HEMINGWAY UNBOUND:
READING A MODERNIST SUBJECTIVITY

by

IRA ELLIOTT

A doctoral dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in English in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1995

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in English in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

14 Sept 1995
Date

Chair of Examining Committee

14 Sept 1995
Date

Executive Officer

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Acknowledgements

To Leigh Knopf,
with love and gratitude

I wish first of all to acknowledge the invaluable assistance of my dissertation director, Distinguished Professor Jane Marcus, a scholar, critic, and teacher of the first order. Her penetrating insights into literature and culture have helped to orient my own critical perspective, and her lively, vigorous writing continues to serve as the model for my own work. Professor Marcus has dedicated her career not only to her own influential feminist scholarship, but also to guiding and nurturing the work of others such as myself -- her eye is on the future.

Thanks also to my dissertation committee members, Professors Louis Menand and Joan Richardson, for their support, encouragement, and many helpful suggestions. Thanks as well to Distinguished Professor Joseph Wittreich, executive officer of the Ph.D. program in English for, among other things, having created a climate in which such work as mine can be undertaken.

While I owe a debt of gratitude to all my friends and family, I wish to mention by name only those unfortunate few who, by virtue of geography, have endured this project longest and most intensely -- Ira Y. Gold, Christopher F. Varga, and Joan Mansbach.

Portions of chapter 5 appeared in somewhat different form as "Performance Art: Jake Barnes and 'Masculine' Signification in *The Sun Also Rises*" in *American Literature* 67:1 (March 1995). A slightly different version of chapter 2 appeared as "*A Farewell to Arms* and Hemingway's Crisis of Masculine Values" in *LIT: Literature Interpretation Theory* 4:4 (1993).

Preface

Hemingway Unbound is about identity formation and attempts to demonstrate how the so-called Hemingway hero frequently occupies (to borrow Djuna Barnes's phrase) a "middle condition" in respect to culturally-determined categories that are understood as expressive of individual identity. It seeks further to locate, and theorize the reasons behind, the *nada* at the heart of the Hemingway canon, the darkness which gives rise to so many of the anxieties experienced by Hemingway code heroes around masculine identity. To this end, I read cultural markers of identity -- primarily gender and sexuality, but also race, ethnicity, and national origin -- in the major work of Ernest Hemingway. As such, *Hemingway Unbound* is meant to join the ongoing conversation of the last decade or so in Hemingway scholarship, a conversation informed and enabled by contemporary critical theories of gender, sexuality, and, most recently, modernism and primitivism.

While it may be true that, as Nancy R. Comley and Robert Scholes suggest in *Hemingway's Genders*, "the Hemingway you were taught in high school is dead," my intention is not simply to hail "*el nuevo* Hemingway" (Comley 146), but rather

to explore the ways in which our perceptions of his work can enrich our understanding of the cultural formation of identity in Hemingway's time and in our time. One goal of this study is, then, to make (after Judith Butler) identity trouble.

But just what do I mean by the title *Hemingway Unbound*? First, I mean that I attempt to free the Hemingway canon from the shackles of male-dominated criticism that has mistakenly imparted the message that Hemingway, and his work, deploy an unproblematic machismo rooted in heterosexism, homophobia, and misogyny. I hope also to unchain ourselves, and our reading practices, from this notion by reading textual silences in Hemingway in order to make transparent what was once thought to be an unproblematic facade of the virile he-man as it applies to the so-called Hemingway hero, an American icon of masculinity that exists in the public imagination independent of the books themselves. In other words, the code hero has escaped the bonds, or binding, of the texts themselves to become a free-floating signifier of manly behavior. At the same time, I hope to offer at least a glimpse of what the Hemingway hero might look like had he not been bound by the restrictions of the code of *aficion*.

What Judith Sensibar says about Edith Wharton's John Campton in *A Son at the Front* is true of many of Hemingway's central male characters as well -- for, like Campton, the Hemingway hero is in part "a victim of his culture's rigid gender classifications and patriarchal exchange systems"

(192). The only difference (aside from being rather more complicated than this) is that Hemingway did in fact examine the sexual and gendered identity of his characters, and with a much more sophisticated eye than we used to think. He did not always do so directly, however, for much of the examination takes place undercover, in the many silences and diversionary tactics that both permeate and help to structure his literary discourse. Throughout Hemingway's work, in fact, we find chracters struggling with the ambiguities of identity and their ever-shifting cultural signs and symbols.

Chapter 1 provides a brief geneology of Hemingway criticism that speaks to issues of primary concern here and situates *Hemingway Unbound* within this critical discourse. I then explore the notion of psychological depth -- that is, the Freudian discovery of the unconscious and its role in structuring individual identity -- and how such psychological depth is linked to the medical model of homosexuality, both of which are mirrored in Hemingway's iceberg aesthetic of literary composition. Chapter 2 examines homosocial constructions in Hemingway in time of war in order to demonstrate the instability of gender categories, and how they are created and complicated within all-male settings and institutions. Chapter 3 focuses on fathers and sons in Hemingway's work in an effort to locate the source of characteral anxieties around paternity (and maternity), masculine identity, and the reasons his characters often search for a safe haven -- that is, the "middle condition" --

between childhood and fatherhood. Chapter 4 continues this discussion, but highlights what I call Hemingway's "adopted" sons and daughters, whose relations strongly suggest incestuous desire as they blur the distinctions between familial intimacy and eroticism. Chapter 5 investigates masculinity as a gender performance and discusses the tension in Hemingway's work between depth and surface. Chapter 6 explores how corporeal signs are manipulated in *The Garden of Eden* to figure and refigure identity in a search for lost time. Chapter 7 emphasizes Hemingway's anxieties about art, the link between art and his deep-seated fears about his own masculinity and male power, and how the code of *aficion* itself undermines the quest for unique individual identity.

Table of Contents

	Acknowledgements	iv
	Preface	v
1.	Preliminaries	1
2.	War and Remembrance	37
3.	The Perils of Paternity	63
4.	"Adoptions" and Incest	112
5.	Performance Art	146
6.	In Search of Lost Time	189
7.	Art and Anxiety	214
	Afterword	227
	Notes	231
	Works Cited and Consulted	237

Chapter 1

Preliminaries

> Between the idea
> And the reality
> Between the motion
> And the act
> Falls the Shadow . . . .
> Between the conception
> And the creation
> Between the emotion
> And the response
> Falls the Shadow . . . .
> --T.S. Eliot, "The Hollow Men" (81-82)

> . . . our apparitions, the things you know us by, are simply childish. Beneath it is all dark, it is all spreading, it is unfathomably deep; but now and again we rise to the surface and that is what you see us by.
> -- Virginia Woolf, *To the Lighthouse* (62)

I do not question, much less challenge, Hemingway's place in the canon of American literature. My aim is rather to reevaluate and reinterpret the Hemingway corpus from what Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick calls "the relatively decentered perspective of modern gay and anti-homophobic theory" (*Epistemology* 1), an emerging sub-discipline of cultural ciriticism often referred to as "queer theory." I also hope that my rereadings will shed new light on the ways in which modernist configurations

of identity are conjoined with the cultural formations engendered by the First World War, most especially in respect to sexual categories and gender roles in Hemingway.

I therefore propose to demonstrate (1) the tension in Hemingway's writing between the idea of psychological depth as constituent of identity on the one hand, and the notion of performative and perhaps multiple identities on the other; (2) the ways in which his writing, intentionally or no, disrupt identificatory classifications as fixed, stable, and immutable, while at the same time working to conceal, deny -- in short, to closet -- such knowledge as a defense against the potential threats such knowledge might present to the maintenance of a heterosexist, masculinist culture, as well as the Hemingway hero's own sense of masculine identity; (3) the way in which Hemingway's self-proclaimed literary aesthetic reflects the depth models of both subjectivity and homosexuality; that is, how one "finds" one's secret, deepest self beneath the layers of social manners and morals; and (4) the anxieties in Hemingway's work that issue from his fear of feminine power, paternal authority, and the *nada* of modern existence, all of which place his work and his central male characters in what Djuna Barnes calls in *Nightwood* (1937) a "middle condition," in Hemingway's case, a straddling of sexual, gendered, and cultural borders.

Implicit in such a critical undertaking is the assumption (which I will expand on) that heterosexual/homosexual, as well as the associated binarisms that congregate around this site,

are co-dependent terms which exist not so much as oppositional categories, but as complementary to each other, the necessary and inseparable threads which create and sustain the fabric of homophobic, masculinist culture. As such, it is virtually self-evident that homosocial institutions -- the battlefield and bullring, the boy's school and men's clubs, virtually all sites of "male bonding" -- are endemic to, and, indeed, foster, the homoeroticism they ostensibly seek to regulate, if not entirely efface. First, however, I will review some of the main currents in Hemingway criticism in order to contextualize my work within the tradition of Hemingway studies that I follow.

1. Main Currents in Hemingway Criticism

Virtually from the outset of Hemingway's career as a serious writer, critics focused on two elements in his work that would dominate Hemingway criticism for decades: his unique prose style and his creation of the so-called code hero or Hemingway hero. Most of the reviews of Hemingway's first full-length novel, *The Sun Also Rises* (1926), for example, praised, not without some astonishment, the power and simplicity of the young writer's prose, describing it in terms that we continue to use in respect to the Hemingway sentence: "understated," "unsentimental," "with a maximum of economy" (Conrad Aiken); "clear," "lean, hard, athletic" ("Marital Tragedy" in *The New York Times Book Review*); "hard-boiled" (Allen Tate); "solid," "firm," "hard," "masculine," and,

again, "hard-boiled" (Lawrence S. Morris); "hard" (yet again) and "clean" (Philip Young). These terms, familiar to all students of Hemingway, also carry with them an obvious gender import, an unformulated (or under-formulated) belief in a kind of *ecriture masculine*. The relationship between Hemingway's art and the cultural construction of gender will be explored later in this chapter, so that for the moment it is enough to say that Hemingway's prose style mirrors the qualities of the code hero, who faces up to, and engages, the chaos and violence of the post-war world with stoical courage and "grace under pressure"; the Hemingway hero whose "separate peace" with the waste land of modern Western culture is forged from the steel of subjectivity; that is, the personal code by which men can live in an apparantely meaningless world ("our nada who art in nada"). Style and theme are thereby united in a macrovision of the Hemingway corpus, variously described as his "dream of order" (Alfred Kazin, *Bright Book*), his "craving certitude" (Richard Hovey), or his "force of will" (Scott Donaldson).

Perhaps the two most important early critics of Hemingway were Edmund Wilson and Philip Young. Their influence has been enormous because they not only analyzed Hemingway's work, but theorized it as well; that is, they attempted in their own ways to account for the reasons Hemingway wrote what he wrote, and in the end their conclusions were not dissimilar. Wilson's chapter on Hemingway in his seminal 1941 text, *The Wound and the Bow* ("Hemingway: Gauge of Morale") concludes

that "genius and disease, like strength and mutilation, may be inextricably bound up together" (237). This psychic wound, or "obscure hurt," to borrow Henry James's phrase, was, in Wilson's view, the origin of all great art, Hemingway's included. Young concurred: Hemingway, he argued, returned "compulsively to the scenes of his injuries" (166), chief among them the wound he suffered as an ambulance driver in the First World War, when a mortar shell exploded his knee and left shrapnel scattered from groin to calf, doubtless the inspiration for Jake Barnes's genital wound in *The Sun Also Rises*. However compelling their arguments, the limitations of Wilson and Young's position is neatly articulated by Nancy R. Comley and Robert Scholes: "it is an attempt to reduce a complex textual phenomenon to an excessively simple formula" (8). Wilson's and Young's claims are finally a reductivist explanation that relies almost wholly on a psychological reading not only of the work, but of the man as well, a biographical-based explanation which fails to take into account wider cultural influences and particulars of Hemingway's life beyond the wartime trauma he presumably suffered. Robert Paul Lam has wryly, and accurately, written that Wilson and Young advance the "war wound" thesis, which Lamb sets against the "childhood wound" thesis (21), a later attempt at a holistic interpretation of Hemingway's work that represents another hugely influential school of Hemingway criticism.

One of the chief proponents of the "childhood wound"

theory is Kenneth S. Lynn, whose critical biography, *Hemingway* (1987), maintains that the conflicts and anxieties in Hemingway's work can be traced to his androgynous twinship with his older sister Marcelline. It is now widely known, and largely through the work of Lynn, that Hemingway's mother, Grace Hall Hemingway, dressed young Ernest and Marcelline in girl's clothing and curled their hair in identical fashion. Though such gender-bending in children was not unheard of in Victorian households, that Grace labelled one photograph of Ernest "summer girl," suggests a rather more bizarre extention of this particular nineteenth-century convention. The problem the "childhood wound" thesis presents is the same as that of the "war wound" thesis: it is strikingly reductive, and while Lynn avails himself of post-structuralist theory in reading Hemingway, his intepretation ultimately relies on Freudian thought. Another important critic of this school is Mark Spilka, but since his approach is rather more complicated, I will defer discussing it until I have outlined the sea change in Hemingway criticism that took place in the 1980s.

In addition to feminist theories, and the rise of post-structuralist discourse which both informs and enables much new critical work on Hemingway, two specific events occurred in the '80s that changed the face of Hemingway scholarship: the July 1980 opening of the Hemingway Collection at Boston's John F. Kennedy Library, and the 1986 publication of *The Garden of Eden*. Before the Hemingway Collection became available for study, Susan F. Beegel correctly claims that

"Hemingway scholarship had fallen into what might be called a productive decline, with more and more articles being written on subjects of less and less importance," including such "trivial subjects as baseball in *The Old Man and the Sea* and whether the author had confused the waiters in 'A Clean, Well-Lighted Place' [he had not]" (3). The 19,500 manuscript pages made available in 1980 renewed and restored the vigor of Hemingway criticism, and with the publication of *The Garden of Eden*, no general reader, much less a Hemingway critic, could ignore issues of central concern to much contemporary criticism as a whole, issues of gender, sexuality, race, and ethnic/national identity. The revelations, most especially those presented by both the published and unpublished versions of *The Garden*, made for a fortunate convergence of the Hemingway canon and new critical approaches to literary and cultural studies. While many excellent articles written over the past ten to fifteen years have explored Hemingway through the lens of post-structuralist thought, only two books have been devoted to a reading of Hemingway exclusively from this point of view: Spilka's Hemingway's *Quarrel with Androgyny* (1990) and Comley and Scholes's *Hemingway's Genders: Rereading the Hemingway Text* (1994).

