

Daniela Crăciun¹

Ernest Hemingway's Heroines from Puppets to Puppeteers: The Case of Brett Ashley in *Fiesta: The Sun also Rises* and Catherine Bourne in *The Garden of Eden*

Abstract: *The paper wishes to explore the way in which two of the most controversial heroines in Ernest Hemingway's fiction, Brett Ashley and Catherine Bourne, may be read through the feminist lens of the binary oppositions introduced by Helene Cixous in her essay "Sorties: Out and Out: Attacks/Ways Out/ Forays" (1975). Although traditional critical interpretations position these characters on one side of the binary oppositions, they are, in fact, more complex than having previously been given credit. They are both insecure and destructive, dependent and independent, both in search of their true identity which seems to surpass the boundaries of patriarchally accepted norms. As a result, they erase boundaries and undermine stereotypes, allowing the reader to decipher their puzzled identities and lives.*

Key words: *binary oppositions, insecurity/destruction, dependent/independent, patriarchal ideology, (conflicting) identity*

Our world is based on dichotomous thinking which organises human culture in terms of opposites such as black/white, sun/moon, reason/passion, good/evil, right/wrong, male/female. These oppositions represent the ideals of what is good or bad and people subconsciously conform to these rules which are part of the education we receive from an early age and which frames our inner and outer universe. As a result, we inherently create these oppositions in mind with everything we are presented with because we have the tendency to create hierarchies which structure our society.

This binary tradition is still strong and is the foundation of structuralist thinking, which supports the idea that binary oppositions give meaning and value to the units of language, as each unit is defined against what it is not. While structuralism argues that binary oppositions occur naturally in the human mind and are forever changing according to our knowledge, poststructuralism is founded on the belief that words do not have actual meanings, they just relate to other words. In *Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences* (1966), Jacques Derrida acknowledges the fact that the human mind has the tendency to think in opposites, but his theory is that the opposite of black is not white, but non-black. Moreover, words overlap and contradict each other according to him.

¹ Ovidius University of Constanța, Romania

The deconstructive reaction to structuralism is taken further by feminist theorists such as Hélène Cixous who argued that behind all the oppositional pairs lies the gender differentiation: male/female. In her groundbreaking essay *Sorties: Out and Out: Attacks/Ways Out/ Forays* (1975), she investigates the place of women in the history of traditional Western philosophy by starting with the question “Where is she?.” When discussing the hierarchical oppositions according to which women have been placed on the inferior scale in relation to men, being attributed the term with the negative connotation, Cixous makes the readers aware of the failures of patriarchal control. As she considers femininity to be situated in culture and language and not in anatomy, it is patriarchy which imposes male privilege and not the individual. Therefore, she identifies the metaphors used by the male imaginary to describe the woman drawing attention to the supremacy of the masculine term over the feminine one. Her binary oppositions show how language structures and legitimates the existing patriarchal order as the first term of the pair always has a positive connotation and refers to male characteristics:

Activity/Passivity
Sun/Moon
Culture/Nature
Day/Night
Father/Mother
Head/Heart
Intelligible/Palpable
Logos/Pathos (Cixous 578)

Corresponding to the opposition man/woman, these pairs are deeply embedded in the patriarchal value system: each opposition can be viewed as a hierarchy where the feminine side is always seen as the negative, dark, irrational, emotional, occult instance. To Cixous, Western thought is constructed in an endless series of hierarchical binary oppositions that are essentially based on the couple of male/female. Some of these pairs were first mentioned by Simone de Beauvoir who stated that

this duality was not originally attached to the division of sexes . [...] The feminine element was at first no more involved in such pairs as Varuna-Mitra, Uranus-Zeus, Sun-Moon, and Day-Night than it was in the contrasts between Good and Evil, lucky and unlucky auspices, right and left, God and Lucifer. (xvi-xvii)

But it seems that human thought and society evolved in such a way that it needed to have men subordinate and dominate women. These examples show that no matter which couple one chooses to highlight the hidden male/female opposition with its positive/negative evaluation can always be traced as the underlying paradigm.

