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Abstract:

In this dissertation I study how Ernest Hemingway’s *A Moveable Feast* altered the classical definition of an autobiographical text in the form of memoir by presenting a piece of autofiction. My suggestion is that although Hemingway is not commonly perceived as a life writer, with *A Moveable Feast* he contributed to the evolution of autobiographical forms and anticipated the critical debate that emerged during the 70s regarding self-referentiality and the problems associated with understanding autobiographical writings as non-fictional texts. Being aware of the impossibility of telling the non-fictional and objective ‘truth’ about the self, Hemingway consciously wrote a piece of autofiction displacing and misrepresenting factual happenings to tell ‘his’ truth of the Paris years without any intention of removing the lens of his own present and perception. Hemingway’s narrative attitude achieves in *A Moveable Feast* a more intense presence of the author of the late 50s; if one assumes -as I have done- that Hemingway is not sincere with the facts, but is faithful to his personal vision, feelings or needs in the late 50s, this piece of autofiction activates the truth-telling about Hemingway’s present and can still be understood as a piece of autobiographical writing, a portrait of the man who was holding the pen.
“Nobody climbs on skis now and almost everybody breaks their legs but maybe it is easier in the end to break your legs than to break your heart although they say that everything breaks now and that sometimes, afterwards, many are stronger at the broken places. I do not know about that now but this is how Paris was in the early days when we were poor and very happy”\(^1\).

Introduction

More than fifty years after the first publication of *A Moveable Feast* (1964) the Paris memoir is still under active discussion, not merely because it is one of the few of Ernest Hemingway’s books in which “the protagonist is (at least nominally) the author himself”\(^2\), but also because after reading it carefully, it becomes quite obvious that this memoir cannot be read as an innocent exercise to remember the Paris years. As Leo Robson pointed out “Hemingway spent 40 years converting himself into a myth, and his readers have now spent 50 years trying to convert him back”\(^3\), trying to discern where the mythomania ends and where the man starts. But Hemingway was concerned enough in “obstructing our view”\(^4\) regarding his own persona and he left us a literary production where the fictional works clearly contain non-fictional materials and vice versa, apparently non-fictional writings that definitely contain considerable quantity of fiction. Discerning the proportions of each and wondering if knowing these proportions really matter -being aware that it is a Sisyphean task, perhaps absurd, perhaps impossible to carry out- kept life-writing criticism really busy over the past decades\(^5\).

EH\(^6\) is on the stage again\(^7\) largely as a result of the publication in 2009 of *A Moveable Feast: The Restored Edition*\(^8\), published by Scribner’s and edited by EH’s grandson Seán Hemingway; a book that metamorphoses AMF\(^9\) into something substantially different from what we were accustomed to with the 1964 edition\(^10\). Perhaps the vignettes of this

\(^4\) Robson, “Glints of a rising son”, 48.
\(^6\) Ernest Hemingway.
\(^7\) More recently, just after the November 13, 2015 terrorist attacks in Paris sales of the French translation of *A Moveable Feast* (translated to French as *Paris est une fête*) rose exponentially: Editions Gallimard, which publishes the book in France “received many orders from groups such as Fnac and Amazon, amounting to 8500 copies” when they usually sell between 6000 and 8000 copies a year (Alison Flood. “Hemingway’s Paris memoir rises to No. 1 in France following terror attacks”. *The Guardian*. 20 November 2015. Web 15 April 2016).
\(^9\) *A Moveable Feast*.
\(^10\) In order to sustain the new edition, Seán Hemingway was guided by Jacqueline Tavernier-Courbin and her *Ernest Hemingway’s A Moveable Feast; The Making of a Myth* (Jacqueline Tavernier-Courbin. *Ernest Hemingway’s A Moveable Feast: The Making of a Myth*. Boston: Northeastern UP, 1991) in which Tavernier-Courbin compared the manuscript versions with the 1964 edition and studied the composition of the book: “The time of its writing [...] the importance of the ‘Ritz Hotel papers’; Hemingway treatment of his enemies in the book, and the issue of truth versus fiction throughout the
new edition of AMF are the best exemplification of what Alfred Kazin suggested: “Autobiography, like other literary forms, is what a gifted writer makes of it”\(^{11}\), and at the same time reaffirm EH as an icon of modernism and guarantee that the aura surrounding EH’s biography, his figure, his self-myth and their interconnections with his literary production will still remain a vivid matter of study and discussion. In the specific case of AMF the author instrumentalized his memoir of the Paris years in order to give final shape to his figure, “or at least to the signifié of Hemingway”\(^{12}\) for his public and for himself through his public. In this dissertation I add my grain of sand to life-writing criticism by suggesting a way to deal with a book that I have defined as a piece of autofiction composed in a memoir form, and which I suggest can be still read as an autobiographical text (as I will argue -as a consequence of EH’s attitude- I prefer not to call it autobiography). I start by presenting briefly the contents of AMF, how is it structured and why I consider together with Trogdon that “despite its limitations, Seán Hemingway’s edition of A Moveable Feast is a marked improvement both in style and substance over the 1964 version”\(^{13}\). Afterwards I define what EH does in AMF and I try to fit it into the terms and notions that life-writing criticism has been using the last decades. I am aware that “formalist and structuralist preoccupations with genre divides have become unfashionable in criticism”\(^{14}\), and life-writing criticism has not been an exception. As a consequence, autobiographical writing has been defined as trans-generic and the main difficulty of accepting this trans-genericity and the fact that as every life is unique so too are the texts

---

which represent them, is that the terms that life-writing criticism has been using have usually become ambiguous\(^\text{15}\). I do not think this ambiguity is the effect of the lack of critical effort in specifying when marking the boundaries of definitions; it is more a consequence of the acceptance of this trans-genericity, of the ambiguities regarding the vague, opaque and puzzling proportions of history, memory, imagination, fiction, self-myth, attitude, intentions… that every single piece of autobiographical writing contains by itself. In this dissertation I am still trying to find terms in the life-writing criticism of the last decades to illustrate as accurately as possible what EH does in *AMF*. I consider that making an effort to use these terms and specifying which nuance of each I am using is also an interesting exercise to introduce the debate that has been originated around autobiographical narratives in recent decades.

Though EH rarely has been studied as a life writer, I suggest that with *AMF* he became a catalyst of a change regarding autobiographical writing and contributed to the evolution of autobiographical forms; and I try to prove this statement in the last sections, where I introduce how EH altered the classical definition of an autobiographical text in the form of memoir by presenting a piece of autofiction, that is, by displacing and misrepresenting factual happenings to tell ‘his’ truth of the Paris years without any intention of denying the fact that writing a memoir is always a personal performance. I present how he deliberately instrumentalized the text to divulge his own perspective of the events (and people) thirty years after they took place and, at the same time, how he proceeded with the myth-making that he had been performing throughout all his life by using alternately and ambiguously facts and fictions in his literary -and even journalistic- works. In the last chapter I state that the same *AMF* that I define as a work of autofiction is still a life-writing text that, as opposed to memoirs that claim to be ‘factual’ and reliable, becomes truthful; if it is accepted that EH is being faithful to his personal vision when fictionalizing and instrumentalizing his past events EH is also activating the truth-telling regarding his present. The Paris sketches, then, become an interesting portrait of the late EH, about what he wanted or needed to talk about and how he wanted or needed to present it.

A Moveable Feast’s unending intricacies

Readers will be always compelled to distrust what they read in AMF, not only as a consequence of the questionable author-narrator-protagonist’s reliability and trustworthiness, but also because the real and definitive edition of the Paris sketches will never stand up. First published in 1964, three years after “Hemingway put a shotgun to his head in the summer of 1961”16, this book concerning EH’s Paris between 1921 and 1926 has always dwelt in the unavoidable confusions and skepticisms surrounding any work published posthumously. In “The Making of the Book” Mary Hemingway -Ernest’s fourth wife- claimed that his husband “must have considered the book finished except for the editing which even the most meticulous manuscripts require”17; but the truth is that by the time of EH’s death AMF was not finished in many important ways, so any attempt to produce a complete or integral book from something that was far from having a definitive shape became impossible (or, if possible, questionable)18.

If AMF is particularly problematic is because “Hemingway’s widow and his publisher at Scribner’s, Harry Brague, performed a little surgery when preparing ‘The Paris Sketches’ for publication”19. Mary claimed she had found an autobiographical typescript -supposedly written between 1957 and 196020- together with the draft of a preface and a list of titles; “Mary then edited the manuscript, adding or removing commas, checking spelling21 and occasionally cutting repetitious words or phrases which she considered “accidental rather than intentional”22. After “making a few further cuts and switching about some of the

---

18 Hemingway himself expressed his opinion to Scribner’s editor Maxwell Perkins regarding the posthumous publication of the half-finished Fitzgerald’s The Last Tycoon (1941): “It is damned hard on Scott to publish something unfinished any way you look at it but I suppose the worms won’t mind” (Baker, Selected Letters, 523).
20 “Ernest started writing this book in Cuba in the autumn of 1957, worked on it in Ketchum, Idaho, in the winter of 1958-59, took it with him to Spain when we went there in April, 1959, and brought it back with him to Cuba and then to Ketchum late fall. He finished the book in the spring of 1960 in Cuba” (Mary Welsh Hemingway. “(Introduction)”. In: Ernest Hemingway. A Moveable Feast. NY: Scribner’s, 1964, p. xi). I would like to note that in the 1964 edition I am using Mary Hemingway apparently said another thing: “Ernest started wiring this book in Cuba in the summer of 1958, worked on it in Ketchum, Idaho, in the winter of 1958-9, took it with him to Spain when we went there in April 1959...” (Mary Welsh Heminway. “(Introduction)”. In: Ernest Hemingway. A Moveable Feast. London: Jonathan Cape, 1964, p. xi).
21 Wineapple, “Paris in a New Light”.
chapters for continuity’s sake” M. Hemingway and Brague decided on the title and on the chapter titles, collected some sentences written by EH into a preface, wrote an introduction to the book and added an epigraph: thus was born the Paris memoir EH’s scholars and fans have been reading for fifty years. There was no reason to believe the book was more a creation than a discovery and in general this first edition was well received. However, it is true that, as the editor of The Restored Edition asserted, M. Hemingway “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 the preface, and she created the ending [...] She really didn’t stick to his writing, she cut from his writing.” Reading Tavernier-Courbin’s The Making of a Myth or Gerry Brenner’s article “Are We Going to Hemingway’s Feast” where they compared manuscript versions of the Paris sketches to those collected in the 1964 edition, it becomes clear that M. Hemingway did more than cut accidental or repetitious words. Even so, when Seán Hemingway assures that the new edition is a “truer representation of the book my grandfather intended to publish” because it is closer to the manuscript versions or accuses M. Hemingway of not serving the interests of the book or the author when certainly we do not know what his intentions were, he is still adopting a somewhat superfluous attitude.

As a matter of fact, I consider, together with Trogdon, that one could be forgiven for expecting the worst from The Restored Edition if we take into account that Scribner’s ‘invented’ the 50th birthday since EH completed a draft of the Paris vignettes in order to

---

sell books\textsuperscript{30}; and especially if we consider that since 1964 the publishing company “has produced [and the verb is meaningful] seven books consisting wholly or substantially of material EH had not attempted to publish or had left unfinished […] None of these works has met with the approval of scholars who have read the manuscript versions”\textsuperscript{31}. M. Hemingway and Brague made the mistake of publishing a complete book from an unfinished manuscript without informing the readers and I believe The Restored Edition is a marked improvement precisely due to its closeness to the manuscript, its willful inconsistency and inconclusiveness. I agree -with Trogdon- that works EH left unfinished should be published “as closely 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”\textsuperscript{32}. Respecting the author implies accepting that his unfinished works should be left as they are. We certainly never will know what intentions EH had with his Paris sketches but this 2009 edition is still good news because, although it is not a true critical edition, everything seems to indicate it is a “less edited”\textsuperscript{33} version closer to what EH left. According to Trogdon, the 2009 version contains 373 substantive differences with regard to the first edition and at the same time it incorporates new material\textsuperscript{34}. I would like to note the following variations: The Restored Edition preserves the titles of the first edition Paris vignettes but almost every sketch contains changes to be closer to the manuscript, it is especially noteworthy to note the decision of recovering the second-person form in many places where it was shifted to the first-person in the 1964 edition. The structure of the book is completely modified in order to recover the original arrangement of chapters according to Brenner and Tavernier-Courbin; editors of the 2009 version have opted for

\textsuperscript{30} Wineapple, “Paris in a New Light”.

\textsuperscript{31} Trogdon, “The Restored Edition a review and a collation of differences”, 24. As Michael Reynolds pointed out, "Ernest Hemingway has published more books from the grave than he did during the last twenty years of his life" (Michael Reynolds. “Ernest Hemingway”. In: Richard Kopley (ed.). Prospects for the Study of American Literature. NY: New York UP, 1997, p. 266). The case of True at First Light (1999) edited by EH’s son Patrick was notorious. The book was a heavily redacted version of the manuscripts EH wrote after his 1953 safari: “The book was hyped in the New York Times months before it appeared [...] and was released in the centennial year of Hemingway’s birth” (Laurence W. Mazzeno. The Critics and Hemingway. NY: Camden House, 2015, p. 179). Joan Didion claimed in The New Yorker the book was a betrayal, especially because Scribner’s reduced the text from its original length: “[True at First Light] does not provide the reader with the essence of what the author intended, but instead provides publishers with a great deal of publicity”. She claimed that in True at First Light the words are “set down but not yet written” and she saw the publication as a fundamental “denial of the idea that the role of a writer in his or her work is to make it” (Joan Didion. “Last Words”. The New Yorker. 9 November 1998, p. 74). Probably due to the heavy criticism True at First Light received, in 2005 the book was re-edited by Kent State UP and re-titled Under Kilimanjaro.

