

Hemingway Scholarship and the Critical Canon in American Literature

Frank Stewart

(Received on May 10, 2000)

Critics of the American literary canon have known for some time the important distinction to be drawn between critical reputation from bestsellerdom. A fine example of this distinction can be found in the life and work of Herman Melville. When Herman Melville died in 1891, impoverished and unknown, he had not managed to sell even a single printing of his masterpiece *Moby Dick*, today regarded as one of the great American novels, if not its greatest literary work. And some of the best selling novels of all time — E. P. Roe's *Barriers Burned Away*, John Fox's *Little Shepard of Kingdom Come*, and Harold Bell Wright's *The Winning of Barbara Worth* — are today forgotten by all but a few students of popular culture.¹⁾ Hemingway had better luck than Melville. His novels made him both well-known and well-to-do. His first, *The Sun Also Rises*, sold more than one million copies during his lifetime.²⁾ *The Old Man And the Sea*, published near the end of his life, reached five and a half million people when published in *Life* magazine.³⁾ Successful yes, but none of Hemingway's books ever came close to matching the best-sellerdom of Margaret Mitchell's *Gone With the Wind* (more than twenty million copies

1) James D. Hart, *The Oxford Companion to American Literature*, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), 56.

2) *Publisher's Weekly* 180 (July 10, 1961): 49.

3) John Raeburn, *Fame Became of Him: Hemingway as Public Writer* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press 1984), 143.

in twenty-seven languages).⁴⁾

Critical reputation also has little to do with celebrity. Hemingway's lifestyle — four marriages, bullfighting, deep-sea fishing, big game hunting, and participation in World War I, the Spanish civil war, and World War II — made him the darling of reporters. Throughout his life, he was followed by headlines: "Worst Shot-Up Man in U. S. on Way Home," "Bull Gores Toronto Writer in Annual Pamplona Festival," "Paris Won't Let Hemingway Live a Private Life," "Hemingway Plans to Hunt Big Game in Tanganyika," "Hemingway 'Captures Six,'" "Ernest Hemingway Weds Writer in Cuba."⁵⁾ His bearded face appeared in *Life* magazine so many times that he was instantly recognized by most Americans. And Hemingway suffered all of the indignities of fame in America: *Vanity Fair* published Hemingway paper dolls with little safari suits and bull-fighter outfits; *Woman's Day* sought his wife's hamburger recipes.⁶⁾

Hemingway's critical reputation was forged of something very different. Early in his career, before he had published a single word of fiction, he won the respect of established writers. In 1921, Sherwood Anderson, acclaimed author of the short story cycle *Winesburg Ohio*, recommended that Hemingway go to Paris, and gave him letters of introduction to members of the literary avant-garde at work in that city. Gertrude Stein, Ezra Pound, and Ford Madox Ford critiqued his work and helped him publish in the experi-

4) *Benet's Reader's Encyclopedia*, 3rd ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1987), 393.

5) *Chicago American* (January 21, 1919), *Toronto Daily Star* (July 30, 1924): Guy Hickok, *Brooklyn Daily Eagle* (March 4, 1924), 2F; *New York Herald Tribune* (November 17, 1933), 3; *New York Times* (August 4, 1944), 3; *New York Times* (March 15, 1946), 12.

6) Alajalkov, "Vanity Fair's Own Paper Dolls. No. 5: Ernest Hemingway, America's Own Literary Cave Man; Hard-Drinking, Hard-Fighting, Hard-Loving — All for Art's Sake," *Vanity Fair* 42 (March 1934): 29; and Mary Hemingway, "Hamburger: Twelve Wonderful Ways with an Old Favorite," *Woman's Day* (January 1961): 34 + .

mental “little magazines” of Paris. F. Scott Fitzgerald, with popular success of *This Side of Paradise* and the critical success of *The Great Gatsby* under his belt, placed Hemingway with his American publisher, Charles Scribner’s Sons, home of the phenomenally prescient editor, Maxwell Perkins.

A partial list of the distinguished men and women of letters who chose to read and review Hemingway’s work during his lifetime reads like a veritable Who’s Who of twentieth century literature: Edmund Wilson, D. H. Lawrence, Conrad Aiken, Andre Maurois, Virginia Woolf, Dorothy Parker, H. L. Mencken, Mario Praz, John Dos Passos, Lewis Galantiere, Klaus Mann, Max Eastman, Wyndham Lewis, Bernard De Voto, Sinclair Lewis, Alfred Kazin, Malcolm Cowley, Lionel Trilling, Mark Schorer, Graham Greene, V. S. Pritchett, Arturo Barea, Evelyn Waugh, and William Faulkner.⁷⁾ Their regard for Hemingway as a writer to be taken seriously helped place him on the road to canonization.

During the 1950s, the last decade of Hemingway’s life, his work began to receive serious attention from academic critics and biographies, despite considerable resistance from Hemingway himself, who was “opposed to writing about the private lives of living [sic] authors and psychoanalyzing them while they are alive.”⁸⁾ Landmark works of scholarship published at this time included Carlos Baker’s thematic study of the fiction and nonfiction, *Hemingway: The Writer as Artist*; Philip Young’s controversial psychoanalytic treatment of the life and work, *Ernest Hemingway*; and Charles Fenton’s examination of Hemingway’s early years as a journalist, *The Apprenticeship of Ernest Hemingway*.⁹⁾ These young scholars were betting their careers that in

7) *Hemingway: The Critical Heritage*, ed. Jeffrey Meyers (London, Boston, and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982), collects important reviews published during Hemingway’s lifetime.

8) Hemingway to Wallace Meyer, February 21, 1952, in *Ernest Hemingway, Selected Letters: 1917–1961*, ed. Carlos Baker (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1981), 751.

9) Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1952, New York and Toronto: Rinehart, ↗

years to come Hemingway would be considered an important figure in American literature, and they were right. By the end of the decade, Hemingway was included in such influential surveys of American literature as Charles Feidelson and Paul Brodtkorb's *Interpretation of American Literature* (1959) and Leslie Fiedler's *Love and Death in the American Novel* (1960).¹⁰⁾

Publication of *The Old Man and the Sea* in 1952 played a crucial role in the development of Hemingway's critical reputation. Prior to the appearance of this crisp and lyrical novella about an old Cuban fisherman's struggle with a titanic fish, Hemingway had published nothing of distinction during the twelve years since *For Whom the Bells Tolls* (1940). The early promise of the brilliant short story collection, *In Our Time* (1925), and his finest novels, *The Sun Also Rises* (1926) and *A Farewell to Arms* (1929), seemed distant and unfulfilled. Hemingway's nonfiction of the 1930s, *Death in the Afternoon* (1932) and *Green Hills of Africa* (1935), had been disappointing by comparison, and a "novel" like *To Have and Have Not* (1937), two previously published short stories hastily cobbled together, seemed a shocking performance from a craftsman once so exacting. *Across the River and into the Trees* (1950) had been savaged by the critics, and Hemingway was widely considered to be a has-been.

The Old Man and the Sea, however was hailed as Hemingway's triumphant return. According to Carlos Baker,

Life sold 5,318,650 copies within forty-eight hours. Advance sales on the regular American edition ran to 50,000 and settled thereafter into a brisk weekly sale of 3,000.... [Readers] kept telephoning congratulations. Those who saw [Hemingway] personally often thanked him and burst into tears.... American reviewers were mostly ecstatic. Harvey Breit called the book "momentous and

↘ 1952; and New York: Farrar, Straus, and Young, 1954.

10) New York: Oxford University Press, 1959, and New York: Criterion Books, 1960.

heartening.” Joseph Henry Jackson had nothing but praise for this “miracle-play of Man against Fate.”... Rabbis and ministers began preaching sermons on Ernest’s text. For three weeks, Ernest himself averaged eighty to ninety letters a day from well-wishers.¹¹⁾

It seemed the world agreed with Hemingway’s often abused wife Mary, who after reading the manuscript, said she “forgave [him] for everything [he’d] ever done,” and showed him the gooseflesh on her arms.¹²⁾

The international success of *The Old Man and the Sea* brought Hemingway the world’s most prestigious literary award, the Nobel Prize, in 1954. His citation praised for overcoming the “brutal, callous, and cynical” tendencies of his early career to produce a work of “heroic pathos,” distinguished by its “natural admiration for every individual who fights the good fight in a world of reality overshadowed by violence and death.”¹³⁾ Receipt of the Nobel Prize is in many cases a guarantee of eventual canonization. With one or two exceptions, the other American writers who have won the award — Sinclair Lewis, Eugene O’Neil, Pearl S. Buck, William Faulkner, John Steinbeck, Saul Bellow, Isaac Bashevis Singer, Joseph Brodsky, and Toni Morrison — are considered pivotal figures in our literature and their works are widely taught in American institutions of higher learning.

Death, however, is the truest test of a writer’s critical reputation. The “loathsome literary world,” as Norman Mailer put it, is “necrophilic to the core — [critics] murder their writers, and then decorate their graves.”¹⁴⁾ Although

11) Carlos Baker, *Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1969), 72.

12) A. E. Hotchner, *Papa Hemingway: A Personal Memoir* (New York: Random House, 1966), 72.