Spilka's work, however, ultimately reverts back to a variation of the "childhood wound" thesis and is therefore limited by the insistence that a single theory can explain all of Hemingway's work in connection to masculinity. Spilka, alluding to Wilson, maintains that "the retrospective vision

of androgyny that *The Garden of Eden* manuscript affords" points to androgyny as "a wounding condition, that is to say, against which Hemingway's artistic bow has always been manfully strung" (5). Spilka also claims that "Hemingway derives opposing yet overlapping strands of feeling about manhood from Victorian protagonists and imperial fictions," and locates the key to Hemingway's "overlapping feeling about manhood" in the author's childhood, "as shaped and reconfirmed by female and male writers whose views correspond roughly to those of Hemingway's parents" (6-7). Hemingway, Spilka concludes, suffered from "a lifelong quarrel between the artist and his secret muses" (13). Worlds collide: Fredudian psychology crashes into biographical criticism, and so in spite of the emphasis Spilka places on androgyny -- which he defines but cannot account for as a cultural phenomenon -- scant attention is paid to post-structuralist theory which attempts to problemitize, among other things, the urge toward, and the reappearance in society, of androgyny and its ambiguous gender signification.

Spilka is more convincing when he focuses less on Hemingway family dynamics and the author's own personal psychology (for the most part sheer speculation), and more on the interplay between the books Hemingway read early in his life and the works he would later produce. Spilka's "selective look at Hemingway's boyhood reading, largely in British literature, helps to show how he was raised by a blend of feminine and masculine versions of manhood" (5), which

speak to Hemingway's "middle condition," poised between the old and the new, a period of enormous cultural dislocation that can further illuminate the conflicts between the centuries as well as those between national identities, in Hemingway's case, the split between the American and the European, and the Euro-American and the Native American Indian. The key Victorian (and in one case Edwardian) writers of primary importance to Hemingway were, Spilka contends, Dinah Craik, whose *John Halifax, Gentleman* (1922) is narrated by a lame male character (not unlike, for instance, Jake Barnes and Harry Morgan), Rudyard Kipling, Emile Bronte (especially *Wuthering Heights*, to which Hemingway frequently alludes), Capt. Frederick Marryat, Frances Hodgson Burnett, and John Masefield.

One is left, however, with the impression that Spilka has constructed a bed and must now cripple Hemingway to sleep in it, for Spilka seems to begin with the thesis and include or suppress material on the basis of how well it supports or refutes the original hypothesis. "Since 1978, when I began this study [*Hemingway's Quarrel*]," Spilka writes, "evidence of Hemingway's androgynous predilections has mounted rapidly, abetted by a spate of recent biographies and research aids" (3). This is a telling comment, for he fails in his book to mention any contemporary criticism or theory, but points only to "biographies and research aids," by which I understand him to mean the "research aids" provided by the Kennedy Library. The term "androgynous predilections" also holds for me

negative connotations, not unlike "latent homosexual," a "predilection" or tendency that should be quashed. The wound theses themselves are, moreover, constructed on the notion that some sort of trauma was suffered by Hemingway at a relatively young age, and trauma in turn denotes an injury to the body caused by shock or violence, in psychiatric terms, a severe emotional shock. Several of these theories therefore rely on the descriptive powers of medical discourse in an attempt to establish the unspoken impetus behind Hemingway's art, the source of which is understood as in some measure pathological. For Hemingway to have been interested in questions of non-normative gendered and/or sexual behavior must mean that he was sick. As David Bergman maintains, "in defending itself against homosexuality, patriarchal discourse has tried to deny both its permanence and its genuiness. All three ways in which the patriarchy has conceived of homosexuality -- as a sin, crime, and disease -- places it within frameworks that deny its permanence since sins may be overcome, crimes avoided, and diseases cured" (87). The idea of androgyny -- a body that at one and the same time signifies male and female -- is collapsed with sexuality and gender in the Spilka text and strikes me, furthermore, as an all too easy rubric for avoiding issues that deal more directly with Hemingway's ambiguous literary take on the instability of the heterosexual/homosexual, masculine/feminine binarisms. While I will have more to say about this later in this chapter, I have quoted Bergman's accurate assessment of our cultural

discourse surrounding homosexuality in order to expose the bias behind the wound theories, which state explicity that some event or series of events in Hemingway's personal life led him, if not to sins or crime, then to falling prey to a disease, a fortunate disease (in that it led to the literature), but a disease nonetheless. What's more, the "spate of recent biographies and recent aids" were only two prerequisites for re-seeing Hemingway; the new critical vision also required an appropriate cultural moment, enabled by feminist theory, gender studies, queer activism, the emergence of queer identities and queer theories. History, more than anything else, allowed critics to finally lift the veil on "Hemingway's genders." All in all, Spilka's work therefore addresses itself largely to interpreting the work through the life; he tends to describe Hemingway's personal psychology, not what the writing itself signifies. This psychological mystification mars many of his close readings, which in and of themselves are of enormous value to the contemporary critic of Hemingway.

Comley and Scholes's *Hemingway's Genders* marks the first attempt to provide a comprehensive interpretation of the Hemingway canon exclusively from the perspective of gender; as they write in their Preface, "We have attempted to read Hemingway" -- what they more generally call the "Hemingway Text" -- "by putting questions of gender ahead of all others" (iv), and I need here point out that for Comley and Scholes,

gender is virtually synonymous with sexuality. Since the stated purpose of their brief but eloquent volume is "to open a conversation rather than to close one" (145), they scrupulously avoid drawing overall conclusions: "An afterword, not a conclusion" (145) reads the first sentence of their Afterword, which basically summarizes their main points and ends with the pronouncement that, "the Hemingway you were taught about in high school is dead. *Viva el nuevo* Hemingway" (146). *Hemingway's Genders* does not, however, so much "open a conversation" as continue one already underway, and while many of their readings are penetrating and dense, touching on virtually all the major works as well as significant material not yet published, the book fails to honor the work of others in this now-central field of Hemingway scholarship. Their discussion of *The Sun Also Rises* (42-46), for example, provides an incisive reading of the novel from the perspective of contemporary gender studies, but much of the same points have already been made by Debra Moddelmog, Arnold and Cathy Davidson, and Wendy Martin, to name a few. 1 Similarly, their discussion of primitivism in *The Garden of Eden* (88-103) restates much of what Toni Morrison had to say about this issue in *Playing in the Dark* (1992). *Hemingway's Genders* is, moreover, limited by the reluctance on the part of the authors to put it all together and offer at least a tentative conclusion. Because of this, their book has the feel of an extended essay rather than a comprehensive study. Still, their work provides a valuable starting point for my own, and

mine will in some measure attempt to extend theirs. Beyond the reservations stated above, other more central theoretical problems exist in the Comley/Scholes text, and these will mark the point of greatest departure for what follows in *Hemingway Unbound*.

The main problem I have with *Hemingway's Genders* is its theoretical grounding, as well as certain unspoken assumptions from which their reading proceeds. First of all, the comingling of Hemingway's life and Hemingway's work creates in the book a vacuum which results in a kind of closed system into which consideration of cultural forces cannot penetrate. Cultural context and the influence of culture are therefore largely absent from their work, leaving the reader with the sense that Hemingway's interest in sexuality and gender was isolated from and indifferent to what was happening on the literary scene or the society at large. The Hemingway of *Hemingway's Genders* thus "exists" only on two points of an axis, the man and his work, and "all patterns reduce to the same act of patterning [on Comley and Scholes's part]; life and writing are textually indistinguishable" (Van Leer 23). Comley and Scholes seem to recognize the limitations of their reading when they ask, but cannot answer, "who else [in 1931] was counting the number of homosexual males in any sport or contest of life and death [as Hemingway had in *Death in the Afternoon*]?" (107); and later, they comment on, but do not attempt to account for, Hemingway's taking Whitman's homosexuality "for granted at a time when many would have

denied it fiercely" (120-21).

Jamie Barlowe shares my concerns, writing that "because Comley and Scholes move methodically from text to author and back to text, the culture has no real contextual force; it becomes merely informational and explanatory fodder" (86). This lack finds a parallel in another missing ingredient, one of a more purely critical/theoretical nature: they do not question or move to deconstruct cultural formations, but instead implicitly accept a variety of categories -- "bitch," "dyke," "whore," "devil," "fag" -- as possessing stable and unchanging signification; that is, these categories are naturalized in *Hemingway's Genders*, not questioned or (re)defined. Barlowe puts it this way: "Comley and Scholes, in spite of their claim to focus on the 'ethical dimension' of Hemingway's work (xi), do not acknowledge the ethical consequences of the Other -- or for gender studies -- of examining the Other only as part of stereotypical categories contemporaneous to Hemingway . . . . and as a way to maintain the focus on -- and re-explain -- an already iconized and canonized male author" (86).

My project is in part to extend the Comley/Scholes project by in part attending to such lapses. Thus, for example, when I argue in chapter 2 that the theatre of war allows for some measure of erotic feelings between men, I attempt to ground this sanctioned transgression not only by exploring male/male relations in *A Farewell to Arms*, but also by examining the conception of battlefield comaraderie that

Hemingway likely absorbed from the culture at large. Or, to provide another instance, when I discuss the similarities between Jake Barnes and the homosexual men in *The Sun Also Rises* (chapter 5), I also take pains to sketch in the cultural landscape that informs their interactions and Jake's response to them. Like Comley and Scholes, I "put questions of gender ahead of all others," save sexuality, all the while striving to avoid the all too common confluence of the gendered and sexual selves, a relationship -- that is, between gender and sexuality -- which has been widely, though unsatisfactorialy, theorized (though I make no claim to having unlocked the mysteries of this relationship). At the same time, I consider issues of national identity (including race and ethnicity) as well as class, though they are subordinated to gender and sexuality. In my discussion of *The Garden of Eden* -- where, in fact, all of these issues reach their apotheosis -- I emphasize national identity more than I do for any other Hemingway work, while attempting to remain aware throughout that gender and sexuality (their construction, signification, and reception) are hardly stable, monolithic categories across cultures. So that when I look at the matador's elaborate *traje de luces* (suit of lights), for example, I make the distinction between what an American, as opposed to a Spaniard, might make of it (chapter 5). The same is true for class and ethnicity in such stories as "Indian Camp," "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife," and "The Battler."

2. The Queer Take

Hemingway Unbound therefore joins the ongoing critical dialogue in respect to the issues outlined above, and seeks to influence the direction of the conversation and introduce or expand upon certain topics. And this almost exclusively from the perspective of queer theory. The reader should also bear in mind that the issues which motivate and ground my discussion -- whether explicit or implicit -- are those laid out by two central figures in literary/queer theory, Johnathan Dollimore and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, both of whom are indebted to the writings of Michel Foucault. (I also rely on Judith Butler's work on gender, though to a more limited degree, and most obviously in chapter 5.) Dollimore's *Sexual Dissidence* (1990) is in part concerned with

> why in our own time the negation of homosexuality has been in direct proportion to its symbolic centrality; its cultural marginality in direct proportion to its cultural significance; why, also, homosexuality is strangely integral to the selfsame heterosexual cultures which obsessively denounce it, and why history -- history rather than human nature -- has produced this paradoxical situation. (28)

Sedgwick's *Epistemology of the Closet* (1990) similarly

> proposes that many of the major nodes of thought and knowledge in twentieth century Western culture as a whole are structured -- indeed, fractured -- by a chronic, now endemic crisis of homo/heterosexual defintion. (3)

She holds, furthermore, that such definition "has affected our culture through its ineffaceable marking" of categories which include -- and these relations are most central to Hemingway -- "masculine/feminine," "secrecy/disclosure," "knowledge/ignorance," "private/public," "innocence/initiation," "natural/artificial," "wholeness/decadence," "domestic/foreign," "same/different," and "active/passive" (11). These are the binarisms that play an important role in structuring meaning in our culture, all of which can be seen to congregate around the site of heterosexual/homosexual, as if magnetized by this cultural obsession with sexuality as a key marker of identity.

I also share Sedgwick's contention that "the relations of the closet -- the relations of the known and the unknown, the explicit and inexplicit around homo/heterosexual definition -- have the potential for being peculiary revealing, in fact, about speech acts" (3). As Foucault maintains, "Silence itself . . . is less the absolute limit of discourse . . . than an element that functions alongside the things said, with them and in relation to them within over-all strategies . . .

There is not one but many silences, and they are an integral part of the strategies that underlie and permeate discourse" (*History* 27). This notion of silence (that is, omission) as a discursive act in its own right bears directly on Hemingway's literary aesthetic, as we shall soon see. And just as "there is no binary division to be made between what one says and what one does not say" (Foucault, *History* 27), so there are no discrete boundaries between such categories as heterosexual/homosexual, masculine/feminine, and so forth, not, at least, if binarisms are understood as polar opposites. Indeed, binarisms are not so much oppositional as co-dependent, flip sides of the same coin, inflections of the selfsame manifestation, for in the inexorable logic that governs relational terms, where there is homosexual there must be heterosexual, where there there is masculine there must be feminine, etc. This is at least a partial answer to Dollimore's question regarding the "symbolic centrality" and "cultural significance" of homosexuality.

That literary creation involves a continual dynamic of putting in and taking out shows the editing process to be a matter of revision in the strict sense of "seeing again." What is especially subject to such revision is that which appears as inauthentic, at odds with, or wholly contrary to the world under construction, for a change in the text is initiated when, seen again, some aspect of it strikes the author as disruptive to the integrity of the whole. That a final version must eventually be arrived at necessitates that

a final, and, for all intents and purposes, lasting choice, be made, for no more than one word (elocutionary act) may occupy a single space in the text. Such inclusion (being a relational term) calls for exclusion (the love which speaks its name/the love which dare not speak its name, for example), so that it is axiomatic that what is said generates what is not said, and vice versa. As Susan Beegel has shown, revision for Hemingway was indeed "principally a business of omission, of discovering the story in the stream of consciousness, and eliminating the personal material leading to and sometimes from it" (11). The said/unsaid, moreover, embedded within the larger text, accrues additional meaning and nuance by virtue of the space which it occupies; that is, the way in which adjacent words effect it. Meaning, then, is constructed and mediated by linguistic considerations which include, but are not limited to, syntax and semantics. Derrida's concept of *differe/ance*, which holds that all meaning is indeterminate (*different*) and deferred (*differant*), is therefore one of the keynote terms applied to the inherent instability of the text. The relevant point here is the connection between Hemingway's literary aesthetic, the idea of psychological depth (which figures the origins of both the self and art in the unconsicous), and the so-called medical model of homosexuality.