According to Cixous, for one term to acquire meaning is to destroy the other. The result is a continuous battle and the victory is equated with activity and defeat with passivity. Cixous denounces the fact that “woman is always associated with passivity in philosophy” and “Either woman is passive or she does not exist” (579). Therefore her goal is to unlock these hierarchical couples and to disclose the constant passivity of woman in all

philosophical discourse. "Philosophy is constructed on the premise of woman's abasement. Subordination of the feminine to the masculine order, which gives the appearance of being the condition for the machinery functioning" (580).

In order to destabilise this masculine structure, Cixous questions the solidarity between logocentrism and phallocentrism. She believes that destroying this philosophical system based on predefined ideological roles means a transformation which would change behaviours, mentalities, roles, and the political economy. Such change is possible according to Cixous if men and women acknowledge their homosexuality which she defines as "I/play of bisexuality" and without which "there is no invention of any other I, no poetry, no fiction" (581). Although this homosexuality is repressed, there are signs, conduct-character and behaviour-acts which give it away, especially in writing.

In addition, Cixous proposes a new definition of bisexuality saying there are

two opposite ways of imagining the possibility and practice of bisexuality:

1. Bisexuality as a fantasy of a complete being, which replaces the fear of castration and veils sexual difference [...] Two within one [...]

2. Bisexuality as the location within oneself of the presence of both sexes. (582)

It is this second definition of the non-exclusion that Cixous uses when she defines woman as bisexual.

Cixous argues that men are also victims of the masculine structure, as seen in man's fear of femininity and castration due to the fact that psychoanalysis has repressed the femininity of masculine sexuality. On the other hand, while growing up, woman did not have her bisexuality erased as man did. Woman's bisexuality opens her to the other, which is harder for man to allow. It is for this reason that Cixous claims contemporary writing to be feminine. While femininity keeps the other alive, writing is a "the passage, the entrance, the exit, the dwelling place of the other in me" (583). Writing is the constant exchange of one with another. For man this non-exclusion is seen as a threat, as intolerable. For woman, even danger or destruction is an opportunity for expansion and exploration.

Cixous ends her essay noting that woman's self has the capacity to deappropriate herself. Because she is a whole that is made up of parts that in themselves are whole, meaning her body has no end, woman does not perform the regionalisation on her self as masculine sexuality does. According to Cixous, woman "does not create a monarchy of her body or her desire" (584). Not inscribed within (self) imposed frontiers, woman is changeable and open. Thus the female tongue does not hold back but instead enables, expressing multitude.

The aim of this paper is use this theory and previous critical interpretations of Ernest Hemingway's heroines and demonstrate that in spite of the traditional view which positions them on the right side of the slash, they have the so-called "male" traits from the left side of the binary oppositions. The result is the fact that these women are, actually, more complex than they have been given credit.

The opposition between the destructive character of Catherine Bourne and Brett Ashley, two of the most powerful women created by Hemingway in his novels, and their insecurities regarding personal abilities is a striking result of their complex and conflicting

personalities. Both are powerful, independent women who undermine patriarchal ideology. Because of their conflicting ideas about sexuality and gender which are, in fact, the outcome of their inner battle for identity, Catherine Bourne and Brett Ashley are perceived as destructive by the men whom they meet.

Brett's search for identity, free of inhibitions and social constraints, places her in the position of the threatening woman because she does not accept her "womanly" condition and explores the opposite sex in a manly way. This has a two-fold paradoxical consequence: on the one hand, she is perceived as an object of male sexual fantasy and, on the other hand, she is feared by the men she meets. As Cixous argues, male desire erases femininity by making women objects of their own lust in order to consolidate their subjugation and to avoid any redefinition of gender differences which might lead to egalitarian status. Thus, in the world created by the novel Brett is unable to change the way men see her. Yet, she tries to negotiate a position between the two worlds in an attempt to evade this *system* of sexual subjugation in which the masculine attitude to femininity places her.

As a result of this threatening male attitude, Brett has been compared to Circe, the Greek goddess who transformed her enemies into animals by using magic potions. Thus, Milton Cohen argues that just like Circe, Brett emasculates the men around her and discusses her relationship with Robert Cohn as being similar to that of the bull to the steer. Cohen explains:

The steer acts as buffer to the bulls to quiet them and keep them from fighting each other; for its efforts it draws the bulls' wrath and is gored repeatedly.... Like the steer, Cohn accepts this abuse as due, the price of his devotion to Brett (Cohen 160).