13) In Baker, *A Life Story*, 528.

14) Norman Mailer, “First Advertisement for Myself” (1959), in *The Long Patrol: 25 Years of Writing from the Work of Norman Mailer*, ed. Robert F. Lucid (New York: ↗

Mailer's bitterness is understandable, the necrophilia of critics does have a certain harsh logic. Not until authors have departed this earth can we begin to determine whether their work is, to paraphrase Hemingway, "good enough to last forever." It is far easier to capture the imaginations and speak to the concerns of one's own generation than to write meaningfully for the children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren of the future. Again, like the saints of the Roman Catholic Church, no writer can be genuinely canonized until he or she is dead.

Hemingway, who never did anything once, managed to die twice. In January 1954, while on safari in Africa, he and his wife Mary were involved in two serious crashes in two days. The first plane, a chartered Cessna piloted by Roy Marsh, swerved to avoid a flight of ibis, collided with an abandoned telegraph wire, and plummeted into the Ugandan bush near Murchison Falls on the Nile. Badly bruised and shaken, the Hemingways and their pilot spent an uncomfortable night among curious hippos and elephants while rescuers began searching for the missing plane. But the search went wide. Marsh and the Hemingways rescued themselves the next day by flagging down a boatload of sightseers on the Nile. It took the boat until late in the afternoon to return to its berth at Butiaba; in the meantime, word flashed around the globe that Hemingway was missing and presumed dead. The second crash occurred when the Hemingways chartered another flight to take them from Butiaba to Entebbe. This time the plane crashed on takeoff and burst into flames; Hemingway, the last one out of the burning aircraft, sustained serious injuries (a concussion, cracked vertebra, first-degree burns, and internal bruising).

Word of Hemingway's survival did not reach the outside world until the

↘ World, 1971), 160.

second day after the first crash, when the battered author, after yet another flight, collapsed in a Nairobi hotel room. There he had the uniquely delicious experience of reading his own obituaries. Mary Hemingway recalled it this way:

Then the obituaries began arriving, first from London and Europe, then from the western hemisphere and India and Hong Kong, two-and three-column stories many of them, reviewing Ernest's life and appraising his work. He read and reread them enthralled and gave no attention when I suggested that the everlasting reading suggested unseemly egotism. After our day's and evening's guests departed, he read in bed. Then, heeding my objections to the light, he read in the bathroom.¹⁵⁾

The African plane crashes may have been as important as the success of *The Old Man and the Sea* in precipitating Hemingway's Nobel Prize. His miraculous survival after being reported dead constituted a second "triumphant return" of the old man, and made him s sentimental favorite for the prize while it gave the Nobel committee advance assurance that their decision would be popular.

Sadly, the plane crashes also precipitated the final downturn in Hemingway's physical and mental health. A thinly controlled alcoholic throughout much of his life, he drank more heavily than usual to combat the pain of his injuries. He began to suffer from diabetes, high blood pressure, and cirrhosis of the liver. Hemingway's mental state began to deteriorate as well, and he experienced bouts of extreme paranoia (believing that the FBI and the IRS were pursuing him), as well as episodes of severe depression, leading to a number of suicide attempts and eventually to his hospitalization for electroshock treatments that destroyed much of his short-term memory. Throughout this difficult period, he struggled to write, publishing "The Dan-

15) Mary Hemingway, *How it Was* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1976), 387.

gerous Summer” in *Life* magazine (1960) and bringing *A Moveable Feast* to near-completion. Finally, however, the struggle grew to be too much. On the morning of July 2, 1961, just days after his release from a psychiatric ward at the Mayo clinic, Ernest Hemingway selected a shotgun from a basement storage room in his Ketchum, Idaho home and blew his brains out.

It is here that the continuing story of Hemingway’s critical reputation, his life after death, really begins. The world mourned his passing, beginning an evaluation of his life and work truly international in scope. His receipt of the Nobel Prize, his expatriate lifestyle, and his easily translatable literary style had made him a global favorite. *The New York Times* of July 4, 1961 recorded worldwide headlines upon his death: “ ‘France Shocked over Hemingway,’ ‘Praised by Vatican Paper,’ [Manchester] *Guardian* Cites Influence,’ ‘Mourned in Madrid,’ Tributes from Lisbon,’ ‘Work Lauded in Norway,’ Stockholm Is Stunned,’ ‘Top Influence in Poland,’ ‘ “One of Us to Cubans,’ and Brazilian Hails Greatness.’ ”¹⁶⁾ A special issue of the *Saturday Review* carried an article titled “The World Weighs a Writer’s Influence,” and included estimates of Hemingway’s work by Salvador de Madariaga of Spain, Frank Morales in India, Carlo Levi of Italy, Ilya Ehrenburg of the Soviet Union, Alan Pryce-Jones of England, and Edward Seidensticker in Japan.¹⁷⁾ Soviet writer Ilya Ehrenburg summarized the international response this way: “The loss of this major writer hurts. It hurts, too, that a man should have died who, through the love felt for him, has brought together people and nations otherwise remote from each other.”¹⁸⁾

American critics, too, were asking themselves a question best formulated by Irving Howe:

16) P. 9.

17) *Saturday Review* 44 (July 1961) —Special Issue: Hemingway: A World View.

18) *Saturday Review* 44 (July 29, 1961): 20 Reprinted in Meyers 433–36.

Now that he is dead and nothing remains but a few books and the problem of his dying, perhaps we should ask the simplest, most radical of questions, what was there in Hemingway's writing that enabled him to command the loyalty of a generation? Even those of us who disliked some of his work and most of his posture, why did we feel compelled to acknowledge the strength and resonance of his voice?¹⁹⁾

The period immediately following Hemingway's death saw many retrospectives of his career as critics explored whether he was worthy of canonization. Articles such as Stanley Edgar Hyman's "The Best of Hemingway," John C. Kelly's "Ernest Hemingway (1899–1961): Formulating the Data of Experience," and C. Hugh Holman's "Ernest Hemingway: A Tribute" were commonplace.²⁰⁾

"Was 'Papa Truly a Great Writer?'" asked Maxwell Geismar in the *New York Times Book Review*.²¹⁾ Critics at work in America's colleges and universities voted a resounding "yes" with their pens. The decade of the 1960s saw the publication of nearly four hundred scholarly articles and books with Ernest Hemingway as their subject.²²⁾ Just how rapidly Hemingway became a mainstay of high school and college classrooms is indicated by the decade's booming industry in study guides to the major novels. *Cliff's Notes*, *Monarch Notes*, *Methuen Notes*, *Ivy Notes*, *Coles Notes*, *Merrill Guides*, and

19) *The New Republic* 145 (July 24, 1961): 19–20, reprinted in Meyers 430–33.

20) *New Leader* 44 (August 14–21, 1961): 22–24; *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review* 50 (Autumn 1961): 312–26; *Books Abroad* 36 (Winter 1962): 5–8.

21) (July 1, 1962): 1, 16.

22) This and other estimates of the amount of Hemingway scholarship produced during a given period are based on the annual *MLA International Bibliography of Books and Articles on the Modern Languages and Literatures*, the only bibliographic reference that follows Hemingway consistently throughout the thirty-year period covered in this essay.

Studymaster all vied for a share of the profitable Hemingway market.

The vast majority of critics at work in the academy during this period were white Anglo-Saxon Protestant males, who shared World War II as their most important historic memory. Indeed, many were combat veterans. Their favorite novel was *A Farewell to Arms*, Hemingway's romantic tragedy of love and duty in a theater of war. *The Old Man and the Sea*, with its existentialist emphasis on courage and perseverance in the face of inevitable defeat and death, came second. Among short stories they preferred those set in Africa, "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber" and "The Snows of Kilimanjaro," reading them as "moral tragedies tipped with irony," of dissolute men finding courage and dying "at the very moment [they commence] to live."²³⁾ Their criticism was profoundly value-centered, focusing on heroism and existentialism, and on attitudes toward love and religion. Representative works of Hemingway criticism composed during the 1960s included John Killinger's *Hemingway and the Dead Gods: A Study In Existentialism*, Cleanth Brook's *The Hidden God: Studies in Hemingway, Faulkner, Yeats, Eliot, and Warren*, Earl Roovit's *Ernest Hemingway*, Robert W. Lewis's *Hemingway on Love*, and Jackson Benson's *Hemingway: The Writer's Art of Self-Defense*.²⁴⁾

Philip Young, however was the single most influential Hemingway critic during these years. His *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration*, published in 1966, created a psychoanalytic paradigm, known as the "wound theory," for reading Hemingway's work. An extensive revision of Young's 1954 study, less inhibited following Hemingway's suicide, the book proposed that the author's life and art had been motivated by the trauma of his wounding in

23) Carlos Baker, *Hemingway: The Writer as Artist*, rev. ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), 187.

24) Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1961; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963; New York: Twayne, 1963; Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965; Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969.

