



Ф И Л О Л О Г

часопис за језик, књижевност и културу
VI 2015 12
универзитет у бањој луци
филолошки факултет



“MUCH SENSE – THE STARKEST MADNESS”: SCHIZOID PERSONALITY IN HEMINGWAY’S THE GARDEN OF EDEN

Abstract: *This paper offers an analysis of two characters, David and Catherine Bourne, in Ernest Hemingway’s The Garden of Eden. The characters are analysed through R.D. Laing’s concept of ontological insecurity. The aim is to show that both these characters exhibit schizoid personality traits, as defined by Laing, however, it is only Catherine who is represented as mad due to her gender reversals. David, on the other hand, despite being involved in their gender reversals, remains “sane” because after getting involved in the sexual/gender experiments with Catherine, he succumbs to the demands of the dominant sexual politics.*

Key words: *Ernest Hemingway, The Garden of Eden, R. D. Laing, ontological insecurity.*

*Much Madness is divinest Sense—
To a discerning Eye—
Much Sense— the starkest Madness—
’Tis the Majority
In this, as All, prevail—
Assent— and you are sane—
Demur—you’re straightway dangerous—
And handled with a Chain—*

Emily Dickinson

The twentieth century witnessed two world wars, and war, not only a catastrophic event, is “always a catalyst for social and economic change” (Gendzel 2004: 23). Among other changes that took place during and after both world wars, a significant change of structures and conventions that regulated gender also occurred. Namely, during these (or any other) wars men, voluntarily or not, joined the army and engaged in defence of their country leaving their places in society empty. Thus companies opened their doors to women, offering them a chance to enter the public and the working arena. And they seized that chance. Women went to work, participated in cultural life, and after the Congress passed the nineteenth Amendment and women finally attained the right to vote, they participated in political life as well. The *angel of the house* was dead; the so-called *New Woman* emerged. Not for long, as it turned out. When the soldiers came home after the war, they found

a world turned upside-down, and women, once on the margins of life, were now at the centre of it. There was an urgent need to restore life as it was, and one way of restoring it was to return women were they supposedly belonged: at home. Though they were allowed to keep their jobs, it was marriage and motherhood that were celebrated as women’s greatest achievements. Namely, although the majority of women worked at some point in their life, the “career” of a working woman lasted only a few years, before she got married. After that, her career was that of a housewife. The homecoming soldiers viewed their return as extremely traumatic, first because they felt humiliated in not being able to earn money themselves, and second because they felt confused by their perception of their wives and girlfriends and their new lives which had changed dramatically (see Deutsch 2000). Masculinity “which family, society, church and authority of every kind have helped form was in need of re-

construction” (Chopra-Grant 2006:112). The propaganda, once so devoted to recruitment of women workers, now started to reinforce the traditional role of a woman and her place in society, and women were slowly but efficiently returned within the four walls of their households.

Furthermore, F. Lundberg and M.F. Farnham wrote *Modern Woman: The Lost Sex*, where they said that the independent woman was a “contradiction in terms”, and that any woman who wanted a career must be “masculinised ... neurotic, wholly or partly incapable of dealing with life”. Since she has rejected the “normal femininity”, she “finds herself facing her fundamental role as wife and mother with a *divided mind*... Thus she stands, *Janus-faced*, drawn in two directions at once, often incapable of ultimate choice and *inevitably penalised* whatever direction she chooses” (1947: 240–241). In addition, the rise in the diagnosis of schizophrenia that occurred during the twentieth century was used to “cover a vast assortment of odd behaviours, cultural maladjustments, and political deviations” (Showalter 1987: 203–204). Schizophrenia, literally “split mind”, was a convenient diagnosis in literature, because it could be applied to almost any character. My attempt here is to show that this diagnosis was mostly applied to women because, as Elaine Showalter points out, the Modernists appropriated the schizophrenic woman as a “symbol of linguistic, religious, and sexual breakdown and rebellion” (1987: 204). I will argue in this paper that the Modernist writers were in fact following this description in their portrayal of women who, in one way or another, broke patriarchal conventions of their gender. Ernest Hemingway’s *The Garden of Eden* seems a perfect material for such a discussion, for not only is it written by one of the most influential Modernist writers, but it tells a story of a World War I veteran and aspiring writer, David Bourne, and his wife, Catherine, who brings a series of gender / sexual experiments into their marriage which involves the switching of traditional gender roles. My aim is to show that both Catherine and David are controlled by ideologies demanded by the gender system; however it is Catherine who, despite their mutual gender experiments, ends up mad. Namely, David, no matter how limited by the social norms regarding sexuality, seems able to lead a “normal” life, and to