As for the thorny problem of identity/behavior, and its most apparent and striking manifestation -- the question of whether sexuality and/or gender constitutes subjectivity or is

rather a set of acts which cannot be relied on to reveal any submerged core identity -- this, too, plays a significant role in the tension in Hemingway's work. In Foucault's now-famous formulation, "the sodomite had been [in the nineteenth century] a temporary aberration; the homosexual was now a species" (*History* 43), 2 and while this notion of the homosexual as a "species" is widely accepted, and deployed for strategic political ends by the gay/lesbian liberation movement itself, it is not quite so determined in Hemingway. The same tension between the stability/instability -- or, put another way, the essentialist/constructionist argument -- of many of the other binarisms outlined above are also constantly in play in the Hemingway canon. For example, is masculinity/femininity a performance, as Judith Butler argues, or is it a fixed and stable quality, a set of behavioral characteristics that issue naturally from the male and the female, respectively? In other words, is gender a fluid cultural formation or a psychologically- or biologically-determined imperative? Is gender -- by which I mean the signs and symbols that demarcate masculine from feminine, not the biological categories male and female -- constitutive of fixed identity or a cultural construction erected for social/political ends, namely, the consolidation of patriarchal (masculinist, heterosexist) culture? I myself side with the constructionist view on these matters, and in keeping with what I understand to be the queer project, I will attempt to deconstruct the binarisms heterosexual/homosexual and

masculine/feminine as sites of fixed identity, which, by virtue of textual slippages, Hemingway's fiction seems to suggest.

In general terms, modern culture -- and modernism itself -- was "preoccupied with the experience of alienation, with metaphysical depth and/or the psychic realization that there is no metaphysical depth" (Dollimore 71). Whether such depth actually exists (and if it does, where on or in the body is it located?) or whether it was, as Fredric Jameson maintains, "merely a philosophical and cultural mystification which sought to persuade people that they 'had' individual subjects and possessed this unique identity" (115), is largely beside the point, for the project here is to reveal Hemingway's struggle with this question. (It may be worth noting here that the macho Hemingway figure of popular imagination was never so singular or unaltered(-able) as Hemingway perceived himself, for his own self-definition was fragmented in the forms of his "doubles" -- Papa, Wemedge, Brute, Hemingstein, Tatie, and so forth.) His work, as already stated, provides evidence of deep-seated conflicts between depth -- sometimes called the "depth model" of personality or an "authentic unified self" (Dollimore 71) -- as opposed to the competing reality of surface. The question can also be put this way: is there a doer behind the deed?

I want to underscore -- and it cannot be emphasized too much -- that I make no claim to know what Hemingway believed or what his intentions might have been in any given work. In

some instances, he expressed what he believed in respect to the questions advanced above (the literary aesthetic of submerged depth, for example), though whether he actually believed what he stated or not, or to what degree or with what reservations, that I cannot know. Let it be understood, therefore, that I reject intentionality as viable technique in literary criticism. What most concerns me, and all that I base my readings on, are the works themselves and what they signify to me. Such signification can of course be various and fluctuate from reader to reader, culture to culture, epoch to epoch. And the signifer -- in this case, Hemingway's writing -- can also bear the weight of multiple significations at one and the same time. When I argue, then, that the binarisms discussed above are central to my interpretation of the Hemingway canon, and that his work disrupts the stability of said categories, I do not know, or care much about, Hemingway's intentions or awareness of these issues that I regard as crucial to the future of Hemingway scholarship. In short, I read the page through history and context, and not the man.

I see the conflicts between depth/performance as in part arising from the famed Hemingway code hero, or more specifically, from the code itself (what Cathy and Arnold Davidson call the "code of *aficion*"). For the code tells a man how to act in public; it does not tell him how to feel, what to think about what he feels, or how to resolve conflicting emotions. The code solves the question of

performance, acting as a blueprint for how a man should behave, but does not speak to depth: the code may have offered a much-needed design for living following the cultural ruptures engendered by the First World War, but like any monolithic system of behavior or values, it cannot settle anxieties aroused when the code comes in conflict with emotions experienced, or beliefs held, by the individual. 3 "The Hemingway code," writes Earl Rovit and Gerry Brenner, "is the ethic, or philosophic perspective, through which Hemingway tries to impart meaning and value to the seeming futility of man's headlong rush toward death" (92). The "meaning and value" of the code, however, often binds the Hemingway hero into a mode of thinking and behavior that undermines the individual self, for the code cannot meet the demands presented by every and all situations. In other words, the code is overdetermined, and, because it is a system imposed from without, cannot always answer the needs that issue from within. Jake Barnes knows, for example, that he should not introduce a woman (Brett Ashley) to a matador on the night before a bullfight, but he does so anyway (*The Sun* 185). Why? Because in this instance the code conflicts with other desires, other aims. Jake also knows that Robert Cohn breaks the code, but cannot help liking him in spite of, or because of, it. The code therefore helps to give meaning to a man's life, but in so doing it requires that a man lose something of his self.

At one time, I agreed with Alfred Kazin and enthusi-

astically embraced his dictum that Hemingway "brought a major art to a minor vision of life" (*On Native Grounds* 257). I no longer believe this; nor do I quite buy into Kazin's proposition that for Hemingway, "There were only absolute values or absolute degradations" (*On Native Grounds* 259). While this statement has the ring of truth, it is only a partial truth. Ivan Kashkeen, who was probably the most important Hemingway critic in Russia, makes an important distinction that Kazin (writing ten years earlier) missed: Hemingway's "main hero," Kashkeen wrote, "feels drawn to all that is simple, integral, and clear, while he himself is complex, divided, and tragic" (78). Yes, but as I hope this work will demonstrate, however much the Hemingway hero cries out for such order, he, too, finds himself "complex, divided, and tragic."

This leads to a second proposition advanced by *Hemingway Unbound*, namely, that at the heart of Hemingway's work there exists a lack, a profound sense of loss, of mourning and melancholia, the *nada* at the dark heart of modern existence. Hemingway's heros, Fisher Kings all, are almost always estranged from family (Frederic Henry and Robert Jordan say as much), very often exhibit a corporeal lack expressive of an emotional or psychic void (Jake's genital wound, Harry Morgan's missing arm, the young man desirous of castration in "God Rest You Merry, Gentleman," the major in "In Another Country"), experience a deep sense of alientation and isolation (Frederic Henry's "separate peace," Thomas Hudson

and Robert Cantwell's longing to recapture the past), or otherwise do not quite measure up to the demands of reality, but instead exhibit insomniac fears (Nick in "Now I Lay Me"), complain of feeling "hollow" or "empty" (especially true for the lovers in Hemingway's fiction, from Frederic Henry and Catherine Barkley to David and Catherine Bourne), which is associated with physical and emotional sterility ("Mr. and Mrs. Elliot," "Cat in the Rain," "Out of Season"), or live in a state of perpetual self-loathing (Harry in "The Snows of Kilimanjaro," the title character in "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber"). Very often this *nada* is filled by a third party -- the wife's lesbian lover in "Mr. and Mrs. Elliot," Marita in *The Garden of Eden*, even the "pilot fish" of *A Moveable Feast* -- who is later blamed for having disrupted and/or corrupted a man's well-being, in many cases, this in the form of a domineering woman, the phallic mother.

3. Depth Wish

> 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 iceberg is due to only one-eighth of it being above water.
>
> -- *Death in the Afternoon* (192)

This is Hemingway's well-known iceberg theory of literary composition, a precise correlative of both the depth model of

identity, which implies that a "real" self is somewhere to be found, and the medical model of homosexuality. For the idea of psychological depth demands that we "read" beyond the surface acts and statements of the individual in order to seek his/her "truth" below the surface, by in part a process of decoding and bringing to light otherwise suppressed emotions and motivations. While the notion of core identity might have been, as Terry Eagleton, in concert with Fredric Jameson, maintains, nothing more than "a fantasy of interiority . . . [a] pathological itch to scratch surfaces for concealed depths" (143, 312), for the post-war world was, as Modris Eksteins has it, "a matter of individual interpretive power . . . . [for] if the war as a whole had no objective meaning, then invariably all human history was telescoped into each man's experience; every person was the sum total of history," and truth could therefore no longer be found "in a social reality but in individual imagination" (212, 292). Hence the tension between "objective" and personal truth, between universal and individual authenticity, between stable and unstable cultural values, between fixed and fluid identity.

Like the individual, the text may be mined to bring up concealed meaning. And like Freudian theories of repression, most of the Hemingway story is concealed, or withheld from the narrative, which suggests that Hemingway had interalized the notion of buried truths, submerged depths. Not only is the large majority of the story undisclosed, but it is precisely this hidden dimension of the narrative that invests its

visible counterpart with "dignity," with "truth." Just as the deep psychology of the individual must be plumbed (uncovered, unmasked, "outed") in order to "know" the subject, so Hemingway's iceberg aesthetic of literary composition (which roughly corresponds to the "close readings" encouraged by the New Critics of the '60s, where the critic discovers the secrets of the text) implies that the "hidden" text must also be decoded for a true understanding of what it's all about; the "essence" is unseen, and the narrative achieves greater force through this mask.

It is very nearly as if what is present in a narrative, that which is "spoken," and so revealed, lacks the signifying power of the "unspoken," or concealed. The reader of a text -- be it corporeal or literary -- must therefore "read" silence and omission. At the same time, however, I argue in chapter 5 that Jake Barnes "reads" the overt social behavior of the gay men in Brett's company as the external signs that lead him to "diagnose" them as homosexual. In this case -- and there are others that I explore in chapter 5 -- outside leads to inside; gendered behavior is for Jake predictive of erotic object choice. Like so many actual people, Jake interprets sexual orientation through the performance of gender, and the unseen sexuality of the gay men in question rises to the surface, so that while they are silent in respect to the love -- and behavior -- that dare not speak its name, observable clues lead Jake to conclude that they are gay. There is, in the final analysis, "no division to be made

between what one says and what one does not say." In respect to aesthetics, then, what's unspoken does not indicate lack, or the fact that something's missing; it is rather "said" through silence. In the case of the individual, however, what's not there -- Jake's ability to perform, Dr. Adams's courage, Harry Morgan's arm -- diminishes one's masculinity. However speech/silence and presence/absence are construed in the Hemingway corpus, the fact remains that the author and his work point to a belief in buried truths, submerged identities.

Indeed, "the first major obstacle that a writer must overcome is the inability to perceive the truth clearly," Hemingway states in *Death in the Afternoon*, and his own "greatest difficulty" as a young writer, "aside from knowing what you really felt . . . .was to put down what really happened in the action; what the actual things were which produced the emotion that you experienced" (2). The writer who loses sight of "knowing truly" what he felt, or of failing to understand "what really happened," risks his artistic credibility and will eventually be uncovered as a "fake" (54).

Once the writer perceives the truth, his task it then to write "one true sentence":

> It was easy then because there was always one true sentence that I knew or had seen or had heard someone say. If I started to write elaborately, or like someone introducing something, I found that

> I could cut that scrollwork or ornamentation out and throw it away and start with the first true simple declarative sentence I had written. (*A Moveable Feast* 12)

"Scrollwork" and "ornamentation," or what he simply calls in *Death in the Afternoon*, "flowery writing" (14), are antithetical to the Hemingway aesthetic. While a prose style that exhibits such qualities may indeed constitute bad writing, what's interesting is that Hemingway (and he is certainly not alone in this) employs a language of femininity and excess to denounce such writing. Certainly a stripped-down, understated style does not ensure good writing, and yet Hemingway emphasizes these characteristics as necessary components for successful prose. In this context, then, Rachel Bowlby's observation that "culture, as a space marked off from business or working concerns, was also associated [at the *fin de siecle*] with femininity, [and] that meant that being an artist might not sit well with male identity" (7) is especially suggestive, especially in light of Spilka's take on Hemingway's boyhood reading.

In fact, the link between "dishonest" writing and femininity/homosexuality is established in part by the Hemingway aesthetic itself. Just as "the bullfighter's discipline and integrity and skill in handling violence in the ring becomes the paradigm for Hemingway's being able to write well about what he sees" (Broer 69), so it is extremely

difficult for the male homosexual to write well, for according to Peter Griffin, Hemingway may have believed that gay men exhibit a "tendency to overreact, or, better, to misreact, because their emotions were somehow short-circuited," a view Jake Barnes seems to share (see chapter 5). Griffin then summarizes what he believes to have been Hemingway's view of the emotional make-up of gay men:

> Usually afraid to let their genuine feelings show [how surprising in a culture that scorns and even penalizes such feelings], they would either amplify or suppress their response -- in keeping up a static of excitement or affecting ennui -- in order to hide themselves. In speech and writing, everything for them had to be more, or less, than it was. (50)

These are Griffin's words, and his conclusions are based on information culled from Robert McAlmon, a gay figure who was once Hemingway's friend and publisher. 4 Though unquestionably an oversimplification of Hemingway's attitude toward the male homosexual, it yet contains some useful truth, for it suggests that gay men are incapable of "knowing truly," or at least of allowing the truth ("their genuine feelings") to show. If they can show "what you really felt" and "what the actual things were which produced the emotion," they are

unable to convey it (they "amplify or suppress their response"). As the narrator of "The Mother of a Queen" says, as far as "queens" go, "you can't touch them. Nothing, nothing can touch them" (*WTN* 96). 5 It is perhaps not that "queens" cannot feel, but that those feelings are warped by their sexual orientation, and so they cannot be "touched" the way a "normal" man might be. It is notable that the title character of this story is called not a homosexual or by some such epithet as "punk," "fag," or "fairy," but a "queen," for this name demonstrates our culture's linkage between the homosexual and the aristocrat (a theme I take up in chapter 5), what Hemingway calls in *Death in the Afternoon*, "all the mincing gentry" (205). As Edmund White points out, "homosexuals . . . have found consolation for their low status in . . . fantasies of aristocratic camp -- not for nothing do they call themselves 'queens'" (x-xi).

