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Introduction

Near the end of his life, Ernest Hemingway had become increasingly paranoid, terrified of a changeable persecution that haunted him in the shape of mistaken friends, tax-collectors, and the ghosts of his past. He had the unreasonable fears of an old man, with worries about unlikely lawsuits, worries about his Irish secretary’s immigration status, worries about “cracking up” like F. Scott Fitzgerald. But above all, Hemingway was troubled by his inability to write. Unable to attend the inauguration of President Kennedy, in January of 1961 Hemingway sat in the Mayo Clinic, where he had been taken by his wife and friends after a nervous breakdown in Madrid, and tried to compose a note of congratulations. Two sentences required four days of work. Writing had always been laborious; it now became impossible (Tavernier-Courbin 1991, xx-xxii; Burwell 1996, 8).

Hemingway was a deeply personal writer, frequently declaring, “I have only known what I have seen” (Baker 1972, 48). He did not mean that he only reported what he'd witnessed, but rather that he drew his stories and characters from his own experience. This process of channeling his sensory life into fiction could be very affecting to the author: as Nick Adams says in “Fathers and Sons”: “If he wrote it he could get rid of it. He had gotten rid of many things by writing them” (Hemingway 1987, 371). But in his last years, the catharsis of the writing process had slipped away from him. It is not difficult to imagine his fear at the prospect.

Personal accounts from the last few years of his life reveal much of this fear. In Mary Welsh Hemingway's account of the writing of *A Moveable Feast*, she describes a chance discovery of suitcases of memorabilia in the Ritz Hotel, and while critics have challenged many aspects of her story's accuracy, the account aptly showcases Hemingway's fragility in his final years:
Tentatively, as a man would peer into the octopus tank in an aquarium, he looked at the remnants of his young manhood, picked up one notebook, then another and leafed through it, scanning.

“It's wonderful,” he said, looking up from one. ”It was just as hard for me to write then as it is now. Cheering.” (Hemingway, M. 1964)

This palpable relief from a man who had feared his powers were in decline only highlights the terror that must have come several years later when he really did find himself unable to write. Biographers generally agree that it was this terror – the fear of a loss of his creative and physical prowess – that prompted him to take his own life. Hemingway shot himself in the kitchen of his Ketchum, Idaho home, six months after his struggle to compose the two sentences of the Kennedy note. Stacked among his papers were the bulk of two unfinished novels, a fragmented set of sketches about Africa, and the nearly-complete manuscript of *A Moveable Feast*, an account of his years in Paris during what was known as *les années folles*, “the crazy years” (Kennedy 1996, 198). *A Moveable Feast* had been almost ready for publication; Hemingway had sent a draft to Scribner’s two years before his death, but he recalled it for further editing. He never managed to finish the project.

*A Moveable Feast* was a memoir about Hemingway's early years in Paris from 1921-1926, written as a series of themed sketches – each sketch focused on an event, a place, or a person. The food and fights of Paris were vividly recalled and displayed, at times matching or exceeding anything Hemingway had written before. The book also perpetuated the public image that the author had so carefully crafted over the years; Hemingway portrayed himself as both fresh young artist and rugged man-of-the-world. It settled many old scores from the author's past, most particularly with Gertrude Stein, and gruffly described Hemingway's loss
of innocence as he broke with his first wife, Hadley Richardson. But these very personal elements had proven difficult for the author to write, and he had never been able to settle on a final form. In addition to artistic concerns, he was worried about hurting those who appeared in its pages, worried about being sued by those still living, and worried about his legacy: as described years later by Gerry Brenner, “How would you like to be remembered? By the people you knew, or the people you knifed?” (Paul 2009, 19). Vacillating even as he approached the end of the editing process, Hemingway added a terse note to the final typescript: “This is too dangerous and libelous to publish. Absolutely” (Tavernier-Courbin 1991, 36).

Hemingway’s uncertainty about *A Moveable Feast* led him to leave it in a problematic state. Essentially complete, the text was nonetheless rough. It was too substantial to be offered in exact reproduction as a reference for scholarly curiosity, but it was too unpolished to send straight to the printer. Yet fierce editing had long been a hallmark of the Hemingway style, as he would relate in the text itself, making it difficult to conceive of a Hemingway work that could be judiciously presented as “unfinished.” Further, one of the editors of the novel was to be his fourth wife, Mary. She had been helping him in his writing for years, but in many ways *A Moveable Feast* was Hemingway's book-length paean to his salad days with Hadley, and it held unalloyed adulation and apologies to the woman who would later say that it recalled the “sweet young man I had married” (Lipscomb 2009).

Mary and Scribner's Harry Brague approached the project seriously, taking pains not to add any new material, except for passages from previous drafts. In addition to standard editorial efforts, they reordered some of the sketches in the book, assembled a final chapter from two of the sketches, and cobbled together a foreword via selected sentences from Hemingway's many attempts at composing one. They also changed the style in numerous
places, apparently seeking consistency with the author's previous works – in several places, for example, Hemingway's use of second-person narration is changed to a more conventional first person. When published, however, none of these changes were revealed: the text was explicitly presented as if it had been completely finished, and no hint was given that the editors had found it necessary to make significant alterations. It was not until years later, when scholars such as Gerry Brenner and Jacqueline Tavernier-Courbin gained access to the manuscripts, that critics realized that *A Moveable Feast* had been altered in many ways from what Hemingway had left behind.

The publication in 2009 of *A Moveable Feast: The Restored Edition* was intended to address many of these concerns. As noted by Robert Trogdon in “*A Moveable Feast: The Restored Edition*: a Review and a Collation of Differences,” the new edition eliminates some of the most questionable editorial alterations, such as the shift in person and the editor-assembled preface (2009). The changes, both large and small, have a serious effect on the work and on how a reader experiences it. Some of these alterations in the reader’s experience appear to have been intended by the new edition, but others were not. The very nature of a restored edition, with its foreword (and justification) and a collection of “new” sketches after the formal chapters, shifts the way the text is read and appreciated.

This thesis will attempt to trace the shifts in style, the results of the changes, and the journey from one edition to the next over the course of forty-five years. *A Moveable Feast* exists in numerous distinct forms, and accordingly presents a variety of possible experiences for the reader. In my first chapter, I explore the development of these versions from a much-corrected manuscript to the published first edition in 1964, as well as the subsequent development of a hypothetical “ideal” text by critics, and finally the publication of a “restored” edition in 2009. An understanding of the history of the text is essential, because the
intertextual relationship is so rich: *A Moveable Feast: The Restored Edition* is not only a new version, but also an explicit response to the initial publication and to scholarly criticism.

In my second chapter, I examine how the production of the *Restored Edition* calls into question many casual assumptions about the possibilities of publication and the hypothetical *Feasts* that might have been. It is tempting to describe a continuum stretching from an unedited facsimile of the typescripts to a wholly rewritten edition, a closer examination of these extremes reveals that the relationship of a new edition with its predecessors, with its critical commentary, and with its own physical nature complicates the picture beyond a single axis of editorial intervention. Instead, as I will show, the 2009 edition exists as simply a new and inconclusive outcome of the process by which new versions are produced, driven by the contrary goals of authorial intention and inclusiveness. This is not intended as condemnation; the new edition is successful in many ways, and critics should keep in mind Darcy Cullen's succinct and complete description of the purpose of publication. "The purpose of publishing," Cullen says, "is to bring a text to its readers" (Cullen 2012, 3).

In my third chapter, I address the manifold specific alterations between the 1964 edition to the 2009 edition. Every sketch has been changed at least slightly, and many of the sketches have been very significantly altered. Further, the shift in the ordering of the sketches and the break-up of the last sketch into its component parts changes the structure of the book in a way that realizes a pattern spotted by Gerry Brenner in 1982. All of these changes alter the manner in which a reader experiences *Feast*, and many of them also highlight the contradictory goals of the new edition.

I hope the resulting thesis will compel new reflection on the editing of all of Hemingway’s work, a well as the production of posthumous texts in general, by focusing attention on the way in which transtexts involve implicit claims of authority. The inclusion of
fragments and alternates, the label of “revised” or “restored,” and other elements assert hidden
messages about the pedigree of a text. Both scholars and readers should be wary of the
necessary deference to the myth of authorial purity inherent in these messages, which
establish textual authority in an intuitive but false appeal to direct authorial transmission,
ignoring the fact that any text is the product of a social process.

This appeal is easily accessible and suggests a simple rule, but ample scholarly work
has shown that any version of any text is the work of many hands, and continued aspiration to
a pleasant myth undermines the necessary transparency that is especially required in
posthumous texts. It is only once intervention is freely admitted that the principles involved
can be discussed and disclosed to the reader – and that the reader can select a text to enjoy.
Chapter 1: History of the Texts and a Critical Overview

What Was Left

In the sport of jai alai, popular in Florida and Cuba, players use long woven scoops, called *xistera*, to whip the hard little ball against the back of a three-walled court, attempting to achieve a speed or angle that will be impossible for their opponent to successfully return. It is an extremely fast and occasionally dangerous sport, and Hemingway said of it, “jai alai is my favorite spectacle. In it I find constant emotion, a manly effort taken to the maximum” (Areitio 1945, 52). Living in Cuba in 1957, he and Mary would have had ample opportunity to watch the sport, and so it came readily to his mind as a metaphor for how he was writing a new book. As Mary wrote,

He was going to do something about Paris in the early days, he said.

Mostly on his typewriter, partly by pencil as he sat at our 10-foot-long library table, he began *A Moveable Feast*. I retyped as usual, correcting spelling and punctuation and consulting him about phrases which I thought needed reorganization. By December he had written the opening chapter and the Gertrude Stein and Ford Madox Ford chapters.

“It's not much about you,” I once objected. "I thought it was going to be autobiography.”

---

1 For descriptions of the state of the manuscripts and typescripts for *A Moveable Feast*, I am reliant on the work of Jacqueline Tavernier-Courbin in her 1991 *Ernest Hemingway’s A Moveable Feast: the Making of Myth*, as well as on the online listings of holdings at the Hemingway Collection of the John F. Kennedy Library’s website.
“It's biography by remate,” Ernest said. Remate idiomatically is used to mean a two-wall shot in jai alai. “By reflection.” (Hemingway M. 2002)

Carlos Baker, Hemingway's first major biographer, pointed out in his 1972 Ernest Hemingway: The Writer as Artist that this definition was not strictly correct, and suggested that Hemingway had meant rebote, or “rebound” (Baker 1972, 375), but Suzanne del Gizzo has persuasively defended the original phrasing and its implications. “[T]raditionally,” she writes, “remate is used to refer to any type of 'kill shot,' a shot so forceful or perfectly placed that it cannot be returned” (Del Gizzo 2009, 122). A “kill shot” may have been Hemingway's intent when he set his pencil to paper, Del Gizzo suggests – even if not in a crass way, but rather in the sense of the rematado of bullfighting: “the last pass of any series of passes with the cape; … an emotional or artistic climax” (Hemingway 1932, 443).

Hemingway began A Moveable Feast in the summer of 1957. The manuscripts consist of pencil drafts and the typescripts of individual chapters, the fragments of incomplete sketches, and a hand-corrected typescript of the nineteen-chapter draft of the finished book (JFK Library 2012). Hemingway initially wrote out most of the sketches, then corrected the typewritten manuscripts provided by Mary Welsh Hemingway or his secretary, Valerie Smith (Tavernier-Courbin 1991, 133-4), but the Hemingway writing process was best and thoroughly described in 1958 by George Plimpton in the pages of The Paris Review:

A working habit he has had from the beginning, Hemingway stands when he writes. He stands in a pair of his oversized loafers on the worn skin of a lesser kudu—the typewriter and the reading board chest-high opposite him.
When Hemingway starts on a project he always begins with a pencil, using the reading board to write on onionskin typewriter paper. He keeps a sheaf of the blank paper on a clipboard to the left of the typewriter, extracting the paper a sheet at a time from under a metal clip that reads “These Must Be Paid.” He places the paper slantwise on the reading board, leans against the board with his left arm, steadying the paper with his hand, and fills the paper with handwriting which through the years has become larger, more boyish, with a paucity of punctuation, very few capitals, and often the period marked with an X. The page completed, he clips it facedown on another clipboard that he places off to the right of the typewriter.

Hemingway shifts to the typewriter, lifting off the reading board, only when the writing is going fast and well, or when the writing is, for him at least, simple: dialogue, for instance.

In February of 1961, Hemingway wrote of his efforts on *A Moveable Feast* to Harry Brague, his editor at Scribner's. He had been working steadily and he’d had the “luck” he describes in *Feast’s* “A Good Café” as being necessary to the process in the book itself, but that good fortune would soon end: at this point, *A Moveable Feast* was very nearly in the same form it would be at the time of the author's death, five months later. Hemingway wrote to Brague:

> Here's gen² to date: Have material arranged as chapters – they come to 18 – and am working on the last one – No 19 – also working on title. This is

---

² A British informal word for gathered intelligence or information.
very difficult. (Have my usual long list – something wrong with all of
them but am working toward it – Paris has been used so often it blights
anything.) (Spanier and Trogdon 2011, 916)

Hemingway did little work after this letter, unable to effectively
concentrate. A.E. Hotchner recounts a contemporary conversation with Mary, when
she confessed that the author was spending hours at a time working on the
manuscript, but achieving little (Hotchner 2011).

On the day that Hemingway left for psychiatric treatment at the Mayo Clinic in
Rochester, Minnesota, on April 25th, the manuscript was unfinished in some important ways,
despite his long efforts to complete it (Hemingway M. 1976, 499). The final version of his
typescript lacked an obvious conclusion; the concluding sketch, as Hemingway had arranged
the chapters, was “A Matter of Measurements,” the last of the sketches about F. Scott
Fitzgerald. There was no denouement or resolution to the issue of his fraying marriage to
Hadley, nor was there a broad benediction about the bygone days celebrated in the book.
Hemingway had toyed with these elements and rewritten them repeatedly, but had not found a
version that satisfied him. Ernest Hemingway died on July 2nd, 1961, with the book
incomplete.

_A Moveable Feast_ was not finished by the time of the author's death, in many
important ways. Thereafter, any attempt to produce a “complete” work – a version that had
been sanctioned by the author – became impossible. Efforts to create such a book recall
Hemingway’s own words to editor Maxwell Perkins upon the posthumous publication of F.
Scott Fitzgerald's _The Last Tycoon_: “It is damned hard on Scott to publish something
unfinished any way you look at it but I suppose the worms won’t mind” (Hemingway 1981, 523).

Little did Hemingway know that he left behind sufficient material for years of editorial work dedicated to polishing his manuscripts into a finished form.

1964: Mary and Harry

Despite the challenges posed by an incomplete manuscript, Scribner’s published *A Moveable Feast* in December of 1964. Mary Hemingway promulgated the release of this first edition in 1964 with an account of how it was developed, published in *The New York Times Book Review* (Hemingway M. 2002). In “The Making of the Book: A Chronicle and Memoir,” she described the couple's discovery of some old suitcases of Paris-era paraphernalia, his subsequent inspiration and composition process, and her own efforts to edit the book for public consumption.