Just as Circe's emasculation of men is symbolised by fawning wolves and lions, Brett's emasculation of Cohn is metaphorically paralleled by the bulls' goring of steers. Moreover, the critic attributes Brett with occult powers similar to those held by Circe, when he cites the scene

in which she is surrounded by dancers during the festival, just like a "pagan queen" (159). But such an interpretation of the dancing scene seems rather far-fetched as the exuberance of the dancers can easily be attributed to the excitement of the celebration and not necessarily to the worship of a sorceress.

Kathy Willingham, on the other hand, considers Brett's association with Circe as misinterpretation. In her article "The Sun Hasn't Set Yet: Brett Ashley and the Code Hero Debate" she compares Brett to Dionysus, the Greek god of wine, ritual madness and fantasy. Thus, while discussing Brett's androgyny, she also contrasts Cohen's analysis by arguing that Brett does not embody the characteristics of a bull, but rather those of the matador, as the control she exerts over her life parallels Pedro Romero's bullfighting technique. Furthermore, the critic identifies Jake as being the picador character, the assistant to the matador who wears down the bulls, so that they become easier for the matador to handle, compared to Brett's matador character. Thus, Jake is constantly there for Brett to ease her problems and to get her out of bad situations, even bringing her to Romero. Jake sacrifices his own well-being and self-respect for the benefit of Brett, just as

the picador works hard to tire out the bulls without any hope of high-esteem for this work that benefits the matador.

Unlike Brett, who enters the novel as a strong character, Catherine Bourne evolves from the patriarchally desired model of submissiveness to threatening fluctuations between boy and girl during lovemaking. These are expressions of her need to understand herself in a phallogocentric society with pre-established norms of acceptable behaviour. Thus, in spite of Catherine's general perception as destructive, she, too, is oscillating between opposing poles of social and sexual behaviour.

At the beginning of the novel she is sexually inexperienced in comparison with David and she displays the same willingness and interest to please David just like other submissive characters such as Catherine Barkley or Maria. Thus, when Catherine asks whether it is normal to get very hungry after making love and concludes that "Oh, you know so much about it" (*The Garden of Eden* 5), she is the embodiment of every man's fantasy: unthreatening and sexually compliant. In addition, she manifests her insecurity in the first chapter during their lunch when she fears being abandoned by David in favour of his work. Since art has traditionally been viewed as a masculine prerogative, she worries that his writing will destroy their relationship by his estrangement from her. Furthermore, her bitterness is clear in her response to the waiter's question as to her profession when he sees them go through the correspondence and the reviews of David's book:

"Magnificent", said the waiter who was deeply moved. "Is Madame also a writer?"

"No", the girl said not looking up from the clippings. "Madame is a housewife." (24)

Her description of herself as a housewife offers an insight into her importance in their relationship, as well as her insecurity about the possibility that David might lose interest in her because of his writing.

By directly questioning David about his work Catherine voices her worry that she will not be enough for him if he continues to be absorbed by his work. "I'm frightened by them and all the things they say. How can we be us and have the things we have and do what we do and you be this that's in the clippings?" (24) According to David, art is a solitary masculine act that may be negatively affected by feminine intervention, therefore denied to Catherine:

It would be good to work again but that would come soon enough as he well knew and he must remember to be unselfish about it and make it as clear as he could that the enforced loneliness was regrettable and that he was not proud of it. He was sure she would be fine about it and she had her own resources (14).

In addition, Catherine's insecurity is revealed by her fear that she might bore him "We're not great conversationalists at meals [...] Do I bore you, darling?" (11). Much like the other submissive female characters, she expresses the same anxiety in the presence of a man who does not accept her in his universe.

