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Artists of all kinds—writers, musicians, painters, and so on—have been known to influence and “talk” to each other through their work. One can look at similar tensions and exchanges between contemporary writers: Wright and Hurston, Ellison and Baraka, the “Men of 1914,” and numerous others. Such intertextual ricocheting creates a dialectic of competition and influence, often due to artists’ own efforts at one-upmanship. Some level of intellectual sway, exchange, and rivalry seems de rigueur in the arts, effecting linkages between peers whose work often engages with others’—sometimes with a rivalrous tenor, sometimes a respectful one, or sometimes both. Most all writers use their métier to dialectically respond to and connect with the larger culture: its historical events and personages, its social codes, its various cultural narratives, and its makers and works of art. As Gellhorn observes in this letter to Scribner, a writer’s “set of emotions” can be (mis)directed away from creativity and “causes” and toward a psychological engagement—or battle—with others. Writing a few months before she and Hemingway officially divorced, Gellhorn had seen such “resentments and angers” from Hemingway during their five volatile years of marriage, both toward other

What in hell is the matter with writers? Why do they have to be so goddamn touchy: I remember all E’s touchiness and phobias and enemies and what-not. It seems such a furious waste of time. I find myself being a kind of Pollyanna and telling them to leave things alone and forget it, one hasn’t time in this life to be so full of resentments and angers. Or rather, one shouldn’t have them personally: one should use up that set of emotions on causes, and try to be a jolly person in normal life.

—Martha Gellhorn to Charles Scribner, July 29, 1945
authors and herself. It seems, judging by her observation about writers being “so goddamn touchy,” that certain creative temperaments resent others of comparable or threatening stature. Writers are emotional beings; it is, perhaps, only natural that the emotional demons fueling their work spill over into their interpersonal relationships. Hadley, Pauline, Martha, and Mary Hemingway knew it, as did Estelle Oldham, Meta Carpenter, Joan Williams, and the other women in Faulkner’s intimate emotional life.

From the early 1930s, when they were published together in *Salmagundi* and Hemingway took the first significant swing in *Death in the Afternoon*, to the 1950s, when both won the Nobel and Pulitzer Prizes, Hemingway and Faulkner remained a powerful presence in each other’s professional life. Psychocompetitively, each was the other’s most important coeval; each, in turn, was among the other’s most spirited critics. Faulkner, for Hemingway, needed less rhetoric and more editing (as long as it wasn’t Max Perkins’s), and tried to “write them all” while sacrificing basic clarity. Hemingway, for Faulkner, was hesitant to take chances, lacked glory and courage in his work, and thus was the aficionado to Faulkner’s matador. Indeed,

Faulkner felt that most of Hemingway’s work had been written from the wrong moral bases in a highly refined but essentially limited style. Hemingway felt that Faulkner had the most abundant natural gifts but that he had written too much, continuing when he was tired and then sometimes going on alcohol, adulterating the works with “tricks” and “rhetoric.” Hemingway spoke of “getting in the ring” with Balzac and Tolstoy; Faulkner would say you wanted to be “better than Shakespeare.” Perhaps the remarkable thing was that they expressed as much admiration for each other as they did.¹

Their different lifestyles and aesthetics notwithstanding, their paths were intertwined throughout their long careers, from Hemingway questioning Faulkner’s productivity in 1932 to the praise, critique, and guarded “admiration” they articulated for each other for almost thirty more years.

The intense, richly intertextual 1950s culminated decades of sparring and debate about art and about each other. After Faulkner won the Nobel Prize and gave a speech implicitly critical of Hemingway, their debate crested in Hemingway’s correspondence and his own Nobel Prize address, which refuted Faulkner’s ideas. The period from 1947–1955 was the acme of their relationship, the almost nine-year period bookended by Faulkner’s ranking of Hemingway and their later commentary on it. This mini-era saw them write their only known letters to each other, Faulkner’s criticisms weigh most heavily on Hemingway, Faulkner publicly praise (but subtly disparage)

Hemingway’s work, and their personal lives echo each other poignantly and dramatically. Yet, their social paths most likely never crossed for any significant period, if at all. Their social distance belied their closeness artistically and psychologically. Perhaps to each man’s chagrin, certain works open themselves up to a more synthetic reading, one privileging commonalities over criticisms. Some connections, such as their reverence for hunting and nature, were circumstantial; each man’s father passed down a love of the wilderness, and part of each man’s masculine code seemed to require them to be hunters. Other textual crossings were consciously or unconsciously psychological, such as the one Hemingway likely imagined during his penultimate trip to Spain, in the “dangerous summer” and early fall of 1959.

**MANO A MANO DUELING IN SPAIN AND AMERICA**

When he was finishing up “The Art of the Short Story” during the summer of 1959 and sniping at Faulkner in it, Hemingway was in Spain to cover the mano a mano bullfights between brothers-in-law Antonio Ordóñez and Luis Miguel Dominguín. First a story in *Life*, Hemingway’s lengthy, psychologically weighted account of their summer-long series was eventually published in 1985 as *The Dangerous Summer*, which follows two craftsmen in another trade he felt gained its worth from rivalry. This posthumous work came out of an arduous time for Hemingway, given his failing mental and physical health, emotional turbulence, writing struggles, and fading career. His inner world was highly mercurial before, during, and after this trip to Spain: “Each trip down his emotional roller coaster took him deeper into his private demons. Each time down, it was more difficult to climb back up. But each time he recovered, his writing exploded.” By the late 1950s, Hemingway had also been writing—but not finishing—what would become *A Moveable Feast, Islands in the Stream, The Garden of Eden*, and *Under Kilimanjaro* during “two manic periods of writing.”

While he saw Faulkner publish a great deal of work and receive numerous honors in the 1950s, Hemingway felt slighted, despite his own reputation, influence, and awards: among them the Nobel and Pulitzer Prizes, the Award of Merit Medal from the American Academy of Arts and Letters, and the Cuban Order of Carlos Manuel Céspedes. Yet, “this avalanche of honors could not undo the damage. The aging, traumatized celebrity who followed the bulls in 1959 was very different from

---

2. Portions of this section were published in *The Hemingway Review* 28.2 (Fall 2008). My thanks go to Susan Beegel for her editorial advice, great support, and guidance.


4. Ibid., 365–66.
the ambitious, eager young man who had followed them in the 1920s and early 1930s.”

Hemingway was in Spain from May 1 to October 27, 1959, to follow Ordóñez and Dominguín, fellow bullfighters whose summer-long competition seemed to be a proverbial, contentious battle for preeminence. Closely watching Ordóñez and Dominguín for several months, thinking about his métier, and facing his own “aging” must have evoked Hemingway’s longstanding animus toward Faulkner. They too were comparably talented, stylistically distinctive craftsmen dueling, one-upping, and influencing each other. Whereas Hemingway does not mention Faulkner by name (as in *Death in the Afternoon* or “On Being Shot Again”) or by coded reference (as in “corncob” in *Across the River and into the Trees* or various letters), Faulkner is very much present in *The Dangerous Summer*, psychologically if not textually. The text is among the last he wrote revealing both Faulkner’s influence and the emotional drain of their intertextual rivalry—further evidence of George Monteiro’s claim that theirs was a rivalry “that, in the last analysis, showed neither of them to good advantage.”

The *Dangerous Summer* subtextually, and perhaps subconsciously, recasts the Hemingway–Faulkner dialectic through its competitive tenor, remarks on craft and professional integrity, and evaluations of the matadors. The text’s competitive grid—one-upmanship, mutual evaluation, showmanship, and trickery—parallels the psychocompetitive patterns we have seen between Hemingway and Faulkner. The matadors are the writers’ psychological counterparts: Hemingway identifies himself with Ordóñez and Faulkner with Dominguín. His contrasts between Ordóñez’s and Dominguín’s styles, audiences, and successes echo similar contrasts he regularly drew between himself and Faulkner. Through this aesthetic lens, Faulkner and Dominguín use forms of trickery, while Hemingway and Ordóñez embody technical perfection, honor, and dignity. Significantly, the matadors’ one-two placement in the text differs from the writers’. Given his late acclaim, many awards, and prolific output, Faulkner was arguably superior, yet Ordóñez is the text’s better matador and Hemingway’s ideal. Whereas Hemingway was strong-willed and hypercompetitive, he often felt inferior to Faulkner during the 1950s when he himself struggled and the latter was more successful publicly. Hemingway’s personal and professional anxiety stemmed partly from their harsh intertextual and professional dialectic in which Faulkner received more public acclaim later in their careers, revealed in numerous correspondence of the 1950s as I have shown in Chapter 4.

5. Mandel, 3.
After January 1959, “[t]he next thirty months was the dark trip down” for Hemingway as he suffered physically and mentally, drank excessively, traveled to Spain, mistreated and estranged himself from Mary, and wrote “The Art of the Short Story,” the only work of his that Scribner’s rejected. Digging “up his old grievance with Faulkner” often indicated that Hemingway “was on the dark side of his emotional curve,” where he seemed to stay throughout that summer and fall. Hemingway’s “moody and depressed” nature during his time in Spain plagued his mind, marriage, creativity, and the somewhat manic composition of The Dangerous Summer. The manuscript reached 100,000 words by January 1960, was cut to 70,000 by A. E. Hotchner for Life in late June, and then vaulted past 120,000 words by early July. The text “looks at all the challenges the artist faces as he labors to subjugate the resisting subject into art, and to communicate that art to the public.” As a “literary testament,” The Dangerous Summer is a psychological intertext that indirectly traces the Hemingway-Faulkner rivalry while directly treating the Ordóñez-Dominguín series. The text examines the competitors’ differing artistic styles and the “challenges” they posed to each other.

At the intertextual level, Hemingway’s identification with Ordóñez in The Dangerous Summer countervails Faulkner’s use of matador and aficionados in “Old Man,” with Hemingway figuratively surpassing him, reclaiming his bullfighting lexicon, and somewhat alleviating his own creative troubles. At the psychological level, this metaphorical quelling of Hemingway’s writerly anxieties echoes Melanie Klein’s “projective identification” construct, which I want to borrow here: it is “based on the splitting of the ego and the projection of parts of the self, into other people” and stems from a weakened ego, “anxiety aroused by the destructive impulses directed against the self and external world,” and the “incapacity to bear anxiety.” Projective identification echoes Freudian positive transference, sometimes seen in patients’ “dreams of recovery,” and it can “signify a wish to be well.” For Freud, transferring one’s anxieties outward suggests “the compulsion to repeat treatment” and an act of denial, in a sense: idealizing something outside oneself affords at best a temporary displacement of anxieties. Positive transference is underpinned by internal anxieties, which are still active, regardless of any outward transference and idealization.

