

Hemingway's Francis Macomber in "God's Country"

Matthew A. Fike, Ph.D.

Winthrop University

In 1925–26, C. G. Jung's Bugishu Psychological Expedition journeyed through Kenya, the setting of Ernest Hemingway's "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber." Although the two authors went to Africa for vastly different reasons, Jung's insights into the personal and collective unconscious, along with the discoveries he made while there, provide a lens through which to complement previous Freudian and Lacanian studies of the story. Francis, a *puer aeternus* and introverted thinker, overcomes his initial mother complex by doing shadow work with his hunting guide, Robert Wilson. As the story progresses, Francis makes the unconscious more conscious through dreaming and then connects with the archaic/primordial man buried deeply below his modern civilized persona. The essay thus resolves two long-standing critical cruxes: the title character makes genuine psychological progress; and his wife, whether she shoots at the buffalo or at him, targets primordial masculine strength.

In *Death in the Afternoon*, Ernest Hemingway states: "If a writer of prose knows enough about what he is writing about he may omit things that he knows and the reader, if the writer is writing truly enough, will have a feeling of those things as strongly as though the writer had stated them. The dignity of movement of an ice-berg is due to only one-eighth of it being above water" (192).¹ "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber," one of two stories that arose from Hemingway's African safari, is a fine illustration of the "ice-berg" principle. Since what lies beneath its action and dialogue are the characters' psychological dynamics, C. G. Jung's insights into the personal and collective unconscious, along with the discoveries he made while himself in Africa, are especially relevant. In the two previous decades, studies by Michael Vannoy Adams, Anthony Stevens, and Blake Burleson have identified Jung's African expedition as the provenance of many assumptions within his model of the psyche, but the trip-theory nexus has relevance to Jungian literary criticism as well. Like most studies of the story, the present essay is "traditional" rather than postmodern, though it *is* post-Jungian in acknowledging the essentialism and misogyny of Jung's statements about the feminine, along with the racism of his view of the primitive. Jung is useful in many

Journal of Jungian Scholarly Studies 2

respects, including the way his theories participate in some of the problematic cultural assumptions that animate Hemingway's story.

The Jungian rubric, however, is surprisingly absent from previous psychological approaches to "Francis Macomber" that sound much of the submerged seven-eighths.² To begin with Horst Breuer's view, Francis plays the role of the child who rejects "mother-*imago*" Margot and embraces father-figure Wilson (193–94). Joseph DeFalco also sees Wilson as "not unlike an authority-father figure" (203), and Richard B. Hovey views him as a surrogate father (126). Kenneth W. Harrow tracks Francis's progress through Lacan's three stages of the Oedipus complex—desire for the mother, repression of desire because of fear of castration, and accession to paternal authority. In another Lacanian study, Bennett Kravitz sees "the Macomers' marriage as a symbiotic relationship" in which husband and wife fill each other's "void of 'ego incompleteness'" (84). Using Penelope Brown's concepts of polite linguistic discourse to analyze the dialogue's psychological significance, Donald E. Hardy suggests that Francis forsakes "not his rational faculties . . . but the control of his own positive face" (132). Finally, in the study most relevant to my own, Michelle Scalise Sugiyama uses evolutionary psychology to analyze the dynamics among the three central characters. Margot's "female reproductive value" (143), Wilson's prowess in hunting, and Francis's ability to make money come into conflict, generating infidelity, sexual jealousy, and possibly murder. Although Sugiyama does not mention Virgil Hutton's well-known study, her evolutionary approach to Margot—that she is trying to maximize her options—sensibly augments his claim that "being upset over her husband's display of weakness" means that Margot does not really wish "to be the dominating female" (248–49). Instead, she simply wishes to be well cared for by the fittest male.

Although Sugiyama generalizes about "the environment of evolutionary adaptiveness" (143), there is no mention that the African savanna, as Jung knew well, is the place where our species evolved.

3 Fike

state in the moments prior to his death. They believe that his change from cowardice to bravery is “much too improbable” (Gardiner 188), that “the fate of Macomber’s manhood [is] undecidable” (Strychacz 18), and that he “illustrates no dramatic change from boyish cowardice to heroic manhood” (Hutton 248), perhaps because his happiness is not “an integrative form of development, but [merely] an abrupt re-cathexis” (Breuer 195). The equivalent of these claims in Jungian psychology would be that Macomber’s change is impermanent because he experiences *enantiodromia*, a swing between the opposites of negative inflation and positive inflation. DeFalco, however, correctly identifies Francis’s experiences as “the journey toward individuation” (206), though the statement’s Jungian resonance is left unexplored. For Jung, individuation means a movement toward psychic wholeness, or the Self, when the unconscious becomes conscious; in this fashion, greater psychic integration leads out of the inflationary cycle toward sustainable well-being. Hemingway hints that Francis’s change is genuine and permanent, and this essay will argue that his individuation becomes clearer if the story is read through a Jungian psychological lens. In brief, Francis, a *puer aeternus* and introverted thinker, overcomes his initial mother complex by doing shadow work with his hunting guide, Robert Wilson. As the story progresses, Francis makes the unconscious more conscious through dreaming and then connects with the archaic/primordial man buried deeply below his modern civilized persona. Like the reader who must infer the seven-eighths below the story’s surface, Francis discovers psychic resources that lie below the veneer of his comfortable lifestyle, “the fairytale world of high society” (Gaillard 32).

It is hard to imagine two more diverse figures than Hemingway and Jung—the macho sportsman and the learned doctor; but both visited east Africa, though for vastly different reasons. Hemingway went on a three-month safari in the summer of 1933, published an account of the hunt in *Green Hills of Africa* in 1935, and used some of the book’s details in “Francis Macomber,” which appeared in the September 1936 issue of *Cosmopolitan*. Jung made two trips to Africa: the first was to Tunis and Algiers in 1920; then for five months in 1925–26 his “Bugishu Psychological Expedition” (BPE) journeyed through Kenya, Uganda, Sudan, and Egypt. Although his main objective was to study Africans’ dreams, the trip afforded him the opportunity to observe what happened to himself, a white European, in a remote third-world setting. The resulting experiences and insights provide a relevant lens through which fresh perspectives on “Francis Macomber” may be discovered.

Jung believes that consciousness is not original to our species but rather that consciousness emerged in prehistory and is still developing. In his autobiography, *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, he identifies the “original state of twilight consciousness” in which humans “had existed from time immemorial” and from which they emerged “to become aware of their own existence,” that is, to achieve

Journal of Jungian Scholarly Studies 4

consciousness as we know it (240). A lyrical passage in *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious* describes how that transformation may have occurred:

. . . I believe that, after thousands and millions of years, someone had to realize that this wonderful world of mountains and oceans, suns and moons, galaxies and nebulae, plants and animals, *exists*. From a low hill in the Athi plains of East Africa I once watched the vast herds of wild animals grazing in soundless stillness, as they had done from time immemorial, touched only by the breath of a primeval world. I felt then as if I were the first man, the first creature, to know that all this *is*. The entire world round me was still in its primeval state; it did not know that it *was*. And then, in that one moment in which I came to know, the world sprang into being; without that moment it would never have been. All Nature seeks this goal and finds it fulfilled in man, but only in the most highly developed and most fully conscious man. Every advance, even the smallest, along this path of conscious realization adds that much to the world. (*CW* 9i, par. 177; emphases in the original)