But soon after this faltering beginning, Catherine becomes the dominant person in their relationship by starting her experiments meant to explore her sexuality and discover her

true identity, even if it means defying the strict rules concerning sexuality established by patriarchal society. And, in spite of her fears and frustrations, her personal concerns and strong will outweigh David's needs "I'm the destructive type [...] And I'm going to destroy you." (5). Not only does she dominate him financially (she comes from a rich American family and therefore has the money to support David), but she also starts searching for means to express her personality. Thus, she cuts and bleaches her hair and then transforms herself from a girl into a boy during their sexual encounters in an attempt to define herself by her own rules rather than by other people's. However, she expects David to accept her escape from the confining patriarchal context and its standards and agree that her haircut was necessary for both of them. This way, she believes that she can reinvent herself and David in roles which are not in the hierarchical relationship male/female.

But, for David, her changes mean breaking the rules of heterosexual society and he fears what Catherine's boyish style might say about him. Moreover, he feels total resentment when his manly fishing experience is overshadowed by her haircut

ordinarily there would have been much talk about that but this other was a big thing in the village too. No decent girls had ever had their hair short like that in this part of the country and even in Paris it was rare and strange and could be very bad. (16)

He obviously needs social and sexual conformity in order to be assured of his own position within the structure. And he finds this position through writing which reassigns him the role Catherine denies him of. As a result, she feels the need to counteract David's perpetuating the law of the father he stands for and she destroys his manuscripts.

Her relationship with Marita is a necessity for Catherine's desire to prove that gender identity is a dynamic and fluctuating entity, fraught with conflicts and contradictions. Her need to explore her same sex drives, despite her initial denial "I don't go in for girls" (105) is unconvincing from the beginning for both herself and David "It was very quiet and her voice did not sound right either to herself or to David." (105). Moreover, the thrill with which she relates to David her first kisses with Marita reveals her need to explore the affair more:

I kissed her and she kissed me and we sat in the car and I felt very strange and then we drove into Nice and I don't know whether people could tell it or not. [...] Anyway she was nice and I was driving and she was so pretty and happy and she was just gentle the way we are sometimes or me to you or either of us and I said I couldn't drive if she did that so we stopped. I only kissed her but I know it happened with me. So we were there for a while and then I drove straight home. I kissed her before we came in and we were happy and I liked it and I still like it. (113)

As opposed to her initial insecurity related to her conversational skills mentioned in the first chapter, here Catherine has an immediate rhetoric which conveys her emotions and her excitement in front of a new discovery of herself.

And once Catherine resigns from her role as a good wife, Marita steps in and joins David in a conservative heterosexual couple in order to reinscribe him in the world of phallogocentric values. In spite of her lesbian experience which allows Catherine to explore

her sexuality, Marita ultimately functions as a means to re-establish David's masculine dominance over female sexuality. This is also marked by David's nickname for her which is used by Catherine as well: Heiress "Do you call her Heiress? Catherine asked. That's a nice funny name." (120). This is symbolic for her part in the threesome, as Marita inherits David from Catherine because she becomes the submissive girl desperate to answer his masculine and heterosexual needs. Only the day after she and Catherine make love for the first time, she begins to focus on her future role as David's dutiful wife. "I'm trying to study his needs." (122) in order to serve him well "That will be good for David." (124). She even reads *Vogue* magazine, a text written explicitly for women, and the ultimate source of information about codified female behaviour. She is particularly careful about his writing and openly blames Catherine for spoiling things for him when suggesting they go to Spain "Damn you, Catherine", Marita said, "He's in the middle of a story. [...] Haven't you any conscience at all?" (152). Moreover, she has a frantic desire to please him sexually. Unlike Catherine, who plays the dominant role, Marita wants David to decide their lovemaking and even suggests that she could do to him the things Catherine did to him:

"You don't want me to do her things? Because I know them all and I can do them."

"Stop talking and just feel."

"I can do them better than she can."

"Stop talking." (185)

Through this character progression, Marita becomes an ideal woman. She is supportive, motherly, attendant to the needs and desires of her troubled yet brilliant author husband. Marita does not question nor manipulate her mate, rather, she prefers to be moulded and guided by him. She becomes so submissive that she seems a puppet on strings with no will of her own. In a conversation with David about a man's giving his wife a black eye, she says, "There's a difference in age and he was within his rights to hit her if she was insulting" (243). Marita's view strikingly contrasts with Catherine's earlier comment to David, "I'm of age and because I'm married to you doesn't make me your slave or your chattel" (225).