\textsuperscript{32} Trogdon, “The Restored Edition a review and a collation of differences”, 25.

\textsuperscript{33} Patrick Hemingway. “Foreword”. In: Hemingway, AMF, ix.

\textsuperscript{34} Trogdon, “The Restored Edition a review and a collation of differences”, 25-6.
dividing the book into two parts, one containing the traditional sketches with many internal modifications and another entitled “Additional Paris Sketches” collecting various fragments and new chapters. The final vignette in the first edition “There Is Never Any End to Paris” was a ‘creation’ to intensify the ending and conclusion of the book from two different sketches left by EH. In the 2009 edition this chapter is divided into “Winter in Schruns” (first part) and “The Pilot Fish and the Rich” (“Additional Paris Sketches”). The preface has been also eliminated and most of its material has been published as “Fragments” at the end of the book. For all that said so far, it seems clear these changes affect how the reader interprets the ‘new’ EH of The Restored Edition throughout the reading experience.

I present these contents in the chapter “Biography by remate’ and Hadley the heroine”, for the moment it is important to know that these modifications alter the way in which the new version depicts EH in relation to his friends (especially emphasizing the contrast between Stein and Beach) and women. In the latter case, in the 1964 edition EH’s second-wife (Pauline Pfeiffer) only appeared in “There is Never Any End to Paris” and she was only alluded to, not named (in the new version she appears in four sketches). Tavernier-Courbin suggested that Mary’s edition of several passages where Pauline appeared in the original 1964 version hid EH’s agony and remorse, making him appear callous and less human. In the 2009 edition we have a more complex EH, a man who is not merely a victim but also a “villain in the story of his life”.

However, not all has been changed in The Restored Edition and many editorial decisions (and Hotchner’s title) from the first edition have been retained. This indicates that the 2009

---

36 Tavernier-Courbin, The Making of a Myth, 179.
38 EH’s friend and biographer A. E. Hotchner criticized the 2009 edition in his New York Times article “Don’t Touch A Moveable Feast”. According to Hotchner “this new edition [...] has been extensively reworked by a grandson who doesn’t like what the original said about his grandmother”. Hotchner recounts his own view of the history of AMF “to demonstrate how involved Ernest was with it, and that the manuscript was not left in shards but was ready for publication”. According to him “there was no extra chapter created by Mary” (A. E. Hotchner. “Don’t Touch A Moveable Feast”. New York Times. 19 July 2009. Web 15 April 2016). It is interesting to note that in his 1966 Papa Hemingway: a Personal Memoir Hotchner explained how the idea of entitling the book AMF came into his mind. Ernest had once referred to Paris as a moveable feast: “If you are lucky enough to have lived in Paris as a young man, then wherever you go for the rest of your life, it stays with you, for Paris is a moveable feast” (A. E. Hotchner. Papa Hemingway: A Personal Memoir. Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2005[1966], p. 57. Also in: Hemingway, AMF[1964], xi). When preparing the book for publication Scribner thought about calling it “Paris Sketches” but -according to Hotchner- “Mary hoped I could come up with something more compelling” so “I wrote down what Ernest said to the best of my recollection” (Hotchner, “Don’t Touch A Moveable Feast”). Certainly Hotchner’s reminiscences of what EH said about Paris not merely became the epigraph of the 1964 edition but also ended up entitling the first edition of the Paris sketches and this new version Hotchner likes so little. It is going to be discussed below, but for the moment it is important to bear in mind that Hotchner’s Papa Hemingway has often been considered a distorted
edition has been prepared not simply by studying the manuscripts, but also by considering the ‘right’ (and not necessarily right) decisions of Mary’s edition. In the end -modified or reordered- all first edition material has been included in the new version so (and I am contradicting what S. Hemingway wrote in the introduction) this Restored Edition is not a “truer representation of the book my grandfather intended to publish”\textsuperscript{39}, is more a work of completionism because The Restored Edition “has aimed to provide everything, not just what Seán guesses Hemingway might have wanted”\textsuperscript{40}.

In what follows, I use and study The Restored Edition because, although this 2009 version is not ideal, I nonetheless consider it to be the best (in the sense that it is closer to what EH left) edition of AMF that has been published.

\textbf{Autobiography: the elusiveness of the term}

Traditionally, autobiography has been defined as a “self-produced, non-fiction text that tells the story of its writer’s life”\textsuperscript{41}. According to Gunzenhauser the term is characterized by additional features such as: “Autobiography has a psychological and philosophical dimension that requires its writer to balance the deeds of an active public self with the thoughts of a contemplative private one”, it “offers the reader a window into thoughts about, motives for, and reactions to the events described” and it has formal conventions among which stand “the epic ones of hero (its subject-author) and journey (toward adulthood, self-awareness, spiritual growth, personal wholeness)”\textsuperscript{42}. However, since the 70s the implicit ‘contract’ between the autobiographer and reader (telling the truth about the self and believing that it is true) has been questioned by the thought that a cohesive and unique self does not exist so, accordingly, knowing or telling the non-fictional and objective ‘truth’ about such a self becomes impossible. In this sense, at least, as Francis R. Hart noted, readers of autobiographies who want to seek the personal focus of an autobiographical truth are required to question “what kind of ‘I’ is selected, how far the

\textsuperscript{39} Seán Hemingway, “Introduction”, 3.
\textsuperscript{40} Trogdon, “The Restored Edition a review and a collation of differences”, 27.
\textsuperscript{42} Gunzenhauser, “Autobiography: General Survey”, 75.
selected ‘I’ is an inductive invention and how far an intentional creation, and whether one single or one multiple ‘I’ persists throughout the work”\textsuperscript{43}.

Behind this preoccupation with ‘truth’ and referentiality emerges the problem of differentiation between fiction and non-fiction. According to the now classic Lejeune’s theory, for example, the fictional textual categories would consist in the non-identification of author-narrator-protagonist, and the non-fictional textual categories with its identification. The common belief is that biographies or autobiographies (which do not transgress on purpose ‘the biographical/autobiographical pact’ - not pretending a deliberate misrepresentation of facts\textsuperscript{44} ) recount the ‘truth’ about an empirical reality and that fiction, by opposition, does not refer to the real: “As opposed to all forms of fiction, biography and autobiography are referential texts: exactly like scientific or historical discourse, they claim to provide information about a ‘reality’ exterior to the text, and so to submit to a test of verification”\textsuperscript{45}. Lejeune also noted an obstacle; articulating “two truly differing points of view concerning a single individual cannot be accomplished in autobiography”\textsuperscript{46} because - as he said- “you don’t scape yourself”\textsuperscript{47}, but he did no pursue the question of the unresolvable tension inherent in self-representation\textsuperscript{48}; if ‘reality’ is not a homogeneous, consistent and continuous entity which language or the literary text can describe transparently; we cannot duplicate reality, we only can construct it\textsuperscript{49}. As Elbaz states, “language is functional to the ideological position of the speaking subject, and ‘reality’ is the creation of this same subject” so any biographer or autobiographer, however much he (or she)\textsuperscript{50} tries to be ‘objective’, he will never report, duplicate or verify the truth: he always will make it\textsuperscript{51}. It is interesting to note that this statement leads to the questioning of the idea that we can really keep saying that autobiography can be defined as a non-fictional genre; because, as Claire Lynch argues, it highlights autobiography’s central generic identity


\textsuperscript{45} Lejeune, “The autobiographical pact”, 316.


\textsuperscript{4}.  

\textsuperscript{50} To simplify, I use the personal pronoun ‘he’ referring to both male and female gender.

crisis as it moves unceasingly between facts and fictions. Although scholars such as Georges Gusdorf have said that “autobiography is a solidly established literary genre” traceable in a series of masterpieces that mark its rules and limits “from Confessions of St. Agustine to Gide’s Si le grain ne meurt, with Rousseau’s Confessions, Goethe’s Dichtung und Wahrheit, Chateaubriand’s Mémoires d’outre tombe, and Newman’s Apologia in between”, the truth is that the multiple and inconclusive forms of autobiography and the exchanges between fictional narratives and factual narratives tend to attenuate considerably the hypothesis that a clear difference between fictional and non-fictional generic systems exist. As Gérard Genette pointed out, “one would have to admit that there exists neither pure fiction nor history so rigorous as to abstain from all ‘plotting’ and all novelistic devices whatsoever, and therefore that the two domains are neither so far apart nor so homogeneous as they might appear”. So as Paul De Man warned us, autobiography lends itself poorly to generic definition: “Each specific instance seems to be an exception to the norm; the works themselves always seem to shade off into neighboring or even incompatible genres”. In this sense, it is not surprising that in his attempt to present a coherent evolution of autobiography as a genre William C. Spengemann stated that “the more the genre gets written about, the less agreement there seems to be on what it properly includes”. In response to this problem, more recently Lynch has defined autobiography not as a genre, but as a trans-generic form that comprises an infinite combination of elements of other genres. According to her, “autobiography is a trans-genre not only for the ways in which authors construct it amidst other forms of writing, but also in the ways in which it is read”. When authors recognize the infinite potentialities of this trans-generic form in which “fact and fiction are applied […] and styles and forms are welcomed from across the literary spectrum” they are able to produce a text as cryptic as the life they aspire to represent. It is important to note that this idea of trans-genericity is not a new 21st century approach. In Autobiographical Acts, Elizabeth Bruss -although she was still using the

term ‘genre’- she described autobiography as “the pirate of literary genres, raiding the other genres to fulfill itself”\(^{60}\).

In connection to Lynch’s and Bruss’s ideas, I believe that one of the most interesting approaches to this ‘unruly’, ‘restless’ or ‘elusive’ textual category (or term, or notion, or imprecise form) was led by H. Porter Abbott in his article “Autobiography, Autography, Fiction”. Abbott, being aware of the problem of defining autobiography as a genre and even of the difficulty of finding a common definition\(^{61}\), tried -and I think he succeeded- to define autobiography as an act\(^{62}\). After demonstrating that scholars have been providing divergent and even contradictory definitions of autobiography Abbott distinguishes two clear trends: the criticism that “not only define[s] autobiography but find[s] in it (or in its most successful form) repeatable narrative shape” and the criticism that considers “autobiography is inherently indefinable”\(^{63}\). Abbott points out that the former typically find the paradigm of autobiography in Augustine’s *Confession*, in the “voyage of self-discovery”\(^{64}\) and the “life-journey”\(^{65}\), and he cites critics such as Roy Pascal and Jerome Buckley as representatives of this current. Of the latter group Abbott stresses the already mentioned De Man’s idea that autobiography would have to include “any book with a readable title-page”\(^{66}\) and James Olney’s conclusion that “there is no way to bring autobiography to heel as a literary genre with its own proper form, terminology, and observances”\(^{67}\). Trying to avoid these two irreconcilable tracks, Abbott opts for defining autobiography as an act -or as an action- in order to include the reader’s response (connected with Lynch again) and all

---


the formal varieties of what could be considered an autobiography. In Abbott’s theory, the difference between an autobiography and a novel does not lie in one being factual and the other being fictive “but in the different orientations toward the text that they elicit in the reader”; when in reading a text with the same author-narrator-protagonist the reader displaces or makes transparent the act of writing, that is to say, he reads with innocence - “in the sense of pure representation, disengaged from a life in progress” - , he is not reading an autobiography, he is reading fiction. But when the reader is aware of the textual action corrupted by the present and is reading keeping in mind the presence of the author in the text, then the reader is reading autobiographically, is reading the autobiography as an act; an act “of self-aggrandizement […] of vindictiveness […] of self-protection […] pushing and shoving the facts, coloring events, in short, doing something for himself”. Thereby, according to Abbott, a text is not merely autobiographical for what it includes in itself (if, for example, it contains the classical correlation of author-narrator-protagonist), it will be or will not be autobiographical depending on the reader’s attitude: if the reader reads with ‘innocence’ as if what he reads was factual, in reality he will be reading a text with a triple correlation author-narrator-protagonist as if it was conventional fiction. On the contrary, if suspicion is activated and the reader is aware of the author being present in the text, then maybe what for another reader was a text that in some respects was read much like conventional fiction (without the reader being aware of it), for the incredulous reader the same text can really be an autobiography of the time the author wrote the book.

The particularity of AMF, at least in the 1964 edition, is that in the preface EH is already warning us: “If the reader prefers, this book may be regarded as fiction. But there is always the chance that such a book of fiction may throw some light on what has been written as fact.” This sentence activates the suspicion of any reader; the one that mistrusts everything he reads, and the one that only activates suspicion if the author gives a reason to do so. Thus, in Abbott’s terms, it is difficult not to read the 1964 edition autobiographically, not being aware that the author and his present are everywhere in the text and that EH is performing a self-serving act, “doing something for himself”.

73 Hemingway, AMF[1964], xii.
In *The Restored Edition* part of this sentence can be found in the section “Fragments” at the end of the book, where the editors decided to publish EH’s “drafts of false starts for the introduction”\(^75\). In there, among other ideas, we can read the following:

This book is fiction. I have left out much and changed and eliminated and I hope Hadley understands. A book of fiction may eliminate and distort but it tries to give a fictional picture of a time and the people in it. No one can write true fact in reminiscences. / 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. / Everyone sees it differently and nearly forty years are gone. / All remembrance of things past is fiction and this fiction has been cut ruthlessly. / This book is fiction and many things have been changed in fact to try to make it a picture of a true time\(^76\).