Noting the contrast to the natural world, which “was still in its primeval state” and “did not know that it *was*,” Jung, in an imaginative reverie, experiences the moment when consciousness emerged from primordial twilight. The last three sentences of his statement evince both the primitive’s movement from twilight to consciousness (the world’s spring into being) and the aware person’s journey toward maximal consciousness. In other words, progress continues in the present within each conscious person. It is as if the evolution of human consciousness and the individual person’s individuation are not separate achievements. Rather one person’s movement toward greater awareness mirrors the species’ emergence from semi-consciousness, much as, for Loren Eiseley, the growth and development of a human being imitate “the long march” of evolution up through the eons: “Even so does every man come upward from the waters of his birth” (147).⁴

Although Africa is the locale where consciousness emerged, Burleson notes that Jung understood the continent to represent the unconscious (200). It follows that the human awareness that Jung observed there diverges markedly from his own highly rational European way of thinking. Unfortunately, some of his further conclusions about the psychology of indigenous peoples are in sync with racist assumptions. He believes, for example, that Africans, like children or adolescents, are dominated by emotion—“these people live from their affects” (*MDR* 239–44). As well, he considers them child-like in their *participation mystique*, a term borrowed from Lucien Lévy-Bruhl.⁵ It is a magical mentality in which two things obtain: events are attributed to “so-called supernatural powers” rather than natural causes (*CW* 10, par. 113), and there is no distinction between the perceiving subject and the perceived object. Jung states: “For primitive man . . . the psychic and the objective coalesce in the external world. . . . Psychic happenings take place outside

5 Fike

him in an objective way” (*CW* 10, par. 128). Whereas modern persons achieve psychic differentiation, “primitives” are less differentiated (*CW* 7, par. 156). Being “primitive” means projecting inner content onto the world and blurring the difference.⁶

Perhaps *participation mystique* fosters the ability to see the basic unity of all life rather than divisions like the one between hunter and hunted. Jung’s experiences, reported in his *Visions* seminar, bear out the point. One morning he was astonished to discover that a lion that lived nearby had left tracks outside his tent. The natives told him, “It is not bad, it is *our* lion.” Additional evidence came when Jung realized “the fact that leopards go hunting with you provided you carry your shotgun and not your big caliber gun; when you carry your big gun no leopard will appear.” When his company shot a guinea fowl, the leopard made off with it before the hunters could reach it. The latter experience implies an almost intellectual process on the leopard’s part, as well as partnership—human and big cat working together. Commenting on these episodes, Jung suggests, “It is quite possible that *participation mystique* with the non-ego means a certain change, not only in yourself, but also in the surrounding conditions” (qtd. in Burleson 135–36).⁷ In other words, when one perceives the world in human terms, the observed animal returns the favor. A lion or leopard—dangerous prey—is no longer Other but brother. Of course, the main characters in “Francis Macomber” wish only to hunt and destroy great game, but the narrator describes the agony of the shooting from the lion’s point of view. Although Hemingway went to Africa to take life and fancied himself a great white hunter, including the lion’s point of view suggests that he may have developed some sense of life’s overarching unity. As Carey Voeller states, “The beast’s humanized, dying moments function as the key factor in forging the connection of humankind with the animal world” (232).

Participation mystique, however, is problematic when applied to an indigenous people because it implies a linkage between their race and their psychology.⁸ A more fundamental, less controversial element of the primitive is that we as civilized persons have “those historical layers in ourselves” that link us to primitive times (Jung, *MDR* 244). In “Archaic Man” (1931), Jung states: “. . . it is not only primitive man whose psychology is archaic. It is the psychology also of modern, civilized man, and not merely of individual ‘throw-backs’ in modern society. On the contrary, every civilized human being, however high his conscious development, is still an archaic man at the deeper levels of his psyche” (*CW* 10, par. 105). Burleson explains that when humans evolved out of “the ubiquitous unconscious,” they carried with them “an undifferentiated layer of the human (and animal) psyche” (16). This layer can be observed, Jung believes, in the daily lives of modern-day primitives such as those he encountered on the BPE (*CW* 18, par. 18, 1288). But because the ancient wellspring is deeply buried, a modern civilized

Journal of Jungian Scholarly Studies 6

person like Francis suffers from malaise, psychic fragmentation, and a loss of vital wholeness.

In the decades when Jung's BPE and Hemingway's safari took place, journeying to Africa was considered therapeutic precisely because it threw the archaic in human psychology into bold relief. As Margaret Torgovnick states in her book *Primitive Passions*, "The primitive' was widely valued as a way station or spa for men suffering from cultural alienation and psychic distress" (qtd. in Burleson 15).⁹ She adds that André Gide, D. H. Lawrence, and others including Jung visited the continent. Jung emphasizes the positive effect: ". . . these seemingly alien and wholly different Arab surroundings awaken an archetypal memory of an only too well known prehistoric past which apparently we have entirely forgotten. We are remembering a potentiality of life which has been overgrown by civilization, but which in certain places is still existent" (*MDR* 245–46). As regards accessing the archaic in the civilized person, Jung biographer Barbara Hannah notes that encounters with indigenous peoples and animals mean that "in Africa you are in a way meeting those layers *outside*. . . ." Her sense that Africa "is the country of the Self, not of the ego" has particular significance for Jung in light of his No. 1 and No. 2 personalities (172). Whereas No. 1 is "the ego-centered, time-bound person," No. 2 is "the Self-centered, timeless person of the collective unconscious" (Burleson 61). Jung went to Africa to seek relief from the stress of his clinical practice, the province of the ego, by researching the unconscious in others and by exploring its nether reaches in himself.

Such exploration of the deep unconscious can be perilous, as the Swahili word *shenzi* attests. In *Green Hills of Africa*, Hemingway translates the word as "a wild man" (180). Burleson states that it means "uncivilized" and identifies a series of English equivalents: "Going *shenzi* meant 'going black', 'going primitive', 'going native', 'going insane'" (188). In *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*, Jung states that "going black" means sleeping with black women (262). Clearly *shenzi* has racist undertones to the contemporary ear; but Adams, in his helpful study of race, understands that the term, which is British in origin, also means "to revert . . . to an earlier and lower state. . . . To go black is to 'go back'—in time and space" (51–52). For example, Jung interpreted his dream, in which his African American barber in Chattanooga, Tennessee, applied a curling iron to Jung's hair (in order to make it "kinky" like "Negro hair"), as a warning that his No. 1 personality was in danger of *shenzi* because his No. 2 personality was reverting to an earlier, more unconscious state by succumbing to *participation mystique* (*MDR* 272). Although a more positive interpretation of the dream can be advanced, it was not possible for Jung who pulled back, forewarned.

While in Africa, Francis Macomber connects with the archaic psyche that is buried beneath his life as a socialite and sportsman. Before the trip and in its early stages, however, the ego dominates his superficial life. As Jung states, "The

7 Fike

predominantly rationalistic European [or American] finds much that is human alien to him, and he prides himself on this [difference] without realizing that his rationality is won at the expense of his vitality, and that the primitive part of his personality is consequently condemned to a more or less underground existence” (*MDR* 245). The duality has some of its intellectual roots in Friedrich Schiller’s *Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man*, about which Jung comments in *Psychological Types*, chapter 2 (*CW* 6, par. 101–222). Schiller argues that civilization has diminished creativity, feeling, imagination, instinct, intuition, matter, and the senses in favor of analysis, empiricism, intelligence, reason, societal control, speculation, spirit, and understanding. He suggests that beauty and the “instinct of play” (part 2, letter 14) can be instrumental in uniting the opposing sets of qualities; and he sounds like Jung in stating, “It will be quite possible, then, that in remote corners of the world humanity may be honoured in the person of the negro, while in Europe it may be degraded in the person of the thinker” (part 2, letter 7). Schiller’s interest, however, lies in classical antiquity, the Golden Age of Greece and Rome, not in prehistory or archaic man. A more personal gloss may have greater relevance: Jung’s own dream of a multi-story house in which each lower floor depicts an earlier age. A stone age cave dwelling, “that is, the world of the primitive man within myself—a world which can scarcely be reached or illuminated by consciousness,” lies beneath the cellar floor (*MDR* 160).