Spinning off Freud, Klein writes, “Projection [. . . ] helps the ego to over-
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come anxiety by ridding it of danger and badness. Introjection of the good object is also used by the ego as a defence against anxiety.”

A shield against internal insecurity and “badness,” projective identification comes out of anxiety, perhaps “of influence” in Hemingway’s case, insofar as a weakened individual seeks a connection with a strong one to allay personal anxieties. The “good object” for the Hemingway of *The Dangerous Summer*, Ordóñez epitomized true bullfighting craft: “he could make all the classic passes without faking,” “he was a genius with the cape,” and “had the three great requisites for a matador: courage, skill in his profession and grace in the presence of the danger of death.” As both aficionado and textual persona, Hemingway found these traits emotionally empowering. Their friendship brought him further into Ordóñez’s cuadrilla—they were often together at restaurants, training sessions, hotels, hospitals, and Hemingway’s sixtieth birthday gala on July 21, 1959. Hemingway embraced this close connection; it garnered him more eminence as the chronicler of the mano a mano series and enabled him to identify with a matador whom he had respected and idealized.

Whereas *The Dangerous Summer*’s events and personages are largely genuine—if a little reshaped, as Mandel notes—Hemingway’s casting of the matadors, their rivalry, and their bullfighting techniques speaks in part to Klein’s notion of projective identification. His psychological link to Ordóñez rests not in the narrative proper but in his somewhat biased portrayal of the matadors and their ostensible rivalry. Hemingway’s remark in *Death in the Afternoon* that Faulkner’s stories are florid and deceptive anticipated criticisms in the 1950s of his literary trickery, some of which we saw in Chapter 4. He would say virtually the same about Dominguín’s affected bullfighting in *The Dangerous Summer*. Whereas Dominguín performed “the tricks the public loved and expected of him” in Bayonne and elsewhere and received rousing applause, Ordóñez embodied the technical perfection of form, getting applause from the spectators and, more significantly, the approval of aficionados such as Hemingway. As Hemingway saw it, the “public” that loved Faulkner’s “tricks” included the Nobel Prize Committee, which awarded him the Nobel first, just as Dominguín satisfied his non-afficionados with his trickery and showmanship. Within each duel over craft and style existed one-upmanship and influence: each figure respected the other’s abilities, studied his performances, and answered with his own more daring performances.

For Hemingway, he and Ordóñez eschewed such showmanship in favor

15. Ibid., 178.
of a truer art, hence the psychological link he wanted—and needed?—to cultivate. While convalescing at Bill Davis’s La Cónsula after being gored in Aranjuez on May 30, Ordóñez asks about Hemingway’s intermittent productivity. After Hemingway notes his struggles—“Some days very well. Some days not so good”—Ordóñez uses variants of write to describe his own work in the ring: “I’m the same way. There are days when you can’t write at all. But they have paid to see you write as well as you can,” after which Hemingway notes Ordóñez “was very pleased, always, to call the faena writing.” Each feels an affinity with the other as a fellow “writer” and insider privy to the secrets and techniques of their respective crafts; for both, write variants underscore the paradigmatic aesthetics of Ordóñez’s bullfighting, couple their crafts, and draw them closer to each other. Hemingway later describes Ordóñez’s techniques artistically: he “made poetry of movement” and “sculptured his passes gently and slowly making the whole long faena a poem” at the Málaga bullfights on August 14. Hemingway seemingly wants to feel that he and Ordóñez have “a good deal in common,” since such an affinity could have displaced some of his own anxieties, recharged his creative process, and pushed him ahead of his literary peers. As Mandel reminds us, Ordóñez’s “unreserved love and admiration soothed an aging, testy man whose relations with his own sons were difficult (none of them came to his sixtieth birthday party), and his success gave Hemingway entry to the energetic and energizing world of youth and talent.” By Klein’s model, the revitalizing Ordóñez is “the good object” with which Hemingway identifies “the good parts of [his] self” to screen out “persecutory anxiety”—his emotional instability, physical decline, waning creativity, and rivalry with Faulkner that both obscured his own accomplishments and depleted his energies.

Like Death in the Afternoon, The Dangerous Summer depicts Hemingway as the über-aficionado and learned, privileged insider tracking Dominguín and (much more so) Ordóñez across Spain. Through this narrative ethos, Hemingway established Ordóñez as his paragon, metaphorically fused with him, and created a foil coupling: Faulkner and Dominguín, both presumably the less pure, dignified craftsmen. The Dangerous Summer crystallizes the Hemingway–Ordóñez and Faulkner–Dominguín pairings as the matadors’ rivalry commences in earnest, but the bullfighters’ staunch rivalry was

16. Thanks to Miriam Mandel’s excellent work with The Dangerous Summer and Hemingway’s time in Spain, I have been able to date specific fights and incidents rather easily.
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not particularly accurate. Casting the bullfighters as strident rivals is part of what Mandel identifies as Hemingway’s “bias.” There were “basic facts that Hemingway knew but did not communicate clearly enough to his readers: namely, that Ordóñez and Dominguín came from different backgrounds, had different personalities and styles, and were at different stages in their careers [. . . .] They were not childish competitors for a prize; they were separate, distinct, and distinguished figures del toreo.” Moreover, “No bullfighting season is a championship fight between two contenders, with a crown or medal or title to be awarded to one of them at the end. The Dangerous Summer treats the 1959 season in precisely this way.”

Ever-competitive and wanting to present a dramatic competition instead of a more accurate picture, Hemingway thus webbed mutual respect, psychological wariness, concern with the opponent’s successes, and a larger sense of creativity as a competitive exchange. He criticizes Faulkner and Dominguín similarly, using variants of trick and stressing that he knows “how it is done” among them. He rarely doubted Faulkner’s and Dominguín’s innate abilities as craftsmen; rather, he condemned their showmanship, lack of discipline, and seeming trickery. Hemingway had disparaged what he saw as Faulkner’s impure, overly rhetorical Nobel Prize address in, among other correspondence, a June 27, 1952, letter to Harvey Breit. Faulkner’s work, though somewhat strong, was too showy; Hemingway felt he himself could produce better, purer work. Not surprisingly, the parts of Faulkner’s oeuvre that appealed most to Hemingway were those that sound less Faulknerian and more Hemingway-esque: straight, realistic treatment of setting, imagery, and character; tighter, more disciplined writing. Hemingway claimed to prefer As I Lay Dying, Pylon, The Bear (perhaps not Part IV), and such stories as “Turn About,” which he included in Men at War. In the June 29, 1952 letter to Breit, also discussed in Chapter 4, Hemingway singled out sections of As I Lay Dying and Pylon as perhaps Faulkner’s best; for him, though, Sanctuary was virtually unreadable and Requiem for a Nun was flimsy and disingenuous.

As I have discussed in Chapter 4, Hemingway must have been tepid at best about Faulkner’s using his name and referring to For Whom the Bell Tolls in Requiem for a Nun’s presumably overdone, undisciplined passages. Faulkner had mentioned Hemingway by name in Pylon and The Wild Palms, and he would do the same in The Mansion, published shortly after Hemingway returned from Spain. One of the four conversational references to Hemingway, Pilar, and Maria in Requiem for a Nun comes from a wordy paragraph of ninety lines, uses a lot of parenthesis and digression,
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moves nonlinearly, and indirectly juxtaposes Temple’s dialogue and inner monologue. Such style is definitively Faulknerian, hence why Hemingway favored a shorter, more direct presentation of Temple’s mental state, not one he felt was written so complexly and showily.

In Hemingway’s view, Dominguín had a similar repertoire of showiness, which weakened his talent and professional character. Having come out of retirement to compete with Ordóñez, Dominguín displayed ample skill and knowledge in Algeciras on June 15. Hemingway, though, frowns upon Dominguín’s showmanship in the coming “dangerous competition”:

I was sure after I watched Luis Miguel do his trick with the bull when, after preparing him with the muleta, he tossed the muleta and the sword aside and knelt carefully inside the bull’s angle of vision unarmed in front of the bull’s horns.

The crowd loved this but when I had seen it twice I knew how it was done. I had seen something else too. The horns of Luis Miguel’s bulls had been cut off at the points and then shaved back to normal shape [. . . .] The horns looked fine unless you knew how to look at horns.24

While granting that Dominguín’s work was “infinitely skillful and perfectly executed,” Hemingway faults him for feigning danger for the crowd’s pleasure while disarming himself, whereas Ordóñez confronted and created authentic danger.25 Such showy maneuvers and dulled horns are a “spectacle” that degrades the dignity of the toreo and Dominguín’s ability to compete evenly with Ordóñez, who never willingly resorted to trickery or subpar bulls. He and Ordóñez watch Dominguín to keep abreast of the competition’s “parlor trick”: “This was what Antonio and I called the truco or trick. It was a good trick but it was a trick. Luis Miguel’s work had been so superior and so brilliant that he had not needed the trick.”26 In their shared aesthetic sensibility, both decry Dominguín’s showmanship because it detracted from his innate ability, catered to the masses, and falsified the bullfighter’s necessary proximity to danger.

Seen through several negative comments in his 1950s correspondence, Hemingway thought that Faulkner had created a similarly showy illusion in Sanctuary with his opaque description of the corncob scene. In Chapter 13, as Temple is held captive in the barn’s corncrib, “[s]itting in the cottonseed
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hulls, in the litter of gnawed corn-cobs,” Popeye approaches her ominously. Yet, she only thinks “Something is going to happen to me.” We know that Popeye is impotent and sociopathic; we know that she is in a corncrib littered with dry corncobs—the narrator does not fully divulge what Popeye does to Temple until Chapters 23 and 28. In the latter, District Attorney Eustace Graham presents a blood-“stained corn-cob” first to the jury and then to Temple. This is the dramatic coda to “this horrible, this unbelievable, story which this young girl has told,” although Lee Goodwin is wrongly accused, convicted, and lynched for Popeye’s crime, caused partly by Temple’s perjury. One could argue that Faulkner’s hinting at Popeye’s use of the corncob as a violent phallus adopts part of Hemingway’s Iceberg Principle. This, for Hemingway, was one of many examples of “how [Faulkner] fooled you the first time” and did not tell his stories “baldly.” One could figure out that the “little black thing” is presumably a dried corncob by revisiting the “litter” image in Chapter 13 after reading Graham’s speech, but Hemingway found such deception disingenuous. Instead, he sought what he saw as the true “mystery in all great writing,” such as the unmentioned war in “Big Two-Hearted River” from which Nick Adams seeks solace, or the somewhat cryptic reference to Faulkner in Across the River and into the Trees through two references to a “corncob.”