After Ernest died I found the typescript of “A Moveable Feast” in a blue box in his room in our house in Ketchum, Idaho, together with his dated draft of his preface and a list of titles, a check mark against this title as well as several others. Making a list of titles and choosing one were the final chores Ernest performed for a book. He must have considered the book finished except for the editing which even the most meticulous manuscripts require. …

I went over the book and gave it the same hard-headed editing I would have done if I had been copying from Ernest’s original typing and
hand script as I used to do in Cuba. … No one added any word to the
book. (334)

This account was later supplemented in Mary's 1976 memoir, *How It Was*:

Since Ernest had expected his Paris memoirs to be his next published
book, I dug out that manuscript, the first part of which I had typed for
him five years earlier in Cuba. With the exception of a couple of chapters
about which he had worried and which I felt not sufficiently germane to
the tenor of the book, I thought it read well. So did Harry Brague at
Scribner's. We worked together checking Ernest's final draft, making a
few further cuts and switching about some of the chapters for continuity's
sake. (520)

As editors, Brague and Mary followed two “principles of procedure,” she wrote:

One was that, whatever the temptations or persuasions, Charles
Scribner's Sons and I would publish nothing we jointly considered to be
of quality inferior to the work published during Ernest's lifetime as
approved by him. The other was that nobody, including me, would be
permitted to put his cotton-picking typewriter to work on Ernest's prose
to “improve” it. Except for punctuation and the obviously overlooked
“ands” and “buts” we would present his prose and poetry to readers as he
wrote it, letting the gaps lie where they were. Where repetitions and
redundancies occurred, we would cut. We would not add anything. (520)
Mary Hemingway wished to establish the book's provenance as thoroughly Hemingway's, flatly declaring in the brief note that preceded the published text that “[h]e finished the book in the spring of 1960 in Cuba” (Hemingway 1964, 2). The intended impression is that A Moveable Feast was discovered by its editors, not created by them, in accordance with the popular view (as articulated by Jerome McGann) that the author of a text is the “ultimate locus of a text's authority” (McGann 1983, 81). To add additional text in any significant way would have given the impression that the editors were also co-authors, diminishing the stamp of authority established by the Hemingway brand name. This has long been accepted practice by many editors, attempting whenever possible to obscure the fact that editing is a major part of preparing a work for publication and requires varying degrees of substantial intervention on behalf of other persons than the author. This is especially true in cases where the identity of the author is especially important, as with “peasant poet” John Clare’s work, so extensively edited by publisher John Taylor that scholar Carlo Bajetta calls Poems Descriptive of Rural Life and Scenery “as much Taylor’s as it is Clare’s;” (Bajetta 2006, 825-7) the text omits any attribution or admission of this intervention because of the importance of the presentation of Clare as a Heaven-taught genius, a selling point that had proven its worth with the appearance of previous working-class poets such as Stephen Duck. There was similar value to be found in the brand name of Hemingway even to the end of the author’s life: editing another posthumous text some years later (The Garden of Eden), Tom Jenks alluded to the strength of the brand, noting that Hemingway's contract “waived an advance in lieu of a remarkably high royalty – 25 percent. Few, if any, other authors could command such a fee. But Hemingway's sales were so certain and so substantial that there had long been no risk in publishing him” (Jenks 2012, 8). The difference between Taylor’s edits – which have since been reversed in “restored” editions of Clare’s work – and the edits of Mary
and Brague, of course, is that Clare was alive and able to approve intervention (at least in theory). Such approval by the author becomes simply another part of authorship in the view of many adherents of authorial intent, with the contribution of the editor and publisher subsumed by the author’s assent, justifying a completely silent editing that admits nothing of itself to readers. The framework falls apart, of course, when the author can approve nothing and the editing process is still hidden – or even actively obfuscated, as in 1964’s *Feast*, which admits very little of the editorial intervention.

In fact, Mary and Brague did a great deal of editing in assembling the text for publication. Their changes added up to significant departures from the typescripts left by Hemingway; Jacqueline Tavernier-Courbin's dense documentation of the changes spans twenty-one pages (1991, 183-203). Many of the edits seemed to be concerned with an imposed new organization of the portrayals, so that *Feast* discussed first Gertrude Stein, then a series of other figures, and finished not with Fitzgerald, but with a final summary sketch. This final sketch, “There Is Never Any End to Paris,” was assembled from two separate drafts left by Hemingway, “Winter in Schruns” and “The Pilot Fish and the Rich,” thus combining the quiet contemplative nature of the former with the latter's satisfying air of finality – as might seem appropriate to finish a book, neatly and in parallel with the text's first sketch. It is difficult to speculate about whether Mary and Brague's motivation was artistic or commercial or both, but it is perhaps useful to recall Susan Seitz's comment in her 1993 discussion of Hemingway’s posthumous texts: “Because the economic risks and rewards of commercial publishing are so great, even texts by an established author such as Hemingway can fall prey to [commercial] editing standards, which in many ways are diametrically opposed to the publication of a work that represents the author’s final intentions” (Seitz 1993, 22). Mary and Brague had the same task before them that Tom Jenks would later tackle, “striking what
balance they [could] between commerce and art,” and attempting “to show the writer at his best, on his own terms, with the material that most closely approached a finished form of art” (Jenks 2012, 8, 3).

Editors had long been struggling with the different demands of the muse and Mammon, but certainly by 1964 there was widespread agreement that, whatever choices were made, they should at minimum be disclosed. The prevailing editorial philosophy of the time can be found in the 1967 edition of the *Statement of Editorial Principles and Procedures* published by the Modern Language Association's Center for Editions of American Authors, adopted largely from the work of Fredson Bowers, which advised that “[i]f the audience for the edition is to be the general reading public as well as students, teachers, and scholars,” then editors were best-advised to publish a “text unencumbered with cancellations, caret-in matter, footnote numbers, or footnotes,” but were strenuously urged to provide an explanatory essay and “set of textual notes, explaining the editor's decision to emend or not to emend” (Gottesman and Bennett 1970, 54; Center 1972, 8-9).

At the time of publication, there was no cause to suspect that Mary Hemingway might have been downplaying her and Brague's contributions. *A Moveable Feast* was very well-received, both critically and popularly. Hemingway had received the Nobel Prize for Literature a decade previously, and his reputation only grew after his death. Sales of the new book were brisk: it became a Book-of-the-Month Club selection and spent twenty-nine weeks on the *New York Times* best-seller list (Raeburn 1984, 199).

Reviews from Stanley Kauffmann, Richard Ellman, Morley Callahan, and many others all included praise for the style and writing in the book, but mild skepticism for the depictions of some prominent persons (Meyers 1982). Mary Hemingway's essay had anticipated any doubts or questions commentators might have had about this first posthumous
volume of Hemingway's writing. Accordingly, their focus was almost exclusively on the contents of the text and how the depictions meshed with other memoirs and with Hemingway's carefully-cultivated public persona. The text is “highly affecting and biographically invaluable,” assessed Stanley Kauffman (1982, 448). Indeed, it was generally agreed by critics that Feast “remind[ed] us of his earlier claims to greatness”: a fond but subtly mixed bit of praise (448).

Early critical work had a similar focus. Philip Young's extremely influential Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration (1966) was published just two years after A Moveable Feast, and it voiced what would become the general, positive critical consensus: “All of the jokes in A Moveable Feast are on other people. … Most of A Moveable Feast is either witty (this was always his most underrated virtue) or hardhitting, or moving and evocative.” (281, 284) As would become a pattern in critical consideration, Young identified several items of interest in the text: the unusual amount of focus on the process of writing; the dominance and justice of the sketches on Gertrude Stein and F. Scott Fitzgerald; and Hemingway's projection of himself as what John Raeburn would later call a consciously-crafted image of the “heroic artist” - rather than the grizzled celebrity (Raeburn 1984, 197). Young also comments on points that would become the focus of later criticism, dryly reflecting on how certain aspects of the book “may indeed, however, ‘be regarded as fiction,’” alluding to the line from the 1964 preface that states, “If the reader prefers, this book may be regarded as fiction” (Young 1982, 288; Feast, Preface). In fact, Young foresees the eventual discovery that the author had gone through many drafts of the preface, and in all of them had emphasized a very different and unalloyed sentiment, as seen in the 2009 edition: “This book is fiction” (Restored, 230).

Importantly, Young also takes note of how the final sketch's climax “wrapped up and end[ed] on the same sad loving note with which it began” (1982, 289), approvingly noting the
way in which the book’s concluding sketch, “There Is Never Any End to Paris,” which takes place on a wintry mountain after Hemingway had broken up with his wife, wistfully recalls and parallels the idyllic remembrances of the book’s opening scenes. He could not have known that this neat conclusion to a narrative arc was imposed upon the text by its editors – as critics would soon discover.

**Interim: Brenner and Tavernier-Courbin**

In the years since that initial and generally positive reception, scholars have benefited from access to Hemingway's personal papers, drafts, and manuscripts. The Hemingway Society in particular has fostered this pursuit, since its 1986 assumption of the duties of the Hemingway Foundation, caring for the authors' personal effects and legacy (Hemingway Society 2012). Investigators of the posthumous books, including *A Moveable Feast* (1964), *Islands in the Stream* (1970), *The Dangerous Summer* (1985) *The Garden of Eden* (1986), and *True at First Light* (1999) have all challenged the editing process as they have more closely examined Hemingway’s papers. In the case of *True at First Light*, which was edited by Patrick Hemingway, critics were so successful in their challenges that a newly-edited edition (retitled *Under Kilmanjaro*) was published by Kent State University Press in 2005, edited by scholars Robert W. Lewis and Robert E. Fleming. Lewis and Fleming commented that their intent had been “to produce a complete reading text of Ernest Hemingway's manuscript,” aiming for “as complete and faithful a publication as possible without editorial distortion, speculation, or textually unsupported attempts at improvement” (Hemingway 2005, 7).

Working from these manuscript resources and developing critical theory, there have been three major strains of critical work on *A Moveable Feast*. The first is the application of
new approaches to gender studies to the common Hemingway themes of dignity and sexuality which prominently feature in the text. The second is a bibliographical exploration of the people, places, and events. The third is criticism of the editorial process, which interrogated Mary Hemingway's history of the book, and which was most prominent in leading to the revised 2009 edition of the text.

Discussions of gender have been one of the most fruitful areas of investigation of the book, often explored in connection with Garden of Eden, another posthumous Hemingway text that contains much of the same symbolism as A Moveable Feast, but that is more blatantly transgressive against gender norms. J. Gerald Kennedy's 1991 “Hemingway's Gender Trouble” unearths numerous parallels between the texts, including the manner in which hairstyle becomes codification for gender roles, and transgression is fatalistically called being “damned” (195). But while much of this material was retained in the half-finished Garden of Eden, Kennedy argues that Hemingway cut the most provocative and revealing segments from A Moveable Feast.

[M]anuscript evidence indicates that at some point in the composition of A Moveable Feast, the author began a sketch [“Secret Pleasures”] which would have disclosed a direct kinship between young Hem, [Garden of Eden's] David Bourne, and [Garden of Eden's] Nick Sheldon by tracing an experiment in androgyny undertaken by the Hemingways in Paris in 1924.

…

Taken together, the memoir, the novel, and the connecting manuscript fragment disclose the intensity of Hemingway's
preoccupation with androgyny and the persistence of his fantasies about crossing the gender line. But the heterosexual matrix of *A Moveable Feast* and the reassertion of gender roles in *The Garden of Eden* display an even more compelling need to deny that ambivalence, a need epitomized by the suppression of the provocative, unfinished sketch about “secrets, taboos, and delights” (194-5; 207).

Kennedy's discussion is particularly pertinent when he discusses the effects of the transgressive “Secret Pleasures” sketch, which was cut from the 1964 edition but that he had the opportunity to examine in manuscript. He describes Hemingway's depiction of himself in the 1964 edition as a “man of conventional passions, with no discernible ambivalence in his libidinal tendencies or in his gendered identity,” uncomfortable with homosexuality and androgyny because such practices “subvert his fundamental assumptions about sex, gender, and desire” (190-1). “Secret Pleasures” was cut, he suggests, because “it would have subverted the masculine, heterosexual image of the young Hemingway, who would have been in no position to mock the uncertainty of Fitzgerald or the lesbianism of Stein and Toklas” (199).

More recent treatments of the subject are also important, as in Meryl Altman's 2010 “Posthumous Queer: Hemingway Among Others.” Altman strengthens Kennedy's argument that Hemingway's occasional transgressions against heterosexual norms serve to reinforce a rigid concept of gender identity:

- Gender-bending, lesbian tourism, may not always be transgressive, progressive, or “queer,” and most commentators, including those who are most critical of *Garden of Eden* editor Jenks have recognized this.
Comley and Scholes: “When it came to sexual transgressions, [Hemingway] was more like Baudelaire and Rodin, who could not contemplate such matters without a cloud of hellfire over them, making such transgressions seem both more interesting and more dangerous.” (137).

Indeed, in the sketch the mild transgression of an unorthodox hair-styling is recounted with the hushed air of daring sin:

I put my arm around her and felt our hearts beating through our sweaters and I brought my right hand up and felt her neck smooth and the hair thick against it under my fingers that were shaking. (Restored, 188)

Importantly, these sorts of comments, along with those of other critics, also highlight the widespread awareness that much interesting or controversial material had been excised from the published texts. The general acknowledgment of this fact, established more than thirty years ago, would provide significant support for the publication of a new edition.

The people, places, and events of A Moveable Feast are frequently important in their own right, and so biographical analysis has been done in such work as The Hemingway Women, Bernice Kert's influential 1983 book, examining the relationship between Hemingway and his first two wives. Many of the changes made in both the original 1964 version and in the 2009 edition concern Hemingway's depictions of Hadley Hemingway and Pauline Hemingway, so the troubled nexus of these three lives is of great importance to the transition between the two editions. Kert's exhaustive analysis reveals that Hemingway's affection for Hadley did truly endure, as depicted in A Moveable Feast: at the conclusion of their marriage, Hemingway sent an emotional cable declaring that her behavior, “like
everything she'd ever done, was brave and generous” (Kert 1983, 190). The strong emotions and deep guilt that Hemingway felt over the end of his first marriage helps explain many of his issues in writing *Feast*. The sketches concerning Hemingway’s relationship with Hadley discuss the problems of “two people who love each other” but who “do not know how not to be overrun” (*Feast*, 208). Writing this material was difficult even after so many decades, and the two sketches of the typescript that were combined to produce this chapter in *Feast* were much-rewritten and hand-edited, described by Tavernier-Courbin as “by far the messiest” (Tavernier-Courbin 1991, 166).

Kert’s scholarship is particularly pertinent in light of many of the changes of the 2009 edition, which include much more discussion of the emotional turmoil Hemingway still felt, years later – turmoil so severe that “[i]n the fall when he had first fallen in love with [Pauline] – he now admitted – he had contemplated suicide, soberly and upon reflection, for it seemed the only way to remove the sin from Pauline and spare Hadley the necessity of a divorce” (Kert 1983, 189).

Further, Kert describes the extra-textual history that may have prompted Hemingway's attack on John Dos Passos in *Feast*'s “The Pilot Fish and the Rich.” In 1916 when Hemingway was summering in Michigan after his junior year of high school, he met and became fascinated with Katy Smith, a girl eight years his senior. While they never become involved, they did become friends. In 1920, Katy introduced Hadley Richardson to Hemingway, and in 1929 – as his marriage with Hadley crumbled – Hemingway introduced Katy to Dos Passos. The two married six months later, and Hemingway remained close with them both. The author was
badly hurt when he heard that Katy was killed in a car accident in 1948, with Dos Passos at the wheel.

Ernest never forgave Dos for Katy's death. His logic was that Dos, with his bad eyesight, should never have been driving in the first place. As if that weren't enough, in 1951 Dos had published a novel, *Chosen Country*, based on Katy's recollections of her summers at Horton Bay and her highly personal opinion of the youthful Hemingway. Ernest raged over the contents. “He's killed her off,” he groaned, “and now he’s stealing my material” (486).

This background and individual insights are confirmed by the voluminous and excellent periodic biographies of Michael Reynolds, which also delve into the truth behind how *Feast* faithfully recounts the past, even as it reshapes it into a narrative. For example, Reynolds provides an acidic autobiographical blurb written by Hemingway to accompany his story “Big Two-Hearted River” in *This Quarter* in 1925. The self-description is very familiar to any reader of *Feast*: simultaneously laconic and sensual, with complicated relationships with rival writers:

...as near as I can figure out am 27 years old. 6 feet tall, weight 182 lbs


Friend of Ezra Pound. Believes Pound greatest living poet. (Reynolds 1989, 266)
This characterization of himself is identical to the one that Hemingway attempts to construct in *Feast*. He praises Stein while condescending to her, lavishes praise on Pound, and exalts in the finer points of dining – all while exhibiting the gruff delicacy he would later write into the “Paris book.” This consistency indicates either that he had a remarkably unchanging self-image or, more likely, that he spent significant time reviewing old documents and refreshing the idea that he had of himself at that time.

Arguably the richest vein of research is found in Gerry Brenner's 1982 article “Are We Going to Hemingway's *Feast?*” and Jacqueline Tavernier-Courbin's 1991 study *Ernest Hemingway's A Moveable Feast: The Making of Myth*, which have challenged the narrative of a found and complete text. Their work came amidst increasing dissatisfaction with the editing process of Hemingway's posthumously-published work. More scholars had been permitted access to the manuscripts, particularly after the opening of the Hemingway Room of the JFK Library in 1980. As the extent of the editing done to such work as *The Garden of Eden* became apparent, the scrutiny had spurred such critics as E.L. Doctorow to note that "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" (Doctorow 1986).