While Marita gives up her lesbian affair with Catherine in order to return to heterosexuality with David, Catherine descends, according to those who conform to patriarchal rules, into madness. In fact, it is the madness induced by attempts of male culture to suppress her plans, such as being totally rejected by David and Marita. Her madness shows that even if her experiments have positive consequences for her and help her evade the heterosexual world, the fact that they undermine David's male sovereignty cannot remain unpunished by society.

In fact, what Catherine does is deconstruct, not destroy. Because she believes that identity is not a cultural construct, but one's invention, she seeks to discover hers, even if it means questioning pre-established patriarchal rules. Throughout the novel, the pressure that she behave in a "normal," wifely role is a source of frustration for Catherine. Because being a woman in a patriarchal world means everything every second term in a binary opposition

represents. According to Amy Lovell Strong “She has a heightened awareness of female stereotypes and tries to make David more conscious of the moments when he himself invokes these stereotypes” (193). The critic brings as example their brief argument in a restaurant during which David tells her to lower her voice so that the others should not hear her and she replies “Why should I hold it down? You want a girl don’t you? Don’t you want everything that goes with it? Scenes, hysteria, false accusations, temperament isn’t that it?” (70). It is obvious that she is aware of the social stereotypical constructs of a woman and she realises how she is not seen as a person, but rather as such a stereotypical construction. Moreover, when Marita accuses her “You aren’t really a woman at all,” Catherine responds, “I know it. I’ve tried to explain it to David often enough” (192).

It is not that she despises either herself or other women; rather, she despises the category of women that defines her as hysterical, passive, and weak. In her desire to circumvent constricting categories, Catherine embarks on a series of gender transformations with the hope of liberating herself from the codes of female behavior. (Lovell 194)

This entrapment between the traditional “normal” definitions of womanhood and her own identity, which cannot conform to these rules, makes her reject the oppressive, predictable, and inexpressive form of the woman imposed by patriarchal rules “Why do we have to go by everyone else’s rules?” (15), “Why do we have to do other things like everyone does?” (27). Consequently, Catherine starts her series of gender transformations with the hope of liberating herself from the codes of female behaviour.

But David cannot live without these stereotypes and her behaviour makes him use another dichotomy: she is no longer his “good girl” (21) from the beginning, but the “Devil” (45) who does “devil things” (29). This is also reflected in the distinction between the things which happen in the day and those of the night and hence also the light or dark activities. On the one hand, their reversals take place at night. She becomes a boy (Peter), therefore the dominant partner, while David is forced to take the position of the woman. Catherine tells David, “Truly you don’t have to worry darling until night. We won’t let the night things come in the day.”(22). On the other hand, this binary opposition of light/dark, day/night is closely related to innocence and sin, hence the nickname Devil. The fact that Catherine wants to be so dark might then mean that she deliberately tries to pursue what is often considered sinful. This is supported by the fact that David calls her Devil and that he refers to their sexual activities as “dark magic” (20). Also, her skin getting darker and her desire to be “darker in the body too” (124) symbolise the fact that what she does is condemned by social rules.

Also, closely related to the binary oppositions from above, is the way Catherine and David’s life and relationship appears in the first chapter, where it is described through imagery of light and bright images, suggesting the innocence of their first period together. For instance, they are on the very first page bicycling nearly every day on the “white road” (3) to Aigues Mortes, looking at the “white town and bright beach of Palavas” (4). However, the atmosphere changes suddenly when the couple is driving towards Cannes, the place in which they are to meet Marita. Here the wind is suddenly heavy, the beaches deserted and the tall grass bending and flattening. By this point, this has changed radically where the couple is driving on the “fast *black* road” (87) and Catherine has a “black brown

face" (88). This suggests, that the couple is moving quickly towards what is dark and sinful, the place where the ending starts "the god damn café" (88).