stay in control of his life. Catherine, on the other hand, is portrayed as completely without control over her life and her mind. This powerlessness manifests itself as madness.

In my approach to madness, I will apply writings of Ronald David Laing, specifically his books *The Divided Self* and *Self and Others*. Laing’s understanding of madness is centered around the idea of ontological insecurity. In order to explain this idea of his, he demonstrates two contrasting positions. On the one side, the person experiences him “as having an inner consistency, substantiality, genuineness, and worth; as spatially coextensive with the body; and, usually, as having begun in or around birth and liable to extinction with death. He thus has a firm core of ontological security” (Laing 1967: 41–42). On the other side, the person lacks a sense of personal cohesiveness, he may not experience himself as worthy, and may “feel his self as partially divorced from his body” (Laing, 1967: 42). The ontologically secure person will seek to gratify himself through his work and interpersonal relationships. The ontologically insecure person, on the other hand, is “preoccupied with preserving rather than gratifying himself” (Laing 1967: 42). For him, life becomes a sequence of efforts to preserve his identity, to “prevent himself from losing his self” (Laing 1967: 43). Since the other represents a threat, he dreads a relationship with the other. But at the same time, he cannot “sustain a sense of one’s own being without the presence of other people” (Laing 1967: 52). In attempt to deal with these kinds of contradictory feelings and underlying insecurities, he dissociates himself from all parts of his being through which he relates to other people, and identifies only with his unembodied self. Thus, we speak of a schizoid individual.

The term schizoid refers to an individual the totality of whose experience is split in two main ways: in the first place, there is a rent in his relation with his world and, in the second, there is a disruption of his relation with himself. Such a person is not able to experience himself ‘together with’ others or ‘at home in’ the world, but, on the contrary, he experiences himself in despairing aloneness and isolation; moreover, he does not experience himself as a complete person but rather as ‘split’ in various ways, perhaps as a mind more or less tenuously linked to a body, as two or more selves, and so on. (Laing 1967: 17)

The term “schizoid” derives its significance from the concept of splitting of the ego, a phenomenon that is in varying degrees common to all people. However, it is the severity of this splitting that determines its psychopathological importance. If it is particularly severe, the person may feel that the only way he can be safe from the threat of annihilation is by sacrificing a part of his being – his false, public self. The person neglects this outer self, and is thus willing to comply with the demands of those around him, and even imitate personalities and behaviours of people he complies to. Still, as the “true” self retreats, he becomes less and less able to experience real relationships with other people, and so loses his sense of realness.

The schizoid disorder, I believe, undoubtedly appears in Ernest Hemingway’s *The Garden of Eden*. By adapting R. D. Laing’s writings, I will attempt to illustrate the roots of the disorder in the major characters, David and Catherine Bourne. What I hope to show is that both of them exhibit the same characteristics of the schizoid disorder, and that, with both characters, we witness a constant fear that their very self will be annihilated. However, there is one crucial difference between David and Catherine: she ends up mad and vanishes at the end of the novel, while David continues his Edenic life with a new wife. I will argue that David is allowed to maintain his “sanity” because, after getting involved in the sexual / gender experiments with Catherine, he embraces and succumbs to the demands of his “public” self and the dominant sexual politics. Catherine, on the other hand, refuses to do so, and as a consequence, must be presented as mad, for her behaviour threatens the stability of the patriarchal order. “What Hemingway does in *The Garden of Eden* and elsewhere” as Richard Fantina says, “is to affirm the patriarchal social mandate while undermining it in sexual relationships” (2005: 77).