Brenner was among the first to review the original manuscripts, sharply criticizing both the editorial choices and their opaque presentation. While asserting that some amount of editing was necessary, Brenner said that “Mary Hemingway’s alterations change *Feast* in ways not intended by her husband,” and that “her cuts more significantly affect it” (Brenner 1982, 531). His complaint hinges on the manner in which the editorial process was conducted. Even where the changes are “judicious,” they “go beyond her principle of ‘cutting only where repetitions and redundancies occurred’” (534). Except for some of the changes made to the
preface that Brenner regarded as more composition than editing, his criticisms are of the presentation of the text: in Brenner’s view, editorial choices like the rearrangement of chapters obscured the “fine patterns that Hemingway weaves” (531). Knowledge of the extensive edits made to the text, Brenner argued, would change a reader's understanding of the finished product, as reading the drafts had allowed “glimpses into personal concerns simmering deep in the work” (529). Brenner discusses, for example, Hemingway's struggle to write about Hadley, describing material now included in the new edition:

The addendum, an unnumbered twentieth page that follows the 19-page pencil holograph, suggests that initially he was reluctant to stir up dormant pools of guilt. It also suggests that he realized the falseness of his idyllic recollections, were he to shy away from the calamitous "nightmare winter." In his addendum, then, he avoids identifying the destroyers of his and Hadley's happiness. But he says they were rich infiltrators whose relentless determination yet good intentions overran him and Hadley, whom he characterizes as a carelessly confident young couple. Interestingly, he magnanimously declares that the blame for the breakup belongs only to himself, acknowledges that he lived with that blame all his life, and then asserts that only one person was blameless and came out of the experience well. Of course he refers, albeit indirectly, to Hadley. (536)

Jacqueline Tavernier-Courbin's in-depth examination of the book, nine years later, was also critical of Mary Hemingway’s narrative of the book's editing process, suggesting that “the editing was … far more extensive than acknowledged by Mary” (Tavernier-Courbin
1991, 171). Tavernier-Courbin takes a closer look at the value added by the edits to the text, arguing that “[m]any instances of copy editing appear to have been gratuitous” (173). These “ill-advised” changes get in the reader's way (172). For example, Mary Hemingway edited out several paragraphs that refer to Pauline Hemingway, a choice that Tavernier-Courbin argues “entailed leaving out much of Hemingway's agony and remorse … making the book less human and Hemingway's persona more callous” (179). Usefully, *Ernest Hemingway's A Moveable Feast: the Making of Myth* also provides a comprehensive list of all edits made to the manuscripts, so that a “dedicated reader [is] given the chance to recapture Hemingway's original *Feast*” (174).

In 2009, Seán Hemingway, the author’s grandson, took the opportunity provided by these criticisms and the continued popularity of *A Moveable Feast*, publishing a “new special edition” to present “Ernest Hemingway's original manuscript text as he had it at the time of his death” (*Restored*, 2). In his acknowledgment, Seán speaks of his uncle Patrick's prompting, but also “numerous scholarly studies,” mentioning “in particular the monograph-length studies of *A Moveable Feast* by Jacqueline Tavernier-Courbin and Gerry Brenner” (xvi).

**2009: Seán**

Seán Hemingway, an associate curator of Greek and Roman art at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, had previously edited two anthologies of his grandfather’s work: *Hemingway on Hunting* and *Hemingway on War*, thematic collections whose undertaking reportedly made him as familiar with the JFK Library’s Ernest Hemingway Collection “as the archivists who work [there]” (Kennedy Forums 2009, 2).
Seán Hemingway undertook his 2009 *A Moveable Feast: The Restored Edition* with direct reference to the many criticisms of the first edition, supplementing the text with previously unpublished material and reversing many of the previous editorial changes. Most particularly, *Restored* returned the original arrangement of chapters, as suggested by Brenner and Tavernier-Courbin. Arguing for the need for the new edition, Seán commented to the *Edmonton Journal*:

I think [Mary Hemingway] was very careful. People comparing the first published edition with the restored edition will see the edits are very minor. In a few places, her editing was spot-on.

It's just that she did more than she admitted to doing. The book did not have an ending that he had settled on, nor did it have an introduction, so she created that preface, and she created the ending out of his manuscript fragments. She really didn’t stick to his writing, she cut from his writing. (Frenette 2009)

While it is impossible to do more than speculate about other motives behind the new edition, it is worth considering potential impetuses. In *Scholarly Editing*, James L. W. West III discusses the distinctive difficulties and motivations of the editing process in twentieth-century American and British literature. He identifies three possible complications: copyright complications, the sheer volume of evidence, and the modern shifts in the book trade (West 1995, 365-70). Of these three considerations, though, when editing modern texts the first and most prominent “hurdle” (as West calls it) is that of copyright.

Most major works of the modernist and postmodernist periods are known to be textually flawed but still under the protection of copyright. These
texts have occupied prominent spots on publishers' backlists for many years and have sold consistently, generating steady income for authors and, later, for their heirs. So long as these works are in copyright, no new versions may be produced without permission from the authors (if living) or from those who control posthumous literary rights. (365)

West argues that the pressures of impending entrance into the public domain have made some controllers of copyright more amenable to the idea of revised editions, which can protect a portion of the soon-to-diminish revenue stream from back sales. However, the passage in the United States of the Copyright Term Extension Act and of similar laws in Europe have made copyright unlikely to be a pertinent factor in the case of the Restored Edition, extending all copyright claims until at least 2019 (Government Printing Office 2013). If there was any pecuniary motivation – not a motivation at which to shrink, it should be remembered, as this necessity has led to many great works of art – it can perhaps be found in the moderate initial run of 16,000 copies of the 2009 edition and associated re-release of Hemingway’s complete back catalog, fresh with new cover designs (Rich 2013).

Restored is markedly different from its predecessor. Almost every sketch receives numerous small changes that bring it closer in line with Hemingway's manuscript, and the structure of the book is dramatically altered. The change in the reader's experience of the book is similarly dramatic, not only because of the inclusion of new material – including sketches such as “Secret Pleasures” that had so intrigued critics – but also because of Restored's claim

---

3 While all of Hemingway's work, including A Moveable Feast, has entered the public domain in many countries (including Anglophonic Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa), it will not come out of copyright in the United States or Europe – where the vast bulk of sales are located – for decades (Justice Laws Website 2012; Parliamentary Counsel Office 2012; WIPO 2012; EUR-Lex 2012; LII 2012).
of “restoration” and the according claim to authority. These changes are discussed in-depth in my second chapter.

The new edition has inspired much scholarly response, just as the first edition did. Trogdon notes with approval that its editorial process was guided by the criticisms by Brenner and Tavernier-Courbin. He points out, in particular, that while his own electronic comparison of the two editions does not match up exactly with Tavernier-Courbin's list of changes, it is “very close” (Trogdon 2009, 26), making the 2009 edition the “best handled of the posthumous Hemingway books” (25). His tentative enthusiasm for the text reflects what he argues is the best manner in which to present Hemingway's unfinished works: “as close as possible to the form in which the author left them, with a minimum of editing, with a textual apparatus detailing what changes the editor did make to the text, and with a complete description of the documents embodying the text” (25). Sandra Spanier, a noted Hemingway scholar, similarly suggests that the new edition contains a truer picture of the author (Rich 2009). This careful but approving reception is typical of the manner in which Restored has been received by the scholarly world.

In popular media, the response has been more mixed. A.E. Hotchner, a fellow author whose career has been bound up with Hemingway since Papa Hemingway, Hotchner's 1966 memoir of their friendship, protested against the new edition, questionably claiming that the manuscript of the text “was essentially what was published” and that “[t]here was no extra chapter created by Mary” (Hotchner 2009). In an editorial on the subject in The New York Times, Hotchner suggested that the 2009 edition “was extensively reworked by a grandson who doesn't like what the original said about his grandmother, Hemingway's second wife,” and poses the question that “[w]ith this reworking as a precedent, what will Scribner do, for instance, if a descendant of F. Scott Fitzgerald demands the removal of the chapter in 'A
Moveable Feast' about the size of Fitzgerald's penis” (Hotchner 2009). This manner of objection – called “rather scathing” by Seán Hemingway – was also taken up by other commentators, such as Robert Fulford of the National Post (“a clumsy and essentially silly revision of the work” [Fulford 2010]), and by New York Times reporter Thomas Lipscomb, whose online column excoriated Seán Hemingway in the strongest terms for “taking a hatchet to a work of art,” pointing to Mary Hemingway's account of the editing process to refute the “blather of this self-promoting grandson” (Kennedy Forums 2009, 6; Lipscomb 2009). Other reviewers found much to praise in the new text, if not specifically in Seán Hemingway's efforts. Christopher Hitchens spoke of a text “ably and attractively produced,” especially delighting in the previously unpublished material (Hitchens 2009), while similarly fond reviews were found in the Sydney Morning Herald, Smithsonian, The Observer, the Wall Street Journal, and the Kansas City Star (Hemingway’s old employer) (O'Grady 2009; Schama 2009; Newman 2011; Wineapple 2009; Paul 2009).

Neither critical nor popular responses have delved into the new edition in any great depth, however, mostly focusing on the validity of any new edition rather than examining the actual text in detail. There are ample reasons to do so, though, especially when the new edition is considered as a response to fifty years of ongoing transtextual conversation. Restored's contributions to this conversation are leather-lunged and constitute two major areas. The first is the book's new claim to authority; while less immediately authoritative because it is obviously not “finished,” the 2009 edition paradoxically asserts itself – both implicitly and explicitly – as the “truer” version of the text. The second category of the new text's implications are the numerous small and large changes and additions made to the text itself, in response to previous criticisms. These two categories of changes will be discussed in the ensuing chapters, after a critical structure has been laid out.
Chapter 2: Making the Text

Textual Editing

There was a time when all scholars desired one thing in a text: that it accurately represent what the author wished it to contain. The paradigm was God as author and sacred writ as text. Texts that were true to their author’s intention contained truth that was worth every effort to get the text right. Textual scholarship in this model was devoted to two complementary but opposite propositions: that the text must be preserved from change, protected from the predations of time and careless or malicious handling, and that the text must be changed to restore the pristine purity it had lost through neglect and time (Shillingsburg 2006, 80).

Dr. Johnson, in emending a section of his own edition of Hamlet that he supposed to have been an error by some obscure hand, declared that “That the words now replaced are better, I do not undertake to prove. It is sufficient that they are Shakespeare’s” (Thorpe 1965, 64). This idea is a clear and attractive one: Shakespeare and all great artists are geniuses, and no editor or publisher should second-guess a genius. Furthermore, when we choose between different editions of the same text, this idea provides us with a solid guideline: authorial intent. What did the author intend to have in his published work?

Unfortunately, it has never really been so simple. In the case of Hamlet, editors such as Dr. Johnson have long faced the problem of deciding between the unsatisfactory choice of discarding some of the most famous and brilliant lines of the play, such as Hamlet’s ode to the
“undiscovered country” in Act 3, Scene 1, in favor of adherence to the version that seems to have been Shakespeare’s favored Hamlet, or creating eclectic versions that incorporate their own aesthetic choices, engaging in increasingly byzantine arguments to justify each choice. And the facade of neatness in the principle of authorial intent dissolves completely when faced with two posthumous editions, such as the 1964 edition of A Moveable Feast and the 2009 edition. Reader and scholar alike is left to ask: which is the better one – and how will we define “better?”

In 1921, A. E. Housman declared to the Classical Association that textual editing was no more and no less than “the science of discovering error in texts and the art of removing it” (2). This “dry and rather dull” study occurs “whenever we notice and correct a misprint” (4; 2). Textual critics, Housman believed, should use their wits to sort out where time has corrupted a text, restoring the poetry of the past to its true version. While textual editing has evolved today into a nearly unrecognizable complexity as compared to its origins in classical and biblical scholarship, the central pursuit has remained to choose among different readings by “considerations of intrinsic merit” (10).

The judgment of wherein that merit lies has generally shifted among several considerations. The pursuit of authorial intent has been by far the most important: a never-ending quest to discover what the author of a work really intended to write. This approach is inherently pleasing, perhaps because of the great respect for artistry held by both critic and the general public: the term “bowdlerization” achieved general use only thanks to the wide contempt to the revelation that Reverend Thomas Bowdler censored some of the oaths of Falstaff in his Family Shakespeare (Bald 1950, 40). Since the turn of the last century, when bibliographic scholarship in the classics spread into general literary practice and led to
codified rules that sanctified authorship, the words of the poet have been sacrosanct and their pursuit has been the goal of publication.

This perception – that authors must transmit their words without any interference – exists among the general public as well, not only scholars. Modern editor Rosemary Shipton tells a relevant anecdote, when she corrects a friend’s perception that she is a glorified grammar-checker:

“I’m more involved in working with authors on organizing their books – shaping them, building momentum, crafting the sentences, choosing just the right word...”

“I’m disappointed to hear that,” she reflected. “I thought that was the whole point of being an author. You can write – and you don’t need someone else to help you with it.”

That’s the rub, isn’t it? Readers want to believe that writers are geniuses (2012, 44)

To this end, scholar James Thorpe wrote a widely-accepted paean to authorial intent in 1965 in *PMLA*, one year after the initial publication of *A Moveable Feast*, summarizing general editorial practice and principles at the time of the first edition. He declared that a work of art, canonized by the hand of an author in public presentation, has a “radical integrity.” “[W]e must take that integrity, once discovered, as it is. The tactic of posing self-made alternatives is one which involves tremendous risks for a doubtful advantage.” (91) What was wanted, as contemporary Robert Halsband wrote with regard to his own editing efforts, were “definitive editions” (though admitting that “[o]ur concept of definitive editions … is perhaps
related to the advertisements one sees in beauty parlors which offer *permanent* waves ‘guaranteed for three months’)’” (1958, 126).

While the 1964 *Feast* lasted considerably longer than three months, we have already seen that significant changes were made to the manuscript as Hemingway left it; the “radical integrity” of the text was violated by the hands of another. Quietly, as we have seen, Mary and Harry took an incomplete manuscript and produced a complete book. At the time of their editing process, authorial intent remained the ideal goal, generally sought under the principles most prominently stated by W.W. Greg in his 1950 essay "The Rationale of Copy-Text," accepted into general canon by Thorpe and other scholars by 1964.

Greg had described what he saw as the flaws of textual editing up until his own time, most particularly a slavish devotion to the "copy-text." The copy-text approach, inherited from the study of classics, selected a single version of the text – usually the earliest coherent printing – and operated under the assumption that this was the most "reliable" text. By 1950, Greg believed that this approach had devolved and had begun to subordinate critical thinking to obedience to a rule. His call to intellectual arms established what would become the most highly-regarded formulation of the search for authorial intent. Greg agreed, on the whole, with the utility of a copy-text. Working with Renaissance plays, he stated, "the historical circumstances of the English language make it necessary to adopt in formal matters the guidance of some particular early text" (29). However, he emphasized that later revisions and variants must be reintroduced to consideration, rather than relying on the infallibility of a single preferred text.

Dissatisfied with the results of eclectic freedom and reliance on personal taste, critics sought to establish some sort of mechanical apparatus for
dealing with textual problems that should lead to uniform results independent of the operator. … Between readings of equal extrinsic authority no rules of the sort can decide, since by their very nature it is only to extrinsic relations that they are relevant. The choice is necessarily a matter for editorial judgement, and an editor who declines or is unable to exercise his judgement and falls back on some arbitrary canon, such as the authority of the copy-text, is in fact abdicating his editorial function. (Greg 1950, 28).

The bibliographic movement at the turn of the century previous had stressed the necessities of formal procedure to overcome individual error and to eliminate attempts at "modernization," but Greg argued for the reintroduction of eclectic editions, proposing that an "editor should in every case of variation ask himself (1) whether the original reading is one that can reasonably be attributed to the author, and (2) whether the later reading is one that the author can reasonably be supposed to have substituted for the former" (30).

Under these terms and under these rules, the first edition of Feast was extremely objectionable. Yet, intriguingly, the passage of years have made editorial intervention more palatable in principle – as long as it is done in the open. Challenging new theories have come to compete with a strict adherence to authorial intention, though they have not supplanted it. Some critics, such as Roland Barthes, declared the author to be “dead” in terms of his relation to the meaning of his work, which opened questions about whether authorial intention would then be relevant to the posthumous editing process – would not the other considerations of an editor then become the sole factors to be taken into account, realizing texts that were the most beautiful or most commercially viable, according to individual intention? More directly,
Jerome McGann's pivotal 1983 *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* considered these and other ideas, proposing an implicitly social theory of the text rather than the previously-held reverence for authorial intent. Not by coincidence, McGann’s book bears much in common with W.W. Greg’s essay, as it calls for the abandonment of strict principles that solely pursue authorial intent in favor of intelligent discussion – however, McGann called for the admission of social factors into the hallowed idea of the writing process, whereas Greg was calling only for an intelligent purity of authorial intent.

Ultimately, McGann suggests that editors should prefer the first edition of a text rather than the final edition or the manuscript; authors had never been ignorant of the vicissitudes of publishing, and given the actual facts on the ground during the production of a text, it was unwise to select as copy-text the manuscript version, which specifically did not see publication and dissemination. McGann was certainly not the first to make this judgment: John Butt proposed a new edition of Dickens’ *David Copperfield* in 1961, suggesting that due to many examples of “incorrect revision by the author,” the editor “take the part-issue [from the serialized first version] as his copy-text and correct it in the light shed by the manuscript, the proofs, and CD” (158; 162). McGann’s brief but powerful statement, however, is the most influential and oft-cited discussion of this new social awareness: the idea that a literary work exists not in any one sanctified text, but in a series of different versions.