Thinking back on the callow youth who went off to Europe during the First World War, Hemingway said in 1942 that he had been "an awful dope . . . . I can remember thinking that we were the home team and the Austrians the visiting team" (qtd. in Baker, *Life Story* 54). Such a parochial view of the conflict, not terribly surprising in a sheltered young man from a puritanical Midwestern family, is reflected in *A Farewell to Arms*, whose narrator/hero Frederic Henry sees the war as a game, an impression the more mature Hemingway would not share with his younger alter-ego. Although Hemingway was always fascinated by war and remained convinced of its value

to a writer (for, like the bullfight, it reveals a man's courage, or lack thereof, in the face of violent death), he eventually came to the political realization that modern warfare is planned and waged by "demagogues and dictators," and during the Spanish Civil War would rightly conclude that in future all war "was to be total war, in which there was no such thing as a non-combatant" (qtd. in Baker, *Life Story* 383).

Given Hemingway's literary aesthetic, encapsulated in the "true simple declarative" sentence -- his "dream of order" -- it is perhaps unsurprising that Hemingway regarded World War I as a kind of game, a struggle between the forces of good and evil, for such a strict binary vision was well-suited to a literary temperment that outwardly insisted on order and certitude. On the side of good was also "truth":

> The writers who were established before the war had nearly all sold out to write propoganda during it and most of them never recovered their honesty afterwards. All of their reputations steadily declined because a good writer should be of as great probity and honesty as the priest of God. He is either honest or not, as a woman is either chaste or not, and after one piece of dishonest writing he is never the

same again. (*Men at War* xiii)

The connection between artistic "honesty" and religion/gender is clear: the writer who becomes "dishonest" resembles the "fallen" woman -- neither will ever be the same again, and the loss of honesty in a writer (presumed male) and chastity in a woman (though not in men), pollutes the self, makes the self impure and "untrue."

Hemingway himself avoided adjectival "ornamentation" as well as words which represent "conditions, causes, contrarieties, that is sophisticated concepts, nuances, intellectualizations," all that "may suggest antithesis or elementary paradox" (Watkins 113). And while I think this is closer to Kashkeen's description of the Hemingway hero than to Hemingway himself, it's nevertheless true that Hemingway viewed abstraction, and to a certain extent, qualification, as untrustworthy. In *A Farewell to Arms*, for example, Frederic becomes disillusioned with the war just as he begins to doubt the integrity of language itself: "I was always embarrassed by the words sacred, glorious, and sacrifice and the expression in vain" (184). Before the war, Paul Fussell claims, "no one would have understood what on earth he was talking about," for "one read Hardy and Kipling and Conrad and frequented worlds of traditional moral action delineated in traditional moral language" (21, 23). The war changed all that.

This dimension of the Hemingway aesthetic -- his distrust of "ornamentation" and abstraction -- was likely internalized by the young author quite early in his career, when he was a

novice reporter for the *Kansas City Star* (during seven months in 1917-18). The influence of the *Star's* famous stylebook cannot be underestimated: "it advocated short sentences, short paragraphs, positive vigorous English; emphasized authenticity, selectivity, compression, precision, clarity, immediacy" (Meyers 24). The reportorial skills and aesthetic values imparted by the *Star* manual were reinforced by the editors of the *Toronto Star* and *Star Weekly*, where Hemingway served as a freelancer, staff writer, and foreign correspondent from 1920 to 1923. The recent discovery of "lost" Hemingway reportage from the *Toronto Star* also indicates that the paper's managing editor found Hemingway wanting in news judgment and overly concerned with "color." Hemingway's own preference was for feature stories rather than "hard" news (Farnsworth; Pieri).

Based on his later writing and public statements on the nature of the writer's craft, it seems reasonable to conclude that the influence of journalistic values -- "compression, precision, clarity" -- on Hemingway's style also carried with it a certain gender import. "Hard" news reporting was (and remains) the stuff of "real" ("true") journalism, which continues to be done largely by men. "Soft" news -- feature stories, human interest pieces, and the like -- were generally reserved for women on the staff. Facts were privileged over impressions, the who/what/where/when over "color." Add to this the lessons of prose rhythm learned from Gertrude Stein -- "She had . . . discovered many truths about rhythms and the

use of words in repetition" (*A Moveable Feast* 17) -- and we have the famous Hemingway sentence: hard-boiled, laconic, sparse; the lean, mean style which served so well in so many of the Nick Adams stories, where the toughness (or the facade of toughness) of the characters and settings are matched by the toughness of the understated, ironic prose -- and "modern understanding . . . is essentially ironic," with its origins located in "the application of mind and memory to the events of the Great War" (Fussell 35). However much Hemingway attempted to write and rewrite Stein's influence on him, when he returned to Paris from Toronto, he was determined to "champion her aesthetics and make her 'proud'" (qtd. in Griffin 63). While Stein once claimed that she was "inclined to believe there is no such thing as repetition," even though journalists "make fun of my writing and of my repetition," she was attempting to convey the idea that her strategic repetitions were more accurately syntactical variations meant to emphasize certain points, for "no matter how often you tell the same story if there is anything alive in the telling the emphasis is different" ("Writings and Lectures" 100). In addition, Hemingway's claim in *A Moveable Feast* that as a young writer in Paris he was "learning very much" from the paintings of Cezanne about "writing simple true sentences" in order that his stories might have the "dimensions" that he was working toward (13), he does not mention (if in fact he knew) that Stein's interest in Cezanne anticipated his own, for Cezanne's *Bathers*, which hung in her studio where she worked,

"influenced the way she wrote *Three Lives*" (1909), inspired by his "planes of color," finding that she could build her characters with "layered sentences that achieved the same effect" as Cezanne's work (Souhami xvi).

For Hemingway the "simple declarative sentence," the visible tip of the iceberg, lies at the core of his identity as a writer. Flowery writing, lush prose, excessive "color," all were antithetical to his early training, which was beyond doubt steeped in the masculinist tradition of daily journalism. "Sexual politics," as Judith Sensibar has it, indeed influenced "the development of modernist aesthetics" (187).

Hemingway often alluded to his desire to write a prose that captures some elusive, mystical "fifth dimension." Joseph Warren Beach correctly interprets this as Hemingway's desire to convey a "sense of greater 'depth' in our experience of life than might be suggested by a mere account in plain words of the outward facts" (235). Such "depth" can be achieved by not disclosing "depth," but rather by suggesting what is silent or omitted; the story, like the iceberg, gains emotional intensity and authenticity of feeling to the degree to which they writer can "omit things that he knows." In the following chapter we shall see, however, that "knowing what you really felt," "what the actually things were which produced the emotion" was not such an easy task.

Chapter 2

War and Remembrance

I proceed for all who are or have
been young men,
To tell the secret of my nights and
days,
To celebrate the need of comrades.
-- Walt Whitman,
"In Paths Untrodden"
(*Leaves of Grass* 112)

. . . male bonding, one man's feeling love for another one in the neighborhood of danger, is often the greatest reward for a character in a story by Ernest Hemingway . . .
-- Kurt Vonnegut,
Fates Worse Than Death (65)

1. Family Matters

The traditional family, initial site of patriarchal authority and heterosexual(-sexist) order, is, through its symbolic appropriation, displaced in *A Farewell to Arms* as a family of brawling men, a kind of brotherhood formed by the homosocial setting of war. But this family is replete with unexpected role reversals and alliances. The family, and with it, Hemingway's deep ambivalence in regard to the oppositional worlds of male and female, can be detected from the opening paragraph of the novel:

In the late summer of that year

> we lived in a house in a village that looked across the river and the plain to the mountains. In the bed of the river there were pebbles and boulders, dry and white in the sun, and the water was clear and swiftly moving and blue in the channels. Troops went by the house and down the road and the dust they raised powdered the leaves of the trees. The trunks of the trees too were dusty and the leaves fell early that year and we saw the troops marching along the road and the dust rising and leaves, stirred by the breeze, falling and the soldiers marching and afterward the road bare and white except for the leaves. (3)

Gerry Brenner, who casts the hero Frederic Henry in the role of a "disoriented and ultimately untrustworthy narrator," finds that "the first sentence alone generates no fewer than seven unanswered questions," questions that include "who the narrator is, where he is, why and what he is doing there, and when these events are taking place" (35-36). The most important question raised in the first sentence is, however, who is the "we"? "We" might easily be taken for a couple or a family on holiday, for the setting described, and the tone

of that description, is elegiac in the extreme. The reader might therefore conclude that the as yet unidentified narrator is recalling a long-ago moment of bliss, a peaceful summer just before the start of the war. That the "we" in question is not that at all, but rather a unit of the Italian army stationed somewhere near the front, is not revealed until the following chapter, three pages later. It is in retrospect, therefore, that the narrating "I" experiences the army as his family, and writes it as such. Estranged from his own relations (304), Frederic associates this makeshift family with the emotional matrix typical of a nurturing home. That he lacks a patronymic indicates that Frederic's link to the father has been severed. His two first names suggest the American myth of the self-made man and underscore the degree to which personal identity is largely a matter of self-invention. 1 As the individual has been broken off from personal tradition, so the war has shattered the coherence of history, and the individual is now, "the sum total of history" (Eksteins 293). The construction of the self by an autonomous subject thus becomes something of a theatrical position, a kind of "stage name" or persona created for the purpose of self-presentation.

It is a virtual necessity, therefore, that Frederic create a battlefield family. And the reader soon discovers that this family takes its meals together, jokes familiarly at the table, enjoys the same diversion (the prostitutes), and even shares the same sensations of the war: "in the dark we

heard the troops marching under the window" (which calls to mind a romantic balcony scene, as the beloved awaits the arrival of her lover). 2 And the two most important members of Frederic's familial construct are the young priest and the surgeon Rinaldi.

The priest functions not as a father figure or spiritual leader, however, but rather as a kindly younger brother to Frederic. When the priest is teased by the other men, especially the captain, for every night playing "'five against one'" (masturbating), Frederic is sympathetic to him, for like the priest, Frederic is both inside and outside the family; as always, the Hemingway Hero stands at the periphery of society. In this case, Frederic is not only an American among Italians, but a more morally conscious man than his fellows. As such, he can identify with the priest and, we might say, feel a part of the priest in himself. This is the self that feels guilty when he goes into town with the other men, the self that experiences an especially intense self-loathing when he returns from leave, wracked with guilt for having squandered his time in drink and fornication. The priest had suggested that Frederic visit his family in Amalfi: "'They will love you like a son'" (8), but Frederic, in spite of the fact that he wanted to go to a place "where it was clear and cold and dry," chose instead "the smoke of cafes and nights when the room whirled." He concludes, in a burst of self-pity, that "we did not do the things we wanted to do; we never did such things" (13).

Rather than having cleansed himself of the "filth" of prostitution and the horrors of war, Frederic chose to abandon himself to further degradation. Unable to discipline his body and resist the temptation of the flesh, his actions, understood within the ideology of Christian manhood, represent a sort of original sin and his leave becomes a kind of private hell. Sin will now follow upon sin, until in the end retribution is exacted in the loss of his faith (in the war and in society at large) and the death of his beloved Catherine. Even now, while the body remains unharmed by the violence of warfare, it has been defiled by sexual congress. Sex (woman) has destroyed the purity and integrity of the spiritual body just as surely as the instruments of war will destroy the wholeness of the physical body.

As the "moral touchstone" of the novel (Donaldson 236), the priest points up Frederic's own moral failings. In representing the priest as a paragon of virtue, the retrospective narrator invites us to regard him as a model in other ways as well. Like Frederic, he is something of an outsider and comes to occupy a middle position between the fighting men and the whoring/ministering women at the front -- the women whose role, as either prostitutes or nurses, is to serve. Frederic himself does not fight, but, as an ambulance driver, ministers to the wounded. An ambulance driver, moreover, stands in the same relation to the soldiers as the priest does to God. The ambulance driver delivers wounded bodies to the surgeon as the priest delivers souls to God, for

each is an intermediary for those (the surgeon, God) who have the power to heal, the power to restore the body or soul to health. Frederic "follows" the soldiers (his "flock") and "serves" them by tending to their wounds. His is a kind of service office to the men who fight. As a battlefield "servant," then, relations of power and class come to mind -- so, too, the image of the homosexual as a feminized man whose sexuality, like a woman's, is conceived of in terms of servicing "real" men. Frederic "cleans up" the killing fields as women clean houses, as Catherine "cleans" Frederic after he is wounded (105), as women at the home front "pick up the pieces" when their husbands, sons, and brothers are killed. The ambulance driver has in many ways more in common with the nurses than with the fighting men, and the "male nurse" is almost always a code for the homosexual (Walt Whitman, gay icon and a virtual transcendental signifier of homosexuality, devoted much of his time to caring for the sick and wounded during the American Civil War). "Real men" kill, but Frederic is a "nurse." 3

Because the priest is held in high regard by the two Frederics -- the one who "performs," or acts in, the narrative, and the one who recalls the events -- we might rightly conclude that his ambiguous sexuality and gender role also deserves to be emulated. As a man of the cloth he is a man who does not sleep with women, a man clothed in perpetual mourning and whose robes, like death itself, are black skirts, a feminine raiment. This intermediary between man and God,

earthly existence and the afterlife, also occupies an uncertain place in regard to sex and sexuality, for like the homosexual, while he may desire, he may not "legitimately" ("morally") act on his erotic impulses. Having already isolated himself from woman and fleshly pursuits, he is at home in the homosocial environment provided by the war. At the same time, however, he is a constant reminder of ambiguous sexuality, which threatens the stability of other men's sexual identities and self-perceptions.

An unknown quantity, the priest suggests to the other members of the "family" their own potentially fluid sexuality and gender. The captain's line that the priest secretly masturbates is not so much a joke on the priest as a gesture (or hidden desire) meant to reassure the captain himself that the priest is like any other man. The captain would doubtless rest easier if the priest *were* to visit prostitutes, for in so doing his sexuality would be fixed, at least in the captain's mind. As it stands, the captain, and some of the other officers as well, experience a double unease: the priest is a man who does not behave like a man, one whose body is male but whose identity is blurred by the skirts of a woman. The unarticulated question then becomes, if one ceases to act like a man (visiting the prostitutes, for example), does one become something else, is one transformed into a feminized or androgynous figure like the priest?

The priest, while symbolic of heterosexual orthodoxy, at the same time represents a challenge to it, owing to his own

sexual marginality and feminine/androgynous signification. The celibate priest, alien to the enactment of erotic desire -- just as the Catholic is himself alien, or an "other" from Hemingway's American Protestant perspective -- the embodiment of a morality which (for its own survival) vehemently denounces sexual relations outside of severely prescribed limits, stands as a constant reminder of the potentialities his priestly function presumes to deny. His attire transgresses gender-role fixity and his chastity (condemned in men, admired in women) suggests his affiliation with women, which in turn raises questions about his own sexual and affectional orientation. In renouncing the pleasures/sins of the body, the priest raises doubts about his own erotic impulses. Is he "passing" for something he is not? Is he hiding? What is the Church, and other all-male institutions (athletics, boys schools, fraternities and clubs, and until recently, the military) promoting or prohibiting in their insistence that women be excluded?