Firstly, I think it is very important to note that the 1964 edition places the sentence at the beginning of the book and, undoubtedly, this statement determines the interpretation of the Paris memoir. But a slightly skeptical reader has more chances to read *The Restored Edition* as ‘factual’ (at least until he reaches page 229), and especially if he trusts in Patrick Hemingway’s Foreword, where EH’s son simply states that the new version of *AMF* is closer to “the manuscript material the author intended as a memoir of his young, formative years as a writer in Paris”\(^77\). Having a preface is important, and the necessity of the preface becomes more evident when, in the 2009 version, we realize that EH worked so consciously in it. Therefore, if future editors prefer not to use the apparently made up sentence of the 1964 edition, maybe the better solution would be moving these “drafts of false starts for the introduction” to the beginning of the book. Without any doubt, reading what EH thought the book contained determines the reading of the pages that follow and at the same time reveals in advance the vertiginous fertility and literary richness of *AMF*.

Secondly, Abbott’s theory of autobiography as an act implies that the reader and the writer understand the work in different ways; in the case of *AMF*, the reader certainly has to approach the book being aware that the textual action is corrupted by the present of the author in order to read the autobiographical aspect of it, but this can only happen if EH is not simply trying to compose a fictional work; this can only happen if the writer is really trying to look for ‘his present truth’ of his Paris years. This search for EH’s ‘present truths’ can include fictionalizations of past events, but he must be faithful to his personal vision. This is the difference between *AMF* and EH’s other works where he does not write using a

\(^{75}\) Hemingway, *AMF*, 229.


\(^{77}\) Patrick Hemingway, “Foreword”, ix.
first person called EH; in this book he is transforming, eluding, dealing and negotiating with what he really remembers of his own past or what he wants to remember. As he says at the end of the book in the 2009 edition: “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”\(^ {78}\); precisely for this reason we can approach *AMF* as a work of autobiographical writing in Abbott’s terms and study what, when holding the pen, EH wanted, could or needed to say and how he wanted, could or needed to say it; then, we might wonder why. In the last section I use Abbott’s ideas with regard to what he understands as autobiography (this self-serving act, this action) to affirm that *AMF* - even containing evident fictionalizations - is a piece of autobiographical writing too; not because of the facts which surely contains the book (hardly testable in which proportions), but for what EH’s fictionalizations tell us about the man who wrote *AMF* in the late 50s.

It was not my purpose to provide a detailed review of the critical approaches to the term autobiography. For this dissertation it is enough to consider the difficulties of defining autobiography as a ‘closed form’ and especially as a non-fictional genre. However, it is not for the difficulties already mentioned that I do not use the notion autobiography to illustrate what EH is doing in *AMF*. If I do not define *AMF* as an autobiography it is for two very clear reasons. The first has to do with the traditional idea that an autobiography comprises a lifetime: “The name implies that the writer will somehow attempt to capture all the essential elements of that life”\(^ {79}\) and *AMF*’s sketches concern the years 1921 to 1926 in Paris; EH has selected these years consciously; he does not have any intention of unfolding all his life in *AMF*. As I see it, from this classic and widespread statement we can conclude that a work that it is focused on a single period or event of the author’s life cannot be an autobiography; and I am aware that it is a statement (with an important historical weight that I find difficult to elude) that -as we have seen with Abbott- could be nuanced and re-interpreted but I believe it is not necessary to do so when I can use other life-writing terms that fit better and with less justifications in respect to what EH is doing in *AMF*. Secondly, in *AMF* the matter is not whether to be objective or able to produce truthful materials about the self is possible (we have seen that it is very doubtful); EH is not merely not writing an ‘objective’ ‘truthful’ memoir, but he is not even trying to do so and he deliberately breaks the ‘unwritten pact’ between author and reader that Lejeune proposed “in which the autobiographer explicitly commits himself or herself not to some

\(^{78}\) Hemingway, *AMF*, 225.

impossible historical exactitude but rather to the sincere effort to come to terms with and to understand his or her own life [in this case his Paris years]**. I think it is important to emphasize this deliberate intentionality when writing an autobiographical piece (an attitude that I mark with the term autofiction) so the main fact that induces me to refrain from defining *AMF* as an autobiography is related to EH’s attitude when recalling his Paris years, to his instrumentalization of the text for his own present purposes, to his refusal to try to stop doing something for himself, to his will of telling “the truth as he sees it, or wants it to be seen”** and to his manifest awareness that he was writing influenced by his present, his thoughts, his feelings, his needs of the late 50s**.

### A Moveable Feast: memoir and autofiction

According to Barrington, if autobiography was “the story of a life”, memoir, on the other hand, “makes no pretense of replicating a whole life […] one of the important skills of memoir writing is the selection of the theme or themes that will bind the work together”**. Similarly, Buss notes that as a general rule “traditional autobiography makes the individual life central, while memoir tends to focus on the time in which the life is lived and the significant others of the memoirist’s world”**. Even though nowadays publishing houses use the word memoir to describe different types of self-life-writing forms, historically memoir was used to name the recollections by someone publicly prominent who wanted to chronicle his own social accomplishments “bracketed in a moment or period of experience rather than an entire life span”**. In this sense, memoir is not as ambitious as traditional autobiography in the goal of telling the whole life and its meaning**. Beyond this structural feature (memoir as a selected moment or period), according to Buss memoir “tend[s] to use devices of prose fiction to narrate those moments […] makes much use of the devices of the personal essay, favoring anecdotes that illustrate particular ideas, concepts, and views

---


**I am not going to discuss what is conscious and what is not, basically because I cannot prove what he was doing on purpose and what he was not. The attacks on his former friends are clearly intentionally, but the self-myth (or the necessity of proceeding with the self-mythification), the idealization and nostalgic writing, for example, not necessarily have to be fully intentional and conscious.

**Barrington, *Writing the Memoir*, 22.

**Helen M. Buss. “Memoirs”. In: Jolly (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Life Writing* (Vol. 2), 595.


**Buss, “Memoirs”, 596.
of the way a life is lived”\textsuperscript{87}. However, it is obvious that these features are not restricted to the memoir form; aside from the fact that there seems to be critical agreement in delimiting the memoir form to texts that are focused on specific moments or periods of the author’s life rather than to a whole life experience, as memoir is still self-life-writing, I detect the same problems of definition I have discussed above regarding autobiography. That is to say, all the problems we have encountered in approaching autobiography as a ‘closed form’ with a definite narrative shape (the problems multiply if we want to use the term non-fictional genre\textsuperscript{88}) still remain when we approach the notion of memoir. My intent, then, is not to separate the internal -and puzzling- characteristics of memoir and autobiography; by saying that structurally \textit{AMF} could be understood as a memoir I am only pointing out the focus; the idea that the book is centered in EH’s Paris years (1921-1926) and divided in vignettes. This structure in “tableaux with almost no narrative connection between them”\textsuperscript{89} will allow EH to take “liberties with facts”\textsuperscript{90}, many of which incline toward his own benefit; but if we want to grant the right attributes to this literary work structurally composed as memoir, we still need another life-writing notion to mark these ‘liberties with facts’, to define what EH is doing within the text. I believe it is important to stress EH’s attitude of not trying to write a transparent window on ‘the past’, but rather on ‘his past’ through ‘his present’, because “the traditional contract between the memoirist and the reader remains the writer’s central commitment not to [consciously] fictionalize”\textsuperscript{91} facts or descriptions for his own present purposes.

I believe that the life-writing notion that better illustrates what EH is doing with this text structured as memoir is the idea of autofiction, even though, again, “there is actually little consensus about either the term’s real meaning or its validity”\textsuperscript{92}. The notion of autofiction

\textsuperscript{87} Buss, “Memoirs”, 596.
\textsuperscript{88} To end this discussion (at least in the present dissertation) it is interesting to note what Elbaz said in 1983 with regard to the generic classification of literary works: “There is nothing in the text itself qualifying it as autobiography: texts do not ‘partake’ in genres [...] Generic classification has to do with the institutionalization -canonization and therefore fetishization- of literature [...] Generic classification is a hegemonic phenomenon which restricts literary practice to approved, institutionalized forms of expression. It might be argued that classification is natural to man [...] This trend is related to the development of the empirical sciences; every piece of knowledge must be compartmentalized for fear of losing it [...] The ‘text’ can no longer be classified due to its ceaseless beginning, its endless process of productivity: it exists only to the extent that it produces meaning. Textuality, in opposition to the specific work, the specific genre, is a field of play with an endless process of transformation and metamorphosis” (Elbaz, “Autobiography, Ideology, and Genre Theory”, 199-200).
\textsuperscript{89} Abbott, “Autobiography, Autography, Fiction”, 604.
\textsuperscript{90} Botta, \textit{A Study in the Genre of Memoir}, 7.
\textsuperscript{91} Botta, \textit{A Study in the Genre of Memoir}, 8.
has a French origin and it is often used for “autobiographical fiction […] in first-person mode”\textsuperscript{93}. More accurately, the term “describes one of the forms taken by autobiographical writing at a time of severely diminished faith in the power of memory and languages to access definitive truths about the past or the self”\textsuperscript{94}. It is important to be aware that if we consider \textit{AMF} as a work of autofiction, EH’s memoir would not only become one of the primary texts of modern autofiction, but it would also precede the very formulation of the neologism because “the notion of autofiction first emerged explicitly in France in the mid-1970s as part of a revival of autobiography at the level of both practice and theory”, coinciding with the publication of works such as Barthes’s \textit{roland BARTHES par roland barthes} (1975), Perec’s \textit{W ou le souvenir d’enfance} (1975), Modiano’s \textit{Livret de famille} (1977) and Doubrovsky’s \textit{Fils} (1977)\textsuperscript{95}. Just after the publication of the 1964 edition of \textit{AMF} something changed regarding the autobiographical forms and for this reason I think EH became a catalyst of this change. The key element all these works -and \textit{AMF}- share is “their promotion of act-value at the expense of truth-value”\textsuperscript{96}. As Gratton notes -and as I have discussed above- “for the purveyor of traditional truth-value, the ideal autobiography [and memoir] is a transparent medium, a window on the past. The parameters of act value, on the other hand, stress that autobiography is a personal performance”\textsuperscript{97}. As scholars Grell and Genon point out on \textit{autofiction.org}, autofiction is a “notion subtile à définir, liée au refus qu’un auteur manifeste à l’égard de l’autobiographie, du roman à clés, des contraintes ou des leurre de la transparence, elle s’enrichit de ses extensions multiples tout en résistant solidement aux attaques incessantes dont elle fait l’objet. Elle vient en effet poser des questions troublantes à la littérature, faisant vaciller les notions mêmes de réalité, de vérité, de sincérité, de fiction, creusant de galeries inattendues le champ de la mémoire”\textsuperscript{98}; as all life-writing terms we have been using so far, the notion of autofiction “has proliferated in usage and expanded in meaning”\textsuperscript{99} so it is difficult to come up with a clear and delimited

\textsuperscript{93} Smith and Watson, \textit{Reading Autobiography}, 259.

\textsuperscript{94} Johnnie Gratton. “Autofiction”. In: Jolly (ed.), \textit{Encyclopedia of Life Writing}, 86.

\textsuperscript{95} Gratton, “Autofiction”, 86.

\textsuperscript{96} Gratton, “Autofiction”, 86.

\textsuperscript{97} Gratton, “Autofiction”, 86.

\textsuperscript{98} Isabelle Grell and Arnaud Genon. “Présentation”. \textit{Autofiction.org}. Web 22 April 2016. Translation: “Subtle notion to define, tied to the author’s apparent refusal of the autobiography, roman à clés, of the constraints or delusions of transparency, enriched by its many extensions all while solidly resisting the incessant attacks of which it is the object. It comes from poising questions that challenge literature, shaking notions of reality, truth, sincerity, fiction, plowing through the unattended galleries in the field of memory”.

\textsuperscript{99} Jones, “Autofiction, A Brief History of a Neologism”, 174.
definition. The term was first coined by the French writer and critic Serge Doubrovsky in 1977 when in the back cover of his book *Fils* he announced: “Autobiographie? Non, c’est un privilège réservé aux importants de ce monde, au soir de leur vie, et dans un beau style. Fiction, d’événements et de faits strictement réels; si l’on veut autofiction, d’avoir confié le langage d’une aventure à l’aventure d’un langage en liberté, hors sagesse et hors syntaxe du roman, traditionnel ou nouveau.” I will use the meaning of autofiction according to Doubrovsky. In “an age in which the subject is no longer accepted to be a unified, simple whole” Doubrovsky tried to answer the problem of self-representation that, as I have said, Lejeune did not pursue in his definition of autobiography. In an interview for *Télérama*, we read that autofiction is not a Doubrovsky’s invention, it “existait avant moi. Simplement, je lui ai donné un nom et l’ai conceptualisée.” As he pointed out, for example, Rousseau “recognized the role of the imagination in filling in the gaps in memory.” It is precisely this statement what allows me to study *AMF* as a work of autofiction. In a previous interview Doubrovsky said that “autofiction can be defined by one clear thing: everything is written in the present [...] this presence of the present is, I believe, the very signature of autofiction.” According to him, in contrast to autobiography “which tend[s] to be written in a relatively formal style [...] [and] the author seeks to tightly control the precise nuances of everything the narrator-protagonist says” in autofiction “there is a much more immediate relationship with the violence of words, scenes and memories.” To try to clarify a little more what a piece of autofiction is according to Doubrovsky, it is interesting to note the most important differences of interpretation in comparison with other critical theories.