World War I (at eighteen Hemingway had been badly injured by Austrian shell and machine-gun fire while acting as a Red Cross volunteer). Young equated Hemingway with the shell-shocked Nick Adams of "A Way You'll Never Be," and viewed the author's many fictive treatments of courage and violence as repeated attempts to master the terrifying, primal scene of his 1918 wounding. From the "wound theory," Young himself a combat veteran, evolved the notion of a Hemingway "code": "A 'grace under pressure' ... made of the controls of honor and courage which in a life of tension and pain make a man a man and distinguish him from the people who follow random impulses, let down their hair, and are generally messy, perhaps cowardly, and without inviolable rules for how to live holding tight."²⁵ In Young's view, this theme is always "introduc[ed] and exemplifi[ed]" in Hemingway's fiction by a "code hero," a "consistent character" embodying the values of the code.

Like all brilliant critical theories, Young's provided a persuasive and enlightening way to read Hemingway's entire output. Many works of the 1960s, including Joseph DeFalco's *The Hero in Hemingway's Short Stories*, Leo Gurko's *Hemingway and the Pursuit of Heroism*, and Delbert Wylder's *Hemingway's Heroes* attest to Young's influence.²⁶ At the same time, the idea of the code hero would smother the originality of lesser critics and stifle alternative views for a long time.

Minority voices were virtually absent from the academy of the 1960s. Of the vast sea of work on Hemingway during this period, only three articles stand out as of special relevance to Americans marginalized by the dominant WASP culture: Gerald Griffin's "Hemingway's Fictive Use of the Negro: 'The Curious

25) Philip Young, *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1966), 63.

26) Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1963; New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1968; and Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1969.

Quality of Incompleteness,'” Josephine Z. Knopf’s “Meyer Wolfsheim and Robert Cohn: A Study of Jewish Type and Stereotype,” and Michael Hoffman’s “From Cohn to Herzog.”²⁷⁾ None was sufficient to press consideration of Hemingway’s relevance to an essentially multicultural society.

Contributions by women were scarce, with only seventeen women writing about Hemingway during the first decade after his death. The seventeen speak volumes about gender and the academy in the 1960s. Nearly 25 percent were nuns, suggesting that a vow of celibacy was necessary, or at least that marriage and family were considered inappropriate for women with careers at this time. A number of women appeared as “second authors,” a respectful two places behind husbands or male colleagues. Only one woman, a 1969 graduate student, dared to challenge male-oriented subject matter and discuss female characters in Hemingway’s fiction.²⁸⁾ Others wrote women’s magazine-style descriptions of Hemingway’s homes in Key West and Cuba. Nevertheless, the decade’s most important woman scholar, Andre Hanneman, produced a monumental work of permanent value: *Ernest Hemingway: A Comprehensive Bibliography*.²⁹⁾ Yet perhaps it is significant that Hanneman, like Katherine Jobes (who edited a useful anthology of essays on *The Old Man and the Sea* in 1968),³⁰⁾ felt more comfortable acting as a compiler than as an opinion maker.

27) *Hudson Review* 1 (1968): 104–11; *Tradition: A Journal of Orthodox Jewish Thought* 10.3 (Spring 1969), rptd. in *Modern Critical Interpretation: Ernest Hemingway’s The Sun Also Rises*, ed. Harold Bloom (New Haven and New York: Chelsea House, 1987), 61–70; and *Yale Review* 58 (March 1969): 321–41.

28) Naomi M. Grant, “The Role of Women in the Fiction of Ernest Hemingway,” *Dissertation Abstracts* 29: 44A.

29) Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967.

30) *Twentieth Century Interpretations of The Old Man and the Sea: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968).

Although the academy was silent on issues of importance to minority readers and women, the almost exclusively male critical hierarchy sometimes carried on like guys in a locker room. With their pronouncements unleavened by feminist thought and unchallenged by female colleagues, some early critics of Hemingway man-handled his striking women characters and ignored those stories where he wrote with sensitivity from a woman's point of view. For such critics, Brett Ashley of *The Sun Also Rises* was a "Circe" who turned men into swine, Catherine Barkley of *A Farewell to Arms* a "divine lollipop," and the female protagonists of the African stories "American bitches of the most-soul-destroying sort."³¹ A great deal of seminal Hemingway criticism was unfortunately written in an era under the influence of Leslie Fielder's *Love and Death in the American Novel* (1960), a tremendously popular critical work suggesting that American literature in its entirety could be interpreted as an elaboration of two ideas: that minority people make terrific sidekicks and that the only good woman is a dead one.

The dearth of minorities and women in the academy during the 1960s is probably the most significant negative influence on Hemingway's critical reputation today. When potential readers reject Hemingway as indifferent to minorities and hostile to women, they are often responding not to Hemingway's fiction, but to the indifference and hostility of some of his early critics, and a negative image of the author those influential first admirers unintentionally projected. Just as Young's notion of the code hero made it hard for subsequent critics to approach Hemingway in any other fashion, so the unconscious and deliberate biases of some early readers would make it hard for some subsequent readers to approach Hemingway at all.

31) Baker, *The Writer as Artist*, 87; Francis Hackett, *Saturday Review of Literature* (August 6, 1949): 32–33; Edmund Wilson, "Hemingway: Gauge of Morale," *The Wound and the Bow* (1947), reprinted in McCaffery 255.

In addition to a burgeoning of critical interest, the 1960s were marked by an explosion of Hemingway biographies. The marriages, the globetrotting, the wars, the adventures, and the tragic mystery of the suicide were (and are) irresistible. Hemingway's death ironically meant that public fascination with his inimitable life could now be indulged to the fullest. A crop of tawdry, exploitative biographies followed almost immediately on the heels of his suicide: Alfred G. Aronowitz and Peter Hammil's *Ernest Hemingway: The Life and Death of a Man*, Kurt D. Singer's *Hemingway: Life and Death of a Giant*, and Milt Machlin's *The Private Hell of Ernest Hemingway* hit the newsstands in paperback form almost before the body was cold.³²⁾

Of greater value to scholars, and held back for publication after Hemingway's death, were two sibling biographies: Leicester Hemingway's *My Brother, Ernest Hemingway* (1962) and Marcelline Hemingway Sanford's *At the Hemingway's: A Family Portrait* (1962).³³⁾ Also of value, although its brutally honest account of the suicide greatly distressed Hemingway's widow Mary, was *Papa Hemingway*, a biography by the author's friend A. E. Hotchner.³⁴⁾ Lloyd Arnold, an Idaho intimate of the Hemingways, produced *High on the Wild*.³⁵⁾ Another biographer with a regional emphasis, Constance Cappel Montgomery, produced *Hemingway in Michigan*, a detailed look at the childhood summers that play so vital a role in the early short stories.³⁶⁾

32) New York: Lancer, 1961; Los Angeles: Holloway House, 1962; New York: Paperback Library, 1962.

33) Cleveland: World, 1962, and Boston: Little, Brown, 1962.

34) New York: Random House, 1966. The Hotchner biography is often dismissed as apocryphal, but doctoral research by Albert J. DeFazio III has shown that it has a solid basis in Hemingway's correspondence with Hotchner, the text often paraphrasing Hemingway letters that Hotchner was forbidden to publish by the terms of the author's will.

35) Caldwell, Idaho: Caxton, 1968.

36) New York: Fleet, 1966.

Many of Hemingway's literary acquaintances, including Sylvia Beach, Morley Callaghan, Kathleen Cannell, Janet Flanner, Lillian Hellman, Robert McAlmon, and Harold Loeb, responded with reminiscences to the hunger for information. Biographies by Hemingway's most negligible acquaintances also blossomed: Jed Kiley's *Hemingway: An Old Friend Remembers* and William Seward's *My Friend Ernest Hemingway: An Affectionate Reminiscence* struck poses of imaginary intimacy.³⁷⁾

The close of the decade saw publication of a scholarly book that still endures as the finest single-volume biography, Carlos Baker's *Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story*.³⁸⁾ Baker's Hemingway biography has no thesis, and is driven not by Freudian fiddle-faddle, but by facts.³⁹⁾ Baker's encyclopedic knowledge, faithful representation, and meticulous documentation of the Hemingway letters and manuscripts he was among the first to handle, give *Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story* an authority as yet unsurpassed. More recent biographers may have addressed controversial issues that Baker avoided out of respect to Hemingway's widow, and they may have had access to information unavailable to Baker in the 1960s, but none has yet matched in objectivity and scholarship.

A writer's critical reputation may languish naturally after death simply because the writer is no longer publishing, no longer stimulating critics with new work to consider. This has not been a problem for Hemingway, who continues to publish prolifically beyond the grave. At his death he left a great deal of uncollected work, as well as three thousand pages of unpublished manuscripts.⁴⁰⁾ The 1960s saw publication of four posthumous volumes, and

37) New York: Hawthorn Books, 1965; and South Brunswick and New York: A. S. Barnes, 1969.

38) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969.

39) Baker, *The Writer as Artist*, 152.