That Frederic sees himself as a friend to the young priest suggests that he, Frederic, is prepared to accept alternative, if not oppositional, sexualities. While the other men are threatened by the nearness of such "perversions," Frederic appears unconcerned: he is perhaps willing to entertain other possibilities in regard to traditional gender and sex classifications.

In time, Frederic, and the other men as well, will be

feminized by the war. When the priest visits Frederic in the hospital, he tells his wounded friend that he feels "'very low.'" Frederic, however, dismisses this by saying that the priest has "'the war disgust'":

> "No. But I hate the war."
>
> "I don't enjoy it," I said. He shook his head and looked out the window.
>
> "You do not mind it. You do not see it. You must forgive me. I know that you are wounded."
>
> "That is an accident."
>
> "Still even you do not see it. I can tell. I do not see it myself but feel it a little." (70)

The unarticulated "it" is the horror and immorality of war, which Frederic does not yet "see" (appreciate, understand), and which the priest himself only "feels" (as a woman "feels" rather than "comprehends" a thing, being, by nature, more "intuitive" and "emotional"). The "it" represents more than the bodily effects of war alone; the two men are also talking about the havoc and chaos wreaked by war, specifically, the destabilization of sociosexual norms it engenders. What the priest "feels" is in part the shifting in the way men relate to one another, of the meaning and validity of gender roles established "at home" and now transferred to the battle front. The priest declares that he better understands the feelings

of his countrymen because he is "'like they are.'" Frederic disagrees:

> "You are different though."
>
> "But really I am like they are."
>
> "The officers don't see anything."
>
> "Some of them do. Some are very delicate and feel worse than any of us." (70)

Even some of the officers, separated by class and often blind to the problems of their men, are already able to see the war for the atrocity that it is, though it remains unclear if that atrocity is killing men or the social order. That "'some'" officers are "'very delicate'" and "'feel worse than any of us'" (though, again, about what exactly?) may suggest the delicacy or somewhat rarified sensibilities of the upper class, from which the officers are drawn. The priest not surprisingly admires the officers for feeling and seeing. He thereby associates himself with the privileged gentry while at the same time positioning the officers and himself (both can "see"/reason and "feel"/intuit) in an androgynous realm where the male/female duality recedes. When the priest departs, Frederic reflects on the Abruzzi where the priest's family lives. Following an "idyllic description" (Reynolds 32) of their uncomplicated way of life, Frederic falls asleep, as he will later fall asleep thinking of Catherine (233).

But in what sense is the priest really like his countrymen? This remains ambiguous, just as the relationship

between Frederic and the priest seems to exist in the space between appreciation and desire (friendship and love): on four occasions in just two pages, Frederic calls our attention not just to the priest's face, but to the fetishizing act of gazing at the priest's face (69-71). And once the conversation turns to the love of God and the love of woman, one cannot help but feel that the real subject of their conversation is their love for each other. Their conversation as a whole suggests a growing eroticism which is amplified in their final meeting.

Not long before Frederic deserts, the priest reports that their major is now "'gentle.'" Frederic, having been "'beaten,'" confides that he feels the same way himself. Looking back upon his last seeing the priest, the narrating Frederic (re)experiences their rendezvous in erotic and romantic terms:

> I went to the door and looked out. It had stopped raining but there was a mist.
>
> "Should we go upstairs?" I asked the priest.
>
> "I can only stay a little while."
>
> "Come on up." (77)

Like a seduction scene or an immediate prelude to love-making (Catherine is herself associated with rain and mist), Frederic here plays the role of aggressor while the priest demures ("'I

can only stay a little while'"). Of course the action played out "upstairs" is not a love scene, but its displacement in Frederic's conviction that the war has its own spiritual significance: "'It is in defeat that we become Christian'" (178). Christianity and defeat are thereby elided together and, united, collapse into the notion that being beaten effects gentility. The symbolic laying down of arms, like the retreat from Caporetto, signals, if not a defeat, than at least a willing withdrawal. Such withdrawal of the male military apparatus from the field of battle, as from the body of another, is constructed as a symbolic retreat from the mother (motherland, mother earth). Gentility, then, becomes virtually synonymous with man's feminization. The weak surrender to the strong, as on the sexual front the woman surrenders to the man, and by surrendering becomes demasculinized -- castrated not by an outside force, but by an inner *faiblesse*. In defeat, man becomes his opposite. 4

The war, in short, feminizes man, and his feminization, in turn, transforms him into a truly Christian being. Hemingway, rather unexpectedly and perhaps unknowingly, has suggested the way in which war turns newly masculinized boys into feminized men, or sissies. Frederic now feels free to lie upon Rinaldi's bed so that the priest may take his (Frederic's) cot. Like so much in this novel marked by narratological slippage and concealment, the meaning behind such an action is difficult to apprehend. Is it that Frederic wishes that the priest remain untainted by Rinaldi's many

sins? Could it be that Frederic wishes in some way to associate himself with Rinaldi? Does he wish that the priest "marry" or bless his union with Rinaldi? Even the narrating Frederic is covert about this meaning, but that his going to Rinaldi's bed has significance is clear: it recalls the role reversal enacted by Frederic and Catherine later in the novel, and it is underscored several pages later when Frederic returns to Rinaldi's bed in order to sleep, though his own cot is now unoccupied (191).

2. Buddy, Brother, Lover

What Claire Tylee calls "the erotic myth of the fellowship of warriors" (13), which carries with it the hint of incest (for the men at the front are Frederic's family, his brothers), is most evident in Frederic's relationship with Rinaldi. As a man of science, the surgeon Rinaldi represents "reason against emotion" (Wylder 83). And while it is true that Rinaldi recognizes that the war has turned the body into a machine, with sex itself having been mechanized so that syphilis is referred to as an "'industrial accident'" (175), Rinaldi more importantly stands in opposition to the priest as symbolic of the profane side of Frederic's nature. Profane, but also the part of him that directly engages the world, that participates in its joys and miseries.

The priest is something of an innocent, and so in his relationship with Frederic, it is Frederic who plays the role of an older brother, a father, or the aggressor. Rinaldi, on

the other hand, knows the physical world (both as an experienced fornicator and competent surgeon) and is intimate with the body in life, exposed and in pain, and in death. It might appear, therefore, that Rinaldi functions as a kind of father or older brother to Frederic, and this is in part the case. At the same time, however, Frederic does not seem to regard Rinaldi as a role model of any sort; he does not look up to him or wish to emulate him in the manner of father/son or mentor/protege. What Frederic responds to in Rinaldi is instead those traits which more closely resemble female -- or, more specifically, maternal -- qualities.

Like Catherine and the other nurses (those who are presented in a positive light), Rinaldi looks after Frederic. He calls him a "baby" and a "good boy." He dotes on him and makes him the object of his affections, lavishing kisses and all manner of tenderness on him. The erotic nature of Rinaldi's love for Frederic is so open that it may be that his strategy is to hide in plain sight. On the other hand, it must be remembered that it is the narrating Frederic who is absorbed with this aspect of their relationship. In this sense, it is Frederic who objectifies the other man. The theme of concealment -- what is the narrator attempting to hide in his past, and yet cannot resist hinting at? -- and the full extent of the homoeroticism at the heart of the Frederic/Rinaldi relationship is revealed in the curious incidents of chapter 10.

When Rinaldi visits Frederic in the field hospital, he

quickly tells the wounded man how "'moved'" he is to see him hurt, how "'proud'" everyone is of him, how "'brave and quiet'" and "'modest'" he is. Rinaldi speaks in a mother's voice, but suddenly "mans" himself again by toasting Frederic's "'valorous wounds.'" Something about Frederic's wounds, the body opened in violent penetration, combined with the maternal sympathies aroused by seeing him laid up, induces Rinaldi to ask, "'when you lie here all the time in the hot weather don't you get excited?'" Frederic replies that he does, "'sometimes,'" but does not say at what times (or if one such time is now). Rinaldi wishes he were back:

> "No one to come in at night from adventures. No one to make fun of. No one to lend me money. No blood brother and roommate. Why did you get yourself wounded?" (64-65)

In this passage the movement is from affection (Rinaldi's feelings for Frederic) to desire (Rinaldi's interest in his body, his wounds, and whether he gets excited) to anger (Frederic deliberately got himself wounded, perhaps to effect a separation from Rinaldi), so that what begins in romantic abstraction ends with the tangible body and a sense of competition. 5

In his absence, Frederic suggests that for diversion Rinaldi "'make fun of the priest,'" which strikes one as a sort of betrayal (or perhaps a deliberate distancing in service of concealment) on Frederic's part, as though he has

thrown over one lover for another. Rinaldi, however, surprisingly expresses his respect for the priest. Frederic backtracks:

> "I like him."
>
> "Oh, I knew it. Sometimes I think you and he are a little that way. You know."
>
> "No, you don't"
>
> "Yes, I do sometimes. A little that way like the number of the first regiment of the Brigato Ancona."
>
> "Oh, go to hell."
>
> He stood up and put on his gloves.
>
> "Oh I love to tease you, baby. With your priest and your English girl, and really you are just like me underneath."
>
> "No, I'm not." (65-66)

Just as the priest's identity is disputed, so there is now some question as to who Frederic is. The three important male figures in the novel, with the God-like presence of the narrating "I" hovering about, engage in a continuing dynamic of identification and definition. Each attempts to assign another a space that he denies. The priest protests when Frederic says he is different from his countrymen just as Frederic denies that "underneath" he is "just like" Rinaldi.

What is important here is not so much the thing denied,

but the act of denial. In the instances cited, neither the priest nor Frederic wish to be identified with other men; they desire to stand alone, singular and detached, a stable and subjective self unaffiliated with others and so not bound by the laws of others. The passage quoted immediately above, however, reveals that total independent agency does not exist, that, as Hemingway would learn, "no man is an island" capable of finding his way alone. Having no acceptable model for same-sex intimacy, their erotic impulses are displaced by a kind of fraternity house rivalry, the guarded yet barbed, erotically-charged exchange between two "brothers" who want each other, if only *he* would make the first move. Unlike the homoeroticism found in English war poetry -- the work of Wilfred Owen or Seigfried Sassoon, for example -- which relies on class-based power relations for its pattern, the American had no such direct experience of a hardened and pervasive class-system which could serve to refract the intensity of homoerotic desire. The American had only the locker room to fall back upon. 6

In some ways Rinaldi has, rather indirectly, made the first move. He not only steers the conversation to the topic of sex and homosexuality, but also shows himself to be rather neutral on the subject of homoeroticism: when Frederic denies Rinaldi's assertion that he thinks Frederic might be "'that way'" -- and it is telling that Frederic rejects Rinaldi's claim, not its validity -- Rinaldi conradicts him. He insists that yes, he does in fact sometimes think Frederic

is a "'little'" homosexual; he passes directly over it, however. The possibility, even if he doesn't actually believe it, seems not in any way to unnerve him.

Rinadli teases Frederic about "'your priest and your English girl,'" the two people he knows Frederic to be closest to, and the pair who least resembles himself, for one is a man of God and the other he describes as an "'English goddess.'" Rinaldi then claims that Frederic is "'just like'" himself, which, as we have seen, Frederic denies. Presumably Rinaldi means that he is like an Italian, "'fire and smoke and nothing inside,'" and it is true that Frederic repeatedly claims to feel hollow and empty. At the same time, however, Frederic's denial of being like Rinaldi seems to relate to Rinaldi's veiled desire for him. After Rinaldi examines Frederic's "'poor head,'" he concludes that although it is unharmed, his physician was a "'hog butcher.'" He then goes on to say that

> "I would take you and never hurt you. I never hurt anybody. I learn how to do it. Every day I learn how to do things smoother and better." (64)

The surgeon and the lover resemble each other in that both work the body. The above passage is then recalled when Rinaldi divides the female into two types:

> "There is only one difference between taking a girl who has always been good and a woman. With a girl

> it is painful. That's all I know." He slapped the bed with his glove. "And you never know if the girl will really like it." (66)

While Rinaldi twice asserts that he and Frederic are brothers, and twice that they love each other -- indeed, Rinaldi loves Frederic "'too much'" (67) -- they are clearly more than brothers. Frederic, Rinaldi's "'baby,'" who is also like Rinaldi, is likewise the girl "'who has always been good.'" Although it might prove painful, Rinaldi would never hurt Frederic. The full extent of Frederic's own androgynous nature now becomes clear: as manhood is achieved through the pain of battle, so womanhood is attained through the pain of childbirth and her "fall" through sexual intercourse. Frederic's rites of passage are, Rinaldi (and the narrating "I") suggests, two-fold: the wound he has suffered and the wound he should suffer -- spear/weapon is to wound as phallus is to vulva/anus. 7

Curiously absent from Frederic's all-male family is the patriarch himself. With the exception of Count Greffi, whose courtly manners stand in sharp relief to the crude mechanized age, no man among all these warring men can fulfill Frederic's need for paternal authority. The Count, in his old age, and perhaps because of it, believes in the strength of youth and the transformative power of love where Frederic does not. Italy, the Count says, will win the war because it is "'a

younger nation'" than its opponents; and love, he reminds Frederic, "'is a religious feeling'" (262-63). Love, and not sex, is the vehicle for transcendence, a transcendence which neither requires that sex reveal some hidden, "true" self nor depends upon (Christian) defeat for its actualization.

But the Count plays a limited role in the novel and is sentimentalized to the point of unbelieveability. One would rather expect to find the missing father in the figure of Rinaldi, because of his worldly experience, or the priest, owing to his station. Innocence and youth disqualify the priest, however, while Rinaldi is an unsuitable father because of the latent eroticism he inspires in Frederic: Frederic cannot permit himself to be attracted to a man, especially one who is older and more experienced than himself. As a reaction to this disturbing desire, Frederic elects not to reject Rinaldi, but instead to associate him with the mother. The retrospective narrator, in accounting for his homoerotic impulses, conceals Rinaldi's gender by inscribing maternal characteristics to it.