---

101 Serge Doubrovsky. *Fils*. Paris: Gallimard, 1977. Translation: “Autobiographie? No, that is a privilege reserved for the important people of this world, at the end of their lives, in a refined style. Fiction, of events and facts strictly real; autofiction, if you will, to have entrusted the language of an adventure to the adventure of language, outside of the wisdom and the syntax of the novel, traditional or new”.
102 Faix, “La autoficción como teoría y su uso práctico en la enseñanza universitaria de la literatura”, 129.
103 Doubrovsky. *Fils*. Paris: Gallimard, 1977. Translation: “Autobiographie? No, that is a privilege reserved for the important people of this world, at the end of their lives, in a refined style. Fiction, of events and facts strictly real; autofiction, if you will, to have entrusted the language of an adventure to the adventure of language, outside of the wisdom and the syntax of the novel, traditional or new”.
107 Jones, “Autofiction, A Brief History of a Neologism”, 117.
108 Contat, “Quand je n’écris pas, je ne suis pas écrivain”, 119-35. Qtd. and translated in: Jones, “Autofiction, A Brief History of a Neologism”.
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In *Autofiction et Autres Mythomanies Littéraires* Colonna affirms that in Doubrovsky’s descriptions of autofiction “l’autofiction se confond entièrement avec le roman autobiographique nominal, une variété de la province du roman autobiographique”\(^{109}\); and then he goes on to say that the fictionalization of the self is universal, that we would do well in restricting autofiction to “the authors who invent a personality and a literary existence for themselves”\(^{110}\). As Jones says, “whereas for Doubrovsky autofiction represents the fictionalization of a framework through which to represent a ‘deeper’ truth of selfhood”\(^{111}\), Colonna proposes to use the term for “those literary texts in which the writer imagines a different life for him or herself”\(^{112}\). And the term seems to increase in ambiguity (and complexity) when we read Gasparini’s *Est-il je? Roman Autobiographique et autofiction*, where he points out that, although it is important, the establishment of nominal identity author-narrator-protagonist is not strictly necessary. According to Gasparini, autofictions are less ‘vraisemblance’ than autobiographical novels and also could include works in which the present identity of the author can be suggested in multiple intratextual characters\(^{113}\). Doubrovsky has rejected both ideas; answering Colonna’s theories, in an interview for *Les Temps modernes* he said: “I completely oppose Vincent Colonna’s argument that autofiction consists of giving your name to a character and inventing an imaginary life for him, no”\(^{114}\). Regarding Gasparini’s idea that autofictions are less ‘vraisemblance’, I believe, along with Jones, that it “is not sustainable with reference to Doubrovsky’s own autofictions”\(^{115}\). Doubrovsky’s autofiction is not defined against the classical idea of autobiography; in fact, he assured that he would place his notion of autofiction “amongst the sub-categories of autobiography”\(^{116}\). He just wanted to stress a way of doing autobiographical writing (preserving Lejeune’s correlation author-narrator-protagonist\(^{117}\)) taking into account the

---


\(^{111}\) Jones, “Autofiction, A Brief History of a Neologism”, 178.

\(^{112}\) Jones, “Autofiction, A Brief History of a Neologism”, 178.


\(^{114}\) Louette, “Je ne cherche aucune absolution, mais un partage”, 210-18. Qtd. and translated in: Jones, “Autofiction, A Brief History of a Neologism”.

\(^{115}\) Jones, “Autofiction, A Brief History of a Neologism”, 180.


\(^{117}\) Lejeune said: “autobiographical novel: this is how I will refer to all fictional texts in which the reader has reasons to suspect, from the resemblances that he thinks he sees, that there is identity of author and protagonist, whereas the author has chosen to deny this identity, or, at least not to affirm it. So defined, the autobiographical novel includes personal narratives (identity of narrator and protagonist) as well as ‘impersonal’ narratives (protagonists designed in the third person); it is defined at the level of
problem of self-referentiality and the ineludible presence of the present when writing that life-writing criticism was discussing in the 70s and continued discussing in the following decades. Undoubtedly, the attempt to distinguish autobiography from autobiographical fiction would be pointless if our objective was trying to fix the boundaries between fiction and autobiography; but what I believe Doubrovsky wants to point out with his idea of autofiction is, precisely, the author’s awareness of the impossibility of differentiating them and the change in author’s attitude in not trying to fight against his present feelings, fears, interests…etc. when remembering. His innovative gesture consisted in marking explicitly something that has always happened (the constructed and disrupted nature of selfhood, the use of imagination when remembering, the ineludible presence of the present when writing about the past) and this is why in his idea of autofiction “the play with non-referential elements is overtly signaled to the reader”. Even though in AMF the use of imagination and non-referential elements is not as constantly highlighted by the author as, for example, in Doubrovsky’s Fils or in Perec’s W ou le souvenir d’enfance, I define it as a piece of autofiction because this idea (using Doubrovsky’s definition) helps me to point out the fact that EH is not trying to use his writing as “a transparent medium, a window on the past” but stressing the act value and the idea that “autobiography is a personal performance”. This is the attitude that the notion of autofiction helps me to emphasize, and that I have tried to introduce in my analysis of the preface of the 1964 AMF edition and the drafts for the introduction of The Restored Edition. Even so, it will be in the next section where I will discuss this attitude more specifically with examples from the book. Though EH fictionalizations are not as overtly signaled to the reader as they are in the works that I have mentioned in my definition of autofiction, with the Paris sketches EH became a catalyst of a change regarding how to approach autobiographical forms being aware of the impossibility of not fictionalizing the author’s own past life; knowing that we are not able to recall the past renouncing to our present situation, that the cohesive and unique self does not exist so telling the non-fictional and objective ‘truth’ about such a self becomes impossible. In AMF the author is not merely “remembering but re-experiencing;

its contents. Unlike autobiography, it involves degrees [...]. Autobiography does not include degrees, it is all or nothing” (Lejeune, “The autobiographical pact”, 307). Contradicting Colonna and Gasparini, Jones assures that “in Lejeune’s classification, the nominal identity between author, narrator and protagonist means that Doubrovskian autofiction is not the same as the autobiographical novel” (Jones, “Autofiction, A Brief History of a Neologism”, 180-81).

118 Smith and Watson, Reading Autobiography, 259.
120 Gratton, “Autofiction”, 86.
121 Gratton, “Autofiction”, 86.
not describing, making”\textsuperscript{122}; the Paris memoir is a foremost book in which EH “exposes both history and fiction as constructs of the imagination that are at least partially linguistic in nature and therefore challenges traditional realist assumptions about the relationship among fact, fiction, language, and reality”\textsuperscript{123}. For this reason, though EH is not commonly perceived as a life writer, I suggest that with AMF he anticipated both some of the reflections which are to be found in later examples of autofiction and the critical debate associated with the problems involved in self-life-writing that I have introduced in the previous chapters\textsuperscript{124}.

\textit{A Moveable Feast}: ‘biography by remate’ and Hadley the heroine

EH is aware of the limitations of autobiographical narratives and the modernity of his attitude is that he decides to exploit these limitations in an artistic sense; he presents a text that manifestly reconfigures the past according to his interests but which not necessarily has to be less credible and truthful than any other piece of autobiographical writing. For this reason, I believe -as Dibattista does- that “the authority of \textit{A Moveable Feast} as a modernist autobiography rests on the innovative form Hemingway devised to ‘put things rightly’”\textsuperscript{125}. After reading one of the first versions of what later would become AMF Mary Hemingway said to his husband: “it is not much about you’ I once objected ‘I thought it was going to be autobiography’ ‘It’s biography by \textit{remate}, Ernest said. \textit{Remate} idiomatically is used to mean a two-wall shot in jai alai\textsuperscript{126}. By reflection’\textsuperscript{127}. In \textit{The Writer as Artist}, EH’s biographer Carlos Baker suggested that Mary misunderstood the word and EH maybe had meant the Spanish word \textit{rebote} or ‘rebound’, and in a footnote added that EH “was writing autobiography by showing himself rebounding from the personalities of others”\textsuperscript{128} in AMF.

In a 2009 article Del Gizzo defended Mary’s original use of \textit{remate}, which in Spanish literally means ‘to re-kill’, traditionally “used to refer to any type of ‘kill shot’, a shot so forceful or

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{122}] Philip Young. \textit{Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration}. University Park: Penn State UP, 1966, p. 283.
\item[\textsuperscript{123}] Dewberry, “Hemingway’s Journalism and the Realist Dilemma”, 34.
\item[\textsuperscript{124}] My intention has not been to categorize AMF and affirm that it can only be understood as a piece of autofiction structurally presented as memoir. So far, I have only tried to justify the terms that I think describe better what the book contains; in order to do so, I believe it was necessary to approach the academic debates that each of these terms have brought with them in the recent decades.
\item[\textsuperscript{126}] A court game in which players use a long hand-shaped basket to propel a ball against a wall.
\item[\textsuperscript{127}] Mary Hemingway, “The Making of the Book”, 334.
\item[\textsuperscript{128}] Carlos Baker. \textit{Ernest Hemingway: The Writer as Artist}. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975, p. 375. In the same footnote Baker clarifies that EH “was doing autobiography rather than biography” in AMF.
\end{itemize}
perfectly placed that it cannot be returned”\(^{129}\). Other EH’s scholars noted the same idea; Reynolds, for example, stated that after reading his own portrait in Stein’s *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* (1933) “Ernest promised himself that when he had nothing else to write, he would produce his memoirs to even up the score”\(^{130}\). Whatever the author really said, what is evident is that in the book EH offers portraits (many of them in a negative light) of his contemporaries absolutely clouded by his own perceptions and inner thoughts so, as Young noted in *A Reconsideration*, “even when the focus, as so often, is on someone else there is an unflagging sense of presence, of himself [EH]”\(^{131}\). The instrumentalization of the text -Abbott assures- is mostly seen by “the author’s means of disclaiming the influence of now canonized literary figures and showing his superiority to all save those who represent no serious threat”\(^{132}\). A text structured in sketches, which allowed EH to separate units “each dominated by Hemingway with one attendant figure, was an obvious way of combining scope with dispatch in completing such an act”\(^{133}\). Even though many changes in the 2009 edition allow the readers to understand the portraits of EH’s friends in a more positive way\(^{134}\) -or at least with a greater presence of mixed feelings-, I believe that the attack on some former friends and the respect for others are still evident. While EH depicts Ezra Pound and Sylvia Beach as kindhearted and benevolent friends and shows consideration to James Joyce\(^{135}\) and Evan Shipman\(^{136}\), the portraits of Gertrude Stein, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Zelda Fitzgerald, Ford Madox Ford, Wyndham Lewis and John Dos Passos, among others, are clear manifestations of what EH thought of them in the late 50s, he shows no mercy ridiculing and treating them with arrogance. I introduce the portraits that allow us to glimpse better the inalienable presence of the man who was holding the pen in the late 50s. In the following pages I use EH’s biographies\(^{137}\) to analyze his

---


\(^{131}\) Young, *A Reconsideration*, 284.


\(^{134}\) Trogdon, “The Restored Edition a review and a collation of differences”, 27.

\(^{135}\) According to Meyers, Sylvia Beach introduced EH in March 1922 to Joyce (Jeffrey Meyers. *Hemingway: A Biography*. NY: Harper&Row, 1985, p.82) but in *The Letters of Ernest Hemingway 1923-1925* we discover no significant evidence of personal contact with Joyce, even though EH seems to have known him and claimed familiarity with Joyce in *AMF* (Spanier, DeFazio and Trogdon, *The Letters of Ernest Hemingway* (Vol. 2), lvii).

\(^{136}\) Novelist, poet and journalist who was among the close circle of expatriate American artists in Paris during the 20s.

\(^{137}\) Using biographical works has its limitations: biography has traditionally been defined as “an account of someone’s life written by someone else” (Oxford Dictionary). As opposed to fiction, biography is based on “an extratextual relationship of trust between author and reader: for a book to work as biography, its readers must believe it to be ‘true’, based on verifiable evidence in a way that novels need
deliberate suspension of truth-telling. Even if it is only a matter of intention (the biographers that I use are trying to keep their imagination as restrained as possible), it is equally true that today EH’s biographies are the only sources we have in order compare what EH did in his Paris years and what he told us in AMF that he did.

Sherwood Anderson wrote an introduction letter to Stein (1921) saying that she would “find Mr. and Mrs. Hemingway delightful people to know”\textsuperscript{138} and as we can read in Meyers’s Hemingway: A Biography “their friendship ripened quickly as [...] Hemingway came under the powerful influence of Gertrude Stein. He liked her paintings and brandies and cakes and conversation; she liked him [...] and treated him like a promising child”\textsuperscript{139}. When their friendship ended, EH “was permanently wounded by Gertrude Stein. She had been more than a friend to him. The loss of her friendship was difficult to bear, especially since she had somewhat of a maternal hold on the author”\textsuperscript{140}. In AMF EH explains that “the way it ended with Gertrude Stein was strange enough”\textsuperscript{141} after he unintentionally heard a sexual quarrel between Stein and Toklas\textsuperscript{142}. EH ridicules his former mentor and advisor saying:

Miss Stein’s voice came pleading and begging, saying, ‘Don’t, pussy. Don’t, please don’t. I’ll do anything, pussy, but please don’t do it. Please don’t. Please don’t pussy’ [...] It was bad to hear and the answers were worse. [...] That was the way it not be” (Ruth Hoberman. “Biography: General Survey”. In: Jolly (ed.), Encyclopedia of Life Writing, 109). But one thing are biographer’s intentions and another what really can be obtained; as we have seen with autobiography, with poststructuralist and postmodernists critiques the epistemological challenge to biography was intensified regarding language, selfhood, and historical narrative: “If language cannot transparently convey reality, if the self is a fictive construct or mere multiplicity of subject positions, if narrative itself imposes a false coherence on events, then no biographical account of someone’s life can be in any sense true” (Hoberman, “Biography: General Survey”, 111). As a result, “literary biographers have become far more skeptical with regard to ever being able to obtain a precise unambiguous model of the relationships between an author, their circumstance, and the text” (Richard Bradford. “Introduction and Acknowledgements”. In: Bradford (ed.), Life Writing, xiv). EH’s biographers are not an exception; Donaldson suggested that while EH and his life would probably always be “an irresistible subject” (Scott Donaldson. “Toward a Definitive Biography”. In: Frank Scafella (ed.). Hemingway: Essays of Reassessment. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991, p. 93) for scholars, “there isn’t going to be a definitive biography of Hemingway” (Donaldson, “Toward a Definitive Biography”, 93); partly because no one can guarantee is writing correctly any life story but more especially because EH is too elusive as subject (Mazzeno, The Critics and Hemingway, 181). Even Reynolds, another renowned EH’s biographer, admitted that a good biographer should reach the point where he realizes “the limits of his genre and the fictive nature of his trade” (Michael Reynolds. “Up Against the Crannied Wall”. In: Scafella (ed.), Hemingway, 170).