The novel starts in France, where the newlywed couple, David and Catherine Bourne, spend their honeymoon. Given the title, we expect the presence of the serpent at some point in the novel, but we soon, almost too soon and too abruptly in fact, find out that the serpent is the wife. Very early in the novel (page 3, to be pre-

cise), Catherine says that she is a “destructive type” and that she is going to destroy David (Hemingway 1986: 3). The destructiveness she introduces into their lives is actually a system of sexual and racial transformations. After announcing her destructiveness, Catherine goes to Aigues Mortes, where she has her hair cropped short and explains that she is a girl, but a boy too now (Hemingway 1986: 8). That night, Catherine changes into a boy, and names herself Peter. She asks David to become a girl, and calls him Catherine. He accepts this exchange, though we are made to believe that he is reluctant and that he objects to this behaviour of hers. But he does not stop her. On the contrary, he helps her: “He lay there and felt something and then her hand holding him and searching lower and *he helped with his hands* and then lay back in the dark and did not think at all and only felt the weight and the strangeness inside” (Hemingway 1986: 9, italics added). However, despite this helping, the first chapter ends with his metaphorically bidding Catherine farewell as she enters her madness. Immediately after their first gender reversal in bed, we are made to believe that he knows Catherine is going mad. How can he know? Is it because this reversal is something only a mad person would wish for, and would persuade another person to do? It is clear that Catherine does all these things: she cuts her hair to look like a boy’s, wears trousers and men’s shirts, changes into a boy, and then back into a girl, apparently as she pleases, causing David’s fear for her mental health. However, one should not neglect her words to David just before her first transformation: “It’s for *you*. It’s for me *too*. I won’t pretend it’s not” (Hemingway 1986: 12, italics added). She does not pretend it is not for her *too*, but we are always made to believe that all she does, she does for herself exclusively, moreover that her behaviour is a product of her mental illness. David must ensure himself (and people around them) that this is true, for to admit otherwise, would mean to admit his own ambiguous sexual identity. And he cannot do that. As we shall see, he cares too much about public opinion, and his manly appearance. Catherine, on the other hand, does not lack the courage to search for her identity, but by doing this she threatens David’s mas-

culinity, and consequently, ends up mad and isolated for wanting to unmask a man, and show his insecurities.

Catherine is indeed presented as a divided self. On the one hand, Hemingway depicts her as an intelligent and unpredictable temptress, provocative and self-centred. On the other, she is too dependent on David's love and approval, and his commitment to their world. She is torn between her role of a "fine girl and good girl" (Hemingway 1986: 55) and her role of a "Devil" (Hemingway 68). But it is important to note that, as much as she plays these roles for herself, she plays them for David equally, perhaps even more for him because he is just as insecure about his identity as she is of hers. In Laing's terminology, both represent a schizoid personality and suffer from the same ontological anxiety, the one which Laing defines as petrification / depersonalisation. However, it is only Catherine that we obviously see as such, because David in fact hides behind her and exposes her schizoidness in order to hide his. The difference between David and Catherine is that David is a famous writer, with a well-established social identity and a male-to-male attraction, which is a part of him, and must be hidden from the public eye. Catherine's only identity is that of the writer's wife, as she admits: "Madame is a housewife" (Hemingway 1986: 12). This is the main issue for Catherine, but also for any reader wanting to understand the reasons behind her madness. We are not given much information about her past, nor is it very clear what exactly she does want. All we know for sure is that she engages in gender reversals with David and, as a consequence, goes mad. But if this really is the reason for her madness, why does David remain sane? Why doesn't Marita, who is sexually available to both David and Catherine, share her madness? I believe we must look at the central figures' childhood years, and search for the roots of their ontological insecurity. In Catherine's case, this is almost impossible to do, for Hemingway mentions her childhood only on two pages, through a casual conversation between David and Colonel Boyle. And even through this, we are assured that madness is something that runs

through her family, so we should not be surprised if it happens to her too. The Colonel informs David that Catherine's father "killed himself in a car. His wife too", upon which she, apparently, stayed with her "silly uncle" in Paris (Hemingway 1986: 61). This is Catherine's background, at least the one we are given access to, and it seems as we are being prepared for the subsequent events because, as Laing explains:

The world of the child, as of the adult, is 'a *unity of the given and the constructed*' (Hegel), a unity for the child of what is mediated to it by the parents, the mother in the first instance, and of what he makes of this. The mother and father greatly simplify the world for the young child, and as his capacity grows to make sense, to inform chaos with pattern, to grasp distinctions and connexions of greater and greater complexity, so, as Buber puts it, he is led out into 'a feasible world'. (1967: 189, italics in the original)

But if there is no one who will lead a child into a "feasible world"? Again, Laing's explains: "The child then has to develop its own piercing vision and to be able to live by that [...] or else become mad" (1967: 189–190).

Catherine, indeed, exhibits characteristics of madness. In fact, similarities between her and one of Laing's patients, Julie, described in his book, *The Divided Self*, are striking. At the time Laing met her, Julie had been in a ward of a mental hospital for nine years. She complained that she was not a real person, but trying to become one. She was trying to find happiness, because there was none in her life. She felt unreal and complained that there was an invisible barrier between her and others (Laing 1967: 178–179). In his conversation with her parents, her sister, and aunt, Laing discovered that they all agreed in seeing Julie's life in three basic phases:

1. The patient was a *good*, normal, healthy child; until she gradually began...
2. to be *bad*, to do or say things that caused great distress, and which were on the whole 'put down' to naughtiness or badness, until...
3. this went beyond all tolerable limits so that she could only be regarded as completely *mad*. (1967: 181, italics in the original)

In short, the original pattern of her behaviour was entirely in conformity with what her parents held as praiseworthy. During the bad phase, however, Julie would say and do “those very things her parents most did not want to see her do or hear her say” (Laing 1967: 182), until her words and actions were disregarded on account of being completely insane.

The good-bad-mad pattern can also be seen in Catherine’s behaviour. As the novel opens, we see the happy couple enjoying their honeymoon, eating, drinking and making love, and not even their night activities of gender reversals spoil the harmony in this Garden of Eden. Even though both David and Catherine are aware that she playing a boy sexually arouses him, it is something that must not be said, not even between them. Catherine, at first, agrees to keep the secret: “I’ll only be a boy at night and won’t embarrass you. Don’t worry about it please” (Hemingway 1986: 56). The problem, however, arises when Catherine finds her Devil role too amusing because as a boy she can do “anything, and anything and anything” (Hemingway 1986: 6). In fact, she finds it so fulfilling that she takes it out of their bedroom and into the public. And with this, the bad phase begins. Catherine visits the Prado museum where Colonel Boyle sees her and tells her that she looks like “the young chief of a warrior tribe” (Hemingway 1986: 62), and Catherine admits that she indeed was a boy in the museum. With just one question, “How did you know I was a boy in the Prado?” (Hemingway 1986: 63), she reveals their “dark things” (Hemingway 1986: 67) to the Colonel. Just as Julie during her bad phase did and say “those very things her parents most *did not want to see her do or hear her say*” (Laing 1967: 182, italics added), so Catherine now says and does things David does not want to see or hear. In the privacy of their bedroom, David is willing to admit and accept his true sexuality, but if he senses the slightest possibility of this secret being revealed, he withdraws from Catherine and acts as if he was seduced to participate in their game. His going back and forth is what maddens Catherine, for she always must be willing to act out any kind of person David needs. She is there to help him act out his sexual desires, on the one hand, without truly acknowledging them, on the other. She

is there to be the “Devil” during nights, but a “good girl” when the morning comes to soothe David’s remorse. Hence her protest: “Do you want me to wrench myself around and tear myself in two because you can’t make up your mind? Because you won’t stay with anything?” (Hemingway 1986: 35).