Similarly, Hemingway praises Dominguín’s unparalleled work with the banderillas, but qualifiedly: “Luis Miguel had been facile and talented in everything, was a great banderillero and what the Spanish call a torero muy largo; that is, he had an extensive repertoire of passes and elegant tricks, and could do anything with a bull and kill just as well as he wanted to.” Still, he found Dominguín’s style suspect, because it detracted from the bullfight’s meaning and sanctity. Hemingway often uses spectacle, tricks, and circus to deride Dominguín’s style, suggesting that such techniques left him ill-fitted against Ordóñez. As he laments of 1950s-era bullfighting, “the public loves these tricks” that Dominguín and others performed:

Many trick passes have been invented in which the man really passes the bull instead of having the bull pass him, or takes advantage of his passage, saluting him, in effect, as he passes rather than controlling and directing the moves of the bull. The most sensational of these saluting passes are done on
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bulls which charge on a straight line and the matador knowing there is comparatively no danger turns his back on the bull to start the pass.

Hemingway sees Dominguín as gifted but over-reliant on such tricks—not standing still, “controlling” the bull, and evincing a graceful courage but turning his back and creating an illusory danger. A true pase would have been “extremely dangerous” and required that “the bull [. . . ] be controlled by the scarlet flannel the matador holds,” as opposed to what Dominguín, Jaime Ostos, and others often did.\textsuperscript{32} In this view, Dominguín’s affected style pales in comparison to Ordóñez’s genuine, controlled grace. As he did with himself and Faulkner, Hemingway contradistinguishes the matadors’ styles. In this view of craftsmanship, one wants to identify not with a rival of questionable discipline but with an ideal of unassailable discipline and talent, done sometimes in response to inner turmoil, self-doubt, or psychological influence.

Having employed spectacle and tricks for Dominguín, Hemingway often uses perfect, slow, beautiful, control, and pure to elevate Ordóñez, fusing with him à la Klein’s projective identification theory. For him, Ordóñez was nearly perfect:

He could only fight as he did by having perfect nerves and never worrying. For his way of fighting, without tricks, depended on understanding the danger and controlling it by the way he adjusted himself to the bull’s speed, or lack of it, and his control of the bull by his wrist which was governed by his muscles, his nerves, his reflexes, his eyes, his knowledge, his instinct and his courage.\textsuperscript{33}

For Hemingway, Ordóñez epitomizes the discipline that Dominguín lacks. He controls the bull with his capework and physical grace, confronting danger instead of feigning it with “tricks.” This echoes a similar criticism of Faulkner, whose “lack of discipline and of character” he aspersed in June 1952 while comparing Faulkner’s apparent creative fatigue to that which he sensed in Fitzgerald’s Tender Is the Night—both, Hemingway felt, revealed more reliance on alcohol than artistic control.\textsuperscript{34} Hemingway implies that he has the discipline and character requisite for the true artist, having posited in Green Hills of Africa that talent, self-control, and conscience were some of the writer’s—and, by extension, bullfighter’s—necessary qualities.

One sees such stylistic restraint in “The Short Happy Life of Francis

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 51.
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Macomber,” among many other stories. Ostensibly describing the landscape around Macomber’s camp, Hemingway makes a subtle connection between the aftermath of Macomber’s cowardice, the scene of it, and the awkward silence it engendered: “So they sat there in the shade where the camp was pitched under some wide-topped acacia trees with a boulder-strewn cliff behind them, and a stretch of grass that ran to the bank of a boulder-filled stream in front with a forest beyond it.” A short time later, Macomber remembers tracking and shooting the lion at a place Wilson earlier guessed was about “A mile or so up the stream.” Hemingway then writes:

Then they went down the steep bank and across the stream, climbing over and around the boulders and up the other bank, pulling up by some projecting roots, and along it until they found where the lion had been trotting when Macomber first shot. There was dark blood on the short grass that the gun-bearers pointed out with grass stems, and that ran away behind the river bank trees.35

These images seem to describe the same place—both have a stream scattered with boulders and are flanked by grass and trees. Hemingway may not have written that his protagonist looks at the surrounding forest, stream bed, and grass, but Macomber can presumably see them from the camp, since they lie so close. Macomber thus endures his personal shame and tense silence while in sight of the place of such shame. This excerpt is one of many that captures Hemingway’s stylistic control, here the measured description of the tension between Macomber, Wilson, and Macomber’s wounded self-esteem. As Hemingway saw it, his own creative discipline enabled him to subtly connect the camp’s unspoken yet palpable awkwardness to the surrounding environs. To paraphrase Hemingway’s description of Ordóñez: His way of writing depended on understanding the story’s psychological essence and controlling it by the way he anticipated the site of Macomber’s shame in a deceptively simple landscape description.

In Hemingway’s view, he and Ordóñez possess the disciplined sensibility Faulkner and Dominguín lack. He thus “takes possession by projection of” Ordóñez, creating “an extension of the self” that made him feel more empowered, less anxious, and superior to Faulkner.36 This act helped him negotiate “the difference between what was and what was desired” in the Ordóñez–Dominguín mano a mano; he readily identified with Ordóñez’s moving technical perfection and beauty, exaggerating the differences between them.

and (implicitly) Faulkner and himself. At Longroño in September 1956, for instance,

Antonio almost made me choke up with the cape. [...] the kind where your chest and throat tighten up and your eyes dim seeing something that you thought was dead and done with come to life before you. It was being done more purely, more beautifully and closer and more dangerously than it could be done and he was controlling the danger and measuring it exactly to a micrometric proportion.

This is Ordóñez’s way of “making sculpture,” an image Hemingway later invokes when describing his pure artistry. Such genuine grace was perhaps a kind of fourth dimension for Hemingway. As he described the aesthetics of Green Hills of Africa to Max Perkins, he claimed to write the text “absolutely truly. absolutely with no faking or cheating of any kind” to capture “all the dimensions [...] to make the country—not describe it.” As outlined here and embodied in his signature work, Hemingway’s art valued a truthful, clear prose, similar to Ordóñez’s purity and beauty in the ring. Whereas he tells Perkins in the same letter that “after you have read it I think you will have been there” and that he wants a book to “make me see and feel Africa,” Hemingway praises Ordóñez’s transferring emotion to his audience, whereas Dominguín’s “style did not move me at all.” For Hemingway, both the fourth-dimension prose and Ordóñez’s bullfighting have a marked, desired palpability.

Hemingway also praises Ordóñez’s recibiendo: “leaning in [...] so that the man and bull become one figure as the sword goes in after it until they are joined and the left hand, all this time, is keeping the bull’s head down with the muleta low, low, and guiding him out of the encounter. It is the most beautiful way to kill [...] It is also the most dangerous.” Whereas Ordóñez was adept at “controlling the danger” in the ring, Hemingway was equally adept at “controlling” its description on the page. Decades earlier, before needing to feel energized by Ordóñez to reassert his professional standing, Hemingway had captured similar moments. In The Sun Also Rises, Pedro Romero, based partly on Ordóñez’s father Cayetano, “let the bull pass so close that the man and the bull and the cape that filled and pivoted ahead
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of the bull were all one sharply etched mass. It was all so slow and so con-
trolled.” Then,

Romero’s left hand dropped the muleta over the bull’s muzzle to blind him, his left shoulder went forward between the horns as the sword went in, and for just an instant he and the bull were one. Romero way out over the bull, the right arm extended high up to where the hilt of the sword had gone in between the bull’s shoulders.43

The aesthetic parallels between Hemingway’s description of Ordóñez’s and Romero’s performances of such dangerous beauty are clear. Both create a “figure” and become “one” with their respective bulls. Hemingway’s imagery and short sentences slow down these “most beautiful” and “most dangerous” scenes, creating symbolic art-objects for narrator and reader.

Compare—as he surely would have—Hemingway’s crisp imagery and direct presentation of Ordóñez and Romero to Faulkner’s more oblique, though perhaps more avant-garde, imagery of a killing in A Fable. The latter’s imagery is highly connotative in its describing an “almost finicking, even niggardly fatal violence like the bullfighter’s” and being “fixed, as with one twitch of his cape the espada does the bull.”44 Assuming he read this part of the novel whose religious overtones he often criticized, Hemingway doubtless would have disdained Faulkner’s bullfighting similes and long sentences: the first section above comes from a paragraph-long sentence of thirty-nine lines. Although Hemingway’s “one figure” and Faulkner’s “one gesture” slow down violent acts and suggest an artistic symmetry between staunch rivals, their respective styles are at odds. Hemingway’s terse, staccato prose freezes the action, whereas Faulkner’s effusiveness seems to speed up the action, even the act of reading. The above excerpt is typical of Faulkner and, by definition, contradistinctive from Hemingway’s succinct, controlled style. Hemingway saw such verboseness, numerous clauses, and stylistic parenthesis as Faulkner’s “tricks”; through a Hemingway lens, perhaps the “neat” image of the razor’s “slash” is obscured by the wordy descriptions of the chase, aftermath, and the woman’s slit jugular vein.

Through the same lens, Dominguín’s unmoving style was far afield from Ordóñez’s moving, genuinely dangerous style. While in Valencia in July, Ordóñez makes “long, slow endless passes that were like some deep music that only he and the bull could hear. He could always break my heart with the cape [. . . ] He had watched Luis Miguel the day before and he was
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showing the public and himself and us and history what Miguel would have to beat to win.” After seeing Ordóñez make “every beautiful, classic and truly dangerous pass,” Dominguín goes “all out to win in his second bull [. . . . ] It [was] spectacular and beautiful but [was] nowhere near as dangerous as passing the bull slowly by with the cape held in both hands” as Ordóñez had done. Encouraged by—but a bit anxious about—Ordóñez, Dominguín resorts to his crowd-pleasing trickery and “play[s] with” the bull:

He stroked his horn and leaned on his arm on his forehead and pretended to talk to him on a telephone. The bull could never have answered but he could answer even less now that he was bled out and winded and unable to charge. Miguel led him through a few tentative moves holding his horn to help him concentrate and then he kissed him.

Now he had done everything he could do with this bull except propose honorable matrimony and all he had to do was kill him.

Dominguín pushes himself to match Ordóñez’s style and example. Nevertheless, his “tentative moves” and undignified joking pale in comparison to Ordóñez’s brilliance, and he seems to lack Ordóñez’s “perfect nerves” and “courage.”