\textsuperscript{139} Meyers, Hemingway: A Biography, 77.

\textsuperscript{140} Botta, A Study in the Genre of Memoir, 58.

\textsuperscript{141} Hemingway, AMF, 91.

\textsuperscript{142} Stein’s life partner.
finished for me, stupidly enough. […] I could never make friends again truly, neither in my heart nor in my head. When you cannot make friends any more in your head is the worst.\textsuperscript{143}

Actually, the reasons for the Hemingway-Stein quarrel “were aesthetic as well as personal”\textsuperscript{144}. In a 1948 letter to his friend W. G. Rogers EH wrote of Stein: “she only gave real loyalty to people who were inferior to her. She had to attack me because she learned to write dialogue from me”\textsuperscript{145}. Being aware of this it is easy to understand why as a rule - because he also recognizes that “for a long time she was affectionate”\textsuperscript{146}. in AMF Stein is portrayed as a manipulative and authoritarian General. In other passages, Stein is directly attacked; EH, for example, says of her and Anderson (with whom he later also had strong disputes): “I thought of Miss Stein and Sherwood Anderson and egotism and mental laziness versus discipline and I thought who is calling who a lost generation? […] But the hell with her lost-generation talk and all the dirty, easy labels”\textsuperscript{147}. Everything indicates that this thought came later -at least two years later- not in the moment Stein explained EH for the very first time the idea of ‘génération perdue’ (before 1925); during that time they were still good friends and EH took the idea of ‘lost generation’ seriously\textsuperscript{148}. Their disputes started after 1926 when EH wrote “a parody of Anderson that made Stein very angry”\textsuperscript{149} in a chapter called “The Making and Marring of Americans” published in EH’s The Torrents of Spring (1926). In here EH does simply not differentiate between what he thought at the time Stein introduced the idea of ‘lost generation’ and what he thought years later. Almost thirty years after Stein “criticized the very things Hemingway prided himself on: his originality, sophistication and fictional heroes”\textsuperscript{150} in her Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas (1933), EH attempted to settle the score in AMF\textsuperscript{151}. And it is important to note that in the 2009 edition EH’s attacks on Stein become much more obvious as a consequence of the

\textsuperscript{143} Hemingway, AMF, 92-3.
\textsuperscript{144} Meyers, Hemingway: A Biography, 78.
\textsuperscript{145} Baker, Selected Letters, 649.
\textsuperscript{146} Hemingway, AMF, 57.
\textsuperscript{147} Hemingway, AMF, 62.
\textsuperscript{148} Hemingway used the idea of ‘lost generation’ as an epigraph for his novel The Sun Also Rises (1926). Although after the quarrel with Gertrude Stein “Hemingway hastened to assure various correspondents that he regarded Gertrude’s remark as laughable”, according to Kenneth S. Lynn “these protestations are belied, however, by the blue notebook he took with him on a short trip to Chartres following the completion of the first draft of the novel. For the notebook shows that he seriously considered calling his novel The Lost Generation and that he even went to the trouble of roughing out a foreword explaining how the phrase had originated”. According to Lynn, all these drafts were written before 1925. (Kenneth S. Lynn. Hemingway. London: Simon and Schuster, 1987, p. 332-3).
\textsuperscript{149} Meyers, Hemingway: A Biography, 79.
\textsuperscript{150} Meyers, Hemingway: A Biography, 86-7.
\textsuperscript{151} Dibattista, “The Real Hem”, 177.
intercalation between the chapters where the author presents his former mentor and the
chapters where he introduces Sylvia Beach\textsuperscript{152}, the owner of the bookstore Shakespeare and
Company, the women who knew “everybody worth knowing, including the incomparable
Irishman, James Joyce”\textsuperscript{153} and who “was always kind to Hemingway”\textsuperscript{154}. According to
Brenner, the 1964 sequence obscured “the contrast that Hemingway achieves by
juxtaposing chapters on Gertrude Stein and Sylvia Beach”. The rearrangement in the 2009
dition “silently contrasts two mother images, the dogmatic, highhanded and imperious
Gertrude Stein against the tolerant, nurturing and modest Sylvia Beach”\textsuperscript{155}. Tavernier-
Courbin called this alternation “the pattern of despotic women versus nurturing
women”\textsuperscript{156}. The 1964 version simply removed this pattern. The following comparison is
revealing:

Sylvia had a lively, very sharply cut face, brown eyes that were as alive as a small
animal’s and as gay as a young girl’s, and wavy brown hair that was brushed back
from her fine forehead [...] She had pretty legs and she was kind, cheerful and
interested, and loved to make jokes and gossip. No one that I ever knew was nicer to
me\textsuperscript{157}.

In the three or four years that we were good friends I cannot remember Gertrude
Stein ever speaking well of any writer who had not written favorably about her work
or done something to advance her career\textsuperscript{158}. / If you brought up Joyce twice, you
would not be invited back. It was like mentioning one general favorably to another
general\textsuperscript{159}. / Finally she even quarreled with the new friends but none of us followed
it any more. She got to look like a Roman emperor\textsuperscript{160}.

Pound was “one of the few writers who commanded Ernest’s admiration from first to last,
from an appreciative notice for the Transatlantic Review in the 1920s to the flattering portrait
in A Moveable Feast”\textsuperscript{161}. In the sketch “Ezra Pound and the Measuring Worm” Pound’s

\textsuperscript{152} Shakespeare and Company served as a lending library and permanent address for expatriate artists.
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\textsuperscript{156} Tavernier-Courbin, The Making of a Myth, 175.
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\textsuperscript{160} Hemingway, AMF, 93.

\textsuperscript{161} Scott Donaldson. By Force of Will. NY: The Viking Press, 1977, p. 44.
description does not differ at all from what Donaldson suggests; EH even seems to make an exception by humbling himself to eulogize his loyal friend:

Ezra Pound was always a good friend and he was always doing things for people […] Ezra was kinder and more Christian about people than I was. His own writing, when he would hit it right, was so perfect, and he was so sincere in his mistakes and so enamored of his errors, and so kind to people that I always thought of him as a sort of saint.  

Few months after the newlyweds arrived in Paris, Ezra was already helping EH publish his poems and short stories in some of the publications in which Pound had good contacts: in February 20, 1922 Hadley wrote EH’s mother that “Pound has sent a number of Ernest’s poems to […] the Dial and taken a little prose thing of his for the Little Review […] The Dial if they take his stuff is such a wonderful place for a young writer to appear”; according to Reynolds, “at the start, or any other time, the Dial was, in 1922, the place to be published in America.”

EH’s relationship with Scott Fitzgerald was more tumultuous and what EH portrays him as being, doing and saying in AMF proves it. In April 1925, two weeks after the publication of Fitzgerald’s The Great Gatsby (1925), EH met Fitzgerald in the Dingo Bar; by then, “Fitzgerald was writing for the three million readers of the Sunday Evening Post while Hemingway was publishing in little magazines.” Fitzgerald also helped EH in breaking into the difficult publishing world, “introduced Hemingway to Scribner’s and helped him toward recognition”. As Meyers suggests, EH became Fitzgerald’s “artistic rival and heroic ideal. Hemingway had masculine strength, capacity for drink, athletic prowess and experience in battle […] Eighteen months after their first meeting he told Hemingway ‘how much your friendship has meant to me during this year and a half it is the brightest thing in our trip to Europe for me’.” Though Fitzgerald was three years older than EH and far

162 Hemingway, AMF, 88.
165 When Fitzgerald met EH in the spring of 1925 he was best known for This Side of Paradise (1920), The Beautiful and Damned (1922), and The Great Gatsby (1925). Fitzgerald was instrumental in EH’s 1925 move from the NY publishing house of Boni&Liveright to Scribner’s.
166 The Dingo American Bar was a drinking establishment that used to be open all night. It became very popular among the Parisian English-speaking artists and writers in the 20s.
167 Meyers, Hemingway: A Biography, 159.
168 Meyers, Hemingway: A Biography, 159. Nine years later, Fitzgerald was still thinking the same; he wrote to Max Perkins: “I always think of my friendship with him as being one of the high spots of life” (Scott Fitzgerald. Dear Scott/Deear Max. NY: Hudston River Editions, 1971, p.219).
better known, “Hemingway lorded it over him right from the start, both as a man and a writer”\(^{170}\). However, as Bruccoli says in *Fitzgerald and Hemingway*\(^{171}\) in which he examined their mutual influences, in fact their friendship was really important to both writers - particularly at the beginning-, even if EH was not always willing to admit it\(^{172}\). Fitzgerald died in 1940 and “a remarkable upward revision in the estimates of Fitzgerald’s achievement brought him posthumous glory in abundance, however, and in the last dozen years of his life an astounded Hemingway responded to this threat to his accustomed primacy by trying to cut his rival back to size”\(^{173}\); apparently he thought that the best way to cut his friend-rival ‘back to size’ would be ridiculing him, and *AMF* allowed him to do so. According to *AMF* the author’s first impression of Fitzgerald was that he was boyish and girlish:

Scott was a man who looked like a boy with a face between handsome and pretty. He had very fair wavy hair, a high forehead, excited eyes and a delicate long-lipped Irish mouth that, on a girl, would have been the mouth of a beauty […] The mouth worried you until you knew him and then it worried you more\(^{174}\).

And then EH goes on to further emphasize Fitzgerald’s femininity by contrasting him with the manly man who was with him, the baseball player Duncan Chaplin “who was extraordinarily nice, unworried, relaxed and friendly and I much preferred him to Scott”\(^{175}\). According to Lynn, “Chaplin later told one of Fitzgerald’s biographers that he had not been in Europe at all in 1925”\(^{176}\). Having ridiculed his former friend’s face, EH goes on to criticize his clothes and to mention that “he had very short legs. With normal legs he would have been perhaps two inches taller”\(^{177}\). In *AMF* we read how this first meeting with Fitzgerald ended with EH leaving Fitzgerald inside a taxi after “his face became a true death’s head, or death mask”\(^{178}\); EH does not specify how much Fitzgerald drank that night, but “the implication is that the number [of glasses of wine] was small”\(^{179}\).

---

\(^{170}\) Lynn, *Hemingway*, 277.


\(^{172}\) Although, for example, in *AMF* the author assures that in the Fall of 1925 Fitzgerald was upset because “I would not show him the manuscript of the first draft of *The Sun Also Rises*” (Hemingway, *AMF*, 158), Fitzgerald, in fact, “read and corrected the novel and Hemingway followed his advice about deleting the first two chapters before he sent it to the printer” (Meyers, *Hemingway: A Biography*, 165).

\(^{173}\) Lynn, *Hemingway*, 278.

\(^{174}\) Hemingway, *AMF*, 125.

\(^{175}\) Hemingway, *AMF*, 125.

\(^{176}\) Lynn, *Hemingway*, 279-80.

\(^{177}\) Hemingway, *AMF*, 126.

\(^{178}\) Hemingway, *AMF*, 128.

\(^{179}\) Lynn, *Hemingway*, 280.
In the same chapter “Scott Fitzgerald” EH explains their trip to Lyon and presents Fitzgerald as an hypochondriac, childish, inept and tiring man who gets drunk too easily and he makes clear that “you could not be angry with Scott any more than you could be angry with someone who was crazy”\textsuperscript{180}. The fact that “Hemingway viewed the trip as a means of cementing a friendship which, in the space of less than a week had acquired as much importance for him as it had for Fitzgerald is nowhere acknowledged”\textsuperscript{181} in \textit{AMF}.

It is difficult to know what EH really thought of that trip as they took it, but certainly what he told Perkins on June 9, 1925 -right after the trip- was quite different from his later portrayal of the journey in \textit{AMF}; in fact, nothing indicates that it was as unbearable for the author as he later described in \textit{AMF}: “Fitzgerald is living here now and we see quite a lot of him. We had a great trip together driving his car up from Lyon […] I’ve read his ‘Great Gatsby’ and think it is an absolutely first rate book. I hope it is going well”\textsuperscript{182}. It seems obvious that EH is fictionalizing his past feelings and impressions towards Fitzgerald to assert his present purposes. Actually, to all appearances EH “ever competitive, ever preoccupied with his own literary reputation, set out in \textit{A Moveable Feast} to remind the world of Fitzgerald’s inferiority,”\textsuperscript{183}, a feeling that had been accentuated especially after the publication in 1936 of Fitzgerald’s “Crack-Up” articles, which described Scott’s alcoholism, self-pity and mental breakdown which EH thought to be a loathsome self-exposure and self-condemnation\textsuperscript{184}.

There are three sketches in \textit{AMF} which EH devoted to ridiculing the image of Fitzgerald; one of the most famous is “A Matter of Measurements”, where EH insinuates that Fitzgerald had a small penis. Although the scene may seem credible because “it fits the long-term pattern of self-doubt in Fitzgerald’s behavior as well as his hero-worship of Hemingway”\textsuperscript{185}, the description of a man with his pants down waiting for a more sexual-experienced friend to give verdict about his manhood, “was, in Hemingway’s view, the final humiliation”\textsuperscript{186}. With this, EH was not only degrading Scott Fitzgerald but also his wife Zelda Fitzgerald; in \textit{AMF} she is portrayed as a drunk, selfish and mad woman with a permanently “bad hangover”\textsuperscript{187} and a “too taut and drawn”\textsuperscript{188} face who wanted her husband to get drunk because she “was very jealous of Scott’s work”\textsuperscript{189}.