With his refusal to “stay with anything”, David fuels the anxiety to which Catherine is already subject, that is petrification/ depersonalisation, which Laing defines as follows:

The risk consists in this: if one experiences the other as a free agent, one is open to the possibility of experiencing oneself as an *object* of his experience and thereby of feeling one’s own subjectivity drained away. One is threatened with the possibility of becoming no more than a thing in the world of the other, without any life for oneself, without any being for oneself. (1967: 47, italics in the original)

Already unsure of her identity, Catherine indeed becomes no more than a thing in the world of David, the thing that has to change its shape any time he wishes it to. She is either a good girl or a Devil, without any being left for herself. It becomes too much for her, it tires her, but not even then does she think only about herself. She introduces Marita to help both her and David, and who will eventually take on the role of the good wife. Marita is, in fact, the good wife pushed to the extreme. Her only task is to study David’s needs and fashion herself into an object of his love and desire. Even though she is a lesbian when they meet her and engages in sex with both David and Catherine, she soon starts a completely conventional relationship with David, in which she takes care of David’s needs, encourages his writing and his manhood: “I want you to have men friends and friends from the war and to shoot with and to play cards at the club” (Hemingway 1986: 125). Men friends, friends from war and card games are there to maintain his masculine appearance, and so is Marita. She is there as just another tool for maintenance of his mask, and any threat to this presentation must be destroyed. And Catherine, at this point, is a threat to David’s presentation of himself. Once Catherine realises that she has been completely marginalised from their *ménage à trois*, she burns

David's African stories, which, as will be shown, serve him as a very foundation of the construction of his male heterosexual identity.

After burning the stories, Catherine's behaviour becomes intolerable to David and Marita. She has entered the third phase, she has become a "crazy woman" (Hemingway 1986: 243). And with this, as she herself says, she has become "nothing" (Hemingway 1986: 192). She tried to be "anything and anything and anything" (Hemingway 1986: 6) for him, but she broke herself into pieces. Catherine becomes literally "nothing", because she has not succeeded in defining herself within the norms of the dominant culture. This is what Catherine in the end is punished for. Not for her sexual experimentations, nor for gender reversals (after all, we see both Marita and David doing the same, but with a completely different outcome), but for publicly defying the norms of society. She reveals David's (latent?) homosexuality to the Colonel, wears men's shirts, looks like a boy, and publicly despises gender stereotypes ("Why should I hold it down? You want a girl don't you? Don't you want everything that goes with it? Scenes, hysteria, false accusations, temperament, isn't that it?" Hemingway 1986: 35). Catherine alone is expelled because, unlike Marita and David, she does not restore herself to a "normal" sexual life. Once the serpent is removed, the new Bournes, David and Marita, regain the Garden. What makes Marita suitable for the position of Eve in this Garden is her confession to David that she is just the way he is (Hemingway 1986: 94). What exactly would that way be? And what kind of a Garden do the two inhabit?

At the heart of the Biblical story of the Garden of Eden is the story of restrictions, of what is allowed and not allowed. It is a story about the nature of freedom, of the costs of human freedom and choice. At the heart of Hemingway's *The Garden of Eden* is David's African story, the story of him, his father, and Juma tracking the elephant, a fitting metaphor for the costs of human freedom. As the story begins, David, as innocent as Adam in the Garden, shares a mystical bonding with the hunted elephant. Presumably wanting his father to be proud of him, he reveals the elephant's whereabouts to his father and Juma, who

start tracking the animal deeper into the countryside. When he realises his error of conspiring with the hunters, David withdraws from both his father and Juma, who has been like a brother to him. Disgusted with the brutality of the hunting, David challenges his father's dominance, even if it is with a soft retort of: "Fuck elephant hunting" (Hemingway 1986: 181). The father firmly responds with the warning: "Be careful you don't fuck it up" (Hemingway 1986: 182). David's attempt to disrupt this world of fixed relations fails, and he has but one option left: "Never tell anyone anything. Never tell anyone anything again" (Hemingway 1986: 181). It is at this moment that David realises that the initiation into manhood, into this society, comes at the expense of losing innocence, of choosing a side. And David, indeed, does make a choice. He makes peace with his father, but only because "he knew this was the start of the never telling that he had decided on" (Hemingway 1986: 202). In his fictional representation of himself, David chooses his acceptance into manhood, but at what cost? - At the cost of hiding his true feelings, at the cost of betraying a part of himself, at the cost of dividing his self into a private and a public part. Hence David's rejection of Catherine once she starts to reveal the "dark things" (Hemingway 1986: 67), and threatens to expose his homoeroticism. The only way he knows how to operate in the world is to hide his true self, to conform to the norms of society, to live through his mask of a "social self"¹. Of course, all human beings have the capacity to present this type of a "mask", however, according to Laing's writings, the "mask" that the schizoid person wears is not merely a social convention but, in fact, crucial to a person's survival in this world which he sees as a threat.