Francis’s connections to the outer world through sports and other activities signal disconnection from this “underground existence,” the archaic elements within the collective unconscious. The narrator enumerates these wide-ranging interests:

. . . he was thirty-five years old, kept himself very fit, and was good at court games, [and] had a number of big-game fishing records. . . . He knew . . . about motor cycles [*sic*—that was earliest—about motor cars, about duck-shooting, about fishing, trout, salmon and big-sea, about sex in books, many books, too many books, about all court games, about dogs, not much about horses, about hanging on to his money, about most of the other things his world dealt in, and about his wife not leaving him. (6, 18)

Ben Stoltzfus describes the statement about “court games” and other activities as summing up Francis’s “essence before he goes to Africa” (220); and Carl P. Eby, who identifies guns as phallic symbols, “suspect[s] that Hemingway’s guns were seldom *just* guns” (283–84 and n. 4). Similarly, Breuer understands “sex in books” as signaling “phallic deficiency” (194). Jung too would see the canalization of sexual libido in Francis’s hobbies: “In men, sexuality if not acted out directly, is frequently converted into a feverish professional activity or a passion for dangerous sports, etc., or into some learned hobby, such as a collecting mania,” like saving

Journal of Jungian Scholarly Studies 8

money (*CW* 3, par. 105).¹⁰ Not only do Francis's activities substitute for the inner work he needs to do; they also fall short of Jung's idea of American sports, which, being ruthless, brutal, savage, and gladiatorial, suggest "a glimpse of the Indian" and manifest, in spectators, "ancient instincts that are akin to bloodlust" (*CW* 10, par. 100 and 977).

Although Francis is now thirty-five years old, his list of hobbies implies a sense of arrested development. Wilson underscores his client's status as a boy-man by calling him "laddybuck" (20) and by thinking that "his American face . . . would stay adolescent until it became middle-aged" (8). "It's that some of them stay little boys so long, Wilson thought. Sometimes all their lives. Their figures stay boyish when they're fifty. The great American boy-men" (25–26). Although Burleson is not writing about the story, he helpfully brings together Hemingway and Jung via a key concept that applies to the immaturity that Wilson recognizes in Francis: "There is exhilaration in living life on the thin line between life and death, and Africa, as Ernest Hemingway discovered, provided the perfect masculine playground for this edge. From a Jungian perspective, this phenomenon might best be understood as the problem of the *puer aeternus*" (32). Some of the characteristics of the eternal child that Jung's associate Marie-Louise von Franz enumerates fit Francis well. Such a person is between thirty and forty-five years of age, has a mother complex, and engages in dangerous sports in an attempt to separate from the mother (1). Flying is the example given, but big game hunting can be equally fatal.¹¹ Francis does engage in hunting and does have a mother-wife, but other characteristics of the *puer* do not fit him precisely. He does not fantasize ineffectually about future plans but merely knows that Margot will never leave him. Insofar as Jung understands that work is the cure for *puer aeternus* (5), Francis seems poised, despite his past attraction to "court games" and "sex in books," to make psychological progress toward greater maturity.

The passage's resonance with Jungian typology yields further insight into Francis's personality. Knowing about "sex in books," along with emphasis on many "books, too many books," implies that Francis, although "very tall, very well built . . . [and] considered handsome" (6), is not a man of deep sexual experience and that he would really rather just read. Being certain that Margot will not leave him suggests that she might want to, perhaps because of sexual inadequacy that motivates her frequent promiscuity. The narrator states, "If he had been better with women she would probably have started to worry about him getting another new, beautiful wife" (18). Francis's problem is at least, as Hovey suggests, "a timidity whose mark is lack of self-assertion" (124). Together, the information about "sex in books" and awkwardness with women suggests that Francis is an introverted thinker, which makes him easy prey for manipulation by extroverted Margot, whose beauty "had, five years before, commanded five thousand dollars as the price of endorsing, with photographs, a beauty product which she had never used"

9 Fike

(6). Further evidence of her extroversion is that she kisses Wilson on the mouth in front of her husband, something an awkward introvert would be loath to do.

With proper caveats in place, an educated guess as to Francis's full personality type is possible: ISTP, which represents introverted, sensing, thinking, and perceiving. According to "Portrait of an ISTP," such a person has an adventuresome spirit, thrives on action, and is attracted to dangerous activities like riding motorcycles. ISTPs tend to be good athletes and have good hand-eye coordination ("kept himself very fit, and was good at court games"); follow through with a project, especially one that involves logical analysis ("hanging on to his money"), and are good at a variety of tasks (motor cars, duck-shooting, fishing, sports, dogs). Also, ISTP is loyal, trusting, and patient—qualities that the narrator implies at the end of the "sex in books" paragraph: ". . . he had always a great *tolerance* which seemed the nicest thing about him if it were not the most sinister" (18; emphasis added). If Francis as ISTP is an educated guess, Margot's type is merely a guess—it is harder to pin down because the narrator comments on so little of her interior life; however, ENFJ (extraverted, intuitive, feeling, judging) captures some of her characteristics. ENFJs are people persons first and foremost, but "Portrait of an ENFJ" suggests a shadow side: they are manipulative and controlling and can easily get under people's skin; they can also be fussy and may judge too quickly. Although the two portraits seem to match Francis and Margot, an exact, reductive identification is neither possible nor desirable, for they are rounder characters than case study allows. The more important point is that they are mismatched and have married for the wrong reasons. Francis's money and Margot's beauty ("His wife had been a great beauty" [18]) bring them together, and significant friction is inevitable between a man and a woman who approach the world differently. Francis's interest in dangerous action brings him to Africa, and Margot dutifully accompanies him; but when inexperience results in an atypical failure to handle a crisis, consequences ensue: his wife becomes picky and judgmental; he in turn becomes over-stressed and angry.

Francis, an introverted *puer*, has arrived at chronological adulthood without achieving full manhood. Instead, sports and his other interests function as an avoidance mechanism—the American equivalent of failure to participate in tribal rites of passage. Jung knows that, in "primitive" societies, chronological age is an insufficient marker of adulthood. A male must also separate from the mother and abandon his childish ways while undergoing "initiation into the 'men's house' and ceremonies of rebirth"; afterwards a mother is sometime not allowed to speak with her son (*CW* 7, par. 314; 18, par. 363). Here one may reprise the criticism of Robert Bly's promotion of "'male initiations' to wean boys from the dangerous contaminations of maternal influences" (Rowland 17). In other words, Bly overlooks gender's cultural subjectivity in order to promote the essentialist idea that a man achieves the authentic Masculine by eschewing the authentic Maternal.

Journal of Jungian Scholarly Studies 10

Still, there is some value in tribal initiation rituals for modern men, and Jung predicts the consequences of improperly navigating the path to individuation.