Despite Ordóñez’s apparent victory in the mano a mano and the matadors’ differences, they shaped each other’s techniques, performances, degrees of risk-taking, and self-conceptions while competing for eminence. In this regard, such mutual risk-taking is analogous to Hemingway’s claim of risk-taking in For Whom the Bell Tolls, as he wrote to Faulkner in July 1947. The novel’s interior monologues, multiple narrative voices, and stream of consciousness suggest Faulkner, and Hemingway equates such chance-taking with a more avant-garde aesthetic. Hemingway saw Ordóñez and Dominguín exert similar psychocompetitive influence over each other at Biarritz. Dominguín’s confidence and ego had been undercut by his injury at Málaga and by Ordóñez’s successes, and he can “only fake a proper kill.” He fights admirably, albeit trickily, yet “Antonio destroyed him mercilessly” and began to outshine the “crippled” Dominguín. Hemingway had earlier anticipated such competitive chance-taking: “If Antonio was not paid the same he would increase the pace until, if Miguel tried to equal him or surpass him he would
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be killed or wounded so badly he could not keep on fighting.” Attempting to match and eclipse Ordóñez could—and was—physically dangerous for Dominguín. To Hemingway’s mind, they warred over who was the better craftsman in the eyes of Spanish aficionados and each other. After Dominguín was injured in the ring at Bilbao, Ordóñez had to finish off his bulls, effectively ending their contest: “There was not any true rivalry anymore to anyone who was present in Bilbao. [. . .] But there was not any question anymore who was the best if you had seen the fights.”50 Theirs was yet another duel between expert craftsmen who traded influence and techniques, with one effectively felling the other in an imagined contest.

Hemingway wanted to be the writer of the American literary scene, and projecting himself onto Ordóñez late in his career may have helped him feel such accomplishment. This victory may have only been symbolic. At his writing desk, Ordóñez’s inspiring style and victories were not truly his. Hemingway was trying “to equal [. . .] or surpass” the literary field; he wrote a lot of material, but he seemingly could not rein it in as he used to. “[F]ighting with imaginary demons” and [f]irmly believing that in his work was his deliverance,” he worked on The Dangerous Summer and A Moveable Feast feverishly, even manically, in 1959–1960: “Because he was leaving work largely completed but not quite finished, one or more books were always begging for attention. [. . .] As summer [1960] approached, Ernest Hemingway was a man pursued, a writer unable to outrun his demons.”51 His creative “demons” must have revealed numerous reluctant truths to him: that his powers had waned, that his life and mind weakened his writing, and that his peers, Faulkner foremost among them, were still publishing. Since he had always wanted to outpace and duel other writers—Fitzgerald, Stein, Stendhal, Cervantes, and many more—Hemingway conceivably felt himself devalued in this self-imagined competition. To his mind, there were no draws in the writing game.

Klein and Segal provide a particularly apt parallel to Hemingway’s troubled mental state in the late 1950s, very much the subtext of The Dangerous Summer. That he was so emotionally and psychologically pained—as “periods of intense writing [were] followed by fallow, emotionally depressed periods”—late in his life indicates that Hemingway attempted to ease his creatively troubled mind by idealizing Ordóñez.52 For Hanna Segal, “anx-
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iety” prompts “projection and introjection [. . .] to keep persecutory and ideal objects as far as possible from one another, while keeping both of them under control.”\(^{53}\) Segal’s use of control is key. Whereas Hemingway wrestled with his personal problems, sporadic creativity, and professional competitiveness, he could to some degree control his portrayal of Ordóñez and separate Faulkner and himself.

*The Dangerous Summer* culminates Hemingway’s decades-long rivalry with Faulkner; its strong resonance with their dialectic dovetails nicely with *Death in the Afternoon*. Texts that doubly juxtapose writing and bullfighting and writers and matadors, they are Hemingway’s first and last book-length evocations of Faulkner’s presence and their mutual psychocompetitive influence. Like the mano a mano *toreo* between brothers-in-law that *The Dangerous Summer* maps, the intertextuality between Hemingway and Faulkner was “a deadly dangerous performance” undergirded “by perfect nerves, judgment, courage and art” in a craft that was also “worthless without rivalry.”\(^{54}\) Hemingway’s writing and emotional health declined rapidly after the summer of 1959, and his two stays at the Mayo Clinic in late 1960 and early 1961 left him a brittle psychological shell of the man he once was. He does not seem to have read Faulkner’s positive references to *For Whom the Bell Tolls* in *The Mansion*, published in the fall of 1959 as Hemingway was beginning his efforts at shaping the Ordóñez–Dominguín narrative into a publishable manuscript. Indeed, this was a poignant emotional and professional struggle woven into *The Dangerous Summer*: a coda to decades of rivalry and shared influence in which Hemingway symbolically assumed the upper hand and launched his parting shot in their protracted intertextual battle. Despite Hemingway’s figurative victory in *The Dangerous Summer*, and despite both men’s late physical and emotional problems, Faulkner’s victory of sorts over Hemingway was not symbolic.

**TEXTS AND ANIMALS THAT RUN BOTH WAYS**

The authors’ personal and artistic differences notwithstanding, their competing interests sometimes intersected—the two most prominent common themes being war and hunting. As discussed in Chapter 2, *The Unvanquished* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* reveal parallelism and influence in the context of internecine war. Likewise, their hunting texts show a similar resonance: they explore gender and racial identity, the ritual practices of hunting, the union of hunter and hunted, the thrill of the pursuit (perhaps more thrilling
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than the kill), the importance of courage, and a veneration for the natural world coupled with the acknowledgment of its coming demise. What I offer in this section is a series of readings of Faulkner’s and Hemingway’s hunting texts, which share themes, imagery, character types, gender constructs, and an almost ecocritical consciousness. At the very least, this section might provide the foundation for further discussion, analysis, and contextualizing of hunting as means of connecting and contrasting the hunters qua rival authors. Hunting had a three-part significance for Hemingway and Faulkner: personal, aesthetic, and intertextual. Their texts of hunting captured what Faulkner in “The Old People” called “the unforgettable sense of the big woods—not a quality dangerous or particularly inimical, but profound, sentient, gigantic and brooding.”

Relatively late in his career, Faulkner gave Hemingway entrée into these personified “big woods” in a late story, “Race at Morning,” symbolically bringing a Hemingway figure into Mississippi as he had done in The Wild Palms.

Mister Ernest in Mississippi

An analysis of the conscious and coincident intertextuality manifested in their hunting works can begin with one of Hemingway’s many criticisms of Faulkner. On October 14, 1955, Faulkner published Big Woods, a collection of four hunting stories interspersed with impressionistic interchapters, reminiscent of In Our Time, Cane, and other short-story cycles of the modernist era. Three of the stories had been published previously: The Bear and “The Old People” in Go Down, Moses, and “A Bear Hunt” in The Saturday Evening Post (1934) and then in Faulkner’s Collected Stories (1950). The last story, “Race at Morning,” was new, having been written in 1954 and sold to The Saturday Evening Post. Always willing and anxious to read Faulkner’s work, Hemingway received a copy of Big Woods, appraising it to Harvey Breit on November 14:

Mr. Faulkner has sent me, or maybe it is only his agents, The Hunting Stories of W/F. They are not dedicated so I do not have to answer. But when you see him, which is inevitable, tell him that I found them very well written and delicately perceived but that I would be a little more moved if he hunted animals that ran both ways. File this under Snobhood: 1st Grade.

Hemingway offers Breit more reserved praise about how the stories are “very well written and delicately perceived” but questions Faulkner’s aes-
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thetic vision and use of bears and deer which, as he sees it, retreat but rarely attack, unlike the lions, leopards, and other animals that he hunted in Africa. Although he admits his own snobbery, he sets his personal and textual experience with African game higher than Faulkner’s with bear and deer in Mississippi. Hemingway eagerly embraces the lack of communication between them, noting that he does not owe Faulkner or Random House any acknowledgment of receiving the book. He thought that he himself hunted more aggressive and dangerous animals, undeniable proof of his greater masculine courage and of “his contentious skepticism toward anything Faulkner said on virtually any subject.” What Hemingway does not discuss, though, is the use of his own name in “Race at Morning.” Perhaps he, as Faulkner had done with *The Old Man and the Sea* in mid-1952, commented on his competitor’s work without actually reading it.

As with all of Faulkner’s hunting fiction, “Race at Morning” depicts the culture of hunting: pursuit (here, of an elusive deer), male camaraderie, drinking, card-playing, and an almost spiritual respect for the wilderness. This aspect of the hunt would be enough to compare Faulkner’s hunting fiction with Hemingway’s, but “Race at Morning” is unique in their mutual hunting oeuvre because it contains an unmistakable cross-reference. In the story, he—as they had often done—seemingly borrowed from Hemingway, not a theme or image but his name, used for the aged, half-deaf Mister Ernest who pursues a deer with the unnamed narrator, a twelve-year-old boy who becomes his adopted son. While Mister Ernest—not given a surname—is not supposed to be Hemingway as such, the name unquestionably evokes him, which is enough to envision a fictional crossing of the authors. In choosing his aged protagonist’s name, Faulkner partly played off Hemingway’s Papa persona. Mister Ernest is a widower who takes the young narrator under his wing to teach him the importance of hunting, school, and farming. Thanks in part to Hemingway’s ubiquitous presence in the press, Faulkner must have known about his practice, while at home and abroad, of gathering a coterie of friends, admirers, and celebrities around himself and instructing them about bullfighting, hunting, fine foods and wines, and travel. Faulkner also seems to have sensed a thematic and gendered connection with Hemingway at the level of hunting, which is another implication of his use of “Mister Ernest.” This choice of name may be coincidental, but the two-plus decades of intertextuality and professional awareness preceding “Race at Morning” suggest otherwise.

As we have seen with *The Wild Palms* and his Nobel Prize address, Faulkner had no qualms about reiving Hemingway’s tropes for his own pur-
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poses, or weaving his judgments of Hemingway into his work—e.g., the matador’s subservient aficionados in “Old Man” or the assertion of honor, glory, sacrifice, and courage as quintessential modern themes in his Nobel speech. “Race at Morning” breaks from this critical mold, because Mister Ernest is portrayed positively, if a little humorously. Granted, Mister Ernest is old and practically deaf—according to another hunter, the young narrator is needed to “do Ernest’s hearing for him”—but he has a keen body of natural knowledge that he passes on to the boy-narrator. Thanks in part to Mister Ernest, the boy is a quick study in camp. Willy Legate remarks that the boy “knows every cuss word in the dictionary, every poker hand in the deck and every whiskey label in the distillery, but he can’t even write his name,” because he had not been schooled in the traditional sense. In turn, the young boy holds Mister Ernest in high regard, suggested by Ernest’s being the only adult in camp whom he addresses as “Mr.” The two make an odd couple indeed, but they also depend on each other throughout the story: the boy guides them when Mister Ernest cannot hear, Mister Ernest instills in the boy an understanding of hunting, and they ride together on the same mount, which the boy names Dan.