40) Philip Young and Charles W. Mann, *The Hemingway Manuscripts: An Inventory* ↗

their carefully metered appearances no doubt account in part for his growing reputation during this period. Of these, the least significant was *Hemingway: The Wild Years*, a group of early *Toronto Star* articles hastily compiled by Gene Z. Hanrahan and published as a Dell paper in 1962 to exploit the publicity attendant on Hemingway's suicide. His 1940 play, *The Fifth Column*, was added to four previously uncollected short stories of the Spanish civil war, to make a second, more engaging "new" Hemingway offering for 1960s readers. In *Byline: Ernest Hemingway*, bibliographer William White anthologized "selected articles and dispatches of four decades," sparking a critical enthusiasm for the nonfiction that culminated in Robert O. Stephen's scholarly study, *Hemingway's Nonfiction: The Public Voice*.⁴¹⁾ By far the most momentous of the decade's posthumous publications, however, was Hemingway's previously unpublished and lyrical memoir of his Paris years, *A Moveable Feast*. Although questionably edited by Mary Hemingway, *A Moveable Feast* is widely and deservedly accepted as one of American literature's "books that matter."

As the 1960s drew to a close, the United States was torn apart over its growing involvement in the Vietnam War. A majority of predominantly conservative, middle-class Americans viewed the war as a necessary attempt to halt the spread of communism in Asia. Many of their college-age children, who possessed no right to vote but could be forcibly drafted to fight in this conflict,⁴²⁾ viewed the Vietnam War as fundamentally racist (one poster referred to the war as "white men sending black men to kill yellow men to defend a nation stolen from red men") and an obscene effort to obliterate an agrarian people who scarcely threatened the United States superpower and its military-industrial complex. In the watershed year of 1968, the nation changed forever as

↘ (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1969).

41) Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1968.

the Viet Cong poured into South Vietnam during the Tet Offensive, civil rights leader Martin Luther King Jr. and liberal presidential candidate Senator Robert Kennedy were assassinated, massive antiwar demonstrations at the Democratic National Convention turned into violent rioting, and Republican Richard M. Nixon was elected president.

As the 1970s began conservatives sought an end to mounting unrest on campus. "If it takes a bloodbath, then let's get it over with," pronounced California Governor Ronald Reagan.⁴³⁾ The bloodbath took place on May 18, 1970, when National Guardsmen opened fire on students protesting the war at Kent State University, killing four. The shots were heard around the world, and commemorated in forums as diverse as a poem by dissident Soviet writer Yevgeny Yevtushenko, and a rock 'n' roll ballad by Neil Young.⁴⁴⁾

Tin soldiers and Nixon coming
We're finally on our own.
This summer I hear the drumming,
Four dead in Ohio.
Four dead in Ohio.

But the incident at Kent State did not "get it over with." By year's end 448 colleges and universities were either closed or on strike, and the nation's tension over the war did not ease until 1973, when the United States signed a ceasefire with North Vietnam.

What does all of this have to do with Hemingway's critical reputation? The truest test of an author's critical reputation is the ability to remain relevant to successive generations, and perhaps no generation gap in American history

42) American men were forced to register for the draft at age eighteen, but the minimum voting age for all elections was twenty-one.

43) Clifton Daniel, ed., *Chronicle of the Twentieth Century* (Mount Kisco, N. Y.: Chronicle, 1987), 1020.

44) Neil Young, "Ohio," copyright 1970.

was as profound as that between the children of the 1960s and their World War II-forged parents. For those who had, like Hemingway himself, participated in the global struggle to end fascism and had stoically confronted horrors like the walking barrages of Hurtgen Forest, the issue of “grace under pressure” was all-consuming. Yet to survive the 1970s, Hemingway’s work would have to appeal to a generation he had never known nor imagined, a generation that did not believe that communism was a global threat and had refused military service en masse.

Statistics show that Hemingway’s critical reputation met the challenges of the 1970s with ease. The decade saw production of some 729 scholarly books and articles about his work and life, up 42 percent from the 1960s. In part, Hemingway’s fictional treatment of World War I and its aftermath assisted him posthumously in bridging the gap between the World War II and Vietnam generations. He believed that World War I was “the most colossal, murderous, mismanaged butchery that has ever taken place on earth,” and hated both war itself and “all the politicians whose mismanagement, gullibility, cupidity, selfishness, and ambition” create wars.⁴⁵⁾ Yet he also believed, writing before Vietnam, that “once we have a war there is only one thing to do. It must be won. For defeat brings worse things than war.”⁴⁶⁾ Both subsequent generations could draw nourishment from his writing — he gave courage to one (“no thing that can ever happen to you from the air can ever be worse than the shelling men lived through on the western front in 1916 and 1917”⁴⁷⁾) and cynicism to the other (“Abstract words such as honor, glory, courage, or hal-low were obscene beside the concrete names of villages, the names of rivers, the numbers of regiments and dates” [FTA 185]).

45) *Men at War* (New York: Crown, 1942), xiii, xi.

46) *Ibid.* xi.

47) *Ibid.*

Change happens slowly in American colleges and universities, despite events like the Kent State tragedy and widespread strikes. The torch is not passed to a new generation overnight; it takes from four to ten years to earn a Ph. D., and another seven years to win tenure. Not until the late 1980s did the Vietnam generation begin to assume dominance in the academy. As the 1970s began, the World War II generation was still in command, but as the decade progressed, new critical trends slowly began to infiltrate Hemingway studies.

Not surprisingly, *The Sun Also Rises* was the favorite Hemingway novel of the 1970s. Its lost-generation characters, alienated by World War I and self-anesthetized with alcohol, were familiar and appealing to an equally lost generation alienated by Vietnam and experimenting with drugs. *A Farewell to Arms* remained immensely popular, its tragic juxtaposition of love and war still supremely relevant. *For Whom the Bells Toll*, with its complex treatment of the political corruption, atrocities, and futile loss of life on both sides of the Spanish civil war, also increased its audience, while *The Old Man and the Sea*, with its simplistic approach to courage and endurance in the face of adversity, began to decline in popularity.

Philip Young's notion of a code hero continued to be influential in the 1970s, dominating doctoral dissertations such as Gary D. Elliot's "The Hemingway Hero's Quest for Faith" and Bhim Singh Dahiya's "The Hero in Hemingway: A Study in Development."⁴⁸⁾ Predictably, however, the post-Vietnam generation was less interested in heroism for heroism's sake, and there were also glimmerings of discontent with this paradigm for reading Hemingway. "Throw away Your Codebook," urged Philip K. Jason in an article for *Indirections*, while Charles Steler and Gerald Locklin advocated "Decoding the Hemingway Hero" in an essay for *Hemingway Notes*.⁴⁹⁾

48) DAI 34: 621A and DAI 36: 2818A-19A.

49) 1.3-4 (1976): 59-64; and 5.1 (Fall 1979): 2-10.

There were other factors at large in the academy of the 1970s as well. In 1972 a constitutional amendment (known as the ERA, or Equal Rights Amendment) prohibiting gender discrimination against women was sent to the states for ratification. That same year, a number of colleges and universities previously closed to women (Dartmouth College, Rutgers, and Yale University are three examples) opened their doors for the first time. Across the United States, women organized to work for passage of the amendment. ERA would eventually fail, but it left behind a highly organized and extremely angry feminist movement with improved access to higher education. If Hemingway's writing was, as Philip Young suggested, almost entirely concerned with "what makes a man a man," how would his reputation survive both the advent of 1970s-style feminism and a fresh influx of women into American colleges and universities?

Feminism's impact on Hemingway studies, like that of the Vietnam War was almost immediate and surprisingly positive. The number of women scholars at work on Hemingway rose from 7 percent of the whole in the 1960s to 13 percent in the 1970s. Women remained a distinct minority, to be sure, but their numbers almost doubled in a single decade. Some, such as Mary Jim Josephs in "The Hunting Metaphor in Hemingway and Faulkner" and Charlotte Kretzoi in "Hemingway on Bullfights and Aesthetics,"⁵⁰⁾ tackled Hemingway's masculine subject matter. Others, such as Carole Vopat in "The End of *The Sun Also Rises*: A New Beginning" and Trisha Ingman in "Symbolic Motifs in 'A Canary for One,'" chose gender-neutral territory.⁵¹⁾ Still others began for the first to explore matters of interest to women readers: Pamela Farley's "Form and Function: The Image of Women in Selected Works of

50) DAI 34: 1282-A; and see MLA 1976 entry 10401.

51) *Fitzgerald-Hemingway Annual* 1972: 245–55; and *Linguistics in Literature* 1.2 (1976): 35–41.

Hemingway and Fitzgerald,” Deborah Fisher’s “Genuine Heroines: Hemingway Style,” and Janet Lynne Pearson’s “Hemingway’s Women.”⁵²⁾ Some, like Anne Greco in “Margot Macomber: Bitch Goddess Exonerated” and Sunita Jain in “Of Women and Bitches: Two Hemingway Heroines Exonerated,” would challenge the assumptions of their male colleagues.⁵³⁾ Nor were woman scholars always complimentary to Hemingway. Judith Fetterley’s “*A Farewell to Arms*: Hemingway’s ‘Resentful Cryptogram,’ ” remains one of the best-known feminist assaults on the author’s hostility to women.⁵⁴⁾ By 1978 there were hints of a developing backlash, as William Spofford published “Beyond the Feminist Perspective: Love in *A Farewell to Arms*.”⁵⁵⁾

If women became increasingly involved in Hemingway studies during the 1970s, scholars interested in issues of race and ethnicity did not. Only Paul Marx, in “Hemingway and Ethnics,” briefly pondered the subject, concluding with a well-developed sense of the obvious, that Hemingway’s use of racial and ethnic epithets in his 1920s stories was the result of “cultural influences.”⁵⁶⁾ And only J. F. Kobler’s “Hemingway’s ‘The Sea Change’: A Sympathetic View of Homosexuality” dared introduce a subject seldom discussed in the pre-AIDS era of the 1970s.⁵⁷⁾

Influence studies were far away the dominant critical trend of the decade. Now that Hemingway’s canonization seemed assured, critics rushed

52) DAI 35: 3735A; *Lost Generation Journal* 3.2 (1974): 35–36; *Lost Generation Journal* 1.1 (1973): 16–19.