The modern civilized man has to forgo this primitive but nonetheless admirable system of education. The consequence is that the anima, in the form of the mother-imago, is transferred to the wife; and the man, as soon as he marries, becomes childish, sentimental, dependent, and subservient, or else truculent, tyrannical, hypersensitive, always thinking about the prestige of his superior masculinity. (*CW* 7, par. 316)

Marital dysfunction arises when the order of individuation is violated. For Jung, “If the encounter with the shadow is the ‘apprentice-piece’ in the individual’s development, then that with the anima is the ‘master-piece’” (*CW* 9i, par. 61). A tribal youth does his shadow work in the men’s house and weds only after achieving full manhood. Otherwise, he is ill-equipped to deal with his mate. Perhaps with Circe in mind, Jung emphasizes the need for such preparedness in stating that “when animus and anima meet, the animus draws his sword of power and the anima ejects her poison of illusion and seduction” (*CW* 9ii, par. 30). The statement works if standard definitions of “animus” and “anima” are held in mind, but he appears to be referring simply to male strength and female seduction. Without the sword of masculine power, a man succumbs to feminine illusion, which in Francis’s case involves a mother complex. Lacking the masculine strength of Odysseus, he has attempted the “master-piece” in marriage with Margot before laying the foundational “apprentice-piece” with other men. As a result, their marital interaction sounds at times like a whining son and a long-suffering mother.

“You won’t leave me.”

“No,” she said. “I won’t leave you and you’ll behave your self.”

“Behave myself? That’s a way to talk. Behave myself.”

“Yes. Behave yourself.”

“Why don’t *you* try behaving?”

“I’ve tried it so long. So very long.” (20)

Hemingway modeled Margot after Jane Mason, with whom he had had an affair in Havana (Flora 76) and whom he considered the “worst bitch” he had ever known, though she possessed an admirable “eagerness to get laid” (Gardiner 188). Jane is no doubt in the background when Wilson reflects on “American female cruelty”: “They are, he thought, the hardest in the world; the hardest, the cruelest, the most predatory and the most attractive and their men have softened or gone to pieces nervously as they have hardened.” He goes on: “She’s damn cruel but they’re all cruel. They govern, of course, and to govern one has to be cruel sometimes. Still, I’ve seen enough of their damn terrorism” (9–10). Hutton aptly

11 Fike

points out “that Wilson criticizes Margaret for what he himself practices on the native boys” (241). The guide’s statements, therefore, are examples of projection. In addition, Hemingway/Wilson is not a solo voice; Jung, another adulterous man of his time, sounds the same misogynistic note that accompanies the story.

I asked myself whether the growing masculinization of the white woman is not connected with the loss of her natural wholeness (*shamba*, children, livestock, house of her own, hearth fire); whether it is not a compensation for her impoverishment; and whether the feminizing of the white man is not a further consequence. The more rational the polity, the more blurred is the difference between the sexes. (*MDR* 263–64)¹²

The statement also illustrates Jung’s essentialist position that there is a standard Feminine from which individual women deviate at their peril. That said, it is true that the Macomers are childless. Lacking children of her own, perhaps Margot treats her husband like one. As well, the further away from the men’s house a modern male strays, the more feminine he becomes. As humans become more “rational” (conscious) and more distant from the archaic layer, traditional gender roles become redefined. Although feminists would not necessarily favor such conclusions, misogynistic thinking does illuminate the dysfunctional Macomers to some degree. Jung’s statement is relevant to Hemingway’s story precisely because both men reflect the sexism of their time.

Hovey notes that Margot “is a Goneril-Regan in her bitchhood, more monster than woman” (126). Trouble arises when Lear makes his disrespectful daughters his surrogate mothers, and they mistreat him because doing so aligns with self-interest. Something similar happens in “Francis Macomber,” but this time, in Breuer’s words, “mother and wife merge as ‘bitch’” (196). The formulation *mother + wife = bitch* is a function of Francis’s psychology as much as of Margot’s. Their psycho-dynamics, however, involve not only Francis’s mother complex but also Margot’s animus possession. In describing the condition, Jung could not have been more accurate if he had had the Macomers—or Lear’s elder daughters—in mind: “Turned towards the world, the anima is fickle, capricious, moody, uncontrolled and emotional, sometimes gifted with daemonic intuitions, ruthless, malicious, untruthful, bitchy, double-faced, and mystical. The animus is obstinate, harping on principles, laying down the law, dogmatic, world-reforming, theoretic, word-mongering, argumentative, and domineering” (*CW* 9i, par. 223).¹³ Statements like this underlie Susan Rowland’s critique of “Jung’s erotic anima [as being] dangerous when substantiated into fantasies of female deviousness and power” (17). As Richard Fantina speculates, “While the misogyny is unmistakable, perhaps Hemingway had more in mind than the portrait of a simply vicious woman” (157). Perhaps bitchery is to the tip of the iceberg as Margot’s “animus possession” is to the submerged seven-eighths. Even worse, in terms of Jung’s “stages of eroticism,”

Journal of Jungian Scholarly Studies 12

Margot merges not only Mary (mother) and Eve (wife) but also Helen (whore).¹⁴ DeFalco rightly calls Margot a “dangerous mother-temptress” (203). How can Francis as husband-son successfully relate to Margot as wife-mother, especially when she also plays the role of whore? The final feminine figure in Jung’s quartet of stages, Sophia (wisdom), plays no part in the inner life of the story’s lone female character, who appears not to be the sympathetic and “heroic” figure whose reputation Nina Baym tries to rehabilitate (118).

There are four types of women in Jung’s stages of eroticism and four “persons” in his quaternity (Father, Son, Holy Spirit, and Satan). The number four is also central for Jung in a group setting that requires prolonged, purposeful action. He comments in *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* on “the archetype of the triad, which calls for the fourth to complete it, as we have seen again and again in the history of this archetype” (261). The BPE was originally conceived as a triad—Jung and his associates Peter Baynes and George Beckwith, a group that would probably have imploded if an English woman named Ruth Bailey had not joined the expedition. Francis, Margot, and Wilson—as a triad—have no fourth to round out the group and relieve the tensions that arise when Francis (son) disappoints Margot (mother) through cowardice, Wilson (father) fornicates with her, and Francis’s values begin to shift toward Wilson’s. In this Freudian interpretation of the story, Wilson functions as a father figure to Francis in order to help him separate from the mother-wife. Jungian theory, however, places greater emphasis on a male’s accomplishment of the “apprentice-piece,” shadow work with another man: Francis projects his shadow onto Wilson; as a result, his interaction with Wilson brings to consciousness an important aspect of himself.

Vastly different though the two men may be (Francis, a boy-man; Wilson, a professional killer and probably a World War I veteran), they share a common typology: introverted thinking. As previously noted, Wilson thinks about Francis’s boyishness and Margot’s bitchery. Wilson also thinks about killing, a matter on which he “had his own standards” (21) so that, when Francis proposes allowing the lion to die on its own, Wilson “suddenly felt as though he had opened the wrong door in a hotel and seen something shameful” (15). The narrator registers the hunter’s visceral reaction as an analogy because even when Wilson *feels*, he *thinks*. When Francis’s act of cowardice sours relations with Margot, Wilson makes a decision that signals an introversion reminiscent of Francis’s knowledge of “sex in books”: “He would eat, then, by himself and could read a book with his meals” (8). Lack of feeling, which is implied by “his flat, blue, machine-gunner’s eyes” (8), veers into cruelty as he thinks about the fornication with Margot: “Well, it was the poor sod’s own bloody fault.” She makes the same point with equal lack of feeling: ““Yes, darling. That’s the way I meant it to be [she had promised not to sleep with other men on the safari]. But the trip was spoiled yesterday [when Francis acted like a coward; therefore, her behavior is his own fault]”” (19). Then, in a moment

13 Fike

of twisted logic, Wilson justifies his behavior by thinking that “their standards were his standards as long as they were hiring him” (21). Since Francis is paying for the trip, his standard (no adultery) ought to be foremost in the guide’s mind.¹⁵