Frederic's family has no need of a father -- the monstrous mother has displaced/devoured him. Viewed from another perspective, however, we might say that Hemingway has cannibalized the father, for as David Bergman suggests about ostensibly gay writers, "the trope of homosexual cannibalism becomes a way to work through his desire for communion with other men" (149). In any case, by subsuming the authority of the father in the male body itself, Rinaldi achieves the

limited authority of the matriarch. The mother, therefore, comes to occupy the space normally reserved for the patriarch, and so Rinaldi is seen caring for, and about, the wounded before he sends them out once again to defend the sacred land, the body of himself, the mother. In the end, of course, such power inevitably reverts once again to the father, for the mother, in the image of Catherine, dies into the son. Society is renormalized so that the opportunity for homoerotic urges are contained and channeled back to the female, who assumes her proper place as mother, just as the men distance themselves from one another and resume command of the family and society.

The point is that while "the homosocial is the realm identified with the father, the realm of power" (Gallop 38), the homosocial is not where that power is most overtly exercised. The homosocial is the space where power is consolidated; it is exercised outside that closed realm where the father is sovereign. Power is wielded against those not part of the homosocial order, which is to say, women and openly gay men as well, in so far as they decline to participate in their own subjugation and to the extent they choose to renounce the automatic privilege conferred upon them by virtue of gender. At the same time, it should be remembered that the homosocial also contains the seeds of its own destruction, for it promotes the destabilizing element of homoerotic "perversion." As we have seen, it is nearness (in this case, the homosexual) rather than the opposite (woman)

which presents the greatest threat to any normalized social construction. Because "desire for the father equals castration, humiliation" (Gallop 38), the narrating Frederic imagines Rinaldi as a mother, thus avoiding the "humiliation" bred of his homoerotic desire. The priest, on the other hand, may be more easily dismissed as a destabilizing figure, for he has been created in the image of the patriarchy itself.

3. Dressed to Kill

Returning once again to chapter 10 of *A Farewell to Arms*, we find that the conversation between the bedridden Frederic and Rinaldi centers not so much around the war as the effects of the war on the body and spirit. What we have not yet addressed is Frederic's preoccupation with Rinaldi's gloves. He cannot take his eyes off them. But in keeping with the rest of the narrative, no explanation is offered as to the source of his fascination:

> I saw he wore gloves. (63)
>
> He took off his gloves. (63)
>
> He slapped his gloves on the edge of the bed. (64)
>
> He stood up and put on his gloves. (66)
>
> He slapped the bed with his glove. (66)

I read the gloves as a sign of Rinaldi's feminization by the war, as well as the momentary return of the father as disciplinarian, the war as (fashion) show whose participants dress up (model) in military drag. Within the homosocial order of war, gender reversal is being "rehearsed" before being taken to the larger stage of the society. It is the war as pageant, as performance, as spectacle, as carnival.

When Rinaldi twice slaps the bed, a number of violent associations come to mind: a challenge to duel, a military threat, sadomasochistic sex, a warning from the father that he has the power to inflict pain on the son in the form of a spanking; the "progress" of the gloves also faintly mirrors undressing for sex and sex itself, for they are sheathed, unsheathed, and then "used" (to "slap" the bed). 8 At the same time, the gloves represent Rinaldi's military rank, which to his mind allows him access to the privileged upper class. The gloves, therefore, also stand as a sign of "delicacy" in both sexes, a reminder of the *fin de siecle* dandy, the flamboyant hetero/homosexual. In Britain, during the postwar period, for instance, "the patriarchy tolerated elite homosexuals because they did not threaten the family" (Marcus, "Sapphistry" 178).

The "class-based humiliation" (Gallop 38) to which lower-class men in same-sex relations were subject both echoes the Greek mentor/student paradigm of cross-generational homosexual sex while further reinforcing power relations between the upper and lower classes. Rinaldi's presumption to high rank

places him among the "elite homosexuals," Hemingway's "mincing gentry" whose homoerotic desire can be subsumed by class prerogative. His affectation of gentility therefore represents a presumptive strike against "charges" of homosexuality by cloaking them in the mantle of power relations. As a feminine affectation in which the feminine elides with upper-class status, Frederic is once again able to displace homoerotic desire by conceiving of Rinaldi as a feminized man, and so not really a man.

Hands, whether naked or concealed (gloved), are, moreover, associated with the sense of touch. And touch suggests autoeroticism ("touching oneself"), sentimentality ("touching"), and excessive sensitivity ("touchy"), with sentimentality and sensitivity constructed as characteristically female and/or homosexual (the neurasthenic male of nineteenth-century discourse). Just as one is "touched" with madness, so homosexuality is a sin or chronic malady of the diseased mind.

Hands are also that part of the body which "know" other bodies. They explore, in sex and in surgery, places both seen and unseen. The gloves are a sign of such intimate knowledge, and a sign, Lawrence Lipking reminds us (albeit in a different context), "originally derive[s] from medical symptoms" (the "love sick," for instance), and as such are related to "external manifestations of something that cannot be viewed directly" (60). Gloves of all types also provide protection from the outside world of nature and the interior world of the

body (a surgeon's gloves), for both can be menacing places, rife with hurt and infection. The power of the hand to inflict pain or pleasure -- here, the gloved phallus (glove = condom) -- assumes a double signification, as Frederic, both ill and "love sick," is able to protect himself from both viral/bacterial infection as well as homosexual "contamination" by focusing his erotic energies on the gloves themselves rather than the hands they cover. Although the gloves will later be stripped off to reveal Rinaldi's "fine surgeon's hands" (166), the narrating Frederic will continue to deny the performing Frederic the recondite knowledge of the gloves, presuming, of course, that he (the elder Frederic) has come to apprehend their significance.

As desire urges the body toward sensual contact, so war prepares the body for assault: the body "now exposed, tense, expectant, awaiting direct violence upon it" (Eksteins 141). The body, exalted in sexual intimacy, also assumes a central importance in war, where it becomes fatigued, frightened, injured, maimed, and potentially destroyed. Not by war alone, but also by those who act in response to the effect of war. As Frederic claims, "Doctors did things to you and then it was not your body any more" (231). Frederic might just as well say that the war did things to you and then it was not your gender/desire/sexuality any more. Fear of doctors and anxieties about what they do become even more pronounced in Hemingway's early short stories, where more strictly generic doctors are particularized in Nick Adams's father, a doctor

like Hemingway's own father.

Chapter 3

The Perils of Paternity

Thirty years ago, Leslie Fiedler understood that Hemingway "aspires to be not Father but 'Papa,' the Old Man of the girl-child with whom he is temporarily sleeping; and surely there is no writer to whom childbirth more customarily presents itself as the essential catastrophe," which results in Hemingway's rejection of "maturity and fatherhood" (317). In respect to "Indian Camp" and *A Farewell to Arms*, though the same can be said for other works as well, Mark Spilka has written that "these male characters are so deeply into maternal sufferings as to define their lives by them -- and quite possibly their deaths" (195). Institutional paternity seems to be the sole way to avoid maternal sufferings and the fate of women, which is almost always in Hemingway an untimely death. And Comley and Scholes have argued that, "A number of his finest early stories have a male protagonist -- a proto-Papa -- who resists fatherhood in one way or another" (13), and go on to write that "Papa, it seems, was always in flight from fatherhood because fatherhood was death" (17). The central problem faced by many of Hemingway's male characters is neatly defined by Comley and Scholes as "how to attain maturity without paternity. They [his characters] ask how one

can cease to be a boy and become a man without becoming a father like one's own father," which is, I might add, one of the reasons our culture denounces the male homosexual -- he is viewed as an irresponsible manchild, a perpetual adolescent who refuses to take up the responsibilities of fatherhood and so never really reaches full maturity. This often seems precisely the goal of Hemingway's men; that is, the search for "a position between childhood and fatherhood" (Comley 19-20).

Paternity in Hemingway takes two forms: those characters who really are fathers, and those who masquerade as fathers by "adopting" children who then become eroticised by the papa in question. In this chapter I examine the anxieties surrounding "real" father/son relationships in Hemingway, where paternity is figured as loss, and where the father often betrays the son even as he strives to introduce him into the realities of life and death. One peril of paternity is, then, the loss of the self, for the son is figured as "taking" something from the father in the process of maturing; another is the betrayal of the son by the father's inability or unwillingness to disclose the recondite knowledge of the adult world to him. In the following chapter I will turn to "adopted" sons and daughters in the Hemingway canon, where the line between intimacy and eroticism becomes so blurred as to nearly efface the distinction. For now, however, I would like to focus on "real" fathers and sons, which first requires a word about the maternal figure in Hemingway.

1. Nick and Dr. Adams

The reader is prepared for the image of maternity presented in "Indian Camp" by the brief story, "On the Quai at Smyrna," which precedes it in *In Our Time* and comments upon it by linking the screams of the Indian woman in labor to the screams of women in war. In this story, the third-person narrator reports that the women on shore "scream every night at midnight," and a comrade tells him that "the worst . . . were the women with dead babies. You couldn't get the women to give up their dead babies. They'd have been dead for six days. Wouldn't give them up. Nothing you could do about it. Had to take them away finally" (*IOT* 9-10). Jean Elshtain has discerned the analogy between the fear aroused by a wartime bombardment and that of childbirth. In the *entr'acte* fragment that precedes "Soldier's Home" in *In Our Time*, the solider "pleads" like a woman in childbirth and then, between each bombing, as between each contraction, falls silent again (Elshtain 222). The sensations of pleasure/pain and the experience of sex/near-death are similarly parallel experiences. Here, for example, is the description of Frederic Henry wounded by a mortar shell:

> . . . then there was a flash, as when a blast-furnace door is swung open, and a roar that started white and went red and on and on in a rushing wind. I tried to breathe but my breath would not come and I

> felt myself rush bodily out and all the time bodily in the wind. I went out swiftly, all of myself, and I knew I was dead and that it had all been a mistake to think you just died. Then I floated, and instead of going on I felt myself slide back. (54)

Now compare the sensation produced by the trench mortar with this description of Robert Jordan and Maria making love in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*:

> For him it was a dark passage which led nowhere, once again to nowhere, always and forever to nowhere, hung on all time always to unknowing nowhere, this time and again for always to nowhere, now not to be borne up once again always and to nowhere, now beyond all bearing up, up, up and into nowhere, suddenly, scaldingly, holding all nowhere gone and time absolutely still and they were both there, time having stopped and he felt the earth move out and away from under them. (159)

Perhaps the three most intense physical experiences -- sex, labor, and direct physical assault -- actually transcend the

body, with each moving the self "bodily out" of the self and "stopping" time -- climax and death leave the physical behind and transcend time. Melvin Backman also points out that, "The feeling of soaring suggests a mystic ascension and recalls the soaring of the airplane in 'The Snows of Kilimanjaro' that symbolizes death," and goes on to quite rightly conclude that "this twinning of sex and death, both fundamental crises of life . . . is central to Hemingway's work . . . . [and are both] basic primitive experiences in which the male asserts his will and proves his manhood" (249). This is the "maternal suffering" that Nick and his father will face in "Indian Camp," where Dr. Adams does not literally "take away" the Indian woman's baby, but where the imposition of Western science represents a cultural appropriation of progeny that so shames the father that he commits suicide.

"Indian Camp" and the following story in *In Our Time*, "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife," may in fact be read as companion pieces that initiate young Nick Adams into a world of pain, betrayal, and death; and they portray scenes that for young Nick can only make him want to distance himself from women. The action of both "Indian Camp" and "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife" center on Nick's father, though the events are seen through Nick's eyes. So that while both narratives focus on the actions of Dr. Adams, the stories are about Nick, whose passage from innocence into knowledge is intimately connected to what he experiences with, and through, his father.

Two triangular arrangments dominate "Indian Camp": Nick, Dr. Adams, and Nick's uncle; and the Indian woman about to give birth, her husband, and their unborn child. The white medicine man, Dr. Adams, is summoned by the Indians to assist in the delivery of a difficult birth: "she had been trying to have her baby for two days" (*IOT* 16). The two cultures -- one "modern" and white, the other "primitive" and dark -- are separated, with the Indians confined to a "camp." Within the Indian camp itself the genders are likewise discrete; while the women attempts to give birth, the men "sit in the dark and smoke out of range of the noise she made" (*IOT* 16). They smoke the cigars Nick's Uncle George has given them, a Western symbol of manhood and successful fatherhood, but also "a remnant of Indian rituals," which Joseph M. Flora reads as reinforcing the "sense of the white man's arrival into the Indian world" (24). The woman's husband, lying in the bunk above hers, is, however, "smoking a pipe," suggesting his bond to Indian culture. We are also told that the husband "had cut his foot very badly with an ax three days before" (16). While visible wounds in Hemingway often serve as "an index of toughness" (Strychacz 251), I see this particular wound as symbolic of his "unmanning." While a pipe may be as phallic as a cigar, it sets him apart from the other men, and the accident with the ax points to his self-castration. That the accident occured "three days before" the story opens invites us to consider the scene in the context of Christian death and resurrection: the husband is "cut" (pierced), kills himself,

and is then "reborn" in the person of his infant child; his "opening," like his wife's, brings forth progeny. Dr. Adams then explains to Nick that the woman is going through labor: "'All her muscles are trying to get the baby born'" (*IOT* 17). The "labor" her husband experiences has nothing to do with "muscles," however. His is a spiritual "labor," and so it is the woman who is affiliated with the masculine ideals of "labor" and "muscles." Her agony is of the body, her husband's of the heart.

Nick pleads with his father to "'give her something to make her stop screaming,'" but for the steely man of science, "'her screams are not important. I don't hear them because they are not important'" (*IOT* 17). But that is all her husband does hear. Immediately after Nick finds that his father cannot, or will not, stop her screams, "The husband in the upper bunk rolled over against the wall" (*IOT* 17). This gesture of looking away from harsh reality -- in "The Killers," Ole also looks at the wall just before his implied assassination (*MWW* 93) -- further emasculates the husband and aligns him with his wife, whose head was also "turned to one side" (*IOT* 16), virtually the same phrase Hemingway uses in *The Sun Also Rises* to describe the way a gay man dances; that is, "his head on one side" (20).

