon, Robert W. *The Lousy Racket*. Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 2007. Print.
- Updike, John. "A Review." *TomJenks*. TomJenks.com, n.d., Web. 3 Nov. 2015.

Varsava, Jerry A. "En-Gendered Problems: Characteral Conflict in Hemingway's *Garden*." *Lit* 3.2 (1991): 115-135. Print.

## Curriculum Vitae

### ***Jesse Cook***

*4734 Roberta Street #4  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89169  
(435)-862-7546  
cookj12@unlv.nevada.edu*

---

## *Curriculum Vitae*

### **Education:**

- Master of Arts, English, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, May 2016
- Bachelor of Science, Literary Studies, Dixie State University, May 2013

### **Work Experience:**

Freelance Writer Feb 2016 – Present  
ClarkHoward.com

- As a freelance writer, I generated topics, researched related information, and wrote articles focusing on money saving tips for consumers purchasing technology and home entertainment products.

Instructor Aug 2014 – Present  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
Courses:

- English Composition 101
- English Composition 102

Consultant, Writing Center Aug 2014 – Present  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

- I Assisted students in improving various aspects of their writing including: proper essay formatting, argument clarity, sentence level coherence, content organization, prewriting, essay brainstorming, and presentation preparation.

Unseen64.com  
Content Writer

May 2015 – March 2016

- I Wrote and edited numerous chapters for a collected work related to video game history and cancelled video game titles. Content spanned the development cycle of the chosen project, and traced the events that led to the games cancellation.

Editor  
*Night Moves* (Currently Unpublished)

Nov 2014

- I worked directly with the writer, providing content suggestions as well as necessary revisions to prepare the text for publication. I Provided rewrites ranging from single sentences to complete paragraphs, assisted with thematic development on early sections of the novel, and performed micro-level corrections to grammar and punctuation throughout the entire work.

### **Conferences, Publications, & Awards:**

#### Conferences:

- “Suicide as Social Change in Chopin’s *The Awakening*” Sigma Tau Delta International Conference, Savannah Georgia, February 2014
- “Subverting the Narrative: Frame Narrative in Charles Chesnutt’s ‘Dave’s Neckliss’” Dixie State University Research Day, Dixie State College, April 2013 “Literature, Gender, and Sexuality: Opening the Book Panel Discussion” Sigma Tau Delta International Conference, Portland Oregon, March 2013
- “The Duality of Gender in Hemingway’s ‘The Snows of Kilimanjaro’” Sigma Tau Delta International Conference, Portland Oregon, March 2013
- “Subverting the Narrative: Frame Narrative in Charles Chesnutt’s ‘Dave’s Neckliss’” Utah Conference for Undergraduate Research, Utah State University, February 2013
- “Hemingway, Gender, and the Masculine Myth in *The Sun Also Rises*” Capstone Presentation, Dixie State College, December 2012
- “The Art of Survival in *New Grub Street*,” Dixie State College Research Day, Dixie State College, April 2012
- “The Art of Survival in *New Grub Street*,” National Conference for Undergraduate Research, Weber State University, March 2012

Publications:

- “The Art of Survival in New Grub Street,” National Conference for Undergraduate Research Proceedings, November 2012

Awards:

- Brooke Hudgins Award, Summer 2015
- Dixie Awards Student of the Year for Literary Studies, May 2013
- Dixie State University Research Day Panel Winner, April 2013
- Sigma Tau Delta International Conference Second Place Winner in Critical Essays on American Literature, March 2013
- Dixie State College Student of the Semester for Literary Studies, November 2012

**Student Leadership Positions & Activities:**

Sigma Tau Delta International English Honor Society:

- Alpha Pi Epsilon, Dixie State College chapter of Sigma Tau Delta 2011 – 2013
- Vice President of Alpha Pi Epsilon 2012-13
- Alpha Pi Epsilon Rummage Sale, Organizer/Coordinator, March 2013
- Literature Through the Lens: Portraits of Women from Exceptional Stories, Panel Presenter, December 2012
- Alpha Pi Epsilon Rummage Sale, Organizer/Coordinator, November 2012
- Alpha Pi Epsilon Poetry Appreciation Day Poetry Reading, Coordinator and Reader, April 2012

Additional Experience:

- Guest Lecturer at Dixie State University April 2016
- Archival Research at the John F Kennedy Library December 2015
- “Blood, Sweat & Tears: Life on the Front Lines of the Human Rights Struggle in Russia, Nigeria, and Iran,” featuring Wole Soyinka and Azar Nafisi.

- Chat-N-Chow, Dr. Comeford, “Dr. Horrible’s Sing-Along-Blog” April 2013
- Chat-N-Chow, Dr. Jasmine, “The Office” March 2013
- Helen Whitney Documentary Lecture “Pope John Paul 2<sup>nd</sup> and Religion After 9/11” October 2012
- Brown Bag Lecture, Dr. Pilkington, “Immortality in Folklore, Science Fiction, and Reality” October 2012