53) *Fitzgerald-Hemingway Annual* (1972): 273–80; and *Journal of the School of Languages* 3.2 (1975–76): 32–35.

54) *Journal of Popular Culture* 10.1 (Summer 1977): 203–14.

55) *Fitzgerald-Hemingway Annual* (1978): 307–12.

56) *Essays in Arts and Sciences* 8 (1979): 35–44.

57) *Arizona Quarterly* 26 (Winter 1970): 318–24.

to rank him among accepted literary figures. In article after article, Hemingway is compared to acknowledged “greats” of American literature. (Poe, Thoreau, Emerson, Melville, Twain, Adams, Dreiser) and to leading lights of his own generation (Anderson, Bellow, Wolfe, Faulkner, Fitzgerald, Steinbeck, Wister, Eliot, Thurber). He is ranked as well with European and British writers (Dante, Flaubert, Merimee, Proust, Malraux, Stendhal, Camus, Gide, Tostoy, Mann, Nietzsche, Baroja, Gironella, Joyce, Shaw, Huxley — even Lewis Carroll and H. Rider Haggard). And Hemingway’s achievement are used as a yardstick against which younger writers (Ralph Ellison, Joseph Heller, John Updike) are measured.

The 1970s also marked the real beginning of a phenomenon known as the “Hemingway industry.” So many critics were now at work on Hemingway that the available spectrum of generalist journals could not accommodate their productivity. In 1970 Matthew J. Bruccoli founded *The Fitzgerald-Hemingway Annual* to provide an additional forum for publication. When this journal folded in 1979, Kenneth Rosen picked up the torch and created *Hemingway Notes*, a publication devoted exclusively to Hemingway Studies and still going strong today as *The Hemingway Review*.

The burgeoning of Hemingway studies during this period may be the reason why many of the decade’s most important books were devoted to helping scholars get a grip on the now considerable literature about Hemingway: Arthur Waldhorn’s *A Reader’s Guide to Ernest Hemingway* and *Ernest Hemingway: A Collection of Criticism*, Audre Hanneman’s *Supplement to Ernest Hemingway: A Comprehensive Bibliography*, Linda Wagner’s *Ernest Hemingway: Five Decades of Criticism* and *Ernest Hemingway: A Reference Guide*, Richard Astro and Jackson Benson’s anthology, *Hemingway in Our Time*, and Benson’s own collection, *The Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway*:

*Critical Essays.*⁵⁸⁾

The year 1975 marked an event of lasting importance to Hemingway's critical reputation, as a large collection of manuscripts (some 19,500 pages)⁵⁹⁾ and letters left at his death opened to the public at a branch of the National Archives in Waltham, Massachusetts. Prior to this date, textual studies of Hemingway's work had taken the form of niggling over misprints, a type of criticism Hemingway himself once labeled the "missing laundry list school."⁶⁰⁾ Now, however, textual studies took on depth, richness, and importance, as scholars could examine multiple drafts of the famous novels and short stories, and study Hemingway's process of composition in detail. Michael S. Reynolds' *Hemingway's First War: The Making of A Farewell to Arms* and Bernard Oldsey's *Hemingway's Hidden Craft: The Writing of A Farewell to Arms* followed almost immediately.⁶¹⁾

The production of Hemingway biographies continued unabated during the 1970s. Once again, a number were slight and exploitative, out to take advantage of the always salable Hemingway name. S. Kip Farrington's *Fishing with Hemingway* and Glassell, Vernon (Jake) Klimo and Will Oursler's *Hemingway and Jake: An Extraordinary Friendship*, and Richard E. Hardy and John G. Cull's *Hemingway: A Psychological Portrait* are examples.⁶²⁾

More valuable acquaintance biographies *also flourished*. *Reminiscences of*

58) New York: Farrar, Straus, & Giroux, 1972, and New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975; East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1974, and Boston: G.K. Hall, 1977; Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 1974, and Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1975.

59) Young and Mann, *The Hemingway Manuscripts*, vii.

60) *Selected Letters*, 751.

61) Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976, and University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1979.

62) New York: David McKay, 1971; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1972; and Sherman Oaks, Calif.: Banner Book International, 1977.

Hemingway appear in Malcolm Cowley's *A Second Flowering: Works and Days of the Lost Generation*, Arnold Gingrich's *Nothing But People: The Early Days at Esquire, A Personal History, 1928–1958*, and Ina Mae Schleden and Marion Rawls Herzog's *Ernest Hemingway as Recalled by His High School Contemporaries*.⁶³⁾ In this genre, Bertram D. Sarason's *Hemingway and the Sun Set* was particularly significant, gathering the recollections of the actual 1920s expatriates fictionalized in *The Sun Also Rises*.⁶⁴⁾

Hemingway family members continued to participate in the biographical rush. Widow Mary Hemingway published *How it Was*, weighing in at five hundred plus pages.⁶⁵⁾ Madeline Hemingway Miller produced *Ernie: Hemingway's Sister "Sunny" Remembers*, and youngest son Gregory Hemingway the embittered *Papa: A Personal Memoir*.⁶⁶⁾ Each is valuable in reconstructing aspects of Hemingway's performance as husband, brother and father.

In the shadow of Carlos Baker, and unable, as yet, to take full advantage of the newly opened Hemingway papers, scholarly biographies in the 1970s was relatively quiet — a sort of calm before the biographical storm of the 1980s. Scott Donaldson's 1977 study, *By Force of Will: The Life and Art of Ernest Hemingway*, was the important biography of the decade, a critical work focusing in detail on the life's shaping of the work.⁶⁷⁾ James McLendon added *Papa: Hemingway in Key West* to the regional biographies of the previous decade, and Alice Hunt Sokoloff added significantly to growing interest in

63) New York: Viking, 1973; New York: Crown, 1971; Oak Park, Ill.: The Historical Society of Oak Park and River Forest, 1973.

64) Washington D. C.: Microcard Editions, 1972.

65) New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1976.

66) New York: Crown, 1975, and Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1976.

67) New York: Viking, 1977.

Hemingway's relationship with women in *Hadley: The First Mrs. Hemingway*.⁶⁸⁾

In the 1970s, as in the 1960s, Hemingway's critical reputation continued to be augmented by posthumous publication. Matthew Bruccoli edited two collections important to an appreciation of Hemingway's young years: *Ernest Hemingway's Apprenticeship: Oak Park, 1916–1917* (an anthology of Hemingway's contributions to his high school newspaper and literary) and *Ernest Hemingway, Cub Reporter: Kansas City Star Stories* (containing his earliest professional journalism).⁶⁹⁾ Nicholas Gerogiannis contributed an anthology of Hemingway's *Complete Poems*, never the author's strong suit, but previously unavailable except in a pirated edition.⁷⁰⁾

These offerings were trivial, however, beside the posthumous publication of a new novel, *Islands in the Stream* (1970). Incomplete, rambling, and like *A Moveable Feast* extensively edited without explanation, *Islands* seemed to critics "a very strange book full of pleasing and disastrous things," and "a gallant wreck of a novel."⁷¹⁾ The tortured and sometimes tortuous tale of painter Thomas Hudson, his betrayal of the women who loved him and final loss of his sons, his loneliness and violent death, all set against a Caribbean background that Edmund Wilson felt included "the best of Hemingway's descriptions of nature," gave the novel, in Paul Theroux's words, "the tone of a suicide note."⁷²⁾ *Islands in the Stream* has yet to be adequately explored by critics, but its appearance in 1970 helped keep Hemingway's reputation fresh, giving the public the impression that a great writer's ghost [was] handing down books

68) Miami: E. A. Seemann, 1972, and New York: Dodd Mead, 1973.

69) Washington, D. C.: NCR Microcards, 1971, and Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1970.

70) Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1979.

71) Irving Howe, in Meyers, *Critical Heritage*, 566; John Updike, in Meyers 562.