\textsuperscript{180}Hemingway, \textit{AMF}, 141.
\textsuperscript{181}Lynn, \textit{Hemingway}, 280.
\textsuperscript{182}Baker, \textit{Selected Letters}, 162.
\textsuperscript{183}Lynn, \textit{Hemingway}, 284.
\textsuperscript{184}Meyers, \textit{Hemingway: A Biography}, 161.
\textsuperscript{185}Lynn, \textit{Hemingway}, 283.
\textsuperscript{186}Lynn, \textit{Hemignway}, 284-5.
\textsuperscript{187}Hemingway, \textit{AMF}, 153.
The malice toward Wyndham Lewis\(^{190}\) is also evident. EH met Lewis for the first time in Pound’s studio in July 1922. Despite having very strong personalities and coinciding in their aggressiveness, hypersensitivity, eagerness for recognition and intolerance of criticism, the two colossal egos did not clash during EH’s Paris years\(^{191}\). On October 27, 1927 EH wrote to Lewis that he was “glad you liked *The Torrents of Spring* and thought you destroyed the Red and Black enthusiasm very finely in *Paleface*”\(^{192}\). However, the same year EH discovered that Lewis had attacked his work in *Time and Western Man* (1927), and years later EH’s hostilities increased after reading “Lewis’ incisive chapter [“The Dumb Ox”] on his work in *Men Without Art* (1934) -a title probably influenced by Hemingway’s *Men Without Women* (1927)-. Lewis influential essay (like Stein’s *Autobiography*) […] criticized the very things Hemingway prided himself on”\(^{193}\). In *AMF* Lewis appears when EH is boxing with Pound:

[Lewis] was dressed like someone out of *La Bohème*. Had a face that reminded me of a frog, not a bullfrog but just any frog, and Paris was too big a puddle for him […] It was embarrassing to see him and he watched superciliously\(^{194}\). / Walking home I tried to think what he reminded me of and there were various things. They were all medical except toe-jam […] the eyes had been those of an unsuccessful rapist. ‘I met the nastiest man I’ve ever seen today,’ I told my wife\(^{195}\).

This passage ostensibly reflects EH’s view of Lewis on their first encounter in July 1922 but I agree with Meyers that “it is not an accurate view of Lewis at that time. It is actually influenced by Hemingway’s hostility after the publication of “The Dumb Ox” in 1934\(^{196}\). Moreover, “Lewis had abandoned his wild bohemian dress in 1914”\(^{197}\).

\(^{188}\) Hemingway, *AMF*, 154.

\(^{189}\) Hemingway, *AMF*, 154.

\(^{190}\) English writer, painter, and editor who was already a close associate of Pound’s in London before WWI. Lewis founded and edited the little magazine of the Vorticists *Blasts: Review of the Great English Vortex* (1914-1915).


\(^{195}\) Hemingway, *AMF*, 89.


\(^{197}\) Meyers, *Hemingway: A Biography*, 87-8. In *AMF* the hostilities against Ford Madox Ford are also very evident. Pound also introduced EH to Ford in January 1924 and EH helped him in the edition of the *Transatlantic Review*. Despite the fact that Ford “had been an invaluable help to the young Hemingway […] praising his work and advancing his career” (Jeffrey Meyers. “Hemingway, Ford Madox Ford and A *Moveable Feast*”. Critical Quarterly. Vol. 25, No. 4, 1983, p. 35) EH started disparaging Ford very early;
What is striking about the attacks is that EH does not give explanations for his apparent malice. In his memoir EH is doing something similar to what he did in all his fictional works; the hostility that motivates the rawness is like EH’s aesthetic theory of the iceberg\textsuperscript{198}: “You could omit anything if you knew that you omitted and the omitted part would strengthen the story and make people feel something more than they understood”\textsuperscript{199}. The book is full of statements that EH does not explain; “final statements designed to ward against going any further in one’s search for cause: to say that’s the way it was, and that’s de way it is. As such, the book is an entombment of secret knowledge, or mass burial, just this side of the grave”\textsuperscript{200}. According to Kennedy, EH’s “omission of exposition -the so called ‘iceberg’ theory by which he submerged meaningful information- produced almost systematic displacement of emotional content onto the terrain of fictive experience”\textsuperscript{201}. It is probably for this reason EH was thinking of mentioning the importance of ‘what is missing’ in his preface to the book; in “drafts of false starts for the introduction” of the 2009 version can be read:

I will not catalogue what is missing. It is not easy to put in the missing all in fiction and it is all in if you leave it out\textsuperscript{202}. / All of that Paris you could never put into a single book and I have tried to write by the old rule that how good a book is should be judged, by the man who writes it, by the excellence of the material that he eliminates\textsuperscript{203}.

The causes that provoke EH’s animosities and the fact that his attitude “was formed long after his Paris years”\textsuperscript{204} influenced by EH’s quarrels with these writers in the 30s are part of the material and the meaningful information that EH removed.

---

\textsuperscript{198} Meyers, “Hemingway, Ford Madox Ford and A Moveable Feast”, 41.
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\textsuperscript{203} Hemingway, \textit{AMF}, 232.
\textsuperscript{204} Meyers, “Hemingway, Ford Madox Ford and A Moveable Feast”, 40.
Among these “drafts of false starts for the introduction” can also be found: “I apologize to Hadley for any mis-representations or mistakes or for any errors. She is the heroine of the stories and I hope she understands. She deserves everything good in life including accurate reporting”\(^{205}\). EH “began an affair with Pauline Pfeiffer”\(^{206}\) in February 1926. He and Hadley separated, after considerable anguish, in August; she divorced him in January 1927 and he married Pauline in May”\(^{207}\). According to Donaldson “when Ernest broke faith with Hadley, he committed, in his own eyes, a sin which he was never able to expiate, though he tried to the end of his life”\(^{208}\). AMF stands as a tribute to Hadley and a recall of a paradise lost written down by a man who was facing mental and physical degeneration. EH “habitually protective of his privacy and laconic about his feelings […] felt impelled by his own intimations of mortality to write the story of his literary beginnings and early happiness”\(^{209}\) settled in a time impregnated with idealized and nostalgic memories. Hadley is the woman “whose love and companionship had made the first part of Paris the best years of his life”\(^{210}\) and AMF becomes a “lyrical apology to Hadley for Hemingway’s foolishness in losing her”\(^{211}\). “When I saw my wife again […] I wished I had died before I ever loved anyone but her. She was smiling, the sun on her lovely face tanned by the snow and sun…”\(^{212}\). EH’s first wife becomes a symbol of the years of idealized innocence, youth, poverty, happiness and ‘lovely magic time’, “the passage of time, in this case, heightened the nostalgic glow surrounding his marriage to Hadley”\(^{213}\). However, EH “also manifests a private remorse for betraying his first wife […] and thus breaking up the marriage that defined the early years in Paris”\(^{214}\):

“We’ll read and then go to bed and make love’ ‘And we’ll never love anyone else but each other’ ‘No, never.’ […] ‘We’re always lucky,’ I said and like a fool I did not knock on wood. There was wood everywhere in that apartment to knock on too”\(^{215}\).

/ Hadley and I had become too confident in each other and careless in our confidence and pride […] I never tried to apportion the blame, except my own part, and that was clearer all my life. The bulldozing of three people’s heart to destroy one

\(^{205}\) Hemingway, AMF, 232.
\(^{206}\) Hemingway’s second wife.
\(^{207}\) Meyers, Hemingway: A Biography, 172.
\(^{208}\) Donaldson, By Force of Will, 148.
\(^{212}\) Hemingway, AMF, 218.
\(^{213}\) Donaldson, By Force of Will, 149.
\(^{215}\) Hemingway, AMF, 33-4.
happiness and build another […] is not a part of this book. I wrote it and left it out.

The only one, Hadley, who had no possible blame, ever, came well out of it finally and married a much finer man than I ever was […] and is happy and deserves it. In the chapter “The Pilot Fish and the Rich” we read how one of EH’s tactics of apology consists in shifting responsibility partly to Pauline, Hadley’s best friend who “contrived to steal Hadley’s husband”, partly to the rich (Gerald and Sara Murphy) who, according to AMF, “encouraged Ernest to drop his less fashionable first wife” and partly to the ‘Pilot Fish’ (Dos Passos) “who led the Murphys to Hemingway and thus contributed to his undoing”. In the 1964 edition Pauline was only alluded to once and she appeared as ‘the other woman’, ‘the meddlesome’ ‘the strange’; in The Restored Edition she appears three more times, and she is even named. The additional material of this 2009 version is far kinder to Hadley than to Pauline and if Hadley symbolizes the Edenic innocence, Pauline represents the sin, the fall from grace and the instigator of that “horror winter”. But this 2009 version offers a more complex EH who is not merely a victim of particular circumstances and evil people; rather than a single thread -EH the victim- this 2009 version “diverges into multiple lines, forming a fabric that darkens as Hemingway gains in wisdom and guilt.”

EH appears as an active agent of the rupture and tries to explain how a man could be in love with two women at the same time:

---

216 Hemingway, AMF, 123.
217 John Dos Passos served in the American Cross Ambulance Service in Italy during WWI, meeting EH in Schio in June 1918. They became close friends after EH returned to Paris from Toronto in 1924, and he joined EH at the Fiesta of San Fermín in July 1924. In 1929 Dos Passos would marry Katharine Foster Smith, EH’s and Hadley’s longtime friend.
218 Kennedy, “Hemingway, Hadley, and Paris”, 217. To understand better this distribution of responsibilities it is interesting to know the following: Pauline Pfeiffer’s Catholicism led her to support the Nationalists during the Spanish Civil War while EH preferred the Republicans and ‘El Frente Popular’. When EH arrived to Spain he began an affair with Martha Gelhorn. EH divorced Pfeiffer in November 1940 and married Gelhorn three weeks later. EH and Pfeiffer had several problems during their divorce, “largely because of her surprising intransigence. All year [1939] he had been complaining that she was trying to put him out of business with her [economic] demands” (Lynn, Hemingway, 484). Dos Passos and EH were close friends for more than 15 years and the breakdown of their friendship did not occur until the Spanish Civil War: “Their dispute concerned Dos Passos’ close friend and translator, José Robles” (Meyers, Hemingway: A Biography, 307) who was arrested by the Communists in 1936, accused of espionage and executed. Dos Passos thought the charges were not legitimate and EH assumed that Robles was guilty and accused Dos Passos of not fighting against the enemies of the ‘República’. According to Meyers “once the initial attraction wore off, the Murphys’ vast wealth, genteel manners, exquisite taste and dabbling in the arts inevitably aroused Hemingway’s wrath. In A Moveable Feast Hemingway -always in search of a scapegoat- bitterly but unjustly blamed Dos Passos and the Murphys for the destruction of his first marriage” (Meyers, Hemingway: A Biography, 176).
219 Davis, A very Mobile Meal, 80.
220 Hemingway, AMF, 215.
221 Davis, A very Mobile Meal, 79.
One is new and strange and if he has bad luck he gets to love them both. Then the one who is relentless wins [...] To love two women at the same time, truly love them, is the most destructive and terrible thing that can happen to a man when the unmarried one decides to marry [...] You break all promises and you do everything you knew that you could never do nor would want to do.222

This is how, according to AMF, the Paris of “the early days when we were poor and very happy” ended. “Having become involved in it and being in love [with Pauline] I accepted all the blame for it myself and lived with the remorse”; this remorse unquestionably contributed to erect Hadley as the heroine of this “bittersweet sketchbook” that I have defined as EH’s work of autofiction of the Paris years.

**Myth-making: when Hemingway was poor and damned**

Most of EH’s “fiction contains numerous autobiographical elements, and his protagonists are often conscious projections of himself” (or the himself he likes to project) and EH’s openly “autobiographical writings [...] are barely more autobiographical than his fiction”.226 As Dewberry indicates, EH’s writings tend to draw on the relationship between fictional and non-fictional narratives “to raise questions about the natures of the realities both kinds of texts create, ultimately challenging traditional assumptions that history exists independently of our perceptions of it and that we can therefore report it accurately and objectively”.227. Certainly, AMF is one of the most interesting works in which the author establishes these dialogues and exchanges and at the same time suggests that for EH the confines between “imagined and experienced realities and among the journalism, nonfiction and fiction that record them, are at least somewhat fluid”, but EH always presented himself as a story-teller and these dialogues were constant throughout his whole literary career.228

Since EH lived the life he wrote about in all genres, he became a living myth (which perpetuated after his death); that is, the ethos of his fictive world mixed completely with his

---

222 Hemingway, AMF, 216.
223 Hemingway, AMF, 220.
229 EH once said that the more the writer “learns from experience the more truly he can imagine. If he gets so he can imagine truly enough people will think that the things he relates all really happened and he is just reporting” (William White (ed.). By-Line: Ernest Hemingway. NY: Scribner’s, 1967, p.215).
own persona and the ‘figure’ of EH began to represent some attributes that were as unbelievable to find in a single person as they were difficult to deny. Separating fact from fiction is already an ambiguous and almost unachievable task with any writer; nevertheless, when the man behind the text has been contributing to feed his own myth by using his own experiences from the very beginning to write both non-fictional works consciously drawn from imagination and fictional works so obviously drawn from reality, and he even has chosen what to do and what to write about in accordance with the legend that he himself has promoted, finding out who is the man behind the myth becomes a Sisyphean task. At the time of his death, the image of Papa Hemingway the sportsman and bull fighting lover, fishing, betting, hunting, at war, boxing, drinking, brawling and defying death “was so deeply imprinted that the person behind it disappeared into the shadows”230. EH’s meteoric rise to literary master was accompanied by the growth of his personal fame “which at first was subordinate to his literary renown, then rather soon began to vie with it on equal terms, and eventually surpassed it to make Hemingway not simply the best known writer of his generation, but one of the most famous men of his time”231. EH was absolutely aware of it and “the public response to him and his personality affected what he chose to write about and what he said when he did write. Nearly everything that he published after 1930, fiction and non-fiction alike, reflected this knowledge”232. However, his fame and public image of the 30s were not simply a consequence of his literary achievements of the 20s; EH started using his articles in the Toronto Star Weekly and the Toronto Daily Star233 (1920-1924) and particularly in the Transatlantic Review (1924) – where he published several chronicles and his early stories to consciously promote and shape his public personality (attitudes, biases, character, avocations, behavior, interests…etc.) from the very beginning, when he was not yet the worldwide known writer he later became. According to Reaburn, in his non-fiction articles of the 20s EH’s great subject was to build his own public character, and in many of these articles EH’s image was ambiguously intermingled with the attributes of his fictional characters. In the “Pamplona Letter”234, for example, EH chronicled the Fiesta of San Fermín and the bullfights in Pamplona. Two

years later he published *The Sun Also Rises* (1926), a novel where the protagonist is Jake Barnes, an expatriate American journalist living in Paris who traveled with some friends to the Fiesta of San Fermín. When he published *A Farewell to Arms* (1929) everyone who had read EH ‘the chronicler’ already knew that he was an ambulance driver in Italy during the WWI, that he was wounded in the legs and that he recovered in Milan. It was not difficult for the reader to identify the image of EH with the main character Frederic Henry (who speaks in first-person account in the novel), a young American Lieutenant serving in the ambulance corps of the Italian Army who is wounded in the knee by a mortar and sent to a hospital in Milan.