As the hunting party begins its yearly “race” for the deer with hoofprints “big as a mule’s” and a rack of antlers “you could cradle a yellin’ calf in,” Mister Ernest and the narrator share the knowledge of the twelve-point buck’s whereabouts: “me and Mister Ernest knowed exactly where he would be—a little canebrake island in the middle of the bayou.” Ernest knows the terrain and its inhabitants, as well as the deer’s location. In fact, he knows more about the deer in this story than Faulkner’s prototypical hunter, Isaac McCaslin, who makes a brief appearance. When the pair finally track the deer to within twenty yards, it first appears that Ernest has made an irremediable mistake: his rifle is not loaded, and both hunters watch helplessly as “the buck turned and give one long bound, the white underside of his tail like a blaze of fire, too, until the thicket and the shadows put it out.” However, the boy later learns that the unloaded rifle was the conscious choice of an experienced, reverential hunter—one who seems to possess a “social conscience,” as John Howell has described it. Ernest values their annual pursuit of the buck much more than killing it, just as the yearly quest for Old Ben drives the hunters of The Bear. The next day, Ernest and the boy return home and discuss the buck:
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“Yes!” I said. “No wonder you missed that buck yestiddy, taking ideas from the very fellers that let him get away, after me and you had run Dan and the dogs durn night [sic] clean to death! Because you never even missed him! You never forgot to load that gun! You had done already unloaded it a purpose! I heard you!”

“All right, all right,” Mister Ernest said. “Which would you rather have? His bloody head and hide on the kitchen floor yonder and half his meat in a pickup truck on the way to Yoknapatawpha County, or him with his head and hide and meat still together over yonder in that brake, waiting for next November for us to run him again?”

Ernest venerates the ritualized yearly hunt in the same way that both his namesake and creator did, and as the boy ultimately does. There is a similar, though less drawn-out, master-apprentice relationship between Ernest and the boy as that between Sam Fathers and Isaac in “The Old People”; both elder hunters teach their companions about pursuit and valuing the natural world.

Because Mister Ernest appreciates aspects of the hunt beyond killing, he upholds the ritualistic values of the “big woods” seen in some of Faulkner’s work and Hemingway’s Green Hills of Africa, Under Kilimanjaro, and other texts. He and Hemingway had been actively challenging each other since 1947. Between his comments then and the October 1955 publication of Big Woods, Faulkner and Hemingway’s competition was especially heated. “Race at Morning”—as “Old Man” had done two decades previously—symbolically unified these rival modernists, again in Faulkner’s terms and in his home state. Faulkner’s “rewriting [was] as important as writing. He was, at heart, a revisionist, concerned with retelling stories more than telling them.”

“Mister Ernest” is consistent with Faulkner’s larger aesthetics of rewriting seen particularly in The Wild Palms and his Nobel Prize address. “[H]e continued to borrow from, echo, and parody other writers even at the height of his powers,” for instance his “creative depredations” and adaptations of Hemingway’s work. Here, he seems to have taken Hemingway’s name, celebrity, and much-photographed love of hunting and revised them into a Faulknerian form and place, though without the tense competitive subtext of The Wild Palms. It is probably not surprising that Faulkner imaginatively united himself with Hemingway, because his personal masculinity, though competitive and occasionally aggressive, was not as explicitly belligerent. Though he—perhaps rightly—felt superior as an artist, Faulkner may have
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seen the depiction of Mister Ernest as a gesture of camaraderie between two aging writers. In the mid-1950s at least, perhaps it was Faulkner’s job as the more accomplished artist to frame their relationship in more positive terms in “Race at Morning” and other late works. Faulkner, though, is still the framer, still the one with the creative energy to add a different dimension to his fiction.

This figurative textual fusion underlines the dual respect-superiority that he felt toward Hemingway. Surely, very few of his readers would not think of Hemingway after seeing “Mister Ernest” printed in the story’s first paragraph. Because there is no overt maliciousness in the story, and because Mister Ernest is mostly admirable, Faulkner likely wanted to associate some of his own fictional hunting world with Hemingway and align them along one of his most enduring, fully realized motifs. Despite his disparagement of Hemingway in front of an international audience five years earlier in Sweden, Faulkner crafted the main character of “Race at Morning” as, in part, a show of respect for the man whose aesthetic agenda he often questioned. This gesture of admiration is consistent with Faulkner’s more subtle, indirect mode of elevating himself above Hemingway. Adapting his coeval’s name and persona in his own work, Faulkner assumed a kind of creative control over him, an act suggestive of how Hemingway’s inclusion of “Turn About” in *Men at War* revealed both respect and competitiveness. As Hemingway saw it, Faulkner’s hunted animals may not have run “both ways.” Faulkner’s competitive temperament did.

*From Mississippi Delta to African Savannah*

Faulkner’s use of “Mister Ernest” in “Race at Morning” can suggest other exegetical links between the authors’ hunting texts. This textual and imagistic parallelism spans several decades and is buttressed by the multivalenced importance they grafted onto hunting. In this section, I want to build on the work that Earl Rovit, John Howell, James Nagel, and others have done in this regard, to suggest that the authors’ complementary hunting texts suggest a degree of artistic symmetry. Such parallelism does not point toward a direct psychological influence or conscious adaptation so much as a personal, literary, and gendered link between authors sharply attuned to the natural world. One such linkage is their analogous portrayal of hunters’ culture and interaction. In *The Bear*, “The Old People,” *Green Hills of Africa*, and *Under Kilimanjaro*, hunters interact similarly at day’s end: drinking alcohol, eating fresh meat, talking, addressing new problems, and trading stories and memories of past hunts. In the midst of their characters’ talking, eating, and drinking, one senses the masculine competitiveness and posturing between
hunters. In both “The Old People” and The Bear, Boon Hogganbeck is regularly chided for his poor aim and is contrasted with Walter Ewell, “whose rifle never missed” and who seems superior to Boon by virtue of class, manhood, and skill. Likewise, Green Hills of Africa shows the hunters discussing who is a better shot or has killed more game; Under Kilimanjaro touches on a written—but largely unspoken—tension between the narrator and Miss Mary after she finally kills a much-hunted lion. As with writing and (for Hemingway) bullfighting, hunting entailed a healthy but somewhat serious contest for success, acclaim, and gendered pride. Their hunters routinely talk about game that has assumed the status of local legend: Faulkner’s fixate upon Old Ben (The Bear) and a huge, elusive buck (“The Old People” and “Race at Morning”), while Hemingway’s discuss kudu (Green Hills of Africa), a lion and leopard (Under Kilimanjaro), and an elephant (The Garden of Eden). Such talk of and obsession with particularly mythic animals textures the dynamic of the hunters’ communities.

These hunting communities are racially diverse as well. In “The Old People” and The Bear, the camp is peopled with whites, blacks, and others of mixed race—Boon Hogganbeck has Chickasaw blood, while Sam Fathers had a Chickasaw mother and black father. As much scholarship has shown, Faulkner’s hunting societies were both racially diverse and manifoldly hierarchized. Joel Williamson, for instance, notes how in The Bear

Faulkner made up a party of men whose blood represented the mixing of not two races but of three, men whose ancestry was not only both black and white, but white and Indian, and Indian and black. […] Further, the Indian blood in the party represented both that of the aristocrat, a chief, and that of the commoner, a squaw. Ash, apparently, was purely black, and the other men were purely white but came from different strata in that society. The party joined youth and age, town and country.

One sees similar diversity-within-hierarchy in Green Hills of Africa and Under Kilimanjaro, both of which show how whites, black Africans (from different tribes), and those from India (Mr. and Mrs. Singh in Under Kilimanjaro) interact in safari society. Expectedly, whites were ostensibly in charge and felt superior to their other companions. In “The Old People” and The Bear, Ash is effectively the camp’s cook/servant and secondary in the social structure. In “The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber,” Robert Wilson feels himself to be in charge of the safari by virtue of his status as the
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proverbial White Hunter, even threatening to whip one of the African boys in camp after the boy looks “curiously” at Francis after his display of cowardice, eerily suggesting the slave trade. Faulkner fairly counterbalances this (realistic) Southern social hierarchy by imbuing Sam Fathers with superior natural knowledge. Although Sam and, relatedly, Hemingway’s African guides are seen as the whites’ social inferiors, they possess indispensable knowledge of the terrain, the animals, and their habits. Faulkner’s natural world, hunting, and the camp’s “highly ceremonial and rule-governed” hierarchy are a “symbolic extension” of “the codes that prevail outside the forest.” In this sense, “natural world is organized throughout by social orders” of race and class that have Major de Spain in charge of the camp and that other Sam, Tennie’s Jim, and Ash. Faulkner, of course, thoroughly explored notions of race, difference, and racial hegemony throughout his oeuvre, and Hemingway’s portrayal of the Africans’ otherness in his hunting texts could beg further examination in light of similar racial portraiture in “The Battler,” “The Killers,” To Have and Have Not, The Old Man and the Sea, and other Faulkner works such as Light in August or Intruder in the Dust.

Another aspect of the characterization of the hunter in both authors’ texts is courage, either its presence or absence. Courage, both physical and moral, is central to The Bear and “The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber,” for example. In Faulkner’s novella, courage spans both human and canine characterization: it is important to the men who hunt and kill Old Ben, as it is to Lion (the large, untamed part-mastiff, part-Airedale) and to one of Isaac’s rat terriers, both of which chase and try to corner Old Ben. Isaac realizes that “it would take a dog not only of abnormal courage but size and speed too to ever bring [the bear] to bay”; he sees such resolve in Lion and his ratter, which was “itself not much bigger than a rat and possess[ed] that sort of courage which had long since stopped being bravery and had become foolhardiness.” Both dogs act courageously. Lion epitomizes courage in his size, strength, ferociousness, and single-minded pursuit of Old Ben, and he cares nothing for other game or for the other dogs. Lion eventually helps Boon kill the bear, but at the cost of his own life. The hunters require a certain amount of masculine courage, too—they all track and seek to kill a fierce bear, which Boon eventually does with his hunting knife while straddling Old Ben’s back. This portrayal of hunting, like Faulkner’s fiction and public persona, has a decidedly masculine element.
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So, too, did Hemingway’s, arguably more so. “The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber” examines gendered courage on the hunt through its presence and absence. The hypermasculine Wilson embodies courage and bravado: he knows how to hunt, he knows the land, and he has a larger cot in his tent “to accommodate any windfalls he might receive,” testimony to his sex appeal. In contrast, Macomber “had shown himself, very publicly, to be a coward,” when he runs away from a charging lion, leaving it for Wilson to kill. When he returns to camp, he is shunned by his wife Margot and upbraided by Wilson. Determined to atone for his cowardice, Macomber shows courage later when hunting a buffalo, though this act proves fatal when he is shot—perhaps intentionally, perhaps not—by his wife, at which point Wilson tacitly acknowledges Macomber’s courage. At the end, Wilson seems to exert a level of power over Margot when he implicitly casts her as Macomber’s killer and discusses the likely “‘unpleasantness,’” only ceasing after she tells him to “‘Stop it’” at least eight times. Unlike virtually all of Faulkner’s hunting texts, Hemingway’s story and several other works are not exclusively male, revealing a gender hegemony complementing the racial one discussed above.