In the years since McGann, and because of his contributions and those of others, the variable nature of a text has become much more widely accepted. Subsequent critics have pointed out the explorations of this concept, such as Jorge Luis Borges' 1939 story "Pierre Menard, Author of the Quixote," the humorous fictional account of a word-for-word facsimile
of *Don Quixote*, given new meaning exclusively by context,⁴ and entire critical careers have been built on the manner in which readers help construct meaning. At the same time, scholars such as Randall McCloud have pointed out the role of editorial choices as part of the process of creation, rather than the idealized role of amanuensis; McCloud’s work uncovers how modern editions drastically and unintentionally alter the meanings of their texts during the process of reproduction.

For many critics, the resulting changeable nature of any text is no longer even considered problematic, except from the practical standpoint of the difficulty of physically reproducing a "fluid" text: “variance is … the innate condition of textuality and of the editing that reflects this condition” (Greetham 1999, 18). The question becomes how to represent a text that is akin to an electron, existing as a field of different possibilities rather than a single fixed point.

In reference to *Feast*, this new diversity of opinion can perhaps help eradicate the stigma of a “bastard text” from a critical standpoint (Brenner 1982, 529), although the opaqueness of Mary Hemingway and Harry Brague’s process would remain an ethical problem. But while many scholars have strongly interrogated the simplistic pursuit of authorial intent, other critics have noted that the idea has not penetrated much beyond the academy. "Most readers are initially inclined to assume textual fluidity is merely textual corruption," John Bryant has noted (Bryant 2007, 18).

Perhaps the reason for this is that the text of revision is invisible. That is, wordings involved in the processes by which one version evolves into another are either discarded or, if found in manuscript, heavily obscured

---

⁴ “The archaic style of Menard—quite foreign, after all—suffers from a certain affectation. Not so that of his forerunner [Cervantes], who handles with ease the current Spanish of his time” (Borges 1962, 53).
by deletions, insertions, or other revision codes. Though real, the process of revision is largely unwitnessable, and current editorial practice has not caught up to the problem of making invisible revision texts accessible, hence discussable, among readers, critics, even scholars. (19)

If this weren’t enough, as Bryant notes, even among the ranks of critics the lack of a definitive lodestone for decision-making can be uncomfortable, despite an acceptance of the basic principle that texts are fluid. A strict pursuit of authorial intention is a simple goal, even if the methodology becomes complex. As recently as 2006, scholar Carlo Bajetta echoed Peter Shillingsburg to pronounce that “editors should not try to recover the author’s (or authors’) intended meaning but ‘his intention to do – to record a specific sequence of words and punctuation that he thinks verbalize his meaning (whether premeditated or newly discovered)’ (826).” Likewise, much of past Hemingway scholarship has focused on authorial intent. This includes the work of Gerry Brenner and Jacqueline Tavernier-Courbin. In 1993, Susan Seitz concluded her detailed examination of other posthumous works by Hemingway with a suggested set of editorial guidelines that focuses almost exclusively on authorial intent:

In order to produce a text that would represent Hemingway’s final intentions, his editors should have set their copy based on the latest manuscript version of these posthumous works. Hemingway’s own additions and deletions should have been honored, and no cuts should have been made if he did not indicate them (212).

To Seitz, “[t]he only acceptable editing would have been to correct spelling and punctuation” (213).
Such a perspective, however, ignores the fact that even corrections to spelling and punctuation alone contribute to the final production of a text, revealing its essentially social nature and hinting at the other considerations at work: aesthetics, ideology, comprehensiveness, or others. As stated by Heather MacNeil, “Authorial intention is not abandoned as a rationale for the reconstruction of a literary text; it simply loses its status as the only legitimate rationale” (2007, 37).

This spread of opinion among scholars and the expectations of readers perhaps explains the nature of the 2009 Feast, which works to serve the interests of both completeness and authorial intent, although only the latter is evident in the stated aims of Seán Hemingway. As an editor he has engaged in several acts of the most classic sort of textual criticism, correcting the “scribes” of 1964. For example, a phrase dropped from a copyist’s eye-skip has been restored to the description of the setting in “Ford Madox Ford and the Devil’s Disciple,” with the restoration of the italicized portion of the sentence, “Most of the clients [at the Closerie des Lilas] only knew each other to nod and there were elderly bearded men...” (Tavernier-Courbin 1991, 55). The missing phrase made the sentence impossible, as Tavernier-Courbin pointed out: “[N]o French café situated on a major artery and in as highly an artistic a quarter as the top of the Boulevard du Montparnasse would ever have, whether in the 1920s or today, a clientèle composed mostly of ‘elderly bearded men’” (55). This edit is one of several that seek to remove unequivocal textual mistakes, once missed by the original editing team; another example is found in the sketch “An Agent of Evil,” with four instances of Hemingway’s uncorrected pidgin-Italian “terza riruce” replaced with correct “terza rima” (Trogdon 2009, 37). These uncontroversial edits are made in service to the goal of
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5 The reasons for the original error are discussed at length by Paul Smith and Jacqueline Tavernier-Courbin in 1982’s “Terza Riruce: Hemingway, Dunning, Italian Poetry.”
Hemingway’s presumed intentions. However, they are joined by numerous inclusions that have been made to establish the text’s own authority and for the sake of comprehensiveness – other considerations that must be taken into account.

These other considerations have always existed alongside and in competition with authorial intent. Many textual critics, in assessing or compiling a text, had their own aesthetic goals in mind. Robert Halsband, for instance, muses about how to construct an index for his edition of the letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, noting that comprehensive editions “are no longer meant to be read but only to be referred to,” as “the editor, instead of presenting a literary work, is setting up an archive” (1970, 125). While ostensibly concerned only with accurately presenting the author’s work for the reader, Halsband describes his own compromises of accuracy for the sake of presentation, arguing that “we judge … by actual words and ideas and not by … flourishes and shorthand” to excuse his expansions of Lady Mary’s “D$h” into “Duchess” and “y$m” into “them” (132). So in addition to authorial intent, deference has been paid by critics and editors to ease of reading, a sharper ideological impact, or another aesthetic goal.

Similarly, the aforementioned “definitive editions” reveal a concern for textual stability and comprehensiveness, two other goals that could and did come into conflict with the idol of authorial intent, or could be called upon in its stead. James Thorpe himself confronted this in his PMLA essay when it discussed authors who produce two full and sanctioned editions of the same work (in this case, W.H. Auden’s “In Time of War”).

The problem of identifying the “real” Great Expectations, we found, was simplified when we insisted on respecting the public version to which Dickens gave authorial integrity. The application of this basic test will
not select one or the other of Auden’s “In Time of War,” however, since each is a fulfillment of his intentions, and each was communicated to his usual public. … [T]he two versions of the Auden collection are equally “real.” They stand, side by side, as two separate works, and each has every bit of the dignity and integrity with which an author can endow any work of art (1965, 94).

In such cases, Thorpe continues, the reader is left without the usual pole-star of authorial intent:

Hence the critic asks “which is the best?” And the editor asks “which shall I print?” And the student asks “which shall I read?”

There is a conventional answer, made smooth by constant use. “It is generally accepted that the most authoritative edition is the last published in the author’s lifetime.” … This rule of thumb … is a desperate substitute for the whole process of critical understanding, which is the only sensible way of trying to arrive at a sound evaluation of anything (94-5).

This is not to say that Seán Hemingway was bereft of guidance in how to reconcile other considerations beyond authorial intent, or without example. The approach of Susan J. Rosowski, Charles W. Mignon, Frederick M. Link, and Kari A Ronning in their editions of the works of Willa Cather is particularly instructive of how a modern editor can approach a new edition of a previously-published text, and inadvertently serve other purposes than a strict reclamation of the author’s intentions. Rosowski et al report that while they explicitly relied on the familiar tenets of W.W. Greg and Fredson Bowers, this was a deliberate (not
doctrinaire) choice made from among several options in deference to Cather’s own “expansive sense of an author’s authority over her work” (2000, 31). Cather “served as her own copyeditor,” specifying “capitalization, spelling, punctuation (including single versus double quotation marks), and hyphenation” - even specifying between em-dashes and en-dashes where necessary - “as well as paragraph divisions, line spaces, and section divisions” (33-4). Such acknowledgment only raises the question of the remaining aspects of a text that were beyond Cather’s control, as the editors admit, as well as the problem of pinpointing any one moment of intentionality in revised texts. This is perhaps unintentionally highlighted by their account of one of the “resources” used in their editing process: doing their work in Red Cloud and Webster County, Cather’s old haunts. “The open prairie and the rich farmland still spread themselves under the great Dôme of the sky, just as they did for Cather. … Under such circumstances, preparing a scholarly edition becomes a living and profoundly human enterprise” (41). This admission cedes the point that there is an ineluctable human element, hidden in the composition of any text. Further, there is an inevitable gap between even the most arduous author’s desire to control their work and the actual results, akin to the *différance* identified by Jacques Derrida, always persisting between signifier and signified: attempts to pursue the author’s intentions themselves constitute a social activity and contribution to the result. These factors reveal the impossibilities that await even rigorous detectives of intention, such as Rosowski et al.

In other words, even when authorial intent is explicitly and consciously chosen as the sole navigational beacon, it is impossible for editors to not only avoid reflecting the social history of the text, but it is impossible to avoid becoming part of that social history. And when a rule of sole authorial intent is dismissed as impossible, then a frank admission of the other concerns at play is necessary. In the case of the Rosowski et al editions of Cather, these
included the problem is the remaining fraction of the writing process outside of even that author’s stringent control – paper composition, typesetting, and other aspects never specified by Cather in the first printings – which must be rejected, retained, or replaced based on individual judgment of their merit and a consideration of their aesthetic merit, as well as the scholarly apparatus that was certainly not present in Cather’s intentions. In the case of the 2009 *Feast*, the same sorts of *différance* stand in the way of Seán and a perfect realization of Hemingway’s intentions.

Having established, then, a set of basic uncertainties hidden in the composition of every text – its fluid nature, the unseen contributors, and the unapproachable gap between intention/expectation and results – one can now turn to identifying the elements that construct the *Restored Edition* for a reader, before deciding on their purpose and success.

The objective critic’s first question, when he is confronted with a new aesthetic object is not, What is this supposed to be? But, What have we got here? (Wimsatt 1968, 195)

**Transtextuality**

In order to consider the relationship a reader develops with a work such as the *Restored Edition*, as well as with its predecessor and other influences, it is helpful to use the terminology developed by French critic Gerard Genette to describe what he has labeled as transtextuality: "all that sets the text in a relationship, whether concealed or obvious, with other texts" (Genette 1997, 1). In 1982’s *Palimpsests*, Genette fleshes out the rough set of categories of transtextuality he initially conceived in 1979’s *The Architext*: 6 intertextuality

6 I am here adopting Genette’s label of “transtextuality” to replace “intertextuality” (the term first proposed by Julia Kristeva), and Daniel Chandler’s label "hypertextuality" to replace Genette’s "hypertextuality," a term
(the use of quotations, plagiarism, or allusion), paratextuality (the effect of paratextual elements such as critical apparatuses and cover design), architextuality (the framing of a text as part of a genre or larger set), metatextuality (the explicit or implicit critical commentary of one text on another), and hypotextuality (the relation between a book and a direct predecessor) (2-5). These descriptors are not wholly discrete or exclusive; Genette demonstrates their interrelatedness with a brief employment, noting that “the architextual appurtenance of a given work is frequently announced by way of paratextual clues” which are themselves metatextual, as when a book’s opening label announces ‘This book is a novel’” (7-8). Despite this perhaps confusing fuzziness, the terminology is helpful when discussing such a book as *A Moveable Feast: The Restored Edition*, wherein so much of the conversation concerns the transtextual elements.

I have already spoken of many of the associated paratexts of the 2009 edition and their focus on the development of authenticity. The cover design is dominated by Hemingway’s picture and the first part of the title, while “The Restored Edition” is unobtrusive; the introductions by both Patrick and Seán Hemingway – which are, incidentally, metatextual commentary on the original *Feast* as well as paratextual commentary on the new edition – seek to establish Ernest Hemingway as a distant figure of genius and themselves as the guardians of the true text; and the pictures even display photographic evidence to tie the book as directly as possible to Hemingway. The implicit appeal is to Hemingway’s authority as author, and the text as his more direct transmission.

The architextuality of the book is also important to take into account: the *Restored Edition* is part of many silent sets: published books, memoirs, and so on. But most

---

that has become too loaded with additional connotations since the development of the Internet (Chandler 2007, 206).
prominently for us – as it was for both sets of editors and for so many readers – A Moveable Feast is a Hemingway text. The “Hemingway book” is a genre unto itself, which is pertinent not just generally but also specifically at this moment, when Hemingway on War, Hemingway on Writing, and other compilations of past work have helped perpetuate the image and develop the genre, as a generation that has grown up with no knowledge of Hemingway as living author have formed their own view of the man.

This form of architextuality implies a larger audience, and comes with certain expectations about tone, characters, and topic. Readers familiar with other Hemingway works, yet not familiar with the original Feast, will expect a laconic narrator who has been deeply wounded in the past, physically or emotionally, and who concerns himself with one of the manly arts (sailing, drinking, or killing something), all related in a sparse but tense phrasing, tightly edited. The book is almost certainly guaranteed higher sales than the work of an unknown author because of the silent commentary invoked by the paratext of the Hemingway name on the cover. As Genette argued with regard to Proust’s À la recherche du temps perdu:

[F]or most readers of the Recherche, the two biographical facts which are the half Jewish ancestry of Proust and his homosexuality, the knowledge of which creates an inevitable paratext to the pages of his work consecrated to these two subjects. I do not say that one must know it; I only say that those who know it do not read in the same way as those who do not, and that anyone who denies this difference is making fun of us (Genette 1991, 266).

The Hemingway brand and bandwagon, in this case, come into conflict with another form of the 2009 edition’s architextuality: its obviously unfinished nature, thanks to the
paratexts that unavoidably remind the reader of the “Additional” unfinished work and the “Fragments” that never found a final draft. Peter Shillingsburg’s 2006 *Gutenberg to Google* spends much time analyzing the contributions a text’s form make to the reading experience, recalling the work of J.J. McGann on the differing receptions of two early editions of Lord Byron’s *Don Juan*:

The text of both types of editions was substantially the same, though the higher incidence of typos in the pirated editions may in fact have added to the sense of surreptitiousness to those versions. But the bibliographic signals of Murray’s edition were very different from those of the pirated books. In each case, readers seem to have derived part of their understanding of the poem from the fact that they encountered it in a form that was NOT something else (72-3).

In the same way, readers with knowledge of the original 1964 edition who encounter the *Restored* edition of 2009 will be considering it in terms of what it is *not* – that is, they will be considering it hypotextually. Because it is the “restored edition,” it is *not* the unrestored edition. To advance this beyond a truism, consider what other antonyms we might pose in instinctual opposition to “restored”: corrupt, damaged, incomplete.

In 1936, Walter Benjamin, in discussing the dilemmas posed to the art world by an age of easy replication, effectively summarized the way in which authority is produced for a viewer, suggesting that it “is the essence of all that is transmissible from its beginning, ranging from its substantive duration to its testimony to the history which it has experienced” (221). The hypotextual rebuke of the 2009 edition is an implicit claim to embrace more of the origin and more of the history of the 1964 edition, especially when the explicit claims of the
Restored introductions are piled on ("a truer representation of the book my grandfather intended to publish" [Restored, 3]).

Even those readers who are unaware of the original Feast, or have never read it, will still encounter a book heavier with perceived authority, thanks to the paratextual "additional sketches." Aside from their function as metatextual commentary on the main body of the work – displaying the rougher and more transgressive possibilities that might have been included, and which still lurk in the primary nineteen sketches – their positioning and formatting make them appear to be complete. The "additional sketches" include three alternates that Hemingway discarded, with their place indicated by asterisks in what is otherwise a "clean" text, joined by the series of eighteen "fragments" of dislocated material, and all reinforced by the included pictures of manuscripts and typescripts.

Yet, certainly any text primarily concerned only with authorial intent should not include such material. Instead, such fragments might belong in the pages of a critical edition, where they would (at minimum) be accompanied by some explanation of editorial practice, specific notes, and other scholarly apparatus.