Francis’s panicked cowardice, his flight from a lion, is put in terms of another animal: “I bolted like a rabbit,” Macomber said” (8). The image resonates with Margot’s image a page later when she describes the eland he has killed: “‘They’re big cowy things that jump like hares, aren’t they?’ ‘I suppose that describes them,’ Wilson said.” Macomber’s rejoinder—that eland “‘are very good meat’”—indicates that he does not grasp the parallelism of *bolted like a rabbit* and *jump like hares* or the implication of hunting prey that are “‘not dangerous’” unless “‘they fall on you’”: namely, that he, in his cowardice, is a big cowy thing himself. The image of the fleeing rabbit takes on further significance in light of Hope B. Werness’s statement that in art “the rabbit symbolized lust, and the image of a knight fleeing from a hare was a Medieval symbol of cowardice” (340). Francis’s use of the rabbit image condenses the cowardice of his flight and the sexual desire that he feels for mother-Margot. What of the lion? In Jung’s *Collected Works* the lion is indexed as a symbol of the Self, and it also “stands for the danger of being swallowed by the unconscious” (*CW* 9i, par. 315; 5, par. 277). The image of fleeing *like a rabbit from a lion*, then, suggests that Francis’s initial response to the shadow work he must do with Wilson is to flee back to the comfort of the mother figure, followed by negative inflation (self-loathing).

Francis’s lapse into cowardice is also a sign of a hyperactive imagination. Hemingway once stated, “‘Cowardice . . . is almost always simply a lack of ability to suspend the functioning of the imagination’” (qtd. in Young 72). Overactive imagination may be the psychology behind “the Somali proverb that says a brave man is always frightened three times by a lion: when he first sees his track, when he first hears him roar and when he first confronts him” (11). Francis’s panic simply illustrates the point. If lions frighten even brave men, his problem may be not that he is a despicable coward but that he is simply a novice big game hunter, as the narrator suggests: “He was dressed in the same sort of safari clothes that Wilson wore except that his were new . . .” (6). Even Jung, who went to Africa to explore the unconscious, panicked on two occasions. In one instance, fearing injury, he had to crack a whip and yell curses in German to get a group of dancing natives to end their festivities. In another that Adams calls “a paranoid delusion,” he spent thirty minutes in the bush feeling as if unseen eyes were watching him (73). As Jung would agree, the point is that being frightened by a lion, dancing natives, or unseen eyes is not a badge of dishonor unless a man first pretends to be something he is not. Or as Hutton rightly states, “fear does not necessarily indicate cowardice” (247).

Whereas Francis’s flight seems to indicate fear of the unconscious, he accomplishes some genuine inner work when he dreams “of the bloody-headed lion

Journal of Jungian Scholarly Studies 14

standing over him, and listening while his heart pounded” (18). To say merely that the “lion symbolizes death,” as Stoltzfus does, is an oversimplification (221). In Hovey’s view, the dream is part day residue and part a reaction to fear of being “killed or hurt by the father” (226, n. 16). For Bert Bender, the bloody lion is “an image not only of primitive suffering, courage and violence, but also of the red-faced Wilson who is at this moment ‘standing over’ Francis by cuckolding him” (96). Breuer considers the dreamer’s subordinate vantage point to indicate a feminine position, and he notes that Francis awakens to discover a Freudian “primal scene” (194). A Jungian interpretation begins with the distinction Jung discovered on the BPE between Africans’ big dreams and little dreams. Big dreams are significant for a whole clan; they are archetypal, collective, God-sent, mythological, numinous, and prophetic. Little dreams are significant merely to individual persons. Francis’s dream is a little dream whose most important characteristic is its anticipatory quality. The bloody-headed lion harkens back to the events of the day (Wilson blew part of the charging lion’s head off; Wilson has a red face), but it also looks ahead to the final scene in which Margot shoots Francis in the head. Jung is quite clear about “the aid of warning dreams” (*MDR* 245) and their role in both anticipating danger and identifying the need for inner work. Sometimes even a little dream can participate in the numinous:

. . . in normal people, archaic dream-products with their characteristic numinosity appear mainly in situations that somehow threaten the very foundations of the individual’s existence, for instance in moments of mortal danger, before or after accidents, severe illnesses, operations, etc., or when psychic problems are developing which might give his life a catastrophic turn, or in the critical periods of life when a modification of his previous psychic attitude forces itself peremptorily upon him, or before during, and after radical changes in his immediate or his general surroundings. (*CW* 3, par. 566)¹⁶

Francis’s lion dream, then, represents his fear of the lion (his pounding heart), Wilson’s superiority in hunting and sex, and Francis’s ultimate fate. But since the lion is a symbol of wholeness, the dream of a bloody-headed lion also implies that blood sport will bring him closer to the Self and that he will end up a dead lion rather than a live rabbit—that his final moments will constitute a short, happy life.

Francis’s dream also moves him closer to the archaic layer whose vitality is a crucial element of his brief happiness. The *East African Standard*, a Nairobi newspaper that reported on Jung’s BPE, supports this archeological role of dreams: “The primitive in man in the European has been found to become active when the individual is asleep . . . ” (qtd. in Burlinson 142).¹⁷ The dream nudges Francis’s psyche in that deeper direction; but there is an intermediate step between dreaming and connecting with his hidden primordial strength: anger at Wilson for

15 Fike

“topping” Margot (19). Breuer accurately describes Francis’s transformation as “the repudiation of the mother, and an unqualified embracing of the father’s mental world” (194–95). Of course, Francis is clearly not embracing father-Wilson (he refers to him as “red-faced swine” and “had no fear, only hatred of Wilson” [20, 22]); but Francis does shift to Wilson’s “mental world” by setting aside thought and imagination in order to funnel his rage into the hunt, becoming at this moment a more complete man. When an introverted thinker embraces emotion (Jung’s term is the “inferior function” because it is secondary to thinking), psychic progress is possible. As a result, the next time he shoots he “felt a drunken elation” and “had never felt so good” (23). The transformation is especially significant because he is hunting a “Cape buffalo, known in East Africa for its fierceness” (Oliver 331). After the admission that he was frightened during the pursuit, fear simply lifts: “For the first time in his life he really felt wholly without fear. Instead of fear he had a feeling of definite elation,” “delight,” “a wild unreasonable happiness,” and “pure excitement” (24–25). Before, he canalized his sexual libido into sports and other activities; now, as he channels his rage at Wilson into the hunt, the strength of the deep unconscious, “the *primordial man*, the two million-year-old man within us all, the positive shadow,” awakens (Stevens qtd. in Burleson 61; emphasis in the original).¹⁸ Now when he shoots at the second pig-eyed buffalo—as “he shot again at the wide nostrils and saw the horns jolt again and fragments fly” (27)—he is shooting not just to kill Wilson, the swine, but also to blow the cuckold’s horns off himself. Several lines later, Margot’s bullet hits the back of his head and blows his face off.¹⁹

Hemingway provides several hints that Francis’s new mental state is not a temporary cathexis, positive inflation, or *enantiodromia* but instead a permanent condition. Wilson thinks of it this way: “More of a change than any loss of virginity. Fear gone like an operation. Something else grew in its place. Main thing a man had. Made him into a man. Women knew it too. No bloody fear” (26). For Francis, the experience is akin to “a dam bursting” (25). Surgical removal, loss of virginity, and a bursting dam are one-way trips that allow no going back. In place of fear there now grows “something else,” a primordial strength that will brook no more infidelity. Margot knows genuine masculine strength when she sees it and is now “very afraid.” When she comments on his bravery, “Macomber laughed, a very natural hearty laugh,” which bespeaks self-esteem, well-being, and wholeness. When she asks if it is not “sort of late,” and he replies, “Not for me,” she knows that he may leave her; he will no longer tolerate her bitchery and infidelity because, presumably, he is now “better with women” (26, 18). The “apprentice-piece” is over. He has achieved a synthesis of what Jung calls the No. 1 and No. 2 personalities: the shadow, no longer an opponent, becomes a source of strength; modern ego melds with archetypal hunter. Hamlet (another introverted thinker with a mother complex), rejuvenated by his sea voyage, declares, “This is I, / Hamlet the

Journal of Jungian Scholarly Studies 16

Dane” (5.1.257–58). Francis, had he lived, might have cried, “This is I, Francis the American!”