Another personal quality that is linked with courage is fear, which Faulkner and Hemingway describe similarly, although in slightly different contexts. In a linguistic sense, courage and fear are binarily opposed but mutually dependent for their respective definitions. Like Faulkner and Hemingway themselves, courage and fear in this sense are not opposed but interdependent; at one level, we might think of one as the reverse of the other. In depicting characters’ naturalistic responses to tense situations, the authors likened the presence of fear and cowardice to the taste of metal. In “The Snows of Kilimanjaro,” when Harry looks back on his life while bedridden on his African safari, he regrets the experiences that he did not write about, one of which occurred during the Greco-Turkish War: “That was the day he’d first seen dead men wearing white ballet skirts and upturned shoes with pompons on them. The Turks had come steadily and lumpily and he had seen the skirted men running and the officers shooting into them and running then themselves and he [Harry] and the British observer had run too until his lungs ached and his mouth was full of the taste of pennies.” While Harry tastes copper during a war and not during a hunt, both circumstances elide insofar as Harry remembers a different kind of hunting while on safari. Ill, unable to hunt, and feeling a lapse of courage in the face of death, Harry remembers a conflict in which he also felt fear. Hunting
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is also key to the narrative—part of which Faulkner superimposed onto *The Wild Palms*—in that Harry is on safari with his wife when he badly infects his leg, which turns gangrenous, takes Harry’s life, and symbolically denotes his moral and artistic decay.

In *The Bear*, a novella about a different kind of conflict, Faulkner compares fear to the taste of brass. As Isaac is walking alone in the woods tracking Old Ben without the intention of killing him, he senses the bear looking at him and then tastes “in his saliva that taint of brass,” which again suggests some fear. Earlier in the story, before the hunters have Lion in their midst, Isaac senses the fear in the dogs who have seen Old Ben and are cowering under the cabin. After realizing that Old Ben has watched, circled, and accepted him as a woodsman, Isaac associates his sensations with the dogs’ reactions to the bear: “[H]e recognised now what he had smelled in the huddled dogs and tasted in his own saliva, recognised fear.”

Though he fears Old Ben, Isaac does so intelligently and without the cowardice Macomber displayed with the lion. Ever the astute woodsman, Isaac understands the power of Old Ben, and Faulkner portrays his wariness as the natural reaction of a true hunter such as Sam, Major de Spain, or he himself.

Besides the themes of cowardice, another textual parallel between Faulkner and Hemingway’s hunting works is the interaction of humans and animals—the physical, even blood, union of hunters and their quarry. On Faulkner’s side, one sees this in both “The Old People” and *The Bear*. In the former, twelve-year-old Isaac, in his third year on the annual hunting trip, finally kills his first deer. Accompanied by Sam Fathers as he approaches the slain deer’s body, Isaac undergoes a rite of passage when Sam “dipped his hands in the hot smoking blood and wiped them back and forth across the boy’s face,” at which point Isaac is “marked forever” as a true hunter.

Isaac later sees the importance of this act, remembering how Sam “marked his face with the hot blood which he had spilled and he ceased to be a child and became a hunter and a man,” ultimately the most knowledgeable and respected hunter in Yoknapatawpha County as “Delta Autumn” and two of the interchapters of *Big Woods* show. “The Old People,” in turn, shows Isaac’s beginnings when his masculine life is united with the source of the animal’s life, thus forging a connection between Isaac-as-“man,” nature, and his sharp understanding of it.

*The Bear* depicts a pair of triangular hunter-animal unions: first, between Boon Hogganbeck, Lion, and Old Ben in Part Three; second, between Sam,
Lion, and Old Ben in Part Five after all three have died. We see the first human–animal amalgam in the final confrontation between the hunters, Lion, and Old Ben. As Lion finally runs down Old Ben and attacks him, Boon (an infamously poor shot) joins the fray with his knife, creating the human–canine–ursine union: “For an instant they almost resembled a piece of statuary: the clinging dog, the bear, the man astride its back, working and probing the buried blade. [. . .] It didn’t collapse, crumble. It fell all of a piece, as a tree falls, so that all three of them, man, dog, and bear, seemed to bounce once.”78 Climactically, the man, dog, and bear blur into a single piece of “statuary,” where time seems to freeze and unite them, almost uncannily. This blurring is also suggested by Faulkner’s pronoun usage—“it,” not “they,” which denotes a single entity falling “of a piece.” Their respective paths all converge in a single moment, when the long-hunted bear finally meets his death, but not before mortally wounding Lion.

The second interspecies triad is symbolic rather than literal; it consists of Sam, Lion, and Ben, who are linked in life as well as death. As we learn in novella’s opening paragraph, “only Sam and Old Ben and the mongrel Lion, were taintless and incorruptible”; they epitomize nature, purity, and each other from the outset.79 They begin to die at the same moment—once Old Ben is stabbed—and eventually they die within a few days of one another. Almost immediately after Old Ben is killed, Sam collapses in the mud, suggesting a natural connection between the bear and the seventy-year-old Indian man. Sam’s symbiotic link to the natural world is so strong that his life and death are intertwined with Old Ben’s, although Boon also had a hand in Sam’s death by, in effect, putting him out of his misery.

Soon after the final confrontation and Lion’s and Sam’s deaths, Isaac and Boon unite bear, man, and dog in death. Sam’s body is wrapped in a blanket and buried paces from where Lion is buried; in a metal box, buried in the same place as Lion, is “Old Ben’s dried mutilated paw, resting above Lion’s bones”—an image reminiscent of For Whom the Bell Tolls (see my Chapter 2 and Howell’s “Hemingway, Faulkner, and ‘The Bear’”).80 The three form a single gravesite, which Isaac later visits to pay his respects after Major de Spain had sold most of their hunting grounds to a lumber company, except for the gravesite. As the central consciousness of both “The Old People” and The Bear, Isaac is involved in these human–animal assemblages. He has the blood of his first deer smeared on his face, watches Boon and Lion take down Old Ben, and helps unite Sam, Lion, and Old Ben in death, later visiting their grave and sensing Sam’s presence there.
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Hemingway offers a similar synthesis of human and animal in Under Kilimanjaro. The first-person narrator and protagonist, Ernest Hemingway, is asked to slay a leopard that had killed sixteen local goats. The narrative persona, whom I call “Ernest” here, intermittently tracks the leopard in the first few months of his safari, based on Hemingway’s own September 1953–March 1954 safari. After shooting the leopard out of a tree and realizing that it was still alive, Ernest and his African companions must track it. As they are following the leopard’s blood trail, Ngui discovers a piece of its clavicle; Ernest then creates the human–animal union:

Out of a clot of blood he picked up a sharp bone fragment and passed it to me. It was a piece of shoulder blade and I put it in my mouth. There is no explanation of that. I did it without thinking. But it linked us closer to the leopard and I bit on it and tasted the new blood, which tasted about like my own, and knew that the leopard had not just lost his balance.

[ . . . ]

I bit with satisfaction on the piece of shoulder bone and waved up the car.
The sharp end of the splintered bone had cut the inside of my cheek and I could taste the familiarity of my own blood now mixed with the blood of the leopard.81

Biting on the leopard’s bone and tasting its blood gives the Hemingway figure a natural understanding, as he learns that it purposely fell from the tree and is waiting for them in the thick bush. Ernest eventually kills the leopard, aided in part by his newfound connection with the animal. That the leopard’s blood tastes “about like [his] own” emblematizes a similar kind of human–animal link as we saw in Faulkner’s fiction. Although Ernest tastes the leopard’s blood, rather than having it smeared on his face as Isaac had, both hunters physically commune their prey’s blood, a symbolic transfusion deepening their understanding of the natural world.

Because some of Faulkner’s and Hemingway’s characters physically connect with and understand the natural world and its inhabitants, they lament any changes that the revered landscape undergoes. They were avid outdoorsmen and infused their hunting texts with rich, poetic descriptions of the American and African wildernesses. Faulkner opens Big Woods by focusing on the importance of place in the context of hunting, a passage reminiscent of the opening of Act II of Requiem for a Nun:

Mississippi: The rich deep black alluvial soil which would grow cotton taller than the head of a man on a horse, already one jungle one brake one impassable density of brier and cane and vine interlocking the soar of gum and cypress and hickory and pinoak and ash, printed now by the tracks of unalien shapes—bear and deer and panthers and bison and wolves and alligators and the myriad smaller beasts, and unalien men to name them too perhaps—[. . . .]

Faulkner describes Mississippi’s wilderness in The Bear as “the big woods, bigger and older than any recorded document.” In both the novella and the above passage, the wilderness is greater than the sum of the trees, rivers, and animals that comprise it; it is a repository of life, history, and meaning that its true hunters, Faulkner himself among them, appreciate. His “hunting stories imply a mystical cycle of regeneration in which such large game as deer and bear are not only flesh and blood but spiritual representations of the natural world.” Mississippi’s woods are saturated with life, from the various animal species to the trees and high cotton. The above are just two examples of many in Faulkner’s oeuvre in which the wilderness is described transcendently, likely in response to “a time of widespread environmental upheaval” in Mississippi in the 1930s and 1940s.

Hemingway, too, placed high symbolic value on the natural world—recall, for instance, his lucid description of the wilderness in two Nick Adams stories, “Big Two-Hearted River” and “The Last Good Country,” where Nick is immersed in the woods, in effect his second home. The wilderness was also important to Hemingway himself and his hunters, as one sees in Green Hills of Africa and Under Kilimanjaro. In the former, Hemingway’s textual avatar connects the natural world to his own health, when he walks with one of his African companions:

I was beginning to feel strong again after the dysentery and it was a pleasure to walk in the easy rolling country, simply to walk, and to be able to hunt, not knowing what we might see and free to shoot for the meat we needed. Then, too, I liked Droopy and liked to watch him walk. He strode very loosely and with a slight lift, and I liked to watch him and to feel the grass under my soft-soled shoes and the pleasant weight of the rifle, held just back of the muzzle, the barrel resting on my shoulder, and the sun hot enough to sweat you well as it burned the dew from the grass.
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In this passage and others in *Green Hills of Africa*, he portrays the landscape as therapeutic and moving. His narrative figure gains strength when walking in the wilderness, feeling the hot sun and grass underfoot. Unlike Harry in “The Snows of Kilimanjaro,” who is bedridden and thus separated from Africa’s wilderness, Hemingway’s narrative persona immerses himself in the woods, hunting, and exploring as he strengthens physically and mentally.