In this way, then, the hypotextual promise of the authentic book sought by Hemingway clashes with an inclusiveness that seeks to provide readers with all the major variants of the book that might be enjoyable. As I show in the next chapter, the specific changes to the text between the 1964 edition and 2009 edition, which not only restores some of the manuscript, but also includes unpublished and fragments, join with the strong message of the transtexts to produce a version that serves both goals.
Chapter 3: Changes in the Text

Presentation

In the production of *A Moveable Feast: The Restored Edition*, editor Seán Hemingway sought to realize a “truer representation of the book my grandfather intended to publish” (3). In an interview with *Oprah* magazine – a venue that demonstrates Hemingway’s continued popular appeal – Seán emphasized as his motivation that there was “still new text to present,” calling the new edition a “less edited, but more comprehensive edition” (Miller 2009). In many ways, this latter sentiment aptly summarizes the editorial approach to the text, which is not un-edited – in many places, the editing of Mary Hemingway and Harry Brague has been retained – but which eliminates some of the changes made to the manuscript for the sake of commercial appeal, such as a final chapter assembled to provide a more-traditional conclusion to the text. The inclusion of fragments, “additional Paris sketches,” and the status of a “restored edition” gives *Restored* an appearance of straight-from-Hemingway authenticity, supplanting with uncertain success the previous addition. The 1964 edition relied on the author’s very recent death, the weight of his wife’s and longtime editor’s word, and an opaque editorial process, which gave no hint that any hand but Hemingway’s had been at work, to produce its own solid authority in the minds of a reader, however flawed the truth. The mixed result of the new edition’s efforts to give itself full authenticity is a new version, but not a canonical, definitive, or “restored” one – and a strikingly different reading experience.

Critics such as Gail Elizabeth Korn have noted the great effect of a cover design on the reception of a text, pointing to the various works of George Eliot to demonstrate the manner in which the “form in which a book first appeared could be used to raise certain expectations in her readers or to influence their initial response to the content” (Korn 2000, 13). The cover of
Restored is illustrative in this way: it does not emphasize the “restored,” for while the subtitle is present, it is unobtrusive. Similarly, the cover is headed by a quotation from The Plain Dealer, speaking of the 1964 edition: “This portable Paris is a joy for the exquisitely evocative sights and smells … It’s also rich in insight into the man and his ultimate sadness.”

Below, a young Hemingway dominates in a youthful passport picture, while behind the picture and faded into semi-transparency is a reproduction of a few lines of the author’s handwriting, drawn from the manuscript for “Miss Stein Instructs.” The spine of the book reads simply, “A Moveable Feast Ernest Hemingway,” a surprisingly important factor in establishing legitimacy to the bookstore or library browser.

The dust jacket on the 1964 Jonathan Cape edition in the UK is thoroughly dominated by “HEMINGWAY,” while the first US edition features a watercolor painting of a bridge and the quiet subtitle, “Sketches of the Author’s Life in Paris in the Twenties” (Royal Books 2012; Bauman Rare Books 2012). In these cases, the message of the cover is the strength of the Hemingway brand. In contrast, the 2009 edition’s cover design imposes an emphasis on the memoir qua memoir: the cover establishes the way the author looked in his Paris youth and a sense of the words he wrote in his own hand. The Restored edition’s cover is overwhelmingly concerned with periodicity, which acts as a paratext to enforce its own authenticity by communicating to the reader that the book is very much a product of its time, and that this edition is a return to that time. While both the 1964 edition and 2009 edition are part of the Hemingway genre, they are also distinct within more granulated parts of that genre, and utilize paratexts to emphasize these different goals.

[A]s a phenomenon of its time, which it always is, a genre does not respond solely to a historically specific situation or “expectation”; it proceeds equally … by contagion, imitation, the desire to exploit or
modify a current of success and, as the vulgar phrase goes, to “jump on the bandwagon” (Genette 1997, 210).

There are two introductory essays in the new edition. Patrick Hemingway’s four-page foreword lays heavy emphasis on the revised nature of the text, comparing *A Moveable Feast* to the Bible in its defense of the production of different editions. Patrick supplies examples of various versions of Genesis 1:1-2, and describes their different effects on his experience as a reader. “From the very beginning,” he writes, echoing the Bible verses he quotes, “there have been different editions of important works of literature” (*Restored*, xi). Patrick, the author’s son by Pauline Pfeiffer Hemingway, devotes almost the whole of his introduction to an extension of this comparison, moving from Genesis to Hemingway’s religious beliefs, and then to the titular Catholic concept of a “moveable feast.” The strong implication of this religious theme, with Hemingway as God and the editors as his translators, is that special sanction is needed to meddle with sacred writ. The sanctity of a canonical work, Patrick implies, requires a strident defense of any new version. Speaking of different translations of the Bible, he writes:

Neither the Protestants nor the Catholics could turn to God for answers to such ambiguities, and such is the case with Hemingway. He died before he had decided on a preface, chapter headings, an ending, and a title for his memoir and no one … has been able to reach him so far regarding these matters. (xvii)

This foreword also contains several pointed references to Henry V, both in context of St. Crispin’s Day (a movable feast in the Catholic calendar) and in allusion to Shakespeare (“we happy few” [xiv]). The allusion puts Hemingway in the company of another author
whose works are constantly being presented in new ways, and is joined by references to James Joyce and W.H. Hudson’s *Far Away and Long Ago*, as well as (more opaquely) Jean Rhys’ *Wide Sargasso Sea* and Coleridge’s *Rime of the Ancient Mariner* (“floating along the stream like a piece of Sargasso seaweed, or, alternatively, soaring along just above it like an albatross on the southern seas” [xii]).

The Henry V allusion is even more interesting when considered as a way of constructing a regal Hemingway; Patrick later directly compares his father to Henry IV of France:

> When my father was free to marry my mother, Pauline, he agreed to convert to Roman Catholicism and undergo a course of religious instruction in Paris. … [L]ike the famous French king whose statue he mentions in the Paris memoir, he knew that Pauline was worth a mass.

(xiii)

The desired result of both the sacred and the profane intertexts in Patrick’s foreword is to establish Hemingway as a distant and powerful figure. The reader is presented with an author whose words are potent enough to be authentic, even when interpreted through multiple editions. This implication helps undercut the authority of the 1964 edition, which is presented as simply a previous translation (perhaps even an antiquated one, such as the Latin Vulgate), by presenting an obdurate ur-*Feast* and two different published interpretations, equally valid.

Patrick echoes this impression when describing the metaphorical character of movable feasts, writing “An experience first fixed in time and space or a condition like happiness or love could be afterward moved or carried with you wherever you want in space and time”
The discussion about the moving of a fixed point has direct implications for *A Moveable Feast*, which had been an ostensibly finished work but was now given new form in a new location.

The second introduction, by editor Seán Hemingway, opens with gracious acknowledgments that particularly note the helpful work of Jacqueline Tavernier-Courbin and Gerry Brenner (xvi). Seán gives a brief account of how Hemingway composed the text and sums up the changes made in the *Restored Edition*, before going on to summarize each of the additional sketches included at the end of the book. Erudite and well-written, Seán analyzes the contents of these sketches, their provenance, and their context within Hemingway’s life. In his description of the additional sketch “Secret Pleasures,” for example, Seán notes that “[t]he sketch, only preserved in a single handwritten draft, is audacious for its intimate portrayal of the author and his wife and recalls certain passages in Hemingway’s posthumous novel, *The Garden of Eden,*” citing in an endnote the work of J. Gerald Kennedy on Hemingway’s “gender trouble” (6, 240-1).

The last section of the introduction recalls the differences between Hemingway’s Paris and the contemporary city. It is important to note Seán’s unusual approach to the subject; he begins this comparison by mentioning that “[r]ecently. I was in Paris to bring a marble portrait bust of the Greek historian Herodotus from the Metropolitan Museum of Art to the Louvre for an exhibition on Babylon from the third millennium B.C. to the time of Alexander the Great and on into myth, when that great city became a place of legend and a biblical symbol of decadence” (12). This segue may seem awkward but it also functions as an indicator of Seán’s personal attainment: he is personally accomplished as an assistant curator at the museum, and he uses this portion of the paratext as a way to communicate his own abilities in the tangential field of art. This demonstration of attainment joins with a brief recollection of his personal
knowledge of the steamer trunks from the Ritz Hotel’s basement to help establish Seán’s credentials as an editor of his grandfather’s work: the message is that he is both competent and connected.

Bound in two different places in the text, there are several included pictures. Many of these pictures had been included in initial 1964 editions, and so their presence is not unusual. However, prominently added to the usual familiar images of smiling Hadley and unreadable Gertrude Stein are a different and newly-published set of images: pictures of Hemingway’s hand-corrected manuscripts and typescripts. Three of these images are of particular interest. The first image shows a page of the manuscript for “A Good Café.” Its inclusion showcases one of the more important changes between the two editions; as the caption points out, “[i]n two places Hemingway has crossed out ‘you’ and replaced it with ‘I’ and then returned to ‘you.’” The 1964 employed the first-person, while Restored (as is emphasized by the picture) has settled on the second-person, as Hemingway had left the manuscript. The penultimate image, the first page of the final typescript for “Scott Fitzgerald,” has similar implications of authority; the return to Hemingway’s preferred foreword for this sketch is another of the major changes in the new edition. The final image is a manuscript page from one of the previously unpublished sketches, “Nada y Pues Nada,” illustrating for potential readers the authenticity of the additional sketches included in Restored. In every way, the included images work to justify the new edition’s status as authentic and closer to Hemingway’s own pen than the 1964 version.

Style

The words between the covers have also changed – in some cases dramatically. There are numerous miscellaneous changes that return the text closer to Hemingway’s manuscript
version, many unremarkable. More worthy of comment are the restorations of a specific tone, omitted slang, altered cases, and dropped details. While each individual instance of these shifts in wording do not usually represent significant changes in what a reader might experience of the book, as a whole they indicate new patterns in the Restored edition, which makes this new version arguably superior in many ways as it contains richer and more developed patterns than the original Feast, even at the cost of the neatness of the original ending.

Retentions and the Inaccroachable

Many editorial decisions from the 1964 edition have been retained in the new edition, demonstrating that the 2009 edition is a palimpsest, produced not solely from the original manuscripts but also in combination with the original Feast. For example, Mary and Brague standardized the typescript’s “Turgeniev” and “Doestoeiovski,” and the nickname “Taty” to “Tatie” (Tavernier-Courbin 1991, 144). Such corrections have never received much complaint from critics and have typically been regarded as incidents of what Gerry Brenner has called “good judgement” on the part of Mary Hemingway and Harry Brague, but they are also not the words of the original manuscript, and represent an active editorial hand in the 2009 edition, which has retained them (Brenner 1982, 534).

The retained edits mimic, instead, an approach to the editing process that is perhaps more conservative than that of the original editing team, but nonetheless an active intervention to “correct” what seemed to need correcting. Each individual edit is, almost without exception, reasonable intervention by any commercial editor; it seems unlikely anyone could argue that they were improperly made. However, their presence also invites contemplation of exactly the degree to which the two editions simply lie along a spectrum of editorial intrusion.
It beggars belief to imagine that Hemingway himself might have ever permitted the publication of a book with blatant misspellings, inconsistencies, and errors of fact (except to the extent he might have shared the latter). This suggests that any process of posthumous editing will rely primarily on either commercially unappealing and harsh rules – as in a strict facsimile edition – or on some degree of guesswork, intervening with a lighter or heavier hand in accordance with considerations of aesthetics or fidelity.

An edit from the 1964 edition in “Miss Stein Instructs,” on the other hand, is somewhat different, as the contemporary slang is restored to the manuscript’s terms. In “Miss Stein Instructs,” the phrase “too uneducated” is returned to “what we would now call a square” (28). The colloquialism emphasizes the writing process rather than the scene being described, which is perhaps why it was removed from Feast. In fact, this change constitutes one of the only shifts in the 2009 text that yields a less evocative text – a book that is less capable of allowing a reader to immerse himself with intimate closeness into the attitude and sights of Hemingway’s long-ago Paris.

Such a break in the scene, however, is singular. Far more often, restorations of Hemingway’s manuscript produces a book that better evokes the depicted scene. For example, in “Une Génération Perdue,” a “fiasco” has been replaced by the more frank “balls-up” (62). The 1964 edition’s censorship is actually amusing, considering that, one sketch ago, Hemingway and Gertrude Stein had been discussing those stories of his that were too vulgar – too “inaccrochable” - to be publish. Simply because of modern standards of vulgarity, it seems unlikely that anyone today would repeat the original emendation, and while Hemingway himself had frequently edited out vulgarity, he just as frequently complained about such necessities. Writing to editor Maxwell Perkins in 1926 about The Sun Also Rises, Hemingway had remarked that "one should never use words which shock altogether out of
their own value or connotation – such a word as for instance fart would stand out on a page …
in such a manner that it would be entirely exaggerated and false and overdone in emphasis" (Bruccoli 1996, 43).

Likewise, in “With Pascin at the Dôme,” the dark girl with the “falsely fragile depravity” who sits with Pascin is now also plainly described as a “lesbian who also liked men,” a phrase cut by the original editing team (Hemingway 2009, 84). It may have seemed necessary to remove this frank detail in 1964, but there would have been no justification for leaving it out in the new edition. An exchange near the end of the sketch has also been added back to the text, when the dark girl replies to a taunt about the "beautiful Nordic types" at the Café with the crack that she "like[s] it very much at Chez Viking" (86). This repetition of the just-spoken "Chez Viking" joke alters the reading of the sketch’s conclusion somewhat, making Pascin more charming as he departs with a rakish reference to "Chez Les Vikings."

**Tone and Grammar**

Hemingway had spent many years developing the peculiar tone of his writing. Understated and with a tactical deployment of slang, it is easy to roughly imitate, but difficult to equal. For this reason and because of the author’s aforementioned dedication to finding an exactly correct wording, any editor would be well-advised to carefully scrutinize changes they make that alter the characteristic “sound” of Hemingway. However, this introduces a difficult question when an editor considers unfinished and experimental posthumous work: should they imitate the “sound” of what has been previously published, or should they attempt to divine the intended pitch for the text in question? In the case of Feast, Mary Hemingway and Harry Brague seem to have thought the former, perhaps guided by their previous editing work alongside the author. Accordingly, they eliminated words they thought too frequently used
(replacing them with synonyms), shifted grammar liberally, and generally tried to conform the text to their expectations.

As one example, in the 2009 edition’s “Hunger Was Good Discipline,” two uses of “bad” as an adverb, when discussing how Hemingway felt after Hadley’s careless loss of his work, have been edited to “badly.”

… Chink had taught me never to discuss casualties so I told O’Brien not to feel so badly. … I was going to start writing stories again I said and, as I said it, only trying to lie so that he would not feel so badly, I knew that it was true (Restored, 70)

The previous use of "bad," chosen by Mary and Brague, seems to have been intended to emphasize the strength of the hurt done to Hemingway; with all his work destroyed, he cannot even muster appropriate grammar. But this is not reflective of Hemingway’s final typescript (Tavernier-Courbin 1991, 151) and furthermore Hemingway’s habitual switching between the two forms clearly demonstrates his command over both versions of the word, as he used them for different purposes. While Hemingway used both “bad” and “badly” as adverbs frequently throughout his career, he seems to have favored the former when referring to a physical ailment, as in “After the Storm” (“He hurt my foot bad” [Hemingway 1987, 283]), whereas emotional hurts are described with better grammar, as in “Fathers and Sons”: “[T]he earliest times when things had gone badly was not good remembering” (371). The change is interesting and less colloquial, elevating slightly his discussion of loss – the change to “badly” makes the hurt less raw and Hemingway’s tone rather less harsh, in consequence.
Another change between the original *Feast* and *Restored* – one that is not as restorative – bears special mention. In “A False Spring,” the author’s account of the end of his time as a spectator at the horse races, Hemingway recounts one particularly traumatic race, when they had a large sum of money riding on “Chèvre d’Or.” In *Feast*, the tragedy is summed in typical laconic style:

My wife had a horse one time at Auteil named Chèvre d’Or that was a hundred and twenty to one and leading by twenty lengths when he fell at the last jump with enough savings on him to keep us six months. We tried never to think of that. We were ahead on that year until Chèvre d’Or (50).

*Restored* here makes a change that is controversial and not a restoration of the manuscript:

My wife had a horse one time at Auteil named Chèvre d’Or that was a hundred and twenty to one and leading by twenty lengths when he fell at the last jump with enough savings on him to —. We tried never to think to do what. We were ahead on that year but Chèvre d’Or would have —. We didn’t think about Chèvre d’Or (42).

As in other areas, this change is one that makes the language of the text more vivid and less formal. The choice by Sean to select the awkward device employed in an earlier draft – an elliptical dash or eclipsis (Henry 2000) – is perhaps an attempt to capture the gravity of the moment as Hemingway attempts to transcribe the speechless despair of a big, bad bet.

Tavernier-Courbin notes the extraordinary messiness of the manuscript at this point, though; the typescript read "have paid for a trip" rather than "keep us six months," but this clause was
struck out and left blank with an eclipsis on the typescript, perhaps explaining the confusion (Tavernier-Courbin 1991, 129).