Margot’s shooting of Francis is the critical crux that has generated the most widely divergent opinions. On the positive side, it has been considered an accident (Baym 116) and an attempt to save his life (Lynn 436). Being shot in the head is a sign of “Francis’ forsaking of his rational faculties” (Seydow, qtd. in Hardy 132), and the act signifies Margot’s “inability to recognize the freedom of the husband-son figure” (DeFalco 206).²⁰ Perhaps the shooting is “a monumental ‘Freudian slip’” in which she aims at the buffalo but shoots him accidentally on purpose (Young 73). “And what she cannot dominate, she must destroy” (Hovey 126). Nor are Hemingway’s own statements helpful in reaching a definitive conclusion. In a 1953 interview with Jackson Burke, the author stated, “Francis’ wife hates him because he’s a coward. But when he gets his guts back, she fears him so much she has to kill him—shoots him in the back of the head” (qtd. in Myers 65). In 1959 he was more tentative: “I don’t know whether she shot him on purpose any more than you do. I could find out if I asked myself because I invented it and I could go right on inventing. But you have to know when to stop . . . ” (qtd. in Flora 78–79). Of the possible interpretations, the most likely based on the evidence in the story is that Margot cannot tolerate the idea that her boy-husband has transformed into a man who might leave her, so she shoots not to save him but to save herself from divorce and poverty. The point is akin to James Gray Watson’s conclusion that “her primary motive is neither to murder her husband nor to save him but to save herself” (qtd. in Sugiyama 148).²¹ The imagery supports this reading. When he is under her thumb, she calls him “Francis, my pearl” (9). “The pearl is white, lily-livered, she implies” (Flora 77). After he attains his manhood and becomes, in Wilson’s opinion, “a ruddy fire eater,” Margot’s face was white and she looked ill” (25). When Francis “felt a sudden white-hot, blinding flash explode inside his head and that was all he ever felt” (27), the transfer of whiteness back to him indicates Margot’s lack of tolerance for his new vigor and her unwillingness to let Francis live except in his No. 1 personality. Having connected with the primordial hunter within him, Francis has incorporated an aspect of the No. 2 personality and can look forward to a life of sustained individuation. Insofar as the shooting denies him the opportunity to enjoy his progress and symbolically returns him to No. 1, the ego-centered boy-man, Margot’s motherhood becomes predatorial.

An analogy to the concept of “bush-soul” may illuminate the shooting in an additional way. Jung states that the bush-soul is “a ‘soul’ that splits off completely and takes up its abode in a wild animal” (*CW* 10, par. 133). In a more extended comment, he gives examples of what happens when such an animal is slain:

This projection of psychic happenings naturally gives rise to relations between men and men, or between men and animals or things, that to us are inconceivable. A white man shoots a

17 Fike

crocodile. At once a crowd of people come running from the nearest village and excitedly demand compensation. They explain that the crocodile was a certain old woman in their village who had died at the moment when the shot was fired. The crocodile was obviously her bush-soul. Another man shot a leopard that was lying in wait for his cattle. Just then a woman died in a neighbouring village. She and the leopard were identical. (*CW* 10, par. 129)

Francis bears a similar relationship to the animals he hunts at the end of the story. First, his anger displaces his fear like a surgical removal. Then his happiness replaces his rage, which comes to rest in the buffalo, meaning that the buff and Francis are one-in-the-same. The first buffalo “bellowed in pig-eyed, roaring rage,” and the second is “coming in a charge” at him (23, 27). Given this identification of man and prey, it no longer matters whether Margot shoots at Francis or at the charging beast; either way, the primordial strength of hunter and hunted, which would have seen her divorced, is the target. Of course, in a modern story, there is no primitive causality such as Jung observed in Africans’ “magical mentality”—Francis dies because he is shot directly, not because his bush soul departs. The key issue is not Margot’s specific aim, which is impossible to discern despite the narrator’s indication that “Mrs. Macomber . . . had shot at the buffalo” (28), but the more general effect, which is to destroy masculine strength.

Francis Macomber’s temperament, childish pursuits, mother complex, and animus-addicted wife have conditioned him to panic during the lion hunt. Subsequently, through shadow work with Wilson, dream, and a connection with the ancient hunter within, he develops a more integrated psyche by forging a permanent connection to mankind’s primordial vitality. Africa thus functions for Francis much as it did for Jung, who looked deeply into the collective unconscious during his BPE and enhanced the connection with his No. 2 personality. Neither the fictional character nor the famous psychologist fell prey to the type of tourism that Jung criticizes. “Jung saw the Westerner’s obsession with world-travel to ‘primitive’ places, which for some meant ‘going black’ in Africa, as symptomatic of the culture’s abiding illness. Travel was . . . a form of ‘evasion’ . . .” (Burlison 225).²² Travelers should not make a full-hearted transformation from a civilized Western mentality to *shenzi*, insanity, by falling prey to the unconscious, as Kurtz does in *Heart of Darkness*. Travel must instead be part of one’s process of individuation, as it was for Jung on his BPE. His friend Laurens van der Post sums up Jung’s achievement and his prescription to the modern masses: “The task of modern man was not to go primitive the African way but to discover and confront and live out his own first and primitive self in a truly twentieth-century way” (51). Macomber and Jung, however, approach this task in contrasting ways—violent blood sport versus conversation and psychological observation. Francis makes

Journal of Jungian Scholarly Studies 18

progress toward individuation the hard way, oblivious to the attitude Jung tried to cultivate, one of calm openness to what the unconscious may reveal. As an old Englishman advised Jung early in his journey, ““You know, mister, this here country is not man’s, it’s God’s country. So if anything should happen, just sit down and don’t worry”” (qtd. in Hayman 267).²³ If Francis had done so, he might have lived to enjoy the fruits of his inner work.

Notes

¹ The passage is reprinted in a helpful source for readers of “Francis Macomber”: John M. Howell’s *Hemingway’s African Stories: The Stories, Their Sources, Their Critics* (New York: Scribner’s, 1969), 51.

² For an annotated bibliography of criticism on “Francis Macomber,” see Kelli A. Larson, “On Safari with Hemingway: Tracking the Most Recent Scholarship,” *Hemingway in Africa*, ed. Miriam B. Mandel (Rochester, NY: Camden, 2011), 323–83. All of the important articles are anthologized in ““The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber,”” *Short Story Criticism*, ed. Jelena Krstovic, vol. 137 (Detroit: Gale, Cengage Learning, 2010), 90–237. The volume is available through Literary Criticism Online.