72) Wilson, in Meyers, *Critical Heritage*, 575; Theroux, in Meyers 584.

intact from Heaven.⁷³⁾

Despite the success of *Islands in the Stream*, a 1972 short story collection, *The Nick Adams Stories*, was the most influential posthumous publication of the decade. Editor Philip Young, with his characteristic audacity, sought to “improve” on Hemingway by retrieving all of his stories about the character Nick Adams, and some stories that *might* be about Nick Adams, from collections published during Hemingway’s lifetime — *In Our Time*, *Men Without Women*, and *Winner Take Nothing*. Young then rearranged the stories “in chronological sequence,” so that “the events of Nick’s life [would] make up a meaningful narrative in which a memorable character grows from child to adolescent to soldier, veteran, writer, and parent — a sequence closely paralleling the events of Hemingway’s own life” (NAS 6). Young also drew on the Hemingway manuscripts, which he had helped inventory, for previously unpublished materials about Nick that would fill substantial gaps in Young’s narrative (NAS 7). This “fascinating and valuable bit of creative editing,” as Louis Rubin called it, greatly enhanced critical interest in Nick Adams stories, and deepened critical confusion about where Hemingway’s life ended and his fiction began.⁷⁴⁾

The year 1980 began the Reagan-Bush era, as Ronald Reagan was elected president of the United States. A two-term president, followed in office by his vice president, George Bush, Reagan left an indelible mark on the nation and its colleges and universities. The Reagan and Bush administrations were perhaps best known for their belief in “voodoo economics,” a notion that if the rich are taxed less, they will invest their savings and new wealth will “trickle down,” to all sectors of the economy. Instead of encouraging investment, however, these theories led to feverish speculation, the engrossment of more

73) Updike, in Meyers, *Critical Heritage*, 563.

74) Rubin, in Meyers, *Critical Heritage*, 585.

and more wealth by fewer and fewer people, and finally, in 1986, a major stock market crash followed by the collapse of the nation's savings and loan industry and double-digit unemployment in many states. State colleges and universities were devastated by the loss of tax support (programs were terminated, employees laid off, hiring frozen, tuitions increased, salaries reduced, and equipment and infrastructure left to age and crumble), while private institutions, dependent on carefully invested endowments, were injured, to a lesser extent, by market volatility.

At the same time, the Vietnam-era students who remembered Reagan well from another ("if it takes a bloodbath") context were earning tenure and assuming positions of leadership in the beleaguered American academy. They felt profoundly threatened by the new conservatism, whose attacks on 1970s legislation menaced much that they had worked for — including freedom of choice for women and equal opportunities for minorities. From 1986 on, as the Reagan-Bush era showed little sign of winding down and American colleges and universities were everywhere being "downsized," the Vietnam generation reacted with a concerted effort to return liberal values to the academy. They began to view America as a multicultural society, including the voices of women and minorities in the canon of American literature and literary criticism. At times too, they overreacted to Reaganism with an intolerance labeled "political correctness," an effort to silence alternative views and dictate values.

In the first five years of this decade, Hemingway studies reached a plateau and even declined slightly, as scholars produced an average of seventy articles and books a year. Because the early 1980s were marked by several events that ought to have stimulated work on Hemingway, it is difficult to explain why the tide of Hemingway scholarship, having risen steadily throughout the 1960s and 1970s, should have peaked, albeit temporarily, at this juncture. In 1980,

the Hemingway manuscripts were moved from the National Archives to a specially designed room in Boston's brand-new John F. Kennedy Library. The collection was opened with great fanfare and a conference that drew scholars from around the nation and led to formation of The Hemingway Society, an organization that would grow from thirty to six hundred members as the decade progressed. In 1981, *Hemingway Notes* became a full-fledged journal, *The Hemingway Review*, which would win one thousand subscribers by the decade's end. And Carlos Baker, the grand old man of Hemingway studies, blessed fellow scholars with a thick volume, *Ernest Hemingway: Selected Letters, 1917-1961*, helping place innumerable aspects of Hemingway's life and work in context.⁷⁵⁾

Certainly Hemingway specialists rejoiced in and were stimulated by the events of 1980 and 1981: the new availability of manuscripts and letters, their own society and journal. Many scholars whose names are household words in Hemingway studies today — Michael Reynolds, Paul Smith, Bernard Oldsley, Joseph Flora, Linda Wagner, Jeffrey Meyers, Mark Spilka, Gerry Brenner, Bernice Kert — were intensely active during the early 1980s. The fall off in Hemingway studies during this period must rather be attributed to the indifference of scholars with wider-ranging or more general concerns. In the early 1980s literary critics as a whole seemed uninterested in Hemingway. Their apathy can be ascribed in part to a literary theory called deconstruction, imported from France, much in vogue as the Reagan-Bush era began, and appropriate to the period's valueless obsession with getting and spending and general ennui with "meaningful discourse" (people were, perhaps, exhausted by the passionate and divisive insistence on values and meanings that characterize the nation's struggle over Vietnam). One theorist describes deconstruction this way:

We inhabit ... an indeterminate universe. Everything is mediated entirely through language — the only way we can know anything is by using words. And words of any discourse constantly shift their meaning. Everything depends on interpretation, and no interpretation is more correct than another. The proper attitude is to regard all interpretations as equally “not true and not false.” To insist that a given piece of discourse means something specific and decided is to elevate one meaning at the expense of the others. It is to uphold a hierarchy of values, and that renders one guilty of a dictatorial urge. Fascism, in short.⁷⁶⁾

Hemingway's prose, based on his belief in the ability of concrete language to construct an objective reality, his craftsmanlike insistence that language is a tool of the writer, and not vice versa, would prove extremely resistant to the critical method of deconstruction. A typical Hemingway sentence — “There was a low, dark room with saddles and harness, and hay-forks made of white wood, and clusters of canvas rope-soled shoes and hams and slabs of bacon and white garlies and long sausages hanging from the roof” (SAR 106) — was difficult to deconstruct, to interpret as equally not true and not false, or as elevating one meaning over another. It was simpler for deconstructionists to ignore Hemingway, and for Hemingway scholars to ignore deconstruction.

During the reign of deconstruction, Hemingway labored instead at a variety of projects. After the previous decade's rash of influence studies, Hemingway's status as a widely read and highly literary writer became taken for granted. Michael S. Reynolds' 1981 compendium, *Hemingway's Reading, 1910–1940*, and James D. Brasch and Joseph Sigman's *Hemingway's Library: A Composite Record* of the same year, created in two complementary volumes a complete record of Hemingway's reading from childhood through old

75) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1981.

76) In David Lehman, *Signs of the Times: Deconstruction and the Fall of Paul De Man* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1992), 58.

age.⁷⁷⁾ Jeffrey Meyers produced an important compendium of a different sort, *Hemingway: The Critical Heritage*, collecting the most influential reviews of Hemingway's work.⁷⁸⁾

The early 1980s also saw a burst of interest in Hemingway's relationship with Hollywood. Gene D. Phillips' *Hemingway and Film* and Frank M. Laurence's *Hemingway and the Movies* explored the many screen adaptations of Hemingway's novels and short stories, and the Hemingway Collection at the John F. Kennedy Library hosted a conference on Hemingway and film.⁷⁹⁾ However, perhaps because the movies made from Hemingway's fiction are as negligible as they are numerous (only Howard Hawks' *To Have and Not Have*, starring Humphrey Bogart and Lauren Bacall, with screenplay by Jules Furthman and William Faulkner, stands out as an exception — and Hemingway's novel is virtually unrecognizable in the film), this critical fad was as short-lived as it was intense.

Despite the academy's growing interest in multiculturalism, such readings gained no ground in Hemingway studies during the 1980s. Rather, critics interested in multiculturalism tended to ignore the author as "politically incorrect." There were just two apologetic articles on Hemingway's handling of race: Gregory Green's "A Matter of Color: Hemingway's Criticism of Race Prejudice" and Joyce Dyer's "Hemingway's Use of the Pejorative Term 'Nigger' in *The Battler*."⁸⁰⁾ Charles Stetler and Gerald Locklin, in *Beneath the Tip of the Iceberg* in Hemingway's "The Mother of a Queen," were more critical,

77) Princeton: Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981, and New York: Garland, 1981.

78) London, Boston, and Henley: Routledge and Paul Kegan, 1982.

79) New York: Frederick Ungar, 1980, and Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 1981.

80) *The Hemingway Review* 1.1 (Fall 1981): 27–32; and *Notes on Contemporary Literature* 16.5 (1986): 5–10.

reading the story as both homophobic and misogynistic, while Ernest Fontana, in "Hemingway's 'A Pursuit Race,'" saw a horror of homosexuality" as driving the short story.⁸¹⁾ Barry Gross, writing about Hemingway's anti-Semitism in "Yours Sincerely, Sinclair Levy," was quite straightforward: "Hemingway never lets the reader forget that Cohn is a Jew, not an unattractive character who happens to be a Jew but a character who is unattractive because he is a Jew."⁸²⁾

During the 1980s the involvement of women in Hemingway studies continued to grow, albeit more slowly than in the 1970s. Many focused on rehabilitating Hemingway for feminist readers, on making him "correct." We had Linda W. Wagner's "'Proud and Friendly and gently': Women in Hemingway's Early Fiction," Joyce Wexler's "E. R. A. for Hemingway: A Feminist Defense of *A Farewell to Arms*," Alice Hall Petry's "Coming of Age in Hortons Bay: Hemingway's Up in Michigan," Sandra Spanier's "Catherine Barkley and the Hemingway Code: Ritual and Survival in *A Farewell to Arms*," Mimi Reisel Gladstein's *The Indestructible Woman in Faulkner, Hemingway, and Steinbeck*, and Pamela Smiley's "Gender-Linked Miscommunication in 'Hills Like White Elephants.'" ⁸³⁾ Some male readers embraced their arguments (Charles J. Nolan in "Hemingway's Women's Movement," and J. Andrew Wainwright in "The Far Shore: Gender Complexities in Hemingway's 'Indian camp' ").⁸⁴⁾ Some did not (Bert Bender in "Margot Macomber's Gimlet").⁸⁵⁾

81) *The Hemingway Review* 2.1 (Fall 1982): 687–69; and *Explicator* 42.4 (Summer 1984): 43–45.