A further sentence was also edited away in Feast and Restored both: "We went out to Enghien; the small, lovely, and larcenous track that was the home of the outsider" (1991, 187). In the 1964 edition, this sentence was relocated to the preceding paragraph, prior to Chevre d’Or, and Seán Hemingway questionably retains this edit. In the process of achieving a more conventional set-up to the anecdote – setting precedes story – Feast’s editors lost much of the point of the episode. Hadley and Hemingway’s departure from the dramatic and tragic Auteuil track and adoption of the pretty but larcenous Enghien is a moral tale: racing is not a money-making or glorious pastime, but rather it is a beautiful theft from oneself. Hemingway’s recognition of this fact, after a moment of high drama at an honest track, foreshadows the next sketch, wherein he quits the hobby altogether. Restored’s retention of this edit is unfortunate.

Such changes are not the norm, thankfully for the text. In two places, Hemingway’s run-on and longer sentences, characteristic of his writing and important to the book’s effectiveness, have been restored from Feast’s version. Tavernier-Courbin noted and praised Mary Hemingway and Harry Brague’s decision to cut some of these passages, calling them “long, convoluted, and ineffective” (172). This decision is strictly a matter of taste, however, for Hemingway had frequently employed such expansive length. The technique was especially powerful when contrasted with terseness. Hemingway had long made a study of how to use this sort of unorthodox sentence structure to achieve an effect. “Summer People” (published posthumously in 1972’s The Nick Adams Stories) uses a long series of comma-spliced clauses to communicate a breathless excitement in thought: “He had once drunk a bottle of milk and peeled and eaten a banana underwater to show off, had to have weights,
though, to hold him down, if there was a ring at the bottom, something he could get his arm through, he could do all right” (Hemingway 1987, 499). Just as the manuscript version of this segment of "Summer People" was truncated into shorter sentences upon publication in The Nick Adams Stories by editor Philip Young to conform in declarative sentences, as Susan Seitz has noted (Seitz 1993, 83-4), so too Mary Hemingway and Harry Brague broke up some of Hemingway’s more rambling sentences. The original punctuation of these passages, as now returned in Restored, sacrifices some amount of easy readability in exchange for a linkage of ideas in their series of thoughts and asides.

In one example from “Miss Stein Instructs,” a negative insertion is restored to its place in the middle of a mostly positive sentiment, rather than the more staccato and harsh 1964 version. The position of the first edition’s period is marked with an asterisk.

But we liked Miss Stein and her friend, although the friend was frightening,* and the paintings and the cakes are the eau-de-vie were truly wonderful (Restored, 24).

In another example, from the end of the same sketch, the end is now one long ramble of happiness, concluding the passage with a breathless last spree.

I was not at all sad when I got home to the rue Cardinal Lemoine and told my newly acquired knowledge to my wife* and we were happy in the night with our own knowledge we already had and other knowledge we had acquired in the mountains (Restored, 30).

Lastly, a final aspect of the tone that is changed between the two texts is in Hemingway’s portrayal of himself. Throughout the book, Hemingway heavily emphasizes his poverty, though Bernice Kert’s 1983 The Hemingway Women explains that the couple would
have been able to live very comfortably on Hadley’s wealth alone, even without supplemental income from journalism. Hemingway had never been very comfortable with the awkward fact of his wives’ wealth, even though his life with Pauline, for example, was spent in a Key West house her family had purchased. In *Restored*, a mention of Hemingway’s advance for *In Our Time* in "The Man Who Was Marked for Death" that would have undermined his romantic past is returned to the text, reflective of the typescript: “The advance I had received from an American publisher on my first full-length book of short stories was two hundred dollars and supplemented by loans and savings it meant a winter to ski and write in the Vorarlberg” (97). Perhaps concerned that this would seem too luxurious, and accordingly would undercut the theme of a struggling young writer being jilted out of a badly-needed literary prize – the topic of the sketch – Mary and Brague had cut the sentence.

**Second Person**

In the new edition, several instances where Hemingway had used the second person are restored to the text (Trogdon 2009, 29). The restoration of the second person occurs thirty-three times throughout the new edition, most frequently in the first sketch, as well as in the later sketches “The End of an Avocation,” “Une Génération Perdue,” and “Winter in Schruns” (29-45). In several of these locations, it proves for a slightly more evocative text, but this effect is most pronounced in the last sketch’s description of skiing: “your ankles locked,

---

7 In the comparison of *A Moveable Feast* and *A Moveable Feast: the Restored Edition*, I have relied on Robert W. Trogdon’s 2009 “*A Moveable Feast: the Restored Edition*: a Review and a Collation of Differences,” which contains a machine comparison detailing the 373 differences between the two texts, as an extraordinarily helpful guide.
you running so low, leaning into the speed, dropping forever and forever in the silent hiss of the crisp powder” (122).

The original decision by Mary Hemingway and Harry Brague to change these passages to a more typical form (the first person) is, perhaps, understandable. The use of the second person was unusual in fiction of the time, and remains so; in the creative writing magazine *The Writer*, writer Mary Miller suggests that this infrequency ensures that the device “immediately catches the readers’ attention” (Miller 2012, 13). It’s a risky proposition if done badly, as it can awkwardly alert the reader to the process of extradiegesis. Arthur Plotnik elaborates:

The very distinctiveness of second-person narrative is one of its liabilities. Being rare in fiction, the “you” voice commits the sin of drawing attention to itself – to technique – and away from story and character (Plotnik 2007, 15).

Nonetheless, Hemingway had previously employed this device when he wished to emphasize the sensory aspects of a recollected scene. The 1933 story “Fathers and Sons,” for example, utilizes the second person when Nick Adams reminisces about an afternoon tryst (“hemlock needles stuck against your belly” [Hemingway 1987, 376]). In the sensual description of physical activity of “Winter in Schruns,” the second person is used in the same manner, and with equal effectiveness, drawing the reader into the brisk exertion and speed of the mountain run.

The restorations in “A Good Café,” however, while less dramatic than in the skiing episode, still work effectively to pull the reader into the sketch – a goal that is particularly important in these passages, which include the book’s third sentence in this atmospheric
beginning to a memoir of a different age. On the next page, too, the shift yields that “you had a room on the top floor where you worked”: a passage that identifies the reader with the author (Restored, 4). In Tavernier-Courbin’s words, the reader “participates in his life” (Tavernier-Courbin 1991, 174) with this phrasing.

Scholarship has yielded some insight into such mechanisms. Narrative apostrophe,\(^8\) Joshua Parker explains,

> allows the emergence of a blank textual figure with which readers often feel encouraged to identify. ... Perhaps even more memorable is the moment in which we can say not, “That’s me!” but instead, “it could be …” - something which second person texts, much like slips into second person in oral narration, would seem to promote. As a form of apostrophe, second person is usually also written in present tense, further increasing the reader’s sense of immediacy (Parker 2011, 7)

The difference in style, however, is less pronounced in the other sketches. The handful of restorations of the second person in “The End of an Avocation,” “Une Génération Perdue,” and scattered other single incidences do not produce noticeable changes in themselves, except perhaps to effect an aggregate shift in overall tone. Still, their presence prompts me to note that Hemingway was a ruthless editor of his own work, and quested for the *bon mot* of his own sparse style. While I have addressed slight changes in tone addressed in this section and

---

\(^8\) Irene Kacandes’s 1990 dissertation at Harvard, which focused on the use of the second person in fiction, identified a spectrum of “reversability” in its use, according to the degree to which a reader and the author are actually in communication and might figuratively “exchange roles.” The manner in which Hemingway employs the second person in these passages is the extreme of total reversability, what Kacandes called “narrative apostrophe” (a term borrowed from classical philology) (3).
in later ones, many other alterations that return to the manuscript’s wording are so minor or isolated that it would be folly to attempt to comment on them all, much less try to litigate out their merit. My hesitation to make the attempt, however, does not imply that they are trivial when considered *en masse*, even if the exact flavor of their change cannot be easily articulated.

**Structure**

The larger-scale changes to *A Moveable Feast: The Restored Edition* include the reordering of the sketches, the demotion of one sketch to a supplemental “Additional Paris Sketches,” the separation of two other sketches into constituent parts, the near-elimination of the preface, the inclusion of seven previously unpublished sketches, and the addition of a final “Fragments” section. Far more than the incremental alterations from sketch to sketch, these amendments to the book’s structure alter the text significantly. Figure 1 illustrates these shifts in structure.
Fig. 1: Changes in the Arrangement of Sketches Between *Feast* and *Restored.*

1964

Preface

A Good Café at the Place St.-Michel
Miss Stein Instructs
*"Une Generation Perdue"
Shakespeare and Company
People of the Sea
A False Spring
The End of an Avocation
Hunger Was Good Discipline
Ford Madox Ford and the Devil's Disciple
Birth of a New School
With Pascin at the Dôme
Ezra Pound and His Bel Esprit
A Strange Enough Ending
The Man Who Was Marked for Death
Evan Shipman at the Lilies
An Agent of Evil
Scott Fitzgerald
Hawks Do Not Share
A Matter of Measurements
There Is Never Any End to Paris

2009

Foreword

A Good Café at the Place St.-Michel
Miss Stein Instructs
Shakespeare and Company
People of the Sea
A False Spring
The End of an Avocation
*"Une Generation Perdue"
Hunger Was Good Discipline
Ford Madox Ford and the Devil's Disciple
With Pascin at the Dôme
Ezra Pound and the Measuring Worm
A Strange Enough Ending
The Man Who Was Marked for Death
Evan Shipman at the Lilies
An Agent of Evil
Winter in Schwans
Scott Fitzgerald
Hawks Do Not Share
A Matter of Measurements

Additional Paris Sketches
Birth of a New School
Ezra Pound and His Bel Esprit
On Writing in the First Person
Secret Pleasures
A Strange Fight Club
The Acid Smell of Lies
The Education of Mr. Bumby
Scott and His Parisian Chauffeur
*The Pilot Fish and the Rich*
Nada Y Pues Nada

Fragments

Appendix I: Concordance of Item Number for Additional Paris Sketches
Notes
The shift of “Une Génération Perdue” from the third position to the seventh position turns out to have been a pivotal change in the patterns of the book, surprising in its magnitude, as I will discuss later. It is also representative of many attempts to restore the manuscript’s choices and wording: in many respects, the 2009 edition is much closer to the final manuscript than the 1964 edition.

On the other hand, as can be seen, no material has been excluded from the new edition. “Ezra Pound and His Bel Esprit” and “There Is Never Any End to Paris” have had much material edited away, but this material is including in the “Additional Paris Sketches,” while even the Preface material (disjointed and in short chunks) has been retained and published as “Fragments.” This has immediate implications when considered as evidence of a goal of completionism, rather than authorial intent: the Restored edition has aimed to provide everything, not just what Séan guesses Hemingway might have wanted.

**Despotic/Nurturing: Stein**

Relatively few scholars have found the overall structure of the book to be worthy of comment. Scholarly summaries of *Feast* do not mention the subject, preferring instead to discuss individual sketches and their veracity (Oliver 2007, 259-63; Waldhorn 1972, 212-220). Gerry Brenner provides some illumination on the dearth of criticism about this subject: Hemingway’s intended structure, he argues, was far more interesting and worthy of comment, but it was disrupted by the editorial decisions of the 1964 edition (Brenner 1982, 531-3).

Brenner identifies two specific patterns in the original text:

Had Mary Hemingway deferred to the “finished” typescript and left out “Birth of a New School,” it would be clear that the book loops back to
Gertrude Stein twice, highlighted as she is in Hemingway’s “Chapter Two,” “Chapter Seven,” and “Chapter Twelve” of Item 188 [in the JFK Library archives]. Her recurring image at those five-chapter intervals lessens the impression of the book as a randomly arranged gallery of portraits. Even more, it better emphasizes, through delayed repetition, her role as adversary, as the “bad mother” of Hemingway’s Paris years. …

The second pattern that Mary Hemingway’s rearranged sequence obscured was the contrast that Hemingway achieves by juxtaposing chapters on Gertrude Stein and Sylvia Beach. In his “finished” typescript “Shakespeare and Company” (his “Chapter Three”) follows “Miss Stein Instructs,” and “Hunger Was a Good Discipline” (his “Chapter Eight”) follows “Une Génération Perdue.” This alternation silently contrasts two mother images, the dogmatic, highhanded and imperious Gertrude Stein against the tolerant, nurturing and modest Sylvia Beach. The rearranged chapters simply blur this pattern (531-2).

Jacqueline Tavernier-Courbin concurs, calling this alternation “the pattern of despotic women versus nurturing women,” and calling attention to the conclusion of the manuscript arrangement with the Fitzgerald sketches, which feature Zelda Fitzgerald, “the epitome of the destructive, castrating woman” (1991, 175-6).

The 1964 edition of A Moveable Feast is instead based around a single narrative arc, a remembrance of an idyll from the past. To the extent that the despotic/nurturing pattern remains, it is badly blurred. The 1964 arrangement has two successive sketches about Stein, "Miss Stein Instructs" and "Une Génération Perdue," which establish the legendary author as a
A careful examination of the three sketches, as placed by Hemingway and restored by the 2009 edition, reveals the development of the pattern which unfolds over the first two-thirds of the text. In "Miss Stein Instructs," Stein is pleasant and only mildly wrongheaded. Hemingway condescendingly portrays himself as a very wise and respectful young man of the world, but also takes pains to describe Stein’s intelligent conversation, her wonderful taste in paintings, and her kindness to him. This Stein may be lazy in serious writing, and a bit naive, but she still has much to offer in the way of insights and cleverness. Accompanied by the sketch’s earlier explications of his new ideas on writing, Stein is established as an elder personification of literary authority: bold and ground-breaking in her own way, and certainly insightful, though she is carefully segregated from being the source of Hemingway’s own ideas, as the author pushed back against the common judgments of history and Stein’s own accounts. In all, "Miss Stein Instructs" illustrates a beginning to their relationship that is fond and mixedly respectful (although not that of a mentor and protégé).

“Une Génération Perdue,” positioned in the Restored Edition four sketches later in the text, evolves into not only further attacks on Stein’s professionalism and a further defense of Hemingway’s independence, but also a beautiful moment of bitterness in its conclusion. Resentful of her application of the “lost Génération” label, he juxtaposes that judgment with gritty memories of driving in the ambulance corps in Italy. Stein’s armchair criticism is
contrasted with hard specifics of a hard time - “how the last [ambulances] were driven over the mountainside empty, so they could be replaced by big Fiats with a good H-shift and metal-to-metal brakes” (31). The passage belittles Stein, especially when Hemingway goes on to link her and himself to the figure of the Napoleonic general, Marshal Ney: Hemingway concludes that while she was hopelessly wrong, "I would do my best to serve her and see she gets justice for the good work she had done as long as I can. But the hell with her lost-Génération talk and all the easy, dirty labels" (31). The implication was that Stein was doomed and that her war for relevance was a lost cause in the end, but Hemingway himself – like the heroic Ney – would fight in the “rearguard” and work to preserve her reputation.

The attacks in this sketch, and many of the other stings on Stein, are almost certainly ripostes made in response to her assertions and a widespread belief that she had mentored Hemingway, a belief that Hemingway had long hated. Stein herself had pointedly made such claims in her 1933 autobiography, *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*. In just one example from the text, she pronounces sharp wisdom upon him:

> Observation and construction make imagination, that is granting the possession of imagination, is what she has taught many young writers. Once when Hemingway wrote in one of his stories that Gertrude Stein always knew what was good in a Cézanne, she looked at him and said, Hemingway, remarks are not literature.(1990, 76)

Elsewhere in *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*, Stein suggests that she essentially invented Hemingway the writer. Daniel Pollack-Pelzner summarizes:

> What good work he had produced was due to her tutelage: she told him to begin his writing over again after he produced bad description; she
taught him the importance of writing a clear sentence, she introduced him to bullfighting; she allowed him to copy her manuscript of *The Making of Americans* so he could learn from her style; and she valued him as a pupil because he took training. (2010, 71)

An unpublished parody by Hemingway, entitled “The Autobiography of Alice B. Hemingway” and numerous personal letters testify to Hemingway’s rage at these claims, but perhaps his ultimate victory would come in *A Moveable Feast*, which presents an enduring vision of Stein as imperious and naïve.