³ See also Anthony Stevens, *The Two Million-Year-Old Self* (College Station: Texas A&M UP, 1993). Stevens states: “To him [Jung], the two million-year-old was a vivid metaphor for an age-old dynamic at the core of personal existence, there by virtue of the evolutionary heritage of our species. . . . The two million-year-old was another such personification: this archaic presence does not have a physical existence inside our heads, any more than the ‘soul’ or the ‘unconscious,’ but as the phenomenological embodiment of our evolutionary inheritance, it can be understood as playing an indispensable role in the drama of our personal lives, ‘personating’ as a companion whom it is possible, as I have learned, to recognize, cherish, and befriend” (3–4). In chapter two, Stevens explores how the two million-year-old man speaks to us in dreams, which have “phylogenetic links” (37). In chapter three, the author explores “the ways in which the two million-year-old human being within becomes frustrated, frightened, or discontented” (57). Stevens’s emphasis, however, is not on literary criticism but rather, as David H. Rosen states in the foreword, on “connections between analytical psychology, anthropology, behavioral biology, dream psychology, psycholinguistics, psychiatry, and alternative modes of healing” (xi).

⁴ For Eiseley, evolution, and other matters, see my article, “The Literary Matrix of Loren Eiseley’s ‘The Secret of Life,’” *CEA Critic* 72.3 (2009): 17–36.

⁵ *CW* 6, 692/417–18 is also relevant to this discussion. Lévy-Bruhl uses the term “collective representations” to describe primitive people’s “collective feeling-value” (Jung’s words). However, the linkage of idea and affect is a more broadly human phenomenon, as the passage goes on to acknowledge: “Among civilized people, too, certain collective ideas—God, justice, fatherland, etc.—are bound up with collective feelings.” The difference—and it is a racist difference—seems to be that, in primitives, the linkage is “mystical” (Lévy-Bruhl’s word).

⁶ Michael Vannoy Adams offers a helpful summary of the difference between “primitive” and “civilized.” Being primitive, in his words, involves concrete percepts, attachment to sense perceptions, and emotion; it means being prelogical and mythical; it emphasizes the

19 Fike

collective; and it involves the law of participation or subject-object unity. Being civilized means dealing with abstract concepts, detaching from sense impressions, and engaging the intellect; it is a logical, causal, and individual way of thinking that emphasizes the law of contradiction or subject-object duality (54).

⁷ See Jung's two-volume *Visions: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1930–1934 by C. G. Jung*, ed. Claire Douglas (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1997), 1.470–71.

⁸ I critique this shortcoming in *A Jungian Study of Shakespeare: The Visionary Mode* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 89–98. See also Adams in note 6 above.

⁹ Mariana Torgovnick, *Primitive Passions: Men, Women, and the Quest for Ecstasy* (New York: Knopf, 1997), 23.

¹⁰ In an *Explicator* note, Cecil D. Eby rightly states that Francis must make a definitive transition to manhood through hunting dangerous prey. But Eby is probably incorrect to identify him as a varsity letterman. Of the mentioned activities, only “court games” are varsity sports; it is unlikely that Francis lettered in four of them. “Four-letter man” is a euphemism for various pejorative four-letter words, as Hemingway's own use of the phrase in *Green Hills of Africa* indicates (84, 95).

¹¹ Bursleson uses Alan Cobham as an example of *puer aeternus* probably because von Franz's example is Antoine de Saint-Exupéry's *The Little Prince*, in which flying is an important motif. Cobham was attempting the first trans-African flight when Jung encountered him (182).

¹² A similar statement appears in *CW* 5, par. 272: “Mother complexes are extremely common in America and often very pronounced, probably because of the strong maternal influence in the home and the social position of women generally. The fact that more than half the capital in America is in woman's hands gives one something to think about. As a result of this conditioning many American women develop their masculine side, which is then compensated in the unconscious by an exquisitely feminine instinct, aptly symbolized by a Sphinx.”

¹³ Jung also states: “A woman possessed by the animus is always in danger of losing her femininity, her adapted feminine persona, just as a man in the circumstances runs the risk of effeminacy. These psychic changes of sex are due entirely to the fact that a function which belongs inside has been turned outside. The reason for this perversion is clearly the failure to give adequate recognition to an inner world which stands autonomously opposed to the outer world, and makes just as serious demands on our capacity for adaption” (*CW* 7, par. 337).

¹⁴ As Jung observes, “The whore (*meretrix*) is a well-known figure in alchemy. She characterizes the arcane substance in its initial, ‘chaotic,’ maternal state” (*CW* 14, par. 415). Jung comments on the “stages of eroticism” in *CW* 16, par. 361.

¹⁵ A view of Wilson as a thinker is in sync with previous comments on the character. Flora states, “He is an incomplete man—unable to merge his life successfully with that of another person” (80). Also, George Cheatham notes in Wilson “an inadequacy, an incompleteness, suggested by his incomplete tan. Significantly, moreover, it's the top of his head that's missing, the distinctively humanizing part, a detail underscored by Wilson's clipped, fragmented, unrationative speech.” Cheatham concludes: “Wilson, in short, lacks full humanity” (113). Hutton's statement about Wilson's eyes begins with the right formulation but veers into caricature: the character's eyes “suggest the deficiency of human warmth one

Journal of Jungian Scholarly Studies 20

finds in the technicolor movie stereotype of a specialist in torture” (239). I suggest that Wilson’s speech is not so much “unratiocinative” as introverted and unfeeling. Yet Wilson is not wholly without feeling, as the narrator tells us after Wilson shares his Shakespearean motto: “He was very embarrassed, having brought out this thing he had lived by, but he had seen men come of age before and it always moved him” (25). It is just that feeling is his inferior function.

¹⁶ Adams adumbrates the five types of Jungian dream interpretation: phenomenological, amplificatory, compensatory, subjective, and prospective (77).

¹⁷ “WHAT DREAMS REVEAL: Scientists Come to Kenya to Study Native Mind: RESEARCH AMONG THE BAGISHU: Psychological Connection Between European and Africa: Primitive Survival in Man,” *East African Standard*, 19 Nov. 1925: 5.

¹⁸ Anthony Stevens, *Private Myths: Dreams and Dreaming* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1995), 122.

¹⁹ When Wilson says to Margot, “I wouldn’t turn him over,” he is implying that Francis’s face is missing. Wilson then “knelt down, took a handkerchief from his pocket, and spread it over Francis Macomber’s crew-cropped head where it lay” (28). The language echoes Prince Hal’s words to Hotspur: “And all the budding honors on thy crest / I’ll crop to make a garland for my head” (*I Henry IV* 5.4.72–73; emphases added). The detail is overlooked in previous studies of Hemingway’s use of Shakespeare by John J. McKenna and Marvin V. Peterson, and Gary Harrington. Harrington does note “Hal’s using his ‘favors’ to ‘hide [Hotspur’s] mangled face’ (*I Henry IV* 5.4.96)” (153). The word “favors” appears in Hal’s promise to “wear a garment all of blood / And stain my favors in a bloody mask” (3.2.135–36). Hutton also does good reading of the Shakespearean motto, but his unawareness of the motto’s personal significance to Hemingway weakens the critique (243–44). As Young notes, a British officer taught Hemingway the motto in 1917 (73). My reading also diverges from Hutton’s sense that “Macomber’s moment of ‘heroism’ resembles that of the soldier who temporarily goes berserk in battle” (248).

²⁰ John J. Seydow, “Francis Macomber’s Spurious Masculinity,” *Hemingway Review* 1.1 (1981): 40.

²¹ James Gray Watson, “‘A Sound Basis of Union’: Structural and Thematic Balance in ‘The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber,’” *Fitzgerald/Hemingway Annual* (1974): 216.

²² Burlson is quoting Jung’s words to Laurens van der Post, as reported in *Jung and the Story of Our Time* (New York: Pantheon, 1978), 53.

²³ When Hannah states (above) that Africa “is the country of the Self, not of the ego” (172), she is interpreting the old man’s words to Jung.