Since Faulkner and Hemingway ascribed such importance to nature, their descriptions of the natural world’s unavoidable changes are all the more emotional. Both the authors and their key characters realize that their hunting grounds are impermanent in the face of industrialization. Faulkner’s “Delta Autumn” marks the loss of the natural world throughout. The title doubly suggests change through both “delta” and “autumn,” given that “delta” marks the increments of increase and decrease in geometric variables and “autumn” suggests the change of seasons. Isaac, now in his seventies, laments the changes that industry has imposed on hunting and on nature, to which he is connected as Sam Fathers was:

At first they had come in wagons[. . . .] But that time was gone now. Now they went in cars, driving faster and faster each time because the roads were better and they had farther and farther to drive, the territory in which game existed drawing yearly inward as his life was drawing inward, until now he was the last of those who had once made the journey in wagons without feeling it and now those who accompanied him were the sons and even grandsons of the men who had ridden for twenty-four hours in the rain or sleet behind the steaming mules.86

Hemingway, too, was aware of how much his old hunting grounds had changed, seen in his and Philip Percival’s wistful memories of the “old days” throughout *Under Kilimanjaro*. Late in *Green Hills of Africa*, Hemingway had described how Africa is “finished”:

A continent ages quickly once we come. The natives live in harmony with it. But the foreigner destroys, cuts down the trees, drains the water, so that the water supply is altered and in a short time the soil, once the sod is turned under, is cropped out[. . . .]. A country wears out quickly unless man puts back in it all his residue and that of all his beasts. When he quits using beasts and uses machines, the earth defeats him quickly. The machine can’t reproduce, nor does it fertilize the soil, and it eats what he cannot raise. A country

was made to be as we found it. We are the intruders and after we are dead we may have ruined it but it will still be [ . . . ].

Faulkner and Hemingway were (ecocritically) conscious of the vast, lasting changes that their respective lands had undergone as a result of industrial forces. Both passages tell of the destruction of nature and loss of trees, water, and game. They also note the detrimental effect of technology—cars have replaced mules as the mode of transportation to get to the ever-shrinking hunting grounds of Mississippi, while “machines” have intruded upon Africa and made safaris into popular excursions—ones seemingly less pure than the safaris Hemingway went on in the early 1930s and mid-1950s. We can also bring Hemingway’s language to bear on Faulkner’s story. While Faulkner does not describe Isaac and his companions as “intruders,” he nevertheless suggests throughout that the new generation of hunters does not revere the wilderness in the same way that the old generation and the authors themselves did, and that they do not understand how “ruined” it has become. Other than Isaac, the hunters of “Delta Autumn” are young and not at home in the wilderness, evincing little respect for it.

In a larger sense, Faulkner and Hemingway shared ideas not only about hunting but also about the world in which hunting takes place; their awareness of the importance of nature spans both their art and their personal lives, as both men saw familiar landscapes shrink or fade away altogether. Faulkner lamented in April 1957, that “the New South has got too many people in it and it is changing the country too much [. . . ] [I]t gets rid of the part of Mississippi that I liked when I was young, which was the forest.”

Likewise, Hemingway, in the letter he wrote to Faulkner in 1947, displayed similar nostalgia for the changed landscapes of his youth, existing then only in his memory and in the unfinished work that became Under Kilimanjaro.

Isaac McCaslin and David Bourne

Of all the textual resonance one can identify between Faulkner and Hemingway’s hunting works, the strongest is that between The Bear and The Garden of Eden, the latter begun late in Hemingway’s life and published posthumously in 1986. For James Nagel, David’s story “has parallels to the story of
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90. Hemingway began the project in the mid-1950s and left behind a considerable amount of material. My source for The Garden of Eden is the Tom Jenks version, first published in 1986 (New York: Scribner, 2003). While the published version was culled from the elephantine
Ike McCaslin” as “the maturation ritual of the hunt” sparks a moral development in both boys. As a core tenet of their writing, hunting joins these two otherwise dissimilar texts through characterization, depiction of animals, themes, and imagery. As it primarily was for Faulkner and Hemingway, the world of hunting is almost exclusively a man’s world in both texts. There are no women in *The Bear*’s hunting scenes (save those Boon and Isaac see in Memphis) or in the portions of *The Garden of Eden* that are part of David’s manuscript about his early life in Africa. All of the principal characters and animals are male—Lion, Isaac’s ratter, and Old Ben (excepting one female dog who is wounded by Old Ben); Kibo and the elephant that David, his father, and Juma are tracking. In *The Bear*, the gender roles are clear-cut. For Isaac, hunting is a crucial part of his male identity as a rite of passage. His early hunting trips, “his apprenticeship in miniature to manhood,” entail drinking “brown liquor which not women, not boys and children, but only hunters”—which is to say, men—“drank.”

Treating gender much more complexly, Hemingway depicts another male-centered world in *The Garden of Eden*’s internal text. For David, writing about an all-male hunt took him away from reality—namely, his tense, tripartite relationship with his wife Catherine and Marita in which the complexities of their transformative gender roles and sexual behavior impinge on his writing and mental wellbeing. “David writes of the elephant hunt nearly two decades after the fact, and even then the emotions of it are difficult for him to contain” seen in the textual “interrelationship” between David’s marriage and hunting and his use of the creative process as a figurative escape from Catherina and Marita. In fact, his story becomes a preferable, male-centered reality, which he has until Catherine destroys it and his other manuscripts. As David writes in a private study separate from his hotel room, the two women, and their sexual activities, he is so immersed in his work that his time hunting in Africa becomes “the real time”:

> But the half past ten was on the watch on his wrist as he looked at it in the room where he sat at a table feeling the breeze from the sea now and the real time was evening and he was sitting against the yellow gray base of a tree with a glass of whiskey and water in his hand and the rolled figs swept away

---

watching the porters butchering out the Kongoni he had shot in the first
grassy swale they passed before they came to the river.\textsuperscript{94}

This “formative event of his youth was the African hunting trip with his
father,” Nagel posits, reminds him of the simple, clear-cut, nearly primeval
masculine world he knew in Africa as a boy.\textsuperscript{95} Later, as David finishes
another morning of writing—by definition a process excluding Catherine
and Marita—he was “still feeling Africa to be completely real and all of this
where he was to be unreal and false.”\textsuperscript{96} For Robert Fleming, David’s self-created
African reality becomes more realistic, more true, than his current life
in France while bringing into conflict “his identity as a writer” with “his
identity as her husband” for Catherine. As Carl Eby posits in his persuasive
psychoanalytical study of Hemingway’s treatment of gender and sexual flu-
diety, “[g]ender affiliation, however, is never stable in this novel.”\textsuperscript{97} Given “the
primary rift in his sense of gender identity and in the basic structure of his
ego,” Eby continues, David is more comfortable when writing of an exclu-
sively male world in Africa where he, his father, Juma, and his dog hunt a
bull elephant, as opposed to his lived reality in France with its women, atten-
dant marital complications, gender volatility, and sexual play.\textsuperscript{98} Hemingway’s
“examination of the effects of writing on a marriage from a male writer’s
point of view” reveals how David’s writing about a homosocial series of epi-
sodes exacerbates such deleterious effects on his marriage.\textsuperscript{99}

The “fraternity of hunters” Isaac joins in Mississippi at age ten is analo-
gous to the slightly smaller “fraternity” of David, his father, and Juma.\textsuperscript{100}
Within these homosocial hunting worlds, some of Faulkner’s and Heming-
way’s characters share other elements besides their genders and maturation
in all-male hunting groups. Isaac and David are young men at the time of
their respective hunts and learn from the older hunters. Each boy is also
the prevailing narrative consciousness of his respective text, in the process
showing the reader how impressionable, observant, and sensitive to his sur-
roundings he is. In turn, both boys are part of hunting parties that have
dogs whose names suggest Africa, as Hilary K. Justice has discussed.\textsuperscript{101} The
principal dog in \textit{The Bear} is Lion, whom Sam captures and trains and whom
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Boon ostensibly controls; “Lion” was also the title of an early version of *The Bear*. David’s dog is named Kibo Mawenzi, the African name for Mount Kilimanjaro. That Isaac and David undergo similar formative experiences in their growth is further textual and gendered parallelism suggesting that Faulkner and Hemingway shared a sense of hunting as a crucial part of the masculine identity, both their own and their characters’. Even though they did so with different degrees of publicity, the authors coupled their art with their constructions of the masculine, to the effect that Isaac and David’s maturation as men and hunters telescopes aspects of their own.

Isaac and David serve wilderness apprenticeships to older, *othered* men—respectively, Sam Fathers, who taught Isaac how to hunt and navigate the terrain, and Juma, who “had always been David’s best friend and had taught him to hunt.” Sam and Juma are also the voices of reason, knowledge, and experience. They know their respective lands the best, they have a keen sense of their prey, and they are the hunters’ liaisons to the natural world. Both Sam and Juma are wounded during the final confrontation with the hunted animal: Sam collapses as Old Ben is finally felled and dies soon thereafter, and Juma is charged and thrown by the elephant, an encounter that Juma survives, though badly wounded.

Both texts center on the pursuit and eventual death of an animal of mythic stature—Old Ben and an elephant. The hunters in each text track the animal by footprints (which are crooked in Old Ben’s case) and other telltale signs (crushed undergrowth, scratched logs). When they meet their respective deaths, Old Ben and the elephant are compared to falling trees. Old Ben, Lion, and Boon fall “as a tree falls,” while the elephant “seemed to sway like a felled tree and came smashing down” after David’s father shoots him twice. Likewise, Isaac and David undergo symbolic unions with each respective animal, similar to the human–animal intersections discussed above. One summer, after Isaac has heard stories of Old Ben, he explores the woods on his own and happens upon the bear, but only after purifying himself by abandoning his gun, watch, compass, clothes, and walking stick—all accoutrements of human civilization that hindered his primordial union with the natural world. Approaching a tree where he once encountered the bear with Sam and his rat terrier, Isaac discovers Old Ben’s fresh prints as
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“the wilderness coalesced” and all goes eerily silent:

Then he saw the bear. It did not emerge, appear: it was just there, immobile, fixed in the green and windless noon’s hot dappling, not as big as he had dreamed but as big as he had expected, bigger, dimensionless against the dappled obscurity, looking at him. Then it moved. It crossed the glade without haste, walking for an instant into the sun’s full glare and out of it, and stopped again and looked back at him across one shoulder. Then it was gone. It didn’t walk in to the woods. It faded, sank back into the wilderness [. . . . ]

At this point, Old Ben has accepted Isaac through a natural ritual. There is no call for fear or worry on Isaac’s part, since the object of this ritual was not for Old Ben to intimidate or attack Isaac but for them to see each other without any unnatural elements. By engaging with Old Ben in his natural habitat in a state of utmost purity, Isaac is further initiated into what Faulkner and Hemingway may have seen—or, at least, sought—as the true wilderness.