As the doctor prepares to operate on the woman, "Nick watched his father's hands scrubbing each other with soap" (*IOT* 18), which recalls Frederic's obsession with the surgeon Rinaldi's gloves and hands (see chapter 2), as well as

Frederic's line that "doctors did things to you and then it was not your body anymore" (231). Like Frederic, a "nurse," Nick is called an "interne" by his father; and like the husband, Nick, too, "was looking away" during the operation. This is repeated four lines later: "Nick didn't look at it [the incision]" (*IOT* 19). When Nick's father prepares to "sew up the incision," he tells Nick that he can watch or not, "'just as you like.'" Nick chooses not to watch, for his "curiosity had been gone for a long time" (*IOT* 19). It is not entirely clear what he had been so curious about or precisely what has caused him to lose his curiosity, but it is reasonable to conclude that the bloody violence of the scene has proved too much for him. Nick therefore occupies a "middle condition" in respect to his burgeoning manhood: he watches more than the feminized husband, but less than his father, a man of cold, hard science for whom emotions (the woman's screams) are "not important." The Indians's cabin has been transformed into an operating room (which is itself often called a "theatre") and, as Thomas Strychacz points out, "functions as a ceremonial space in which particular rules of conduct govern violent action" (249). It is in fact a "ceremonial space" like the bullring or battlefield, where the performance of masculinity is enacted (the importance of such specularity in Hemingway will be discussed at greater length in chapter 5). When Dr. Adams finishes the caesarian, he "stood up," and then "Uncle George and the three Indian men stood up." Nick, however, "put the basin out in the kitchen"

(*IOT* 19). The "real" men become erect after their perceived triumph -- Dr. Adams himself feels "exalted and talkative as football players are in the dressing room after the game," thus underscoring the performative/specular -- but Nick, in an intermediary stage of manhood, cleans-up like an "interne" or nurse.

Nick's father then brags that his operation is "'one for the medical journal . . . . Doing a Caesarian with a jack-knife and sewing it up with nine-foot, tapered gut leaders'" (*IOT* 19), which points to his superior knowledge (Western medicine taught him how to perform such a procedure) and skill (he can operate with primitive equipment). Nick's Uncle George, however, undermines the doctor with the ironic comment that, "'Oh, you're a great man, all right'" (*IOT* 20), which is underscored five lines later when Dr. Adams discovers that the husband has killed himself:

> He [Dr. Adams] pulled back the blanket from the Indian's head. His hand came away wet. He mounted on the edge of the lower bunk with the lamp in one hand and looked in. The Indian lay with his face toward the wall. His throat had been cut from ear to ear. The blood flowed down into a pool where his body sagged the bunk. His head rested on his left arm. The open razor lay, edge

up, in the blankets. (*IOT* 20)

This scene deftly aligns images of birth and death, while also pointing to the double signification of masculine power, the knife (or scalpel) as phallus. Again, the hand of the doctor, the hand which can both cure and kill, is emphasized along with the Indian's posture (he has turned away not only from the realities of life and death, but from his paternal responsibilities as well). The blanket that Dr. Adams pulls back suggests not only the shroud of death, but also the sheet which covers lovers and the patient on the operating table. The doctor's hand that "came away wet" from the deathly pool of blood is the same hand that had earlier "come away" from the life-giving blood of the womb (the Indian's throat, "cut from ear to ear" also suggests a womb; so, too, the term "flowed"). The image of the doctor "mounting" the bunk also calls to mind the sex act, with the "real" man "mounted" on top of the feminized man. His body makes the bunk sag, so that seen from the right angle (from the mother's position below, for example), the bed is "pregnant" with the dead father. Just as Dr. Adams had assisted her in childbirth by cutting open her belly, so the husband, by making a similar incision in himself, has delivered himself to death. All of this points to the razor's edge that separates the life/death border, a frontier which may be more easily crossed than that between masculine/feminine, for the "real" men -- Dr. Adams, Uncle George, and the Indians who smoke the cigars -- are never affiliated with the feminized man, the dead father.

As they leave the Indian camp, Nick asks his own father if "'ladies always have such a hard time having babies.'" Dr. Adams replies no, that this delivery was "'very, very exceptional'" (both unusual and a brilliant performance by the doctor). Asked why her husband killed himself, Dr. Adams answers, "'I don't know, Nick. He couldn't stand things, I guess,'" though he does not offer, and Nick does not pursue, what those "things" might have been. Nick then wants to know if "'many men'" or "'many women'" kill themselves (Nick already knows how important a distinction gender is; he does not simply ask if many people kill themselves). His father reassures him by saying "'not very many'" men, and "'hardly ever'" any women. Nick then wonders if dying is "hard." His father replies, "'No, I think it's pretty easy, Nick. It all depends.'" He does not say why death is "pretty easy," or on what its ease of difficulty "depends." As they row away from the camp toward home, Nick observes signs of life: "The sun was coming up over the hills. The bass jumped, making a circle in the water," perhaps the circle of life and death, as the bass move from their life-sustaining element into the air and back again, just as the sun also rises. Hemingway concludes the story by writing that

> Nick trailed his hand in the water. It felt warm in the sharp chill of the morning.
>
> In the early morning on the lake sitting in the stern of the

> boat with his father rowing, he felt
> quite sure that he would never die.
> (*IOT* 21)

Nick's hand is in the literally life-sustaining water, which in metaphorical terms is also the earth/womb. His hand is warm in the "body" of the earth, as his father's hand must have been warm in the blood of both the mother and father. The warmth provided by the water out of which we come is juxtaposed to the "sharp chill" of the air, not unlike the "sharp chill" of a knife, as well as the "chilling" experience Nick has just gone through. What Nick has learned from this experience, whether the symbiotic relationship of life and death, and the violence inherent in both, has been revealed to him remains ambiguous. He continues to feel safe in company of his father and is "quite sure that he would never die." If this is what he has taken away from the Indian camp, his initiation into manhood has failed, for in having looked away from reality, Nick shows that he remains in need of paternal protection.

In "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife," the patriarch is directly threatened by his wife. Nick is largely a bystander to the action of this story, for, as the title implies, it centers on the relationship between his parents, who are viewed more in relation to each other than to Nick. The narrative point of view is curious here as well because Nick is not said to be present during much of the action, and yet, as the first line makes clear, the story is being told from

his perspective: "Dick Boulton came from the Indian camp to cut up logs for Nick's father" (*IOT* 25). When the action shifts inside to the Adams home, however, "Nick's father" becomes "the doctor," "her husband," or "Harry." Just as "Indian Camp" juxtaposes the white world and the world of the Indian camp, so "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife" contrasts the realm of nature, the outdoors, with the domestic sphere, or the indoor world where the doctor's wife is sovereign. Nick lives in both worlds, but nowhere reacts or reflects upon the events which take place in either space. The reader must therefore articulate the silences which inform and enable the story by assuming Nick's subject position. In so doing, Nick's feelings toward his parents may be inferred, for while the story is told by an omniscient narrator, one senses that an older Nick Adams has selected and constructed its details in order to reveal the effects of his parents and their troubled relationship on him. In this sense, we have a narratological split similar to, though less pronounced than, that of *A Farewell to Arms*: the performing, or participatory, Nick of the story itself is a spectator to the central action, while the restrospective Nick comments on the action through the presentation of the material rather than through overt comments on it.

The story pivots on the logs that "had been lost from the big log booms that were towed down the lake to the mill by the steamer Magic" (*IOT* 25) and which have come to shore on the Adams property. The question is whether Dr. Adams has stolen

these logs, as the Ojibway Indian Dick Boulton claims. Just as the Ojibway of "Indian Camp" call upon Dr. Adams for his superior medical knowledge, so in this story Dr. Adams calls upon the Indians for their superior physical strength; they labor on his behalf, charged with the task of cutting and then splitting the logs "to make cord wood and chunks for the open fireplace" (*IOT* 26). Dr. Adams is therefore "civilizing" or "domesticating" nature for his own ends, just as Mrs. Adams attempts to "civilize" or "domesticate" him through religion. The home becomes a site of surveillance, just as it is in "Soldier's Home" (to be discussed in the following chapter). That Dr. Adams actually steals the logs -- he claims they are "driftwood" (*IOT* 26) -- points to a moral violation not unconnected to his failings as a man. This split between what the doctor appears to be (a man in charge of the logs he owns) and what he really is (a man who, through deceptive means, appropriates the logs) is underscored in the person of Dick Boulton, a "half-breed" many in the area believed "was really a white man" (*IOT* 26).

During the opening pages of the story, which take place at the beach itself, a constellation of images undermine the doctor's manhood and call into question his masculinity. One of the Ojibway, first of all, hangs his saw "by one of its handles in the crotch of a tree" (*IOT* 26), suggesting that the saw (not unlike a doctor's scalpel) will emasculate the tree. When the Indians begin the actual work, they remove the logs one by one from the sand and roll them into the water. "'Put

it right in,'" Dick Boulton shouts in reference to the first log, '"I want to see who it belongs to'" (*IOT* 27). When it is discovered that "the mark of the scaler's hammer in the wood at the end of the log" belongs to White and McNally, Dr. Adams becomes "very uncomfortable" (*IOT* 27). The doctor therefore has no logs; he appropriates the logs of others in order to provide for his family's warmth. Exposed as a fraud, Dr. Adams still refuses to come clean and own up to his theft, even though Dick tells him, '"You know they're stolen as well as I do. It don't make any difference to me.'" Angered by the truth, Dr. Adams declares that, "'If you think the logs are stolen, take your stuff and get out,'" threatening that he will knock Dick's teeth down his throat if Dick continues to refer to him as "Doc." This only leads to his further humiliation, however; Dick replies, "'Oh, no, you won't, Doc,'" which leaves Dr. Adams to "chew the beard on his lower lip" -- effacing a presumed sign of masculinity -- before making a hasty retreat "up the hill to the cottage" (*IOT* 27-28). Dr. Adams's theft of the logs is, moreover, a commentary on the larger theme of the founding of America, for the logs, like much of the American continent itself, was stolen from the native Indians. Even if Dr. Adams is the "first man," as his name suggests, the trees belong not to the white "father" of Western culture, but to the land; and subjugating the land to his own purposes requires that he subbordinate the claims of other people and cultures as well. In this sense, the story asks who owns the land, and who is the primary or "first

man" of the nation, the white westerner or the native of color? Like "Indian Camp," "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife" addresses itself to the more global issue of cultural paternity, for it questions who can rightly identify himself as the "father" of America, the transplanted European or the indigenous American.

Once Dr. Adams arrives home, he is shamed all the more by his wife, which leads to further deception. Asked why he has returned so soon, Dr. Adams confesses to having had a "'row with Dick Boulton.'" Mrs. Adams replies by saying, '"I hope you didn't lose your temper, Harry,'" before hitting him with the Biblical bromide, "'he who ruleth his spirit is greater than he that taketh a city'" (*IOT* 29). The irony here is two-fold: (1) she fails to realize that his temper, which in fact he did lose, effects nothing, because he cannot back it up with action; and (2) his "spirit" is ruled more by her than by himself, for he is more preoccupied with taking a city (in the form of the raw material which builds one) than his spiritual condition. Mrs. Adams, a Christian Scientist, keeps her *Bible* and copies of *Science and Health* and the *Quarterly* "on a table beside her bed in the darkened room," while the doctor's "pile of medical journals on the floor by the bureau" in his bedroom "were still in their wrappers unopened. It irritated him" (*IOT* 29). Mrs. Adams, then, has easy access to her spiritual life, while Dr. Adams is estranged even from his secular life of modern science and medicine. Her belief in Christian Science doctrine, moreover, aligns her with Indian "medicine

men," who also see limited value in, and have little use for, Western science and medicine.

The doctor then turns to his shotgun: "He was sitting on his bed now, cleaning a shotgun. He pushed the magazine full of the heavy yellow shells and pumped them out again. They were scattered on the bed" (*IOT* 29). His wife continues to nag him about "the trouble" at the shore, imploring him not to "'try to keep anything from me.'" In order to silence her, Dr. Adams invents a story about Dick owing him money for "'pulling his squaw through pneumonia,'" suggesting that he "'wanted a row so he wouldn't have to take it out in work'" (*IOT* 30). This seems to satisfy his wife, and so he continues playing with his gun: "The doctor wiped his gun carefully with a rag. He pushed the shells back in against the spring of the magazine. He sat with his gun on his knees. He was very fond of it" (*IOT* 30), just as Frederic, escaping the battlefront in a flat-car filled with guns, finds it "very fine under a canvas and pleasant with the guns" (232). A sign of manhood and masculine power, the doctor must "clean" the gun (as the Indians cleaned the log to determine its rightful owner) to reassure himself that it remains in good working order. That he "pumps" the shells onto an empty bed suggests that the "shells" of his own "gun" are squandered, that he perhaps "shoots blanks." This scene also intimates of course that the doctor would like to kill himself, his wife, their marriage, maybe all three. That he places the gun across his knees implies that what he has between his legs is inadequate, that

he desires to symbolically supplement and enhance his masculine identity with a larger and more potent phallus.

Mrs. Adams then returns to the "row" by telling her husband that, "'I can't really believe that anyone would do a thing of that sort intentionally'"; that is, refuse to repay Dr. Adams's kindness by working off his debt. This reveals her own unworldly nature as well as her misplaced trust in the doctor. Pained by his wife's continued inquiries and pronouncements, and shamed by his own deception, the doctor sees that he must "go for a walk" in order to escape the domestic prison. On his way out, Mrs. Adams asks that he tell Nick that "'his mother wants to see him.'" Departing, "the screen door slammed behind him," and he hears "his wife catch her breath" at the sound. He apologizes "outside her window with the blinds drawn," and she forgives him: "'It's all right, dear'" (*IOT* 30). Now in the bright heat of day, a marked contrast to Mrs. Adams's "darkened room," he finds Nick "sitting with his back against a tree reading," which affiliates the son with the father: Nick is both outside the home and in contact with a tree (logs). Though Dr. Adams tells his son that he's wanted inside, Nick says, '"I want to go with you,'" and Dr. Adams acquiesces. Nick tells him that, '"I know where there's black squirrels,'" and the story concludes, "'All right, said his father. Let's go there,'" suggesting that "colored" squirrels are perhaps easier to deal with, or kill, than "colored" people (*IOT* 31). Unsuited to the company of other men and unable to tolerate his wife's

inquisitorial commentary, Dr. Adams looks to Nick and the outside world for some measure of comfort and relief from his role as husband.

Both "Indian Camp" and "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife" reveal Nick's affection for his father. In the first story, Nick looks to the doctor for protection from violent death, in the second story, Nick rejects his mother in order to be in his company. If the Frederic who narrates *A Farewell to Arms* prevents the Frederic who acts in the narrative from understanding precisely what his wartime experience means in terms of gender and sexuality, here the authorial voice, through dramatic irony, does not grant Nick insight into his own situation, but does disclose to the reader information enough to see the father/son dyad at play in the stories and in Nick's life, the perceptions that will likely come to a more mature Nick. However fond Nick may be of his father, these portraits of him expose Dr. Adams as ineffectual beside other men, his wife, and even in his profession (in "Indian Camp," he saves two lives, but loses one); they also point to the United States as a country built on lies (white men stole the land, symbolized by the trees). The theme of paternal deception recurs in "My Old Man," in which another youthful narrator who loves and admires his father finally acknowledges that his "old man" is not all that he once thought him to be.