Works Cited

- Adams, Michael Vannoy. *The Multicultural Imagination: “Race,” Color, and the Unconscious*. New York: Routledge, 1996. Print.
- Baym, Nina. “Feminist Perspective: ‘Actually I Felt Sorry for the Lion.’” Krstovic 115–20.
- Bender, Bert. “Margot Macomber’s Gimlet.” Krstovic 92–97.

21 Fike

- Bevington, David, ed. *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*. 4th ed. New York: HarperCollins, 1992. Print.
- Breuer, Horst. "Hemingway's 'Francis Macomber' in Pirandellian and Freudian Perspective." Krstovic 190–97.
- Burleson, Blake W. *Jung in Africa*. New York: Continuum, 2005. Print.
- Cheatham, George. "The Unhappy Life of Robert Wilson." Krstovic 112–14.
- DeFalco, Joseph. *The Hero in Hemingway's Short Stories*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1963. Print.
- Eby, Carl P. *Hemingway's Fetishism: Psychoanalysis and the Mirror of Manhood*. Albany: State U of New York P, 1999. Print.
- Eby, Cecil D. "Hemingway's 'The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber.'" Krstovic 133.
- Eiseley, Loren. *The Secret of Life*. New York: Time, 1962. Print.
- Fantina, Richard. *Ernest Hemingway: Machismo and Machoism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.
- Fike, Matthew A. *A Jungian Study of Shakespeare: The Visionary Mode*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Print.
- . "The Literary Matrix of Loren Eiseley's 'The Secret of Life.'" *CEA Critic* 72.3 (2009): 17–36. Print.
- Gaillard, Theodore L., Jr. "The Critical Menagerie in 'The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber.'" *The English Journal* 60.1 (1971): 31–35. *National Council of Teachers of English*. Web. 13 Mar. 2013.
- Gardner, Martin. "Ernest Hemingway and Jane." Krstovic 187–90.
- Flora, Joseph M. *Ernest Hemingway: A Study of the Short Fiction*. Boston: Twayne, 1989. Print.
- Hannah, Barbara. *Jung: His Life and Work: A Biographical Memoir*. New York: Putnam's, 1976. Print.
- Hardy, Donald E. "Strategic Politeness in Hemingway's 'The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber.'" Krstovic 122–32.
- Harrington, Gary. "'A Plague of All Cowards': 'Macomber' and *Henry IV*." Krstovic 151–56.
- Harrow, Kenneth W. "Gordimer *contre* Hemingway: Crossing back through the Mirror That Subtends All Speculation." Krstovic 167–75.
- Hayman, Ronald. *A Life of Jung*. New York: Norton, 1999. Print.
- Hemingway, Ernest. *Death in the Afternoon*. 1932. New York: Scribner's, 1955. Print.
- . *Green Hills of Africa*. New York: Scribner's, 1935. Print.

***Journal of Jungian Scholarly Studies* 22**

- . "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber." *The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway*. The Finca Vigía Edition. New York: Scribner's, 1987. 5–28. Print.
- Hovey, Richard B. *Hemingway: The Inward Terrain*. Seattle: U of Washington P, 1968. Print.
- Howell, John M. *Hemingway's African Stories: The Stories, Their Sources, Their Critics*. New York: Scribner's, 1969.
- Hutton, Virgil. "The Short Happy Life of Macomber." *The Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway: Critical Essays*. Ed. Jackson J. Benson. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1975. 239–50. Print.
- Jung, Carl G. *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*. Ed Sir Herbert Read et al. Trans. R. F. C. Hull. 20 vols. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1953–79. Print. Bollingen Series 10.
- . *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. Ed. Aniela Jaffé. Trans. Richard and Clara Winston. New York: Vintage, 1989. Print.
- . *Visions: Notes of the Seminar Given in 1930–1934 by C. G. Jung*. Ed. Claire Douglas. 2 vols. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1997. Print. Bollingen Series 99.
- Kravitz, Bennett. "'She Loves Me, She Loves Me Not': The Short Happy Symbiotic Marriage of Margot and Francis Macomber." *Journal of American Culture* 21.3 (1998): 83–87. Print.
- Krstovic, Jelena, ed. "'The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber.'" *Short Story Criticism*. Vol. 137. Detroit: Gale, Cengage Learning, 2010. 90–237. *Literary Criticism Online*. Web. 3 Jan. 2013.
- Larson, Kelli A. "On Safari with Hemingway: Tracking the Most Recent Scholarship." *Hemingway in Africa*. Ed. Miriam B. Mandel. Rochester, NY: Camden, 2011. 323–83. Print.
- Lynn, Kenneth S. *Hemingway*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987. Print.
- McKenna, John J., and Marvin V. Peterson. "More Muddy Water: Wilson's Shakespeare in 'The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber.'" Krstovic 97–99.
- Myers, Jeffrey. *Hemingway: Life into Art*. New York: Cooper Square, 2000. Print.
- Oliver, Charles M. *Ernest Hemingway: A Literary Reference to His Life and Work*. New York: Facts on File, 2007. Print.
- "Portrait of an ENFJ." Personalitypage.com. Web. 19 Mar. 2013.
- "Portrait of an ISTP." Personalitypage.com. Web. 19 Mar. 2013.
- Rosen, David H. Foreword. Stevens xi–xvi.
- Rowland, Susan. *C. G. Jung and Literary Theory*. New York: Palgrave, 1999. Print.
- Schiller, Friedrich. *Letters Upon the Aesthetic Education of Man*. Internet History Sourcebooks. Fordham University. Web. 17 Apr. 2013.
- Seydow, John J. "Francis Macomber's Spurious Masculinity." *Hemingway Review* 1.1 (1981): 33–41. Print.

23 Fike

- Shakespeare, William. *The First Part of King Henry the Fourth*. Bevington 766–803.
- . *Hamlet*. Bevington 1065–1116.
- Stevens, Anthony. *Private Myths: Dreams and Dreaming*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1995. Print.
- . *The Two Million-Year-Old Self*. College Station: Texas A&M UP, 1993. Print.
- Stoltzfus, Ben. "Sartre, *Nada*, and Hemingway's African Stories." *Krstovic* 217–30.
- Strychacz, Thomas. *Hemingway's Theaters of Masculinity*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 2003. Print.
- Sugiyama, Michelle Scalise. "What's Love Got to Do with It? An Evolutionary Analysis of 'The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber.'" *Krstovic* 142–51.
- Torgovnick, Mariana. *Primitive Passions: Men, Women, and the Quest for Ecstasy*. New York: Knopf, 1997. Print.
- Van der Post, Laurens. *Jung and the Story of Our Time*. New York: Vintage, 1975. Print.
- Voeller, Carey. "'He Only Looked Sad the Same Way I Felt': The Textual Confessions of Hemingway's Hunters." *Krstovic* 230–37.
- Von Franz, Marie-Louise. *Puer Aeternus: A Psychological Study of the Adult Struggle with the Paradise of Childhood*. 2nd ed. Santa Monica, CA: Sigo, 1970. Print.
- Watson, James Gray. "'A Sound Basis of Union': Structural and Thematic Balance in 'The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber.'" *Fitzgerald/Hemingway Annual* (1974): 215–28. Print.
- Werness, Hope B. *The Continuum Encyclopedia of Animal Symbolism in Art*. New York: Continuum, 2004. Print.
- "WHAT DREAMS REVEAL: Scientists Come to Kenya to Study Native Mind: RESEARCH AMONG THE BAGISHU: Psychological Connection Between European and Africa: Primitive Survival in Man." *East African Standard* 19 Nov. 1925: 5. Print.
- Young, Philip. *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1966. Print.