As opposed to Catherine, whose evolution of selfhood acquires new dimensions and meanings as the story unfolds, becoming from weak and insecure a fascinating and seducing, yet a neurotic and destructive woman, Brett's identity is like a puzzle. In spite of being feared by men, she has the same insecurity as Catherine which partly stems from the different ways in which she is perceived by the other characters from the novels and even herself. Thus, there is clear opposition between her social identity, her exterior self, which is that of an assertive, self-possessed woman, and her real self, which is that of a confused and insecure woman. She plays the role of a *femme fatale* because this is what others expect from her. Michael, her fiancé, is not disturbed by her affairs and this could also be interpreted as lack of affection. He accepts her pose as independent woman who does not make compromises for any man, without realising that she is, in fact, searching for that only man to whom she would like to commit.

For example, her affair with Robert Cohn in San Sebastian does not stop him from acting as if nothing happened and claiming her favours in bed "let's turn in early" (*Fiesta: The Sun Also Rises* 69). Moreover, the passionate relationship between Brett and Pablo Romero leaves Michael with a wounded ego, but definitely not with a broken heart. He even deliberately and mischievously uses it to hurt Robert Cohn "Brett's gone off with the bullfighter chap. They're on their honeymoon" (165). Apparently he has a careless attitude towards Brett's relationships, yet this could be explained by her previous misfortunes and his desire to allow her to have fun. The story of Brett's former husband, count Ashley, who made Brett sleep on the floor and threatened to kill her might thus justify his indifference for some and transform it into generosity:

I gave her a fearful hiding about Jews and bullfighters, and all sorts of people, and do you know what she said: "Yes. I've had such a hell of a happy life with the British aristocracy!" (*Fiesta: The Sun Also Rises* 176)

In addition, he does display bouts of jealousy because of Brett's open display of sexual independence. As the three of them (Michael, Brett, and Jake) engage in conversation in a bar, Michael coolly states that Brett had affairs with men before and that she tells him about everything. Brett completes him by adding that they understand each other. However, Michael gets into a drunken fistfight with Robert Cohn. Brett and Michael's relationship is an example of how Brett's sexual independence leads him to forced passivity if he wants to stay with her.

Robert Cohn is obsessed with Brett and cannot go beyond the image he has created for himself. He accepts to accompany the group to Pamplona and to be humiliated by Brett. He is so jealous of Brett and Romero, that he goes to their hotel room and beats the young bullfighter. "He nearly killed the poor, bloody bullfighter" (*Fiesta: The Sun Also Rises* 174). He has extreme reactions, because after attacking Romero he starts crying and wants to shake hands with him. The scene told by Michael seems rather comical, yet it reveals the desperation from Cohn's feelings. As a result, he is told off by Brett who does not want to be bothered by a former lover while being in love with another man.

Pedro Romero is attracted to Brett's beauty and exuberance, but he has neither the wisdom nor the feelings needed to understand her and accept her the way she is. He tries to change her in order to fit in conformity and standards. Her short hair means lack of femininity which is an obstacle for him. "He really wanted to marry me. So I couldn't go away from him, he said. He wanted to make it sure I could never go away from him. After I'd gotten more womanly, of course" (*Fiesta: The Sun Also Rises* 212). Just like Robert Cohn, Romero too wants to have Brett for himself and marriage thus seems like imprisonment. Their encounter is "a clash of patriarchy and feminist freedom" (Beniwal 83) because of his demand and the outcome is her metamorphosis into a new woman who realises that promiscuity is not the answer to the modern question of meaning of life.

It appears that the only man who understands Brett is Jake Barnes, who, ironically and tragically at the same time, cannot completely satisfy all her needs. But he never fails her on emotional level. He accepts with difficulty her flirting and her affairs, being extremely jealous and blaming himself for his infirmity. Seeing Brett with other men is a trauma for him. But no matter how hard it might be for Jake, he is always by her side, whether it is a whim at midnight or a summon through a telegram. "COULD YOU COME HOTEL MONTANA MADRID AM RATHER IN TROUBLE BRETT" (*Fiesta: The Sun Also Rises* 209). This is the telegram Brett sends him after she ends her affair with Romeo and Jake desperately goes after her. Just like other times, he comforts her, holds her, caresses her and accepts her for what she is. His immediate reaction upon entering her room "I went over to the bed and put my arms around her" (211) offers evidence of his recognition of both her deeper need for him and his willingness to fill that need despite the difficulty with their relationship. He repeatedly declares his love for her "Oh, Brett, I love you so much." (*Fiesta: The Sun Also Rises* 48) and he wants nothing but live with her "Couldn't we live together, Brett? Couldn't we just live together?" (*Fiesta: The Sun Also Rises* 48) and is even willing to accept her cheating.