The damage to Stein’s character is rendered even more evident, gradual, and cutting in the 2009 edition: Stein transitions over the course of the *Restored Edition* from being merely an intellectual in any ivory tower into being insultingly facile in her thought. Further, Hemingway identifies her with Napoleon, in a manner that held him as most famous for his concussive defeats. In the first edition, there is little transition; the successive placement of the two sketches gives simply a larger composite portrait of Stein, taken as a whole. Charles M. Oliver’s summary of “Une Génération Perdue,” for example, describes it as “continu[ing] with his memory of meeting with Stein in her apartment” - note that Oliver refers to a singular memory that is continued from “Miss Stein Instructs” (Oliver 2007, 261)

Further exacerbating the changes are the restorations of some little material cut during the original editing process. In “Miss Stein Instructs,” Stein’s conversation is described in the 2009 edition as “very intelligent,” and she gives the well-received advice that Hemingway must devote himself only to his writing, and her need for publication is now phrased in terms of the necessity of “true happiness of creation” (*Restored* 25, 27). These passages, perhaps
eliminated by Mary and Brague for the sake of a consistent picture of Stein under the original arrangement, produce an initial portrayal of her that is softer and more positive.

Similar shifts have been made within the text of “Une Génération Perdue,” with the insertion of discursive thoughts - “She loved to talk about people and places and things and food” (58), and Stein’s delight in hearing “gallows-humor” is softened with the qualification that she “did not like to hear really bad nor tragic things” (57). These restorations maintain the pattern, as Hemingway’s view of Stein becomes more patronizing – a character unfamiliar with the real world, sloppy in her understanding of its problems (and thus delighted to hear jokes about its darker side) while secluded from its harshness (and thus unwilling to endure discussions of true tragedies).

In “A Strange Enough Ending,” a further four sketches further on, the final break with Stein occurs and the end of the pattern arrives. Overcome with disgust when he overhears Stein speaking intimately to her lover, Alice B. Toklas, Hemingway flees in embarrassment, and while they became friends once more “in order not to be stuffy or righteous,” it was not the same (119). Tellingly, Hemingway says that she “got to look like a Roman emperor” - implying that her evolution in his eyes, from naivete to despotism, was now complete (119). Great emphasis is made of Stein’s comparative wealth, a trait that had only lurked in the background of the previous two Stein sketches: a maidservant shows Hemingway into the house and pours him a drink, and in a moment of paralipsis, Hemingway compares Stein to the villainous, faceless rich, while setting himself in parallel to Pablo Picasso:

She had asked me to come and visit... [b]ut Hadley and I had other plans and other places where we want to go. Naturally you say nothing about this, but you can still hope to go and then it is impossible. It was
something that we never learned. … Much later Picasso told me that he always promised the rich to come when they asked him because it made them so happy and then something would happen and he would be unable to appear. But that had nothing to do with Miss Stein and he said it about other people (91).

Aided by the restored arrangement of the Stein chapters, in five-sketch intervals (second, seventh, and twelfth), this sort of cutting condescension grows over time. Its climax ceases to be a simple moment of homophobic disgust on Hemingway’s part, and instead becomes the embittered demise of the intelligent figure in an ivory tower, who has transformed in the portrayal, in parallel with Hemingway’s own growth of knowledge, into a dictator in a gilded temple. The resentment becomes all the more keen with the restoration of some previously-removed text to the end of “A Strange Enough Ending,” as Hemingway muses during the close of the sketch:

   It never occurred to me until many years later that anyone could hate anyone because they had learned to write conversation from that novel that started off with the quotation from the garage-keeper. But it was really much more complicated than that (93).

The reference, of course, is to The Sun Also Rises (whose epigraph had been under such dispute in “Une Génération Perdue”).

   Interestingly, however, this new and stinging sentence had been added to the heavily-corrected carbon copy of the typescript by Hemingway, but was later crossed out (Tavernier-Courbin 1991, 156). Mary Hemingway and Harry Brague’s choice in this regard is understandable, as Hemingway appeared to wish to leave out this attack and the reference is
not immediately accessible to new or casual readers of Hemingway. Its vitriol would also risk making Hemingway seem petty for seeking one final attack on Stein.

Less understandable, on the other hand, is Seán Hemingway’s decision to over-rule his grandfather and return this final attack to the end of the sketch. As with the emendations made in the 2009 *Feast* to the Chev d’Or episode of “A False Spring,” this is an editorial decision not supported by either precedent in the 1964 edition or Hemingway’s own drafts. It is possible, of course, that Seán felt that the manuscripts really did indicate that Hemingway wished to include this sentence, and has only interpreted the messy draft differently from past readers, such as Harry Brague, Mary Hemingway, or Tavernier-Courbin. Setting such a question aside, though, the individual merit of the change deserves scrutiny: what is the effect on the text of this change, made by Seán’s hand?

The change probably makes the sketch less effective, and contributes little to the revelation of the pattern previously discussed. The final paragraph of Hemingway’s manuscript and the 1964 *Feast* already contains a doubling-back on itself, as Hemingway asserts that he and Stein tried to make friends, but could never truly do so. The addition of the new lines, and their own self-refutation - “it was really much more complicated than that” - simply seems confused and abrupt. It is an ineffective addition, and a mystery.

While Stein’s part is changed significantly and her role in initial pattern made clear, there has been less change with her counterpart in the despotic/nurturing contrast, Sylvia Beach. Beach, the owner of the Shakespeare and Company bookstore, generously allows Hemingway to borrow books on credit and has several pleasant and supportive chats with the young writer. She is very unlike Gertrude Stein.

The contrast begins with Beach’s initial appearance in the third sketch, “Shakespeare and Company,” immediately following Stein’s “Miss Stein Instructs,” and continues with
Beach’s reappearance in “Hunger Was Good Discipline,” immediately following Stein’s “Une Génération Perdue.” Beach does not re-enter the text, aside from brief (always positive) mentions, but the pattern is easily evident, especially in the 2009 arrangement. Beach is generous and kind without being cloying, offering to lend books or money, chiding Hemingway for neglecting himself, and encouraging him to pursue his writing.

The wording in respective descriptions makes the differences obvious: Beach is said to have "had a lively, very sharply cut face," very unlike Stein, who is called "very big" with "thick immigrant hair" (*Restored*, 31;24). Beach is a "small animal" or "young girl," whereas Stein is a "northern Italian peasant woman" (31;24). Stein "insisted," while Beach only "teased" (61; 67). Certainly, Stein dominates the pattern, and has many more lines devoted to Hemingway’s painstaking portrait, but the cycle is apparent: the two women represent the first stage of a gradual descent on Hemingway’s part, as he comes to terms with the world and sheds his innocence. This pattern is continued and completed in another pair of contrasts: Pauline and Hadley.

**Fallen/Innocent: Pauline and Hadley**

The emerging figure of Pauline, Hemingway’s second wife, is the other half of a pattern that was almost completely eliminated from the 1964 edition by Mary Hemngway and Harry Brague. While assigned by Tavernier-Courbin to the same "despotic/nurturing" pattern as Stein and Beach, the critical work on such texts as *The Garden of Eden* and a close look at the text suggest that a more suitable set of adjectives might be “fallen/innocent.” Pauline, the “other woman,” is matched against an innocent Hadley. Two changes have made this pattern clearer: the reduction of the constructed final sketch of the 1964 *Feast*, “There Is Never Any End to Paris,” to its constituent “Winter in Schruns” and “The Pilot Fish and the Rich,” and
the restoration of two pivotal mentions of Pauline to “The End of an Avocation” and “Winter in Schruns.”

The 2009 edition’s “Winter in Schruns” has much material restored to it from the manuscript – sections dropped for clarity when assembling “There Is Never Any End to Paris” - while the unfinished “The Pilot Fish and the Rich” has been demoted to “Additional Paris Sketches.” Due to this major surgery, “Winter in Schruns” is the most-changed sketch in Restored, and Robert W. Trogdon’s collation of differences shows 96 different changes between the two now-separate sketches, including several changes to multiple paragraphs (2009, 40-5). The task of sorting out the nature of these edits is complicated by the fact that “Winter in Schruns” was seemingly the most difficult sketch for Hemingway to write, with dozens of pages and multiple drafts marked up and frequently contradicting each other.

Despite the obfuscating nature of this confusion, it seems clear that the pattern, present in the manuscript and absent from the 1964 edition, carefully establishes the intrusion of Pauline into an intimate duo – and the resulting destruction of innocence.

Hemingway’s preoccupation with gender and innocence has become increasingly clear in recent years, particularly with intelligent scholarship on The Garden of Eden. Critics such as Robert Fleming and Susan Seitz have long noted the harm done to the book’s theme by Tom Jenks (Fleming 1989; Seitz 1993), and critics have identified Hemingway’s subversive ideas of gender that he developed late in his life (Kennedy 1991; Altman 2010). The Garden of Eden was an attempt to tell the story of “the happiness of the Garden that a man must lose” (Seitz 1993, 164); during the evolution (or devolution) of the protagonist’s relationship, he and his wife begin to experiment with androgyny, cutting their hair to the same length and engaging in sexual games. This theme is only made more powerful and explicit in the unpublished version, as K.J. Peters’ “The Thematic Integrity of The Garden of Eden”
discovered, with the addition of a Rodin statue as a central symbol of androgyny (Peters 2012). Seitz summarizes the problem:

As the story advances, Catherine begins to fail in her attempt at a metamorphosis into a new identity, and she needs David to recreate her identity for her. Jenks’ cut of the Rodin statue diminishes this theme and results in the reader’s view of Catherine as simply a destructive Eve who is responsible for the lovers’ fall from paradise. (Seitz 1993, 186)

This revelation helpfully parallels what Hemingway appears to have been attempting in Feast. Just as The Garden of Eden uses David and Catherine’s exploration of themselves to highlight a central theme – the human search for knowledge and an inevitable fall from ignorant bliss – so too was Hemingway moving towards a similar theme in A Moveable Feast with the despotic/nurturing pattern in the first half of the book, as the text returned three times to Gertrude Stein and the author grows progressively more disillusioned. The intelligent but naive authority becomes a brilliant despot, and finally an ancient dictator. Hemingway grew into knowledge and confidence, and accordingly lost the innocence of his Paris youth, the time when he looked at the good pictures at the Luxembourg museum with a sharpening awareness brought on by hunger. The pattern remains in the 1964 edition, but it is less obvious and poorly-paced. It lacks the contrast of Hemingway’s original arrangement, as restored in the Restored Edition, and the major cause of this flaw is the excision of Pauline.

It is certainly true that Pauline’s removal from “The End of an Avocation,” “Hawks Do Not Share,” and “Winters in Schruns,” the sketches in which she appeared with varying degrees of prominence, made the book simpler and more traditional, but such an edit is difficult to justify. While the manuscript was very messy and much amended, Pauline’s
presence was not an element that received revision during the drafting process of these sketches (Tavernier-Courbin 1991, 149), and so Mary and Brague’s removal of her appearances is questionable. Gerry Brenner considered it judicious, arguing that “mention of her would have required information that Hemingway had not provided” (Brenner 1982, 534), but this may have been Hemingway’s intention – a delicate circumlocution.

While the author did a great deal of editing on “The End of an Avocation,” he does not appear to have struggled with the inclusion of Pauline or to have ever rethought it (Tavernier-Courbin 1991, 148-9). Indeed, while this edit to “The End of an Avocation” and the other mention of Pauline, restored in “Hawks Do Not Share,” have been considered to be oversights, or to lack necessary context that Hemingway never managed to write, there is no evidence to support these claims. On the contrary, Hemingway frequently referenced places and people without seemingly necessary context, and to good effect.

In both versions of “A False Spring,” mention is made of both a “Mrs. Gangeswich” who once cooked for them and their friend “Chink” (Restored, 46). Chink, a character who grows more prominent in the sketch, is later carefully described as a “professional soldier” whom Hemingway had “met first in Italy and [who] had been [his] best friend for a long time” (47), but no context is ever provided for the hospitable Mrs. Gangeswich. Her mention and inclusion in the text, however, is clearly not a mistake on Hemingway’s part: she was never going to re-appear later in the book. Her mention instead serves a different purpose: Hadley speaks of her during a private discussion of a past excursion to Italy, and the reader is intended to be excluded. It is a shared memory between two lovers, and it emphasizes their intimacy. It strengthens the reader’s perception of the strength and depth of their relationship. The mentions of Pauline, again seemingly without purpose, are revealed under close
examination to have a specific utility for the reader: a deliberately subtle introduction of the “other woman,” who eventually crashes onto the scene in full force.

Pauline’s first appearance in the new edition is in “The End of an Avocation.” This sketch, which describes the end of Hemingway’s interest in horse-racing (which he and Hadley are described as enjoying greatly together), and projects forward to the interest that would replace it: watching bicycle racing. Recalling a later time, Hemingway mentions that enjoyment of the bike races “came to be a big part of our lives later when the first part of Paris was broken up” (54). The pronoun “our” is, perhaps, ambiguous upon re-reading. This aspect of the sketch lends special weight to another bit of foreshadowing now present in the *Restored Edition*: the presence of the never-before-seen Pauline with Hemingway at some point in the future at the cement track of the Parc du Prince near Auteil, where they see the “great rider Ganay” tumble from his bicycle (55). It seems exceedingly unlikely that this latter foreshadowing was simply an oversight or that it might mystify a reader: it is clever and effective.

The second restoration of Pauline to the text, in the 2009 edition’s penultimate chapter, when she notices Zelda Fitzgerald’s madness (“Nobody except Pauline thought anything of it at the time” [186]) works in the same manner, coming as it does in the wake of the breakup of Hemingway and Hadley’s marriage, an event which no reader could have missed in its heartbroken rendition in “Winters in Schruns.” Pauline is not explained or described, but her presence is an unmistakable explanation: this, Hemingway is telling the reader, is the woman who made me wiser and less innocent.

The restoration of other material, concerning Hadley, is set as counterpoint to Pauline. Hadley Richardson Hemingway is depicted without flaw: Carlos Baker justly describes her as the heroine of *A Moveable Feast* (Baker 1972). While other characters are undercut even as
they are warmly praised, Hemingway depicts a life with Hadley that is perfectly simpatico and loving. He had often attempted to write of couples in love, but had his greatest success in *A Farewell to Arms* and its account of Catherine and Frederic. His other attempts were either not stories about copacetic lovers (as with the emasculated protagonist of *The Sun Also Rises* or Nick Adams’ relationships) or were hobbled by a steadily-increasing age discrepancy that mimicked Hemingway’s own infatuations. Hemingway, in his devotion to writing from real-world experience, had only once attempted to – or been capable of – successfully depicting a strong marriage of equals. In *A Moveable Feast*, however, Hadley and Hemingway speak with the warm certainty of feeling of two people in love; when Hemingway proposes a trip, Hadley fondly replies, “I want to go right away. Didn’t you know?” (*Feast* 7)

This intimacy is retained wholly in Mary and Brague’s editing of *Feast*, but the cobbling-together of “There Is Never Any End to Paris” transforms the text into a simple remembrance of things lost. In the 1964 edition, Hemingway and Hadley are deliriously happy through the first half of the book. In “Hunger Was Good Discipline,” at the midpoint of the text, Hadley loses all of Hemingway’s writing on the infamous train incident: “[E]verything I had written was stolen in Hadley’s suitcase that time at the Gare de Lyon when she was bringing the manuscripts down to me at Lausanne as a surprise. … She had put in the originals, the typescripts and the carbons” (*Restored* 69). From this point on, there is an unseen descent, and the book ends with a final chapter in which the break has come; Hemingway is already reminiscing about what had been. The arrangement is uncomplex, traditional, and satisfying. The review in *The New York Times* in 1964 aptly summarizes the efficacy of this arrangement:
Then, in the final section, bearing the lyric title, “There is Never Any End to Paris,” the purport of the book is revealed. By a species of literary architectonics at which Flaubert would have cried “Bravo!” this masterly artist arranges to give unity to his book, plead his case with the wife he left 30-odd years before, and at the same time curse from the grave (as it turns out) the small handful of readers who will know at whom his finger points – in particular two individuals: “the pilot fish” who led him to “the rich” and caused (he says) the corruption of his purity as artist and estrangement from his wife, and "another rich" to whom he felt he owed a grim legacy (Galantiere 1964).

While disapproving of the creation of “There Is Never Any End to Paris,” Tavernier-Courbin agreed on its neatness, noting that this particular edit “does not in itself affect the nurturing/destructive-women pattern … moreover, it has the important advantage of functioning as a parallel chapter to ‘A Good Café on the Place St.-Michel’” (1991, 176).