82) *Commentary* 80.6 (December 1985): 56–59.

83) *College Literature* 7 (1980): 239–47; *Georgia Review* 35.1 (1981): 111–23; *The Hemingway Review* 3.2 (Spring 1984): 23–28; in *Ernest Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms*, ed. Harold Bloom (New York: Chelsea House, 1986), 131–148; Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI Research Press, 47–73; *The Hemingway Review* 8.1 (Fall 1988): 2–12.

84) *The Hemingway Review* 3.2 (Spring 1984): 14–22; and *Dalhousie Review* 66.1–2 (Spring-Summer 1986): 181–87.

85) *College Literature* 8.1 (Winter 1981): 12–20.

Philip Young too, continued to be influenced at least through 1982, when Joseph Flora published his Hemingway's *Nick Adams*,⁸⁶⁾ a detailed critical study and evaluation of Young's Hemingway narrative. But there was trouble brewing. In 1981, and again in 1983, an aggressive scholar named Kenneth Lynn attacked Young's "wound theory" at the roots, discounting the testimony of Hemingway contemporaries Edmund Wilson and Malcolm Cowley that the short story "Big Two-Hearted River" was about Nick Adams' recovery from the trauma of war.⁸⁷⁾ Lynn's assertions prompted a bitter and public argument among himself, Cowley, and finally Young, and it became clear that the "wound" and the "code" were about to be muscled off the stage of Hemingway studies.⁸⁸⁾

It was not so clear, early in the 1980s, what would replace Young's powerful paradigms for reading Hemingway. There were, however, inklings, in Mark Spilka's 1982 essay, "Hemingway and Fauntleroy: An Androgynous Pursuit," and Gerry Brenner's 1983 psychoanalytic study, *Concealments in Hemingway's Works*.⁸⁹⁾ Although neither Spilka nor Brenner can be called a deconstructionist, both these critics have been deeply influenced by feminist thought, it is natural that their irreverence should be directed toward Hemingway façade of hypermasculinity, which they set about dismantling with psychoanalytic tools. For Spilka, Hemingway's "strenuous defense of maleness becomes part

86) Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982.

87) "Hemingway's Private War," *Commentary* 72.1 (July 1981): 24–33, reprinted in Kenneth Lynn, *The Air-Line to Seattle: Studies in Literay and Historical Writing about America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), 108–31.

88) Malcolm Cowley, "Hemingway's Wound — and Its Consequences for American Literature," *Georgia Review* 38.3 (Fall 1984): 670–72; Kenneth Lynn, "Reader's Forum," *Georgia Review* 38.3 (Fall 1984): 668–69; and Philip Young, "Reader's Forum," *Georgia Review* 38.3 (Fall 1984): 669–70.

89) In *American Novelists Revisited: Essays in Feminist Criticism*, ed. Fritz Fleishman (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1982; Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1983).

of a larger struggle with his own androgynous impulses,” while Brenner asserts that “Beneath his masculine swagger lay puerile diffidence. An advocate of courage, he was fear-ridden.”⁹⁰⁾ Their ideas were not new — in 1933, a critic named Max Eastman, in a notorious review called “Bull in the Afternoon,” had tried to expose Hemingway’s masculine posturing as “a wearing of false hair on the chest”⁹¹⁾ — but they had never before taken center stage in Hemingway studies. Indeed, little attention was paid to Spilka’s and Brenner’s ideas during the early 1980s.

In 1985, a remarkable series of events began that ended the plateau in Hemingway studies. From 1985 through 1991, the last year of this survey, the productivity of Hemingway scholars surged upward more sharply than ever before, doubling, and in some years almost tripling the output seen in the energetic period of canonization immediately following Hemingway’s death. Sadly, the first, and perhaps most important factor in this surge, was the final illness and death of Hemingway’s widow, Mary.

When Mary Hemingway became unable to manage the literary affairs of her late husband’s estate, her trustees embarked upon a flurry of publication. Whereas Mary had been relatively cautious about placing Hemingway’s remaining uncollected and unpublished work before the public, her trustees brought out more “new” Hemingway books in two years than Mary had permitted in the previous decade. The year 1985 saw the publication of *Date-line: Toronto, The Complete Toronto Star Dispatches, 1920–1924*, edited by William White, and a book-length version of Hemingway’s *Life* magazine article, “The Dangerous Summer,” padded with previously unpublished materials and an introduction by James Michener. The year 1986 saw publication

90) In Kelli Larson, *Ernest Hemingway: A Reference Guide, 1974–1989* (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1991), 143; Brenner, *Concealments*, 13.

91) In Meyers, *Critical Heritage*, 172–80.

of a Hemingway novel, *The Garden of Eden*, as well as Mary's death in November. The year 1987 brought *The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway*, a volume in progress during Mary's final illness. With the possible exception of *Dateline: Toronto*, all of these books were hastily and disastrously edited; they are rife with glaring omissions and misrepresentations of manuscript materials. Reviews of these posthumous publications, as well as scholarly indignation about the poor quality of their editing,⁹²⁾ represented one factor in the scholarly surge.

Despite such difficulties, the appearance of *The Garden of Eden* was one of the most important benchmarks in Hemingway studies. Although textual scholars concur that the novel Scribner's published is only one-third of the novel Hemingway wrote, its treatment of feminine madness, male androgyny, bisexuality, and lesbianism was sufficient to prompt a radical reassessment of Hemingway's canonical output. These themes, of course, are omnipresent in the work published during Hemingway's lifetime, but nowhere treated with the candor of *Eden*, which brings them to the fore. Prior to publication of *The Garden of Eden*, most readers of Hemingway could only focus in a simplistic way on Young's question about "what makes a man a man." Now that question was enlarged to include what makes a man a woman? What makes a woman a woman? What makes a woman a man? What makes men and women heterosexual? Homosexual? bisexual? Where are the boundaries of gender? And what importance does gender have in our makeups? With so many new questions to answer, Hemingway scholarship exploded, and today the flawed text of *The Garden of Eden* is almost as often read and criti-

92) See William Kennedy's "The Last Ole," *New York Book Review* (June 9, 1985): 1, 32–33, 35 on *The Dangerous Summer*; Barbara Solomon's "Where's Papa? Scribner's *The Garden of Eden* Is Not the Novel Hemingway Wrote," *New Republic* 196 (March 9, 1986): 30–34; and my own grumblings about the not-so-complete *Complete Short Stories* in *Resources for American Literary Study* 18.1 (1992): 108–11.

cized as *The Sun Also Rises* and *A Farewell to Arms*. The novel's complex gender issues did more than any number of feminist apologies to make Hemingway politically correct, dispel the notion of his intolerance, and undo the damage of Hemingway criticism's early misogyny. Following publication of *The Garden of Eden*, the number of women in Hemingway studies doubled again, and today women account for 29 percent of published scholarship. Both psychoanalytic critics and the iconoclasts of deconstruction found much that was fascinating in the novel, and interest in Hemingway expanded beyond an insular group of specialists. Spilka's prescient focus on Hemingway's androgynous impulses, and Brenner's psychoanalytic slant on the author's gender-bending relationships with his troubled father and strong-willed mother, once unusual points of view, were suddenly the order of the day.

The early 1980s had begun quietly for biography. Bernice Kert's *The Hemingway Women* and Noberto Fuentes *Hemingway in Cuba* were the significant scholarly contributions of this period.⁹³⁾ But in 1985, coincident with the rash of posthumous publication, an equivalent surge in Hemingway biographies began, prompted, perhaps, by an absorption of the recently opened papers and the relaxation of permissions (and scruples) attendant upon Mary Hemingway's departure from the scene.

Jeffrey Meyers' surly, demythologizing *Hemingway: A Biography* (1985) begins this trend, portraying the author's life as a rake's progress from the "the confident genius of the twenties and swaggering hero of the thirties to the braggart of the forties and sad wreck of the late fifties."⁹⁴⁾ Peter Griffin began what is projected to be a five-volume biography with *Along with Youth*, written in almost novelistic fashion, and accompanied by previously unpublished frag-

93) New York and London: W. W. Norton, 1983, and Secaucus, N. J.: Lyle Stuart, 1984.

94) Dustjacket, New York: Harper and Row, 1985.

ments from Hemingway's early fiction and letters.⁹⁵⁾ Michael Reynolds, too, began a five-volume biography, commencing with the highly *regarded* *The Young Hemingway* and *Hemingway: The Paris Years*.⁹⁶⁾ Less thesis-driven and more meticulous in his research than other biographers of the 1980s, Reynolds may, when his work is completed, become the legitimate heir to Carlos Baker's mantle.