David undergoes a similar ritual initiation with the elephant. When in bed with Catherine in their Riviera hotel, a dream of Africa wakes him, and he “went direct from that dream to work.” David writes of his past nighttime encounter with the elephant:

His arm was around the dog’s neck now and he could feel him shivering. All of the night sounds had stopped. They did not hear the elephant and David did not see him until the dog turned his head and seemed to settle into David. Then the elephant’s shadow covered them and he moved past making no noise at all and they smelled him in the light wind that came down from the mountain. He smelled strong but old and sour and when he was past David saw that the left tusk was so long it seemed to reach the ground. [. . . . ]

The two of them followed the elephant until he came to an opening in the trees. He stood there moving his huge ears. His bulk was in the shadow but the moon would be on his head. [. . . . ] The right tusk was as thick as his own thigh and it curved down almost to the ground.107

After seeing the elephant, David tells Juma and his father of its approximate whereabouts, allowing them to track his course and David to feel a strong connection to him. This scene is reminiscent of that in The Bear: the human–animal encounters are in secluded, silent areas, are momentary interspe-
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cies crossings, and contribute to the boys’ understanding of the wilderness and of the hunted animal. Both Isaac and David are unarmed, having left, respectively, their rifle and spears elsewhere; both scenes suggest an uncorrupted connection that goes beyond hunting, a figurative bonding between a young boy and an old, legendary male animal. As two initiates into the natural world, Isaac and David come to understand their animals as sentient beings, not simply mindless beasts. David’s hesitation about killing the elephant might also suggest Mister Ernest’s refusal to kill the deer in “Race at Morning.” For both, the animal’s survival means a desire and respect for hunt’s continuation. David regrets that he told his father and Juma of the elephant’s location, sensing its impending death at their hands. Hemingway was working on *The Garden of Eden* and a number of other projects in the mid- to late 1950s, and Faulkner’s work may have left a mark on him, or given him another theme to reshape in his own work. As do Santiago in *The Old Man and the Sea* and David Hudson in *Islands in the Stream*, David Bourne “begins to realize the full emotional investment he has in the animal his father regards only as prey”,108 the same is true of Isaac’s and Sam’s regard for Old Ben.

After his father shoots the elephant, David makes eye contact with the animal: “He did not move but his eye was alive and looked at David. He had very long eyelashes and his eye was the most alive thing David had ever seen.” Throughout the pursuit and eventual killing of the elephant, David feels sympathetic toward the elephant, which becomes “his hero” in a further connection between human and animal.109 Like David, Isaac, Mister Ernest, and Faulkner’s other hunters would know that “the pursuit of large game reaffirmed a bond between humans and the natural world,” seeking the perpetual sustenance of such a “bond.”110 As Nick Adams would do in a handful of stories, Isaac and David begin their personal, natural, and social maturation in their respective stories. They learn much from their native guides about the importance of the wilderness and the ethics of the hunt, knowledge that, presumably, Faulkner and Hemingway themselves had in common both socially and genderedly. Both authors understood the experiences essential to the young hunters’ personal growth because they had undergone comparable experiences as boys with an appreciation of the natural world and with fathers equally appreciative of nature, grafting at some level their own experiences onto Isaac’s and David’s. This mutual spiritual awareness points toward how their similarities could counterbalance their competitive differences, at least where their hunting aesthetic was involved.

---
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The reverberations between *The Bear* and *The Garden of Eden* culminate the wealth of links between Faulkner and Hemingway concerning the hunt, where their competing works intersected and resonated. Predictably, Hemingway took issue with Faulkner’s aesthetic preferences, including his choice of animals, regarding lions, rhinos, and elephants as superior to bear and deer. Hemingway and Faulkner had their differences—which they eagerly articulated—but their thematic similarities are equally pertinent in painting their complex dynamic of one-upmanship and psychological influence accurately. Their personal experiences and frequent disagreements aside, their hunting texts and personae reveal numerous parallels, which Malcolm Cowley noted in the 1940s and which numerous scholars have studied since. Although Faulkner and Hemingway would have hunted and written about the hunt without each other’s presence or example, there seems to be a mutual awareness of each other’s hunting aesthetic, if not a degree of influence. Faulkner had admired, as he termed it in a few cases, Hemingway’s “African stuff,” elements of which may left some mark on him—perhaps helped by his owning Hemingway’s *Green Hills of Africa* and *The Short Stories.*111 This may have in part psychocompetitively driven him to offer his own better spin on ideas of hunting, the wilderness, and courage in his work and home state. Likewise, Hemingway praised *The Bear* on more than one occasion, so he may have tried to one-up Faulkner by reshaping parts of the novella in *The Garden of Eden*—using similar human–animal interaction, young wilderness initiates and their dogs, and all-male hunting parties while still telling his own story in a key Hemingway place. They did not inspire one another to depict hunting, but we can say that they motivated each other to innovate, personalize, and experiment with their own works, partly due to a strong quest for repeated one-upmanship. Faulkner and Hemingway wanted to outwrite each other, and this drive toward innovation seems to have resulted in thematic and textual echoes of one another’s writings, seen here and elsewhere in this study.

Although Hemingway was much more photographed and celebrated as a hunter, both he and Faulkner had woven hunting into their masculine personae. Lifelong hunters and outdoorsmen themselves, in addition to their other roles (writer, wounded veteran, father, husband, lover, literary competitor), they viewed hunting symbolically, almost spiritually. Faulkner shared what Scott Donaldson has termed Hemingway’s “worship of the natural world,” a certain “glory” grafted onto nature.112 Their hunting grounds were geographically diverse: Mississippi, Virginia, the American West, and

Africa. Both revered hunting’s codes and ethics and, more generally, those of the natural world. They hunted with celebrities and locals: from Gary Cooper and Clark Gable to Africans, European guides (Philip Percival), and Mississippians (Red Brite and Ike Roberts). They never hunted together but bestowed vast importance on hunting, which linked their competing personal and artistic lives and counterpointed their rivalry’s bitter intensity.

**DESCENDANTS AND ANCESTORS**

As their competition decrescendoed by the late 1950s, Faulkner and Hemingway were far from their post–World War One days in New Orleans and Chicago with Sherwood Anderson, and from their wounded veteran–bohemian posturing in Oak Park, Oxford, and Europe. Yet, they had for decades seen and treated each other with similar, though more protracted, professional hyperconsciousness and intertextual competition. Each of course achieved wide influence and prominence. Ralph Ellison (who regularly claimed Faulkner and Hemingway as two of his literary “ancestors”),

Ellison’s good friend and colleague Albert Murray, Shelby Foote, Tim O’Brien, Cormac McCarthy, and a host of others would all locate themselves within the sphere of Faulkner and Hemingway’s influence. Theirs was one of the most nuanced and intriguing artistic rivalries in the American canon, one that reveals “a recognition of the pervasive influence of their work and personalities,” on their peers, heirs, and each other. In *Intertextual Dynamics within the Literary Group*, Dennis Brown notes that “meanings” in such a self-created intertextual dynamic “are built up in intergroup participation, influence and struggle.” Likewise, the longstanding interaction between Hemingway and Faulkner is richly meaningful. Each “influence[d]” and readily “struggle[d]” with the other throughout his career, creating a strong resonance between their writings and artistic philosophies, despite their lack of a social relationship. At some level, their intensely competitive relationship was stronger because its only outlet for their feelings and attitudes about each other was their writing, their sole debating platform on which they expressed all positive and negative assessments of each other.

113. Ellison, though, took issue with what he saw as Hemingway’s misreading of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* in *Green Hills of Africa*, as well as Hemingway’s limited portrayal of black characters in his fiction. Whereas Ellison the fictionist seemingly embraced Hemingway, Ellison the essayist and public intellectual eagerly debated him in several pieces in *Shadow and Act* (1964) and *Going to the Territory* (1986).


His possibly justified feelings of superiority notwithstanding, Faulkner always sensed a connection between himself and Hemingway, one that Anderson inadvertently—but significantly—engendered. Late in his life, a long time from his 1920s parodies of Anderson, Faulkner fondly recalled his mentor’s impact. In August 1955, he remarked to his audience in Nagano, Japan, “I think that he was the father of all of my works, of Hemingway, Fitzgerald, etc., all of them—we were influenced by him. He showed us the way.”\(^\text{116}\) A year later, he told Jean Stein of the *Paris Review* that Anderson “was the father of my generation of American writers and the tradition of American writing which our successors will carry on. He has never received his proper evaluation. Dreiser is his older brother and Mark Twain is the father of them both.”\(^\text{117}\) In Faulkner’s literary genealogy, he and Hemingway were artistic siblings nurtured by Anderson, giving further significance to the fraternal language in their summer 1947 letters. As symbolic modernist doubles—at least in their 1947 correspondence—they sometimes shared and sometimes pushed each other out of the American literary spotlight. In this sense, imagined fraternity and real rivalry are not mutually exclusive: the authors occasionally felt a writerly connection but more often felt the desire to outperform each other, their craft simultaneously allying and pitting them against one another. In their own ways, Faulkner and Hemingway sought after—and frequently achieved—the perfection of craft for which all artists strive in one another’s shadow.

**EPILOGUE**

*September 1947.* Hemingway and Toby Bruce, one of his closest Key West friends, are in Hemingway’s new blue Buick Roadmaster en route to northern Michigan and then Idaho. At Hemingway’s request, they add a destination to their trip—Oxford, Mississippi. He and Bruce pull into Oxford with the hopes of running into Faulkner, but they leave without meeting him when they realize that he was being feted that very day. Hemingway would have wanted little to do with anything that celebrated Faulkner, especially with Faulkner’s recent fourth-place ranking of him still echoing in his mind. As H. R. Stoneback has observed of this near meeting of strident rivals, “There is no more poignant moment in American literary history.”\(^\text{118}\) Because Hemingway and Bruce left Oxford without running into Faulkner, we can

---

116. Qtd. in Meriwether and Millgate, 101.
only imagine what would have happened if they had spent time together at Rowan Oak—talking about their trade or Faulkner’s rating, having a few drinks, maybe going on an impromptu hunt in Mississippi’s wilderness, or perhaps discussing the duel that Hemingway had envisioned in his letter to Faulkner in July of that year. Bruce also recollected that there were a handful of other times that Hemingway talked of making the same detour “to the Capitol of Place in American literature,” but they never did so. One must wonder what two writers with such strong artistic egos would have talked about or how they would have interacted had they been in each other’s presence in what was clearly Faulkner’s place. Had they met on that September day when Hemingway and Bruce made their detour to Oxford, Faulkner and Hemingway probably would have debated, among other things, their respective quests for accomplishment, quests that oftentimes clashed with, sometimes mirrored, and continually informed each other.

119. Ibid.