David's "social self" is his culturally constructed identity as a writer, whose reputation sells books and brings profit, and provides a confirmation of his masculine selfhood.

"The book's made some money already," he told her. "That's wonderful. I'm so glad. But we know it's good. If the reviews had said it was worthless and it never made a cent I would have been just as proud and just as happy."

¹ "Social self" here is used as defined by Erich Fromm, see: Fromm, Erich (2001), *The Fear of Freedom*. London: Routledge.

I wouldn’t, the young man thought. But he did not say it. He went on reading the reviews, unfolding them and folding them up again and putting them back in the envelope. (Hemingway 1986: 25, italics added)

Though Catherine would be proud of him if the book did not make any money at all, David makes clear to us just how much he depends on public recognition. When Catherine threatens to expose his bi-sexuality, and destroy his “social self”, David emotionally abandons her, just as he abandoned his father and Juma during the elephant hunt in Africa. This emotional abandonment is actually a technique Laing calls depersonalisation, and describes as follows:

Depersonalisation is a technique that is universally used as a means of dealing with the other when he becomes too tiresome or disturbing. One no longer allows oneself to be responsive to his feelings and may be prepared to regard him and treat him as though he had no feelings. The people in focus here both tend to feel themselves as more or less depersonalised and tend to depersonalise others; they are constantly afraid of being depersonalised by others. The act of turning him into a thing is, *for him*, actually petrifying. In the face of being treated as an ‘it’, his own subjectivity drains away from him like blood from the face. (1967: 47, italics in the original)

As Catherine becomes too disturbing for David, he starts dealing with her as though she was a mere thing, she becomes an “it” to him: she becomes nothing more than a Devil, a Crazy woman. As long as he does not see her as a living being with feelings, he does not feel threatened with being depersonalised by her.

David, in fact, uses Catherine not just as a hook on which to hang his projections, but strives to induce her to become the very embodiment of his phantasies, and requires her cooperation to complement the phantasy identity he himself feels impelled to sustain.² He admits that he likes the changes Catherine introduces into their relationship: “‘All right. You like it,’ he said. ‘Now go through with the rest of it whatever it is and don’t ever say anyone tempted you or that anyone bitched you.’” (Hemingway 1986: 34). It is important to note that he admits that nobody

“bitched” him into anything, and reminds himself to take advantage of this game³, because it will soon be over: “You didn’t work at all really. And you better soon because everything’s going too fast and you’re going with it and you’ll be through before ever you know it. Maybe you’re through now. All right. Don’t start. At least *you remember that much*” (Hemingway 1986: 18, italics added). His words suggest that it is not his first time to perform this gender / sex reversals, only now he performs them with Catherine (and will continue to do so with Marita, afterwards). He remembers the game, how it goes, how it ends, and as long as Catherine is willing to participate in the game, without exposing it, she does not represent a threat. Their relationship is, in fact, a “game played by two or more people whereby they deceive themselves. The game is the game of mutual self-deception” (Laing 1990: 91).

However, the problem arises when Catherine tires of this charade, of being both and yet neither, and tries to regain her subjectivity. Since Catherine’s public role is that of a writer’s wife, that is a submissive female, any transformation of her status directly affects David’s status as a husband, a dominant male. In other words, any alteration of her status is a direct threat of depersonalisation to David, of giving away his “mask”. Catherine, as we have seen, indeed tries to do this. However, the attempt proves to be fatal for her; David, Adam of this Garden, obeys the rules, and is rewarded for his obedience with both the Garden and a new Eve, while Catherine must suffer because of her independence and, already labelled as mad, vanishes. For even when David surrenders to Catherine, he does so exclusively in the privacy of their bedroom, that is, in a very closed and limited space. And though, as Fantina says, Hemingway’s “women often dominate in the bedroom”, it is his men who “dominate in the world” (2005: 77). In other words, not even Hemingway, arguably the most influential writer

³ Several critics have pointed out the connection between David’s writing and the sexual role reversals. See, for example: Comley, Nancy R., and Robert Scholes (2012), “Tribal Things: Hemingway’s Erotics of Truth.” In *Hemingway’s The Garden of Eden: Twenty-five Years of Criticism*. Ed. Suzanne del Gizzo and Frederic J. Svoboda. Kent (OH): Kent State UP, 185-204.