The "old man" of the title is a jockey on the racetrack circuit in Europe. His son, the narrator of the story, accompanies him to the tracks in San Siro and Mirafiore, and

also recalls his father's glory days in Paris at St. Cloud, Tremblay, Enghein, and Auteuil. The narrator's first inkling of trouble comes when he overhears an argument between two men and his father: "They were all talking French and the two of them were after my old man about something" (*IOT* 155). The narrator departs, but when he returns finds his father alone, his face "white" and looking "sick as hell." He continues, "I was scared and felt sick inside because I know something had happened and I didn't see how anybody could call my old man a son of a bitch and get away with it" (*IOT* 156). His father explains to him, however, that, "'You got to take a lot of things in this world, Joe'" (*IOT* 157). Later, unbeknownst to his son, the father throws a race:

> "Wasn't it a swell race, Dad?" I said to him. He looked at me sort of funny with his derby on the back of his head. (*IOT* 164)

But Joe was all along aware that something was not right: "Of course I knew it was funny all the time. But my old man saying that right out like that sure took the kick all out of it for me and I didn't get the real kick back again ever" (*IOT* 165). Not long thereafter, his father takes to drink and rides little. When he does return to racing, on "a rainy Sunday in Auteuil" (*IOT* 170), he is killed in a pile-up of three horses going over a water-jump. Joe later hears two racegoers discussing his father's death. One asserts that, "'Butler got his, all right'" (a butler, another servant),

while the other agrees that, "'He had it coming to him on the stuff he's pulled.'" Joe's friend, George Gardner (George like Nick's uncle, Gardner like a gardener who tends young growth), reasures him, saying, "'Don't you listen to what those bums said, Joe. Your old man was one swell guy.'" Joe has the last word, however: "But I don't know [about his being a "swell guy"]. Seems like when they get started they don't leave a guy nothing" (*IOT* 173).

The world is an unkind place, for "they" -- or "it" -- "leave a guy nothing." Just as Nick will come to be disappointed by his own father, so here young Joe is unsure about the worth and integrity of his father. The "guy" of Joe's final lament refers to both his father and himself: "they" have soiled not only his father's professional legacy, but Joe's image of him as well. And this was to be the theme of Hemingway's 1933 collection, *Winner Take Nothing*, where his self-composed epigraph figures life as combat:

> Unlike all other forms of lutte or combat the conditions are that the winner shall take nothing; neither his ease, nor his pleasure, nor any notions of glory; nor, if he win far enough, shall there be any reward within himself.

Therefore even the knowledge Joe has gained in respect to his father will come to nothing in this cruel world where even the winner takes nothing. While Joe is not Nick, their ambivalent

feelings toward their respective fathers are quite similar, and in "My Old Man" and the two Nick Adams stories already discussed, sons are initiated into the adult world by the fathers they love, only to discover the world, and their fathers, rife with deception and betrayal. When Nick becomes a father, little has changed.

In "A Day's Wait," Nick is the father of a nine-year-old boy known only by the nickname Schatz (which is repeated in *Islands in the Stream*). Schatz is suffering from a headache and high fever. In respect to Nick, the story title refers only to his "wait" for his son's fever to decline. For Schatz, however, the wait is for death: he has confused centigrade with fahrenheit. As he says at the end of the story, "'At school in France the boys told me you can't live with forty-four degrees. I've got a hundred and two'" (*WTN* 134). Nick, who calls his son "poor old Schatz," reassures him that he is not about to die and compares the different thermometers to miles and kilometers. Nick's son accepts this explanation and Hemingway ends the story by telling the reader that Schatz's "gaze at the foot of the bed relaxed slowly. The hold over himself relaxed too, finally, and the next day it was very slack and he cried very easily at things that were of no importance" (*WTN* 134).

Nick is here the kind father who nurses his son throughout the day and finally, having learned of the boy's until-then undisclosed fear, explains the situation in terms

that Schatz can readily understand. Once again, however, initiation into life is also an initiation into death, or at least the awareness of the thin divide between being and non-being. However kind and affectionate a father, it is the patriarch who introduces his son into death. Even at the tender age of nine, the boy experiences both the *nada* of existence and the insomniac fears that plagued his war-weary father in "Now I Lay Me." When Nick the father here asks Schatz why he doesn't "'try to go to sleep,'" his son replies that, "'I'd rather stay awake.'" Throughout the day Schatz is "very white" and "very detached," and he continues to stare "at the foot of the bed" (*WTN* 130-31).

At the child's behest, Nick takes a break from his bedside vigil and goes hunting. Walking along "a frozen creek" with his Irish setter, Nick slips and falls twice, once dropping his gun and having it "slide away over the ice" (*WTN* 131). He goes on to flush a covey of quail from the brush and kills two of them, "happy there were so many left to find on another day." Nick then returns to find his previously "white-faced" son, who "can't keep from thinking," "flushed by the fever, staring still, as he had stared, at the foot of the bed" (*WTN* 132-33). Hemingway here again contrasts the world of the home with its domestic duties and paternal obligations with the violent conquest of nature, a "manly" occupation. The home is warm, the outdoors cold, and the quails are flushed-out just as Schatz's secret is flushed-out while he himself is flush with fever. For the quails, the result is

death; for Schatz the result is the promise of continued life, through he is not initially so happy about the prospect as his father, who is pleased more that life (the quails) will be around to kill another day. While Nick goes out to kill, Schatz worries about death. His father kills the birds, nurses Schatz back to health, but also introduces him to death. The father, like the doctor, can both heal and harm. That Nick drops his gun and has it "slide away over the ice," which, however thin, cannot be penetrated, functions in similar fashion to Dr. Adams's gun in "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife" and the accident with the ax endured by the father in "Indian Camp": symbols of male power and potency which cannot be fully controlled. Schatz, sensitized to life by his illness -- "the next day . . . he cried very easily" -- is left to determine for himself how manhood, which may be achieved at least in part at the end of a rifle, can be reconciled with loving care. How can one trust -- and whom or what to trust? -- in a world where even one's father kills? Schatz will have to determine for himself what "things" are indeed important, what "things" to have faith in. Like Joyce's "The Dead," this story also points to the inability to gain access into the emotional life of others, or, as Joseph Flora puts it, the story shows how even in a loving relationship, "it is easy to miss the big issues" (222), issues of life and death, and the role of the father, who can both restore life and take life, even in the space of a single day.

"Fathers and Sons" also focuses on Nick's relationship with his son, though Nick is not the narrator and is often called "Nicholas," doubtless meant to indicate that he is a mature adult. The story takes place entirely in Nick's car; he and his young son, who dozes intermittently, are on a Sunday drive through an area that "was not his [Nick's] country but it was the middle of fall and all of this country was good to drive through and see" (*WTN* 225). While the locale remains undisclosed (it is, however, northern Michigan), Nick knows "the town he would reach before night" (*WTN* 226). Essentially a story of memory and the connection to those memories as traced through his own father, Nick's recollections, stirred by the countryside and his unnamed son's questions, resonate with physical details and thematic echoes of several earlier Nick Adams tales already discussed.

Early on, Nick notes the lay of the land, as well as "where the cabins and houses were in relation to the fields and thickets" (*WTN* 226), with the emphasis placed not on the things themselves, but on their "relations," just as Nick himself, and his father and son, are seen not in isolation, but as intimately connected, one to the other, each informing and helping to construct the identity of the other. Nick is, to borrow a phrase, thinking back through his father, his son through his father and grandfather. Nicholas recalls his father teaching him to shoot quail and the narrator tells us that "when[ever] he first thought about him it was always the eyes" (*WTN* 226), which is exactly repeated a sentence later --

"it was always the eyes," for his father "saw as a big-horn ram or as an eagle sees, literally" (*WTN* 227). Sight, and the ability to see life clearly, forms a central motif in this story, which concludes with Nick telling his son, "'I can see we'll have to go'" to his own father's tomb (*WTN* 244).

Before Nick can begin to resolve some of his own internal conflicts in respect to his father and his adolescence, and before he can fully connect his past to his future, he must first mindfully relive and make sense of the experiences of his youth. While Nick admired his father's eyesight, the older man was unable to see into things; he could not penetrate to the heart of the matter. His father, both "very nervous" and "sentimental," was, Nick thinks, "like most sentimental people . . . both cruel and abused." He also had "much bad luck," was "betrayed . . . many times," and was wholly "unsound on sex" (*WTN* 228). Although Hemingway does not explain why Dr. Adams was nervous and sentimental, or to whom he was cruel, or who or what he abused, or by whom and how he was betrayed, it's safe to say, based on other Nick Adams stories, that his own cowardice before other men and Nick's mother was a kind of betrayal; that is, his own "nervous" and "sentimental" constitution led him to betray himself, which led to his cruelty toward Nick and Mrs. Adams, who perhaps abused him in turn. In any case, "Nick could not write about him yet" and was "very grateful to him for two things: fishing and shooting" (*WTN* 228). The suggestion is that while Dr. Adams was comfortable with sports, he never

came to a secure identity in terms of his personal life.

Nick's father gave him "only two pieces of information" about sex. When Nick "shot a red squirrel out of a hemlock tree" (the tree is described in "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife"), the squirrel bit Nick and he called it a "'little bugger'" (recall how in "Indian Camp" the pregnant woman bites Nick's Uncle George). Nick remembers his father telling him that, '"A bugger is a man who has intercourse with animals,'" though when Nick asks why, his father admits to not knowing; he can only add that "'it is a heinous crime'" (*WTN* 229) -- bit of information number one. The other piece of "direct sexual knowledge bequeathed him by his father" concerns Enrico Caruso's arrest "for mashing." Nick asks for an explanation of mashing, but his father only replies that it is '"one of the most heinous of crimes,'" which leaves Nick imagining "the great tenor doing something strange, bizarre, and heinous with a potato masher to a beautiful lady who looked like the pictures of Anna Held on the inside of cigar boxes." Nick therefore "resolved, with considerable horror, that when he was old enough he would try mashing at least once." Nick goes on to recall how Dr. Adams "summed up the whole matter by stating that masturbation produced blindness, insanity, and death, while a man who went with prostitutes would contract hideous veneral diseases and that the thing to do was to keep hands off of people. On the other hand his father had the finest pair of eyes he had ever seen and Nick had loved him very much and for a very long time" (*WTN* 230).

This limited knowledge of the adult world, crystallized in its secret of secrets -- sex -- perplexes and horrifies Nick. He does not understand, and his father is unable or unwilling to explain, just why someone would want to have sex with an animal or just what a "masher" is. Given his father's superficial explanations, Nick's conclusions are both funny and sound. Like the Nick of "A Day's Wait," fathers and sons experience a debiliating miscommunication that leads to an unclear picture of life, its people and its esssential character. While in "A Day's Wait" Nick sees his son through an illness and provides accurate information once he understands his son's fear, Hemingway yet leaves the impression that ultimately we are all alone and apart. In "Fathers and Sons," the thirty-eight-year-old understands that in spite of his father's eyes, he does not see life clearly; neither does he attempt to fully illuminate his son in respect to what he does know. Quite naturally, therefore, "the thing to do was to keep hands off of people"; that is, avoid intimacy, for touching people (or being touched by people) results in abuse and betrayal.

Nick's thoughts then turn to memories of his "own education in those earlier matters [, which] had been acquired in the hemlock woods behind the Indian camp" (*WTN* 231). The pine needle loam" that Nick recalls looks ahead to Robert Jordan in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, which opens and closes on the the image of Robert lying on pine needles, and looks back to "Indian Camp," and, in "the peeled logs" that lay "where

the trees had been felled," to "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife" (*WTN* 233). Both are sexual images: the pine needles can be either tiny phalluses, or, taken together as a "loam" (or "floor," as described in *The Bell*), as inviting (and perhaps as prickly -- *vagina dentata*?) as the vulva. The logs, as mentioned above, represent Dr. Adams's "felled" manhood. Having established the mood for his anecdote, Hemingway then has Nick recall how the Indian girl Trudy was pushed on him by her own brother. "Then afterwards," Hemingway writes in typically elliptical fashion, with the words "then afterwards" indicating the omitted sex scene, Nick, Trudy, and her brother listen for a black squirrel that Nick is prepared to shoot with his "shotgun with a very long barrel." The two shells his father has given him are not enough, however, and Nick ends up feeling "hollow and empty" (*WTN* 234), the very words Hemingway uses to describe the post-coital mood of characters from Frederic and Catherine to David and Catherine.

Trudy then tells Nick that her older half-brother, a seventeen-year-old, wants "'to come some night to sleep in bed with your sister Dorothy'" (*WTN* 234). If that happens, Nick declares, he'll kill "'that half-breed bastard,'" which seems to excite Trudy, for "she put her hand in Nick's pocket" and begins "exploring" (*WTN* 235). After going on about what he'll do to Eddie, Trudy pleads with Nick not to kill her half-brother. "'I won't kill him unless he comes around the house,'" Nick promises. Satisfied with this news, Trudy asks, "'you want to do anything now? I feel good.'" Nick replies,

"'If Billy [her other brother now in their company] goes away,'" and the narrator adds that, "Nick had killed Eddie Gilby, then pardoned him his life, and he was a man now" (*WTN* 236). Violence (or the threat of violence), mercy, and sex make the man.

Nick and Trudy's sexual encounter takes place in the white space between sections of the story, which resumes with the connective, "Then, later . . . " Trudy now wonders if they've made a baby, but Nick doesn't think so; in fact, "Something inside Nick had gone a long way away," but what? His innocence? his desire? his feeling of male potency? The image itself recalls that of soaring presented above. The story is ambiguous on this point, though probably all of the above have merit. Nick's "gun" does not create new life, and without emotional satisfaction and/or progeny, he feels a vague sense of loss. As noted in chapter 2, Hemingway characters are regularly "punished" for fleeting sexual encounter. Billy's gun, on the other hand, does produce something, which is death; he returns with "the gun over his shoulder," holding "a black squirrel by the front paws" (*WTN* 237) -- the prize that had eluded Nick is his. Nick immediately says that he must go home. Following this episode, and with only a paragraph break to mark the transition, Hemingway