In 1933 EH wrote a letter to his Scribner’s editor Perkins saying that “I invented every word and every incident of *A Farewell to Arms* except possibly 3 or 4 incidents. All the best part is invented. 95 per cent of *The Sun Also Rises* was pure imagination. I took real people in that one and I controlled what they did. I made it all up”\(^{235}\). Still, the consequences of these correlations between “fiction and reality was to suggest that Hemingway was a man who ‘lived it up to write it down,’ that he sought out adventures in order to gather material”\(^{236}\). Though all his life EH affirmed that his one true calling was his literary production\(^ {237}\), he also shaped his own public image working in collaboration with the mass media, which over the years were more focused on his non-literary activities than his literary ones\(^ {238}\). The myth-making in relation to his legendary figure established particularly “with Hemingway’s nonfiction of the 1930s, which included *Death in the Afternoon*\(^ {239}\) [1932], *Green Hills of Africa*\(^ {240}\) [1935], a series of articles for *Esquire* on sports, politics, and art, and correspondence from Spain during the Spanish Civil War\(^ {241}\); whether he was writing about bullfighting, boxing, hunting or an specific battle of the Spanish Civil War EH was actually

\(^{235}\) Baker, *Selected Letters*, 400.

\(^{236}\) Reaburn, “Hemingway in the Twenties”, 132.

\(^{237}\) Frederick Busch suggested that EH wrote “because it meant his life to him” and when he lost the faculties to keep writing he committed suicide because living was meaningless (Frederick Busch. “Reading Hemingway Without Guilt”. *New York Times*. January 12, 1992. Web 30 April 2016).

\(^{238}\) Reaburn, “Hemingway in the Twenties”, 126.

\(^{239}\) Written in first-person narrator, EH presents his experiences with the Spanish bullfighting and its magnificence. Begins: “At the first bullfight I ever went to I expected to be horrified and perhaps sickened by what I had been told would happen to the horses...” (Ernest Hemingway. *Death in the Afternoon*. NY: Scribner’s, 1999).

\(^{240}\) Written as an account of a month on a safari EH and Pauline Pfeiffer took in East Africa in 1933. In the introduction EH announces: “Unlike many novels, none of the characters or incidents in this book is imaginary”. Begins: “We were sitting in the blind that Wanderobo hunters had built of twigs and branches at the edge of the salt-lick when we heard the truck coming...” (Ernest Hemingway. *Green Hills of Africa*. NY: Scribner’s, 1998).

\(^{241}\) Donaldson, “Hemingway and Fame”, 11.
writing about himself. Reaburn suggested that all these works “were sketches toward [the] autobiography.” Reaburn suggested that all these works “were sketches toward [the] autobiography.” EH himself decided to project publicly, and he defined nine roles: the sportsman, the tough manly man, the exposé of sham, the arbiter of taste, the world traveler, the drinker and bon vivant, the insider, the stoic veteran and the heroic artist. Features that Donaldson reduces into EH’s intentionally projected image of a “tough guy who also happened, incredibly, to be a literary genius.” Donaldson reduces into EH’s intentionally projected image of a “tough guy who also happened, incredibly, to be a literary genius.” When in the late 30s EH published, for example, the novels To Have and Have Not (1937) and especially For Whom the Bell Tolls (1940) the distinction between EH himself and what he had written was so blurred that determining “who or what the ‘real’ Hemingway was” became impossible. The myth surpassed the man behind it.

It is true that in either Death in the Afternoon, Green Hills of Africa or AMF the reader seems to be “rewarded with more reality than imagination” as author’s focus is on his own “literary persona, autobiographical reflections and incidental opinions.” In these books EH wrote using a first-person narrator called EH who evoked his past experiences, but he also used the conventions of autobiographical writings -real names, dates, places, events- for his imaginative purpose as a creative artist. As Kazin suggested, AMF is the sort of narrative that “deliberately retains the facts behind the story in order to show the imaginative possibilities inherent in fact” and we glimpse this imagination inherent in facts partly because the style in which AMF is written does not differ from the style of EH’s fictional works: “It is in subject and tone indistinguishable from much of Hemingway’s fiction, and it is full of dialogue as maliciously clever as Hemingway’s fiction.” Yet if EH had wanted to write the story of AMF without a main character called EH and without clear references to facts he really experienced he would have done so; actually, The Sun Also Rises has the same setting as AMF but, being clearly a novel, the

---

242 Donaldson, “Hemingway and Fame”, 11.
243 Reaburn, Fame Became of Him, 15.
244 Reaburn, Fame Became of Him, 40-3.
245 Donaldson, “Hemingway and Fame”, 11.
246 Harry Morgan, a fishing boat captain whose economic situation forces to work in smuggling between Cuba and Key West (Florida).
247 Robert Jordan, a young American who joins the International Brigades to fight with a republican guerrilla during the Spanish Civil War. Both novels, again, contain autobiographical undertones EH had dedicated himself to introduce with the already mentioned non-fictional publications.
248 And also in The Dangerous Summer, published posthumously by Scribner’s in 1985 and in True at First Light. Both present several editing problems. We have already mentioned the innumerable editing problems True at First Light contained (see footnote 31).
249 Botta, A Study in the Genre of Memoir, 37.
251 Kazin, “Autobiography as Narrative”, 211.
reader does not necessarily expect, for example, the Paris in the novel to look like the historical Paris of the time.

We have seen that EH claimed that “95 per cent of The Sun Also Rises was pure imagination” but the implication of writing a book with EH as a first-person narrator who is meeting the people, and doing things all Hemingway-reader knows he did is, at least, that the reader will expect that the percentage of facts-fictions will be different. Although at the beginning of a AMF the readers are warned that “this book is fiction” because “all remembrance of things past is fiction”, ambiguous statements such as “there is always the chance that such a work of fiction may throw some light on what has been written as fact” suggest that AMF is ‘less imagined’ than EH’s overtly fictional works, that the 95 per cent of the book would not be imagination so this book written as memoir should contain more factuality than his short-stories and novels. When an author writes a book in a memoir form using his name and the first-person narrator when he has already used the same past for a novel (The Sun Also Rises) it is obvious that he turns to autobiographical writing out of some creative longing that the overtly fictional story has not fulfilled. In a 1924 Transatlantic Review article EH said that “it is only when you no longer believe in your own exploits that you can write your memoirs”, but the truth is that far from lacking invention he found in the memoir form “some particular closeness and intensity of effect” that he valued; the esthetic effect that EH “seeks would seem to be the poetry of remembered happenings, the intensity of the individual’s strivings, the feel of life in its materiality.” Indeed, one of the possible readings of the idea that “such a work of fiction may throw some light on what has been written as fact” is that EH, as Kazin says, is creating his “mask of sincerity”; he is trying to “convince the reader that his account, although sounding like fiction in many respects, might be less fictional than what the reader

253 Baker, Selected Letters, 400.
254 I have already suggest that in the 2009 edition the section “drafts of false starts for the introduction” should be located at the beginning of the book because it clearly affects the reading.
255 Hemingway, AMF, 229.
256 Hemingway, AMF, 230.
257 Hemingway, AMF, 230.
258 Kazin, “Autobiography as Narrative”, 212.
261 Kazin, “Autobiography as Narrative”, 212.
262 Hemingway, AMF, 230.
263 Kazin, “Autobiography as Narrative”, 213.
has been told. Among the techniques EH uses to emphasize his attempt to be sincere in AMF I would include ‘memoir problems’ and ‘nostalgic writing’. Although it is obvious that EH is making things up because certainly we cannot believe that anyone would be able to remember the amount of details he puts in the book and the dialogues after 30 years, he still tries to be more truthful by admitting that there are things he cannot remember:

“The maidservant”-she used her name but I have forgotten it- ‘will look after you.”

/ I cannot remember whether she was walking her dog or not, nor whether she had a dog then. […] Later I often met Miss Stein with her dog in the Luxembourg gardens; but I think this time was before she had one. / I do not remember whether it was that day, or much later, that he showed me a review.

The implication of indicating that he does not remember some things is that the author is being sincere so the reader can trust his recollections when he affirms without doubts.

Meyers defines AMF as “Hemingway’s nostalgic memoir of his life in Paris during 1921-1926 when he was in love with his wife and writing his most original work.” AMF is full of nostalgia for the past, that is to say, full of a “sentimental longing or wistful affection” for the life EH lived in Paris. Every reader can conceive that a man who is aware of his dementia problems and who is facing the end of his life in a severe state of depression may need to recall his past years -when he was young, happily in love and his literary skills were at his peak- with some sort of nostalgia and idealization. And in the case of AMF this nostalgia seems sincere because it affirms the identity of the writer, it can be easily associated with the physical and mental state of EH when he was writing the Paris sketches: “All I must to do now was stay sound and good in my head until morning when I would start to work again. In those days we never thought that any of that could be difficult.” It is impossible to know to what extent this nostalgic evocation is deliberate; the only thing we know is that “this sense of melancholy is present from the start.” As “Hemingway’s fiction about the remembered past is never as straightforwardly nostalgic as
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264 Birgitt Flohr. *The Relationship between Fiction and Autobiography*. Diss. King’s College London, April 1998, p.6. We can think, for example, of what has been stated earlier in this dissertation about Stein’s *Autobiography*.


267 Hemingway, *AMF*, 130.


272 Young, *A Reconsideration*, 283.
his nonfiction”273 even this idea of nostalgia and idealization of a paradise lost, by which the whole book is impregnated, becomes an attempt to prove the sincerity of the author; an attempt to affirm his identity and his sincere urge to tell what he really remembers. In this case, the ‘mask of sincerity’ would consist in showing a nostalgic or melancholic attitude to prove that there is something real behind it, because even being a nostalgic account which clearly idealizes the past, it seems difficult to miss or idealize something that has not really been lived.

In other words, the relation the text establishes to an external reality (Paris of the 20s, with real people such as Stein, Fitzgerald or Pound) via the identity of author and narrator (including this self-serving nostalgia, idealizations274 and memory problems) encourages us to read AMF as a sincere approach to how the author remembers his past, to believe what EH says. Even being aware of the fictionalizations (dialogues, for example, or how EH also ‘remembers’ exactly which brand of alcoholic beverage he was drinking on every occasion) and instrumentalizations in the text, these ‘sincerity techniques’, and especially, as Kazin says, this intensity of author-narrator’s strivings, “the feel of life in its materiality”275 associated with the use of EH as a first-person narrator, encourage the thought that this book written as memoir involves more real facts than EH’s openly fictional novels. The reader intuits that AMF contains more factuality, but he does not know to what extent, because it is difficult to assess at what point memory is shaped by imagination; this circumstance perfectly paves the way for the perpetuation of the myth-making. I will end this chapter by trying, as Weber276 and Tavernier-Courbin277 did in their respective works, to “demystify his [EH’s] efforts at self-mythologizing”278 his Paris years as the time when he was poor and damned.

Three weeks after their arrival, in January 9, 1922 the newly married couple moved into a flat near the Place Contrescarpe, just in front of the Café des Amateurs:


274 In AMF EH is the best drinker, the most disciplined writer and the man with the most common sense of the entire Paris City.