² See: collusion, in Laing, R.D (1990), *Self and Others: Further Studies in Sanity and Madness*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

of the 20th century, was willing to allow the angel to leave the house. Even Hemingway only sustains traditionally male and female social roles for though he creates a subversive female, in the end, he intervenes on the patriarchy's behalf and makes her disappear.

Works cited

1. Berman, Ronald, *Modernity and Progress: Fitzgerald, Hemingway, Orwell*, Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.
2. Comley, Nancy R. and Robert Scholes (1994), *Hemingway's Genders: Rereading the Hemingway Text*, New Haven: Yale UP.
3. Comley, Nancy R. and Robert Scholes (2012), "Tribal Things: Hemingway's Erotics of Truth.", *Hemingway's The Garden of Eden: Twenty-five Years of Criticism*, Ed. Suzanne del Gizzo and Frederic J. Svoboda, Kent (OH): Kent State UP, 185–204.
4. Chopra-Grant, Mike (2006), *Hollywood Genres and Postwar America: Masculinity, Family, and Nation in Popular Movies and Film Noir*, New York: I. B. Tauris & Co Ltd.
5. Deutsch, Sarah (2000), *Women and the City: Gender, Space and Power in Boston, 1870–1940*, New York: Oxford UP.
6. Dickinson, Emily, "Much Madness is divinest Sense.", *Poetry X*. Ed. Jough Dempsey, 25 Aug 2004, Internet, available at [http://poetry-poetryx.com/poems/2751](http://poetry.poetryx.com/poems/2751) (accessed on 8 Nov. 2013).
7. Fantina, Richard (2005), *Ernest Hemingway: Machismo and Masochism*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
8. Fromm, Erich (2001), *The Fear of Freedom*, London: Routledge. Kindle file.
9. Gendzel, Glen (2004), "1929–1941.", *A Companion to 20th-Century America*, Ed. Stephen J. Whitfield, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 19–36.
10. Hemingway, Ernest (1986), *The Garden of Eden*, New York: Scribner.
11. Laing, Ronald David (1967), *The Divided Self: An Existential Study in Sanity and Madness*, New York: Penguin,
12. --- (1990), *Self and others: Further Studies in Sanity and Madness*, Harmondsworth: Penguin
13. McEuen, Melissa A. (2010), *Making War, Making Women: Femininity and Duty on the American Home Front, 1941–1945*, Athens: The University of Georgia Press.
14. Oliver, Charles M. (1999), *Ernest Hemingway: A Literary Reference to His Life and Work*, New York: Facts on File.
15. Showalter, Elaine (1987), "Nervous Women: Sex Roles and Sick Roles.", *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture 1830–1980*, New York: Penguin, 121–144.

„MNOGO RAZUMA – POTPUNO LUDILO“: ŠIZOIDNA LIČNOST U HEMINGVEJEVOM RAJSKOM VRTU

Rezime

U radu se analiziraju glavni likovi Hemingvejevog romana *Rajski vrt*, Dejvid i Ketrin Born. Likovi su analizirani kroz Leingov koncept šizoidnog poremećaja. Analizom se želi pokazati da oba lika ispoljavaju karakteristike šizoidne osobe, onako kako je definiše R. D. Leing, ali samo Ketrin biva prikazana kao takva zbog eksperimentisanja na polju seksualnosti. S druge strane, iako i Dejvid učestvuje u istim eksperimentima, on ne biva prikazan kao šizoidna osoba jer se ipak povinuje zahtjevima društveno prihvatljive seksualnosti.

sbpeezza@gmail.com