Brett herself is confused when she thinks about her identity and she is aware of the role she plays, yet she appears to have the sense that she must create an identity for herself in order to be happy. However, at the end, her decision to leave Pedro Romero is ridding herself of the persona she has been forced to adopt. Not having her life dictated by Romero's conservative Spanish upbringing is another refusal of conformity and a celebration of her freedom and independence. Her decision is symbolic for her new-found determination not to settle for a state of alienation from herself. Once she decides against marrying Romero, choosing, thus, her independence, she feels good "You know it makes me feel rather good deciding not to be a bitch." (214).

Her conflicting and contradicting emotions and attributes are also revealed by her bodily expressions, especially by her stare. "She looked as though there were nothing on earth she would not look at like that, and really she was afraid of so many things" (23). Jake thus demonstrates one of the conflicting aspects of Brett: her apparent courage and strength, which are but a mask for the fearful battles raging inside of her.

Another particular and repeated aspect throughout the novel which bears significant importance is Brett's bathing which can be seen as cleaning herself. At first her comments about this might seem irrelevant, as in the episode when she and Count Mippipopolous come late at night at Jake's apartment. Hearing that he was just bathing, Brett's response is evidence of her wish to get clean: "Aren't you a fortunate man? Bathing." (*Fiesta: The Sun Also Rises* 47). Later, in a conversation about Michael's arrival in Paris she mentions her

obsession three times: "Haven't bathed even. Michael comes in tonight.", "Must clean myself.", "Must bathe." (*Fiesta: The Sun Also Rises* 65). This fixation could be easily linked to her return from San Sebastian where she had an affair with Robert Cohn. Knowing that both Cohn and Michael consider her to be a sexual object, her natural response is her need to wash herself. Thus, the significance of bathing in terms of defining herself for herself becomes obvious for the reader.

According to Wendy Martin, Brett's dilemma of being independent from and enslaved to the masculine view of femininity at the same time is what stops her from escaping and finding her identity. Because she is

caught between two modes of gender representation: that of the idealized woman on the pedestal and that of the self-reliant woman. She is both the idealized other whom men seek as a prize for their prowess and the autonomous woman who tries to make her own decisions. (Martin 71)

it is very difficult for her to avoid being moulded or perceived by the male crowd as the object of their desire.

Yet, in spite of her blunt sexuality and independent attitude, Brett is financially dependent on the men she is with. She is a Lady by marriage and she enjoys the benefits and luxury of a carefree life due to the men around her. In her article "Brett Ashley as the New Woman", the critic discusses Brett's financial dependence. Thus, in spite of being a flapper who has escaped the entrapment of the nineteenth century patriarchal conventions, she still is confined to the traditional relationship of money. Even if Brett is free of the traditional constraints of the household, she still depends on men to be financially secure. The critic brings as example the paragraph of the unpublished beginning of the novel which was left out in the published version on the advice of F. Scott Fitzgerald:

Lady Ashley was born Elizabeth Brett Murray. Her title came from her second husband. She had divorced one husband for something or other, mutual consent; not until after he had put one of those notices in the papers stating that after this date he would not be responsible for any debts, etc. He was a Scotsman and found Brett much too expensive, especially as she had only married him to get rid of him and to get away from home. At present she had a legal separation from her second husband, who had the title, because he was a dipsomaniac, he having learned it in the North Sea commanding a mine-sweeper, Brett said. When he had gotten to be a proper thoroughgoing dipsomaniac and found that Brett did not love him he tried to kill her, and between times slept on the floor and was never sober and had great spells of crying. Brett always declared that it had been one of the really great mistakes of her life to have married a sailor. She should have known better, she said, but she had sent the one man she had wanted to marry off to Mesopotamia so he would last out the war, and he had died of some very unromantic form of dysentery and she certainly could not marry Jake Barnes, so when she had to marry she had married Lord Robert Ashley, who proceeded to become a dipsomaniac as before stated. (Hemingway cited in Martin 71-72)