275 Kazin, “Autobiography as Narrative”, 212.


277 Tavernier-Courbin, *The Making of a Myth*.

278 Sanford Pinsker. “*Hemingway’s Art of Non-fiction, and Ernest Hemingway’s A Moveable Feast: The Making of a Myth (review)*”. *MFS Modern Fiction Studies*. Vol. 38, No. 2, Summer 1992, p. 470. As I have said in the introduction, Leo Robson indicated that “Hemingway spent 40 years converting himself into a myth, and his readers have now spent 50 years trying to convert him back” (Robson, “Glints of a rising son”, 48). On this occasion my aim is far from ‘converting EH back’ and discerning exactly where the mythomania ends and where the man starts. My purpose is only to demonstrate with an obvious example that in AMF the author is feeding his myth-making.
A sad, evilly run café where the drunkards of the quarter crowded together and I kept away from it because of the smell of dirty bodies and the sour smell of drunkenness. The men and women who frequented the Amateurs stayed drunk all of the time or all of the time they could afford it. In AMF the author also presents himself as a poor and insatiable drinker, but already on the first page of his memoir he makes clear that he is not the kind of poor and drunk who frequents places like the Café des Amateurs; EH was as poor and drunk as somebody who had a bohemian lifestyle needed to be (according to Meyers, when EH was living in Paris he was already “intoxicated by the romance of bohemian life”). In the following page, EH tells the reader that as the noisy flat disturbed his work, he rented a writing room on the top floor of “the hotel where Verlaine had died.” Many scholars accepted this information as fact, among others Baker in his A Life Story, but, according to Meyers and Lynn, Verlaine had died at 39 rue Descartes, near the Panthéon; “Hemingway’s mythic connection with Verlaine […] was meant to suggest his sympathetic fellowship with an artist who had lived in poverty and suffered neglect. It amused Hemingway, after he had achieved wealth and fame, to give the misleading impression that he had once been as poor as Verlaine.” In AMF allusions to poverty are constant:

There was no money to buy books. / It was all part of the fight against poverty that you never win except by not spending. / You got very hungry when you did not eat enough in Paris because all the bakery shops had such good things in the windows and people ate outside […] so that you saw and smelled the food. When you were skipping meals at a time when you had given up journalism… / It is necessary to handle yourself better when you have to cut down on food so you will not get too much hunger-thinking. Hunger is good discipline and you learn from it.
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As can be seen, “poverty is virtually apotheosized” and according to the legend AMF promotes EH “worked all day in his unheated garret, too poor to buy firewood or afford lunch”. This vindication of poverty suggests that the good artist is the hungry artist because an empty stomach promotes a definite sharpening of perceptions: into the Luxembourg museum “all the paintings were heightened and clearer and more beautiful if you were belly-empty, hollow-hungry. I learned to understand Cézanne much better [...] when I was hungry”. As Donaldson suggests, this statement “implicitly proposes the corollary that should you become fat and rich, you will be finished as an artist”. Still, the myth of poverty in the Paris years has been perpetuated not simply for what EH says in AMF, also for what has been blindly repeated in some distorted biographical accounts that as “Hotchner’s Papa Hemingway, have perpetuated the idea that Hemingway’s life was his fiction and vice versa”. Hotchner does not hesitate in saying that EH lived a “penurious life” in Paris and in his Papa Hemingway Hotchner even claimed that EH had no money for getting milk for his son Bumby and that he tried to catch pigeons in the Luxembourg Gardens in order to fill his stomach. However, more reliable biographies affirm that they were “never so badly off as the writer, in retrospect, liked to believe” and all indications are that the Hemingways were not poor in Paris. Meyers assures that they were earning around 3.000$ a year; this was a lot of money in the Europe of the 20s: “They could afford to dine every week on tournedos and observe the Joyce family at a nearby table in an expensive restaurant”, and though their apartment was cheap “they ate well, bet money on bike races and horses, […] went skiing in Switzerland and Austria, traveled extensively in northern Italy, spent long summers following the bullfights around Spain and bought a painting by Miró in 1925”. But at the end of his life EH decided to continue his myth-making and presented himself as a damned young man: damned (or auto-damned) to drink more than he should and at all hours, damned to poverty and starvation, damned to have damned friends as interesting as eccentric and alcoholics, damned to have poet friends “marked for death”, damned to work hard as a writer in cafes frequented by the most
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famous artists of those times. EH writes: “I enjoyed being considered damned, and my wife and I enjoyed being considered damned together”\(^\text{300}\). He presents, in short, a portrait of a genial, eccentric, alluring, captivating time while also with the required amount of decay and decrepitude that makes \textit{AMF} a better story. In what proportion EH offers fictions and realities? In the sketch “On Writing in the First Person” he himself answers:

What is, if not easy, almost always possible to do is for members of the private detective school of literary criticism to prove that the writer of fiction written in the first person could not possibly have done everything that the narrator did or, perhaps, not even any of it. What importance this has or what it proves except that the writer is not devoid of imagination or the power of invention I have never understood\(^\text{301}\).

\textit{A Moveable Feast: still an autobiographical text}

What is interesting about \textit{AMF} is that the author himself seems to be aware that every life story is corrupted by the present so “all remembrance of things past is fiction”\(^\text{302}\). As EH is aware that “no one can write true fact in reminiscences”\(^\text{303}\), he decides not to fight against his present; quite the opposite. Precisely for this reason the self-serving acts (acts that certainly might be defined as fictionalizations) become apparent.

EH’s attitude does not necessarily contradict the claim that the writer is trying to write “how Paris was”\(^\text{304}\) because he is really shaping his own and present ‘truth’ of the Paris years in the only possible way: writing from what he needs, feels or wants in the moment of writing. As I have introduced with Abbott’s concept of autobiography as an act, I believe that \textit{AMF} is still an autobiographical text, as Tavernier-Courbin suggests, “not in the sense of faithfulness to events as they actually happened, but in the sense that Hemingway was faithful to his personal vision”\(^\text{305}\). Defining \textit{AMF} as a piece of autofiction does not mean “to cut this text off from a reality outside of itself. It only means to see this reality in a different aspect of the text”\(^\text{306}\). So my way of understanding the book as an autobiographical text does not contradict defining it as a work of autofiction; rather the contrary, the notion of autofiction helps me to stress the act value and the idea that, as EH

\(^{300}\) Hemingway, \textit{AMF}, 184.
\(^{301}\) Hemingway, \textit{AMF}, 181.
\(^{302}\) Hemingway, \textit{AMF}, 230.
\(^{303}\) Hemingway, \textit{AMF}, 229.
\(^{304}\) Hemingway, \textit{AMF}, 220.
\(^{305}\) Tavernier-Courbin, \textit{The Making of a Myth}, 97.
\(^{306}\) Flohr, \textit{The Relation between Fiction and Autobiography}, 5.
knew that writing a memoir always would be a personal performance, he decided not to try to use his writing as “a transparent medium, a window on the past”\textsuperscript{307}. EH was aware that no writer is able to recall the past renouncing to his subjectivity and present situation; that the cohesive and unique self does not exist so knowing or telling the non-fictional and objective ‘truth’ about such a self becomes impossible. When reading the Paris sketches “the historical truth or falsity are important only insofar as they express the identity of the author”\textsuperscript{308} in the moment he was writing. In this sense, AMF, unlike the texts that claim to be ‘factual’, is really true; “in spite of and even by creating fiction presents truth, the truth of the self that reveals itself in the presentation of the fiction of his […] life”\textsuperscript{309}; that is to say, by fictionalizing and instrumentalizing his past events the author achieves a more intense and real presence of the EH of the late 50s and what ‘his’ Paris is.

EH is certainly suspending the “truth-telling intentions inherent in the ‘autobiographical pact’”\textsuperscript{310} regarding the past, but, by doing so, he is intensifying the ‘truth-telling’ regarding his present. Nevertheless, it is very important to note that this piece of autofiction can only be understood as an autobiographical account if EH is sincere and faithful to his personal vision, perceptions, needs and feelings -in the 50s- about his Paris years and the people he met there. I assume that in all instrumentalizations, fictionalizations, nostalgic writings, idealizations and attacks that I have mentioned in the present dissertation EH is being sincere with his actual perceptions and feelings of those happenings, and these perceptions and feelings (either conscious or unconscious) influence what the author wants or needs to do with those happenings; he renounces to make a mechanical reproduction of a portion of his life to tell us what it ought to be, how he wants to remember it or even what he thinks it would have been a better story\textsuperscript{311}.

Certainly Stein was not a manipulative and authoritarian General until after her Autobiography, Fitzgerald did not have a small penis until their friendship deteriorated in the 30s, Lewis did not have the eyes of an unsuccessful rapist until he published “The Dumb Ox” in 1934, and the time and aging turned Hadley into the heroine that she probably not always was in the early 20s. But the work of autofiction all these modified and instrumentalized memories make up (by choice or necessity) really tell us about the man who was holding the pen and struggling with his notebook. Clearly, at the end of his life

\textsuperscript{307} Gratton, “Autofiction”, 86.
\textsuperscript{309} Flohr, The Relation between Fiction and Autobiography, 5.
EH used *AMF* to distribute stabs and taking revenge on people that had hurt him in recent or more distant past or to disparage people he thought were a threat to his preeminence as a writer; a happier EH “might have been more compassionate toward Fitzgerald” or maybe would have “exercised more discretion in his choice of materials”\(^{312}\). We have seen that EH used the traditional conventions of a memoir form to manipulate them to his advantage and to proceed with his myth-making by blurring when his memory was being shaped by imagination. Knowing that EH was proceeding with his myth-making and studying its characteristics may allow us wonder why EH needed or wanted to give that final shape to his figure; definitely, the legendary EH was more a complete whole and less troubled and self-disrupted than the man of flesh and bones that had inspired it. I think EH loved Hadley, I also think he knew he betrayed her and idealizing their marriage and proclaiming his first wife as the heroine of his Paris years may seem a great way to honor her and their youth, their love, and their years together. I think it is also probable that the nostalgic writing, the romanticism and the idealization of the young, strong and hard-working self might be closely related to the mental and physical degeneration EH was facing while writing the manuscripts that later became *AMF*. A book that, surely, amalgamates despair, ego, anger, illusion, fury, esteem, and fact with blinding skill.

Conclusions

_The Restored Edition_ of _AMF_ is not a true critical edition, but it really improves the 1964 version in the sense that it is less edited and closer to the manuscripts EH left. Certainly, it is difficult to imagine EH agreeing to the publication of his drafts and half-finished chapters, but I think that when the decision of publishing an unfinished posthumous work has been made, at least editors have to try to publish all the materials instead of deciding what to include in accordance to what they guess the author would have wanted or intended. Although the 2009 edition clearly improves Mary Hemingway’s version in this regard, I think one of the major mistakes of the recent edition has been placing the section “drafts of false starts for the introduction” at the end of the book. The primary purpose of a preface or an introduction is that it should be read at the beginning and the need of it increases when reading these “drafts” because it is clear that EH worked really consciously on it. As the ideas contained in these “false starts for the introduction” really determine the reading of the entire book, I believe that, instead of using the apparently constructed sentence of the first edition, the best option would be moving the section “drafts of false starts for the introduction” to the beginning.

If I have decided not to use the term autobiography to define _AMF_ it is because I think the notions of memoir and autofiction fit better and with less justifications with what EH did in _AMF_. One of the obvious problems with the terms used in life-writing criticism is their ambiguity, their elusiveness, and we have seen that, in fact, life-writing criticism has added nuances and interpretations to all the notions we have been using. Consequently, on every occasion a critic wants to use them, he is forced to specify which nuance of the life-writing term he is using and in which sense he is interpreting the term; at the same time, this also implies that if the interpretation and explanation of the term are consistent it is difficult to say that the critic is using a misnomer. Abbott, for example, defined _AMF_ as an autobiography, but to do so, he had to present an interpretation of the term autobiography (as an act, action) that differed absolutely from the classical one. In my case, I preferred not to avoid the traditional and historical implications of the notion autobiography and I have not used it because _AMF_ only concerns the years 1921 to 1926 in Paris (a purely structural matter) and above all because I thought it was necessary to remark upon EH’s attitude and intentionality when recalling his Paris years. I have noted this focus -the idea that _AMF_ is centered in five years of EH’s life- by saying that structurally the book can be understood as a memoir, and I have emphasized EH’s attitude of not trying to present a window on his past, but on ‘his past’ through ‘his present’, using the notion of autofiction. The chapters
“Biography by remate’ and Hadley the heroine” and “Myth-making: when Hemingway was poor and damned” introduced how EH composed the work of autofiction of his Paris years, and how all these fictionalizations tell us about the man who wrote AMF in the late 50s, about his needs, his purposes, his feelings or, for example, his desire to give a final shape to his figure when proceeding with his myth-making. Precisely for this reason this piece of autofiction in the form of memoir is still an autobiographical text of the moment EH wrote it; because if one accepts that in all these self-serving acts and fictionalizations EH is faithful to his personal visions, the book is still a personal performance that truly reveals the identity of its author.

EH seems aware that “one’s story in the end is an explanatory myth”313 and what he did with his memoir influenced the beginning of a change regarding self-life-writing narratives. I think EH became an important catalyst of this change by introducing the problems of self-referentiality and the idea that when writing about one’s own past no one can pretend to tell the truth in an objective or verifiable sense: “all remembrance of things past is fiction”314, EH says. Therefore, I really think he anticipated the critical debate that emerged during the 70s associated with the problems involved in understanding autobiographical writings as non-fictional texts; and I really do not understand why, with his major contribution to the evolution of autobiographical forms, EH is not mentioned -not even once- in books such as, for example, Smith and Watson’s *Reading Autobiography: A Guide for Interpreting Life Narratives* or, and perhaps more shockingly, why he does not have an entry in Jolly’s *Encyclopedia of Life Writing* when Barthes, Perec, Nabokov, and many others, have it. In 1997 Reynolds assured that “Hemingway’s nonfiction continues to be the most neglected part of his canon”315. In her *Companion to Hemingway’s Death in the Afternoon* Mandel used Reynold’s sentence as the epigraph to her introduction, and she catalogued AMF as a neglected non-fictional memoir316. I firmly believe that AMF will continue to be both neglected and distorted whether we persevere defining it as a non-fictional text or we continue obviating the autobiographical character of “such a work of fiction” that “may throw some light on what has been written as fact”317.

313 Egan, *Mirror Talk*, 47.
315 In *Prospects for the Study of American Literature* Reynolds used this sentence referring to *Green Hills of Africa and Death in the Afternoon* (Reynolds, “Ernest Hemingway”, 277).
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