The most influential biography of the 1980s, however, was Kenneth Lynn's psychoanalytic, single-volume *Hemingway*.⁹⁶⁾ Published the year after *The Garden of Eden*, Lynn's book seized upon the idea advanced by Spilka in "Hemingway and Fauntleroy." Lynn interprets Hemingway's life and work exclusively in the light of the author's "androgyny" and "sexual confusion," which Lynn views as the result of Mrs. Hemingway's dressing the toddler Ernest in baby dresses identical to his older sister's. Public fascination with *The Garden of Eden* and Lynn's biography gained national attention for his "theory of androgyny." The baby clothes instantly became part of the Hemingway myth, and the "theory of androgyny" overtook the "wound theory" notion of "code hero" Lynn had worked hard to debunk. Spilka's own book-length critical study, *Hemingway's Quarrel with Androgyny*, which places the idea of androgyny in its literary and cultural context and uses it in more complex ways to interpret Hemingway's fiction, did not appear until 1990, to be followed in 1994 by Robert Scholes and Nancy R. Comley's *Hemingway's Genders: Rereading the Hemingway Text*.⁹⁷⁾

By the late 1980s the market for exploitative biographies seemed sated, perhaps because some scholarly biographies were now more sensationalistic than

95) New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

96) New York and Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986, and New York and Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

97) New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987.

their popular precursors. Acquaintance biographies fell off almost entirely as old age and death took their toll among Hemingway's cohorts; those that did appear are assisted (Denis Brian collected interviews with Hemingway acquaintances in *The True Gen*; James Nagel worked with World War I veteran Henry Villard on *Hemingway in Love and War: The Lost Diary of Agnes von Kurowsky*).⁹⁸⁾ Family members, too, were relatively quiet, with the exception of son John in his *Misadventures of a Fly Fisherman*.⁹⁹⁾

The availability of manuscripts, posthumous publication, the debut of *The Garden of Eden*, the spate of scholarly biographies, and the overthrow of Philip Young's theories by Mark Spilka's and Kenneth Lynn's, all contributed to a single tendency: the return of scholars to familiar Hemingway texts for reassessment in the light of new ideas. This tendency was responsible for the general surge in Hemingway studies in the late 1980s, and affected the entire canon, but for some reason scholars seemed most compelled to revisit the short stories. The decade closed with Joseph M. Flora's *Ernest Hemingway: A Study of the Short Fiction*, Susan F. Beegel's *Hemingway's Neglected Short Fiction: New Perspectives*, Paul Smith's *A Reader's Guide to the Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway*, and Jackson Benson's *New Critical Approaches to the Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway*.¹⁰⁰⁾

And that, of course, brings us to the final and most obvious trend of a decade so lavish in scholarship — efforts designed to help Hemingwayans manipulate this wealth of material, including Earl Rovit and Gerry Brenner's *Ernest Hemingway*, Linda W. Wagner's *Ernest Hemingway: A Reference Guide, 1974–1989*, and Albert J. DeFazio's biannual bibliographies for *The Hemingway Re-*

98) Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1990; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

99) New York: Grove Press, 1988, and Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1989.

100) Dallas, Tex.: Taylor, 1986.

view.¹⁰¹⁾

It is too early to assess our own decade, but we can get out the crystal ball and make some predictions. The interest of widely known mainstream scholars of American literature, including Marjorie Perloff, Nina Baym, and Robert Scholes, suggests that Hemingway's place in the canon is more secure than ever.¹⁰²⁾ A distinguished book chapter, "Disturbing Nurses and the Kindness of Sharks," by Nobel prize-winning African-American novelist Toni Morrison, may finally generate interest in multicultural interpretations of Hemingway's Work.¹⁰³⁾ A great deal of meat-and-potatoes critical and textual study remains to be done on *The Garden of Eden*, but by the end of the decade talk of androgyny will be old hat. With issues of gender taking center stage, the number of women in Hemingway studies will continue to grow, and perhaps by the year 2000 they will produce half of published scholarship.

It is harder to predict what new ideas might replace discussion of androgyny and gender as these issues grow stale, but perhaps Glen A. Love has the answer:

Race, class, and gender are the words that we see and hear everywhere at our professional meetings and in our current publications. But curiously enough ... the English profession has failed to respond in any significant way to the issue of the environment, the acknowledgment of our place within the natural world and our need to live heedfully within it, at peril of our very survival.¹⁰⁴⁾

101) Boston: Twayne, 1989; Ann Arbor: UMI, 1989; Boston: G. K. Hall, 1989; Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1990.

102) Boston: Twayne, 1986; East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1987; and Boston: G. K. Hall, 1990.

103) " 'Ninety Percent Rotarian: Gertrude Stein's Hemingway,' " *American Literature* 62 (1990): 668-82; " 'Actually, I Felt Sorry for the Lion' " in Benson, ed. *New Critical Approaches*, 112-20; with Nancy R. Comley, "Tribal Things: Hemingway's Erotics of Truth," *Novel* 25 (Spring 1992): 268-85.

104) Toni Morrison, *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination* (Cam-

Love suggests that critics may revise the canon to reflect a growing eco-consciousness, and that works such as *The Old Man and the Sea*, “which engages such issues profoundly,” may become more widely taught. There are glimmerings that such a transformation may be underway in Hemingway studies: Margot Norris’s “The Animal and Violence in Hemingway’s *Death in the Afternoon*,” Anne E. Rowe’s “The Last Wild Country,” Love’s own “Hemingway’s Indian Virtues: An Ecological Consideration,” and Susan Schmidt’s “Ecological Renewal Images in ‘Big Two-Hearted River’: Jack Pines and Fisher King.”¹⁰⁵⁾

Posthumous publication must, necessarily, abate, as materials are exhausted, but there will be at least a volume of Hemingway’s World War II short stories, still largely unpublished, and perhaps publication of his African book from the disastrous safari of the 1950s. As Hemingway’s cohorts wend their way to the grave, leaving their papers behind, a new volume of letters also seems likely.

Biography, too, ought to slow. It is difficult to imagine anyone wanting to write another single-volume biography after Baker, Meyers, Lynn, and, in 1992, James Mellow’s excellent *Hemingway: A Life Without Consequences*.¹⁰⁶⁾ However, the significant women in Hemingway’s life are claiming single-volume biographies. We have Carl Rollyson’s 1990 *Nothing Ever Happens to*

↘ bridge: Harvard University Press, 1992).

105) Glen A. Love, “Revaluing Nature: Toward an Ecological Criticism,” in *Old West – New West: Centennial Essays*, ed. Barbara Howard Meldrum (Moscow: University of Idaho Press, 1993), 284.

106) *In Beasts of Modern Imagination* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1985), 195–219; in *The Idea of Florida in American Literary Imagination* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press) 92–106; *Western American Literature* 22.3 (Fall 1987): 201–13; *The Hemingway Review* 9.2 (Spring 1990): 142–44.

the Brave: The Story of Martha Gellhorn and Gioia DiLiberto's 1992 *Hadley*.¹⁰⁷⁾ Biographies of Hemingway's second wife, Pauline Pfeiffer, and of his influential mother, Grace Hall Hemingway, seem both inevitable and necessary. And the multivolume biographies are not yet finished. Peter Griffin, who published *Less Than a Treason* in 1990, owes us three more volumes; and Michael Reynolds, who produced *Hemingway: The American Homecoming* in 1992, owes us at least two more.¹⁰⁸⁾

It is also too early to tell what role the computer will play in the future of Hemingway studies but it will probably be significant. The enhancement and wider availability of scanning technology should assist textual studies, stylistic analyses, and finally, perhaps, the creation of scholarly editions. And, as the worldwide web of the Internet allows Hemingwayans around the world to communicate instantaneously with the click of a mouse, as on-line bibliography grows more complete, and electronic publication more prevalent, global appreciation of Hemingway's literary achievements can only intensify.

Ernest Hemingway was born in 1899, into a world with horsedrawn buggies, ragtime, and old growth forests; a world without airplanes, television, or women's suffrage. He committed suicide in 1961, the year the Berlin Wall was built, the Bay of Pigs debacle took place, the first intercontinental ballistic missile was launched, and Steinbeck's *The Winter of Our Discontent* was published, with Steinbeck becoming the next American-born Nobel laureate after Hemingway. Hemingway's critical reputation today is stronger than at any time since his death. He is widely read in a world where astronauts leave space shuttles to repair telescopes, eighty million Americans own computers, nations send delegates to international Earth Summits, and women and

107) Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1992.

108) New York: St. Martin's 1990, and New York: Ticknor and Fields, 1992.

109) New York: Oxford University Press, 1990, and Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1992.

minorities, although still not in full possession of equal rights, have opportunities unheard of at either his birth or his death. Hemingway's critical reputation has already withstood the test of generations he set for himself: "Quite a lot of people remember and they tell their children and their children and their grandchildren remember And if it's good enough it lasts forever."

The research for this paper was generously supported by a grant from the Institute for Advanced Studies at Hiroshima Shudo University.