It seems that her marriages and her affairs are meant not only to express herself, but also to maximise her opportunity to a carefree life from a financial point of view. Even Count Mippipopulous, a brief appearance in the novel, is such an example of a suitable provider. His generosity and desire to indulge not only Brett, but also her friends is part of the value system she counts on. Thus, he represents the embodiment of the provider: willing to buy anything and finding pleasure in giving it away. According to Brett, "he is extraordinary about buying champagne. It means any amount to him" (*Fiesta: The Sun Also Rises* 49).

This binary opposition regarding Brett's sexual independence, yet financial dependence has led Wendy Martin to argue that Brett reflect the two traditional stereotypical images of a woman: the wife and the prostitute, yet she can never be either because she does not submit to the authority of men, nor does she take money for the payment of sex. This is illustrated in the text because she never pays her way. Unlike Georgette, who explicitly accepts money for sex, Brett implicitly 'sells' herself. Thus, they may be seen as commodities according to Luce Irigaray who believes that

The society we know, our own culture, is based on exchange of women. Without the exchange of women, we are told, we would fall back into the anarchy (?) of the natural world, the randomness (?) of the animal kingdom. The passage into the social order, into the symbolic order, into order as such, is assured by the fact that men, or groups of men, circulate women among themselves. (Irigaray 170)

As a result, Georgette compliments Irigaray's idea because of her position as a prostitute. She is "bought" as a commodity for the sexual pleasure of men. Brett, on the other hand, is again in a duplicitous situation, playing two opposite roles which the reader understands in relation to his own view of the world.

It could be concluded that, in spite of having conflictive characters, both women are punished for daring to express their masculine side to the world. Thus, Catherine becomes crazy after refusing to be confined to the stereotypes of her gender and by mixing the masculine and the feminine, she reveals woman's frustrations with the binary oppositions which structure patriarchal Western thought, whereas Brett is punished by not being allowed to find physical and emotional fulfilment with Jake Barnes.

References

- Beauvoir, Simone de. (1953) *The Second Sex*. Trans H.M. Parshley. New York: Bantam Books, 1970.
- Beniwal, Susheela. "Hemingway, the Feminist". *Studies in American Literature*. Ed. Mohit K. Ray. Delhi: Nice Printing Press, 2002. 70-99.
- Cixous, Hélène. "Sorties: Out and Out: Attacks/Ways Out/ Forays". *Literary Theory: An Anthology*. Ed. Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998. 578-584.
- Cohen, Milton A. "Circe and Her Swine". *Brett Ashley*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House, 1991. 157-165.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences". *Modern Criticism and Theory*. Ed. David Lodge and Nigel Wood. Edinburgh: Parson, 2000. 89-104.

Ernest Hemingway's Heroines from Puppets to Puppeteers: The Case of Brett Ashley in Fiesta: The Sun also Rises and Catherine Bourne in The Garden of Eden

Hemingway, Ernest. (1926) *Fiesta: The Sun Also Rises*. London: Arrow Books, 2004.

Hemingway, Ernest. (1986) *The Garden of Eden*. New York: Scribner, 2003.

Irigaray, Luce. (1985) *This Sex Which Is Not One*. Trans Catherine Porter. New York: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Lovell Strong, Amy. "Go to Sleep, Devil: The Awakening of Catherine's feminism in *The Garden of Eden*". *Hemingway and Women. Female Critics and the Female Voice*. Ed. Lawrence R Broer and Gloria Holland. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2002. 190-203.

Martin, Wendy. "Brett Ashley as New Woman in *The Sun Also Rises*". *New Essays on The Sun Also Rises*. Ed. Linda Wagner-Martin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. 65-82.

Willingham, Kathy G. "The Sun Hasn't Set Yet: Brett Ashley and the Code Hero Debate". *Hemingway and Women. Female Critics and the Female Voice*. Ed. Lawrence R Broer and Gloria Holland. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2002. 33-53.