While it is very pat, however, the Restored Edition vindicates Hemingway’s craft (and Gerry Brenner’s insight) by demonstrating that this arc is not lost when the picture is complicated by the addition of the Stein/Beach despotic/nurturing pattern, or by the inclusion of Pauline. Rather, it is enriched. The apex of the story remains at its midpoint, “Hunger Was Good Discipline,” which now marks not only the height of Hemingway’s closeness with Hadley, but also precedes the final decline of his friendship with Stein (as well as Beach’s last appearance in person). Rather than a single thread, the weave diverges into multiple lines, forming a fabric that darkens as Hemingway gains in wisdom and guilt.
Lastly, it should be noted that despite nasty suggestions from critics that *A Moveable Feast: The Restored Edition* is just an attempt by a “grandson to paint his grandma in a more sympathetic light” (Hotchner 2009) or simply “payback time” (Lipscomb 2009), the additional material is far kinder to Hadley than to Pauline. Hadley’s re-marriage to another man is called the “one good and lasting thing that came of that year” in the close of “Winter in Schruns,” for example (Hemingway 2009, 123). Indeed, the new edition makes clear that Pauline is the symbol of a fallen world, wiser and sinful; Diane Johnson notes that the 2009 edition’s Pauline is “this kind of home-wrecker who insinuated herself into the affections of Hadley” (Kennedy Forum 2009, 21).

**Denouement: Scott and Zelda**

With the new arrangement, there is a final implication to the main body of the text. In the 2009 edition, the end of the book is not wholly preoccupied with the break-up in a direct manner. Instead, the final sequence of three sketches all concern F. Scott Fitzgerald and his wife, Zelda. The integration into the pattern of women is clear enough, as the Zelda in the text is certainly despotic and fallen. Brenner noted the effect in his initial review of the manuscript’s structure:

> Five chapters after the last Gertrude Stein material he brings his thematic momentum against destructive women to its crescendo, for the last three chapters of his "finished" typescript focus indirectly, then directly, upon Zelda Fitzgerald, in his eyes a predatory hawk (Brenner 1982, 532).
Thanks to portrayals like that of Hemingway, Zelda is still remembered as “the profligate shrew who had driven [Fitzgerald] to drink and ruined his career and then gone entirely insane” (Fowler 2013).

Her husband also does not come off well, faring even more poorly than in the first edition. Hemingway’s account of Fitzgerald is even more condescending than his treatment of Stein; the author decides that “no matter what Scott did, nor how preposterously he behaved, I must know it was like a sickness” (Restored, 151). In both texts, Fitzgerald is an insecure hypochondriac, wildly incompetent and a poor friend, and even as a fellow writer (or perhaps especially as a fellow writer, since Hemingway had long been savagely jealous of any rivals) almost everything he wrote received a beating from Hemingway’s pen. Arthur Waldhorn suggests that “Hemingway’s pride disabled his decency,” considering the many indisputable favors Fitzgerald, the already-successful writer, had done for Hemingway at the start of his career (1972, 219). “Both sketches are unkind,” Waldhorn muses, “so cleverly done that they deprive their victim not only of dignity but of refuge in pathos” (218). The Great Gatsby, which Hemingway admits is a “fine” work, is the only aspect of Fitzgerald’s career to redeem him in the author’s eyes. While the mechanics have changed slightly in the move to the 2009 edition, Fitzgerald does not gain by the alterations.

The new edition replaces an epigraph at the beginning of the first Fitzgerald sketch, “Scott Fitzgerald,” which softens the portrayal as it introduces the other author, edging the depiction away from outright disgust. The epigraph, which formerly read

His talent was as natural as the pattern that was made by the dust on a butterfly’s wings.
At one time he understood it no more than the butterfly did and he did not know when it was brushed or marred. Later he became conscious of his damaged wings and of their construction and he learned to think and could not fly any more because the love of flight was gone and he could only remember when it had been effortless (*Feast*, 147).

is changed slightly; the latter half of the last sentence is replaced by Hemingway’s gentler and more final phrasing, “...and he learned to think. He was flying again and I was lucky to meet him just after a good time in his writing if not a good one in his life” (*Restored*, 125).

Perhaps unfortunately for Fitzgerald, however, this slight nod to grace is vastly outweighed by the new arrangement. “A Matter of Measurements,” wherein Hemingway relates how he worked to assuage Fitzgerald’s anxiety about the size of his genitalia, is one of the most memorable parts of the book for many readers, perhaps simply because it is salacious. The conclusion of the sketch is even more cutting. Taking place “many years later, Georges, the barman at the Ritz, asks Hemingway, “Papa, who is this Monsieur Fitzgerald everyone keeps asking about?” (165) Hemingway is the fondly regarded “Papa,” while Fitzgerald has become an unknown – Hemingway uses paralipsis to imply that the author was simply a “tourist” (165).

This, then, is the end of *A Moveable Feast: The Restored Edition:*

“I am going to write something about [Fitzgerald] in a book that I will write about the early days in Paris. I promised myself that I would write it.”

“Good,” said Georges.
“I will put him in exactly as I remembered him the first time that I met him.”

“Good,” said Georges. “Then, if he came here, I will remember him. After all one does not forget people.”

“Tourists?”

“Naturally. But you say he came here very much?”

“It meant very much to him.”

“You write about him as you remember him and then if he came here I will remember him.”

“We will see,” I said. (165)

Endings are powerful, even when – as in this case – they are followed by addenda in the form of additional sketches. In Restored, the concluding image of the main text is this final conversation about a forgotten F. Scott Fitzgerald – perhaps revered by the rest of the world, but unimportant to Paris (as personified in Georges). Georges, and Paris by extension, has no memory of Fitzgerald – yet obviously respects Hemingway. Note, also, that Paris approves of the composition of A Moveable Feast – Hemingway strengthens his own authority over his account through this nod from Georges.

Somewhat embittered and wistful, the new ending is drastically different from the previous one. It no longer focuses on Hemingway and Hadley, but instead on a pattern of contrasting women and an overall theme of lost innocence. But while these would be changes enough for any edition, Restored continues from this point, with the inclusion of the “Additional Paris Sketches.”
Additional Paris Sketches

One of the most notable aspects of the new edition is the division of the text into two main sections: a core of nineteen sketches and a new section, “Additional Paris Sketches.” About a third of these additional sketches are material from the first edition: “Birth of a New School” - Hemingway’s cutting conversation with a budding critic – is moved in toto to the new section, in apparent deference to the manuscript (from which Hemingway had cut the sketch) (Brenner 1982, 531), while material from two other sketches, “Ezra Pound and His Bel Esprit” and “The Pilot Fish and the Rich,” has also been demoted. Substantial portions of these sketches, discarded by Hemingway, had previously been incorporated into recombinant sketches in the first edition of the text. While it is interesting to think about how they might challenge or support the patterns previously described in the text, their segregation effectively removes them from consideration in this respect; instead, they speak to other aspects of *A Moveable Feast.*

“Birth of a New School” is not merely included in the book as appendicized material, but is even supplemented with an alternate ending in which a surly Hemingway fantasizes about beating up the hapless Harold Loeb (Hemingway 2009, 174) – the smarmy new critic whose name had been rendered simply as an anonymous “Hal” in 1964.⁹ Beyond this provided alternate, little has changed about this sketch, the sketch which follows – the demoted material of “Ezra Pound and His Bel Esprit” - or a later sketch, “The Pilot Fish and the Rich.” The notable thing about these sketches is, instead, their inclusion in the text.

---

⁹ This is only one of several restorations that owe their existence to the passage of time. For example we are now informed of Hemingway’s specific address (“over the sawmill” is now “where we lived over the sawmill at 113 rue Notre-Dame-des Champs” [Hemingway 2009, 81]).
Hemingway had struck them out, they were not to be published – he did not want them in *A Moveable Feast*. This fact is not contested, but rather assented to by their removal to “Additional Paris Sketches.” Their inclusion is another reminder of the editorial philosophy at work in *Restored*, creating a version both authorial and completionist.

Of the new sketches, almost all of them may be divided into two categories: those burnishing Hemingway’s image, and those that further attacks on other writers. Most simple to appreciate are “On Writing in the First Person,” “Secret Pleasures,” and “A Strange Fight Club.” These sketches further establish, respectively, the author’s expertise in writing, relationships, and boxing. However, as I will detail, their affect on the careful Hemingway image is more complicated than simply furthering his credentials.

“On Writing in the First Person” upholds Hemingway’s long identification as not simply an artist, but a worldly man. After a brief description of the way in which a created story can become a part of a person’s own memory – a section Robert W. Trogdon has noted as “the most direct statement I have ever read of Hemingway’s intentions for his prose” (Trogdon 2009, 26) – the author moves on to ascribe such power to the personal experiences that lie at their core. While they might sometimes be the stories and personal experiences of others, Hemingway states that his “own small experiences gave me a touchstone by which I could tell whether stories were true or false” (*Restored*, 181). Accordingly, and in sharp contrast to his portrayal of Gertrude Stein, Hemingway was able to write because he was experienced in the real world, knowing many people “who were not writers,” and was able to distinguish good material by virtue of his worldliness.

Somewhat differently, “Secret Pleasures” is a longer sketch concerning Hemingway and Hadley’s experimentation with hair length, and its singular concern is the establishing of the author as bold and free, able and willing to accede to the closest pleasures of intimacy.
despite the disapproval of society. The previous scholarship on this passage has focused on the transgressive nature of the experimentation, and explored the hints it may provide about Hemingway’s attitudes towards sexuality; Meryl Altman’s “Posthumous Queer: Hemingway Among Others” and Gerald Kennedy’s landmark “Hemingway’s Gender Trouble” are both fruitful assessments of this aspect of the work and its implications for readers. For my purposes, it is enough to note that the publication of this sketch will help introduce such elements of Hemingway’s work to a wider audience.

Much of the text has always been about the construction of the author’s self-image. This was not only set in contrast to the other figures portrayed, who were often so fashioned as to highlight Hemingway’s manliness or artistry, but also in the pursuit of a specific vision of himself that Hemingway had long upheld. Visitors to his Key West, Florida home can view a penny pressed into the concrete by the side of the swimming pool; according to legends he spread himself, the cost of the pool – built at Pauline’s request – had been ruinous and he had flung the penny down once it was built, declaring that she might as well have the last cent. Hemingway delighted in showing off the penny, according to the staff of the museum that now occupies the building, and this concern for the construction of his legend is very much in evidence in *Feast*, but is complicated by the new edition’s inclusion of some of this additional material, in particular “Secret Pleasures,” which yields a Hemingway who is bolder and more sensual, able to take sexual pleasure even in a daring new haircut. It is much more complex than the traditional image of masculinity established by most of the Hemingway canon, and a departure even from the 1964 edition’s version of Hemingway.

“A Strange Fight Club” is the last among this division of stories, and is devoted to revealing Hemingway’s boxing expertise by way of an amusing story. The sketch narrates an account of the training of a boxer, Larry Gaines, whose skill and whose manager’s ability are
sharply contrasted with Hemingway’s own judgment. Well-written, the sketch uses understated criticism to make its point:

“Aren’t you going to show him how to protect himself in close?” I asked the trainer. “He’s going to fight on Saturday.”

“Too late,” the trainer said. “I’m not going to ruin his style?”

“His style?” (Restored, 198)

Almost all of the other sketches are devoted to attacking rival writers.”The Acrid Smell of Lies” deals harshly with Ford Madox Ford, describing a fantastically foul odor and a poor habit of untruthfulness, while “The Education of Mr. Bumby” and “Scott and His Parisian Chauffeur” further savage F. Scott Fitzgerald, with a comparison between him and Hemingway’s child (in which Fitzgerald comes off the worse), and a brief scene in which a ridiculous Fitzgerald avows to his desperate French driver that American cars do not require oil. This material, perhaps excluded out of concern that it would upend the text’s balance between fond remembrance and score-settling, is salacious but unremarkable – unless it be for the audacity of its blows.

The only sketch which does not fit into either category – glorification or attack – is the final “additional sketch,” “Nada y Pues Nada.” This sketch is a meandering, obviously unpolished bit of writing. It veers from skiing, to writing, to a description of a conversation with dying poet Evan Shipman (already respectfully depicted in “Evan Shipman at the Lilas”). Sorrowful and rather too self-aware, it provides a second ending to the text:

I went out to the telephone. No, I thought. I would not forget about the writing. That was what I was born to do and had done and would do
again. Anything they said about them, the novels of the stories or about who wrote them was all right by me.

But there are *remises* or storage places where you may leave or store certain things such as a locker trunk or duffel bag containing personal effects or the unpublished poems of Evan Shipman or marked maps or even weapons there was no time to turn over to the proper authorities and this book contains material from the *remises* of my memory and of my heart. Even if the one has been tampered with and the other does not exist.

The most intriguing thing to contemplate about these lines, though, is that to their wistfulness is added banality, yet this relatively poor writing is elevated and made far more poignant for its presence at the text’s conclusion, hard on the heels of the detritus of Hemingway’s marriage recounted in “The Pilot Fish and the Rich.”

The presence of this relocated material as well as the seven new sketches, previously unpublished, is one of the strongest signs that *A Moveable Feast: The Restored Edition* was not simply a pursuit of the hypothetical text that Hemingway would have published – it is evidence of a dedication to hybrid and divergent motives. It is a book that was not only concerned about the text that the author “might have” published, but also evinces a clear goal of establishing its own authority and a concern for inclusiveness, as it provides unpublished material and fragments.
If the reader prefers, this book may be regarded as fiction.

*A Moveable Feast* (Preface)

This book is fiction but there is always a chance that such a work of fiction may throw some light on what has been written as fact.

*A Moveable Feast: The Restored Edition* (230)

It was inevitable that *A Moveable Feast* would require significant editing before it could be published as a finished text, because Ernest Hemingway left only a rough manuscript behind. For those who admit to the possibility of posthumous editing at all, then, many of the changes made to the 1964 edition by Mary Hemingway and Harry Brague came well within the bounds of standard editorial behavior. Indeed, adherents of the social theory of the text, which moves past the doctrine of authorial intent and accepts the necessity of additional hands at work in the production of any book, might well absolve them of the significant changes they made to the text – shifting the chapter order, removing mention of Pauline, and creating the composite final sketch. In such a view, it remains a problem only that their editorial process was opaque and that the book was presented as a finished work, as Seán Hemingway complained: “It's just that she did more than she admitted to doing” (Frenette 2009).

Such acceptance of intervention, however, also implies that a posthumous text can never be definitive. Once we stop considering the ideal editor and publisher to be merely frictionless channels for the author, and admit that they have the role of co-author, then any individual production of a posthumous text will of necessity be merely a version. And to those
who consider that the author has no special right to approve a version and that the hypothetical intent of the author is unattainable, this idea of “versioning” can be extended to all texts.

An examination of the 2009 Feast reinforces such a view, because this version was produced not only out of a concern for the book Hemingway might have wished to publish, but also as an effort to publish all significant variants and fragments, out of a concern for inclusiveness. However, these two goals are inherently contrary: it is difficult to imagine Hemingway ever having agreed to publish the broken sentences realized during the writing process, or pictures of his drafts. Further, the transtexts found within the new edition, such as the paratexts of the book design and the hypotextual commentary on the 1964 edition, are dedicated not to a representation of the manuscript’s version but rather in reinforcing the authority and necessity of the 2009 edition itself. In this way, the 2009 Feast admits of other, contrary concerns than authorial intent.

When evaluated in this light, neither the 1964 edition of A Moveable Feast nor the 2009 Restored edition can be said to be “better” than the other in any moral sense. Instead, versions are chosen by virtue of their own merits, which cedes the easy rule of authorial intentions and instead requires intelligent assessment of a reader’s needs and the version’s abilities.

Applying this assessment process to the 2009 edition, I have shown that it reveals a variety of patterns that were obscured in the 1964 edition, as detected by Gerry Brenner more than three decades ago. The contrasting figures of despotic and nurturing women that appear throughout the text, and the overall parallel story of the loss of innocence and gains of knowledge by a young Hemingway are made more accessible with the shift of "Une
Génération Perdue" and restoration of Pauline to the text. Further, in numerous small ways the language has been made more evocative.

However, the neatness of the ending of the 1964 edition is also beyond question and has long been praised, and there remains much merit in the edition, which the edits of Mary and Brague focused more on the single dramatic arc of Hemingway’s relationship with Hadley. Further, Mary and Brague had long worked with Hemingway in producing his previous books, and we should not forget the value of that collaborative experience in realizing his art. Further, the first edition has been the subject of years of study and comment, and will always remain valuable for study in its own context.

The selection of which Feast to read, then, remains a question without a definite answer – and it seems likely that no definitive answer is possible. Those readers who are interested in a more consistent Hemingway experience – a book matching the rest of the author’s milieu – might prefer the 1964 edition, which is a simpler text in some respects and has a more traditional ending. Other readers might prefer to read a text that is closer to the manuscript, either out of the persistent reverence for sacrosanct genius or because the newer edition includes a richer panoply of patterns. And space remains for other editions: a scholarly edition with an apparatus that includes notes on the composition process, or yet another edited version achieved by a third set of editors and their own vision.

Until then, and after then, scholars and readers must choose their Feast. Fortunately, they can confidently select the new edition without fear that something sacred has been damaged by the production of a new version. The manuscript that was left to us was broken and incomplete, but the published texts are, each in their own way, strong in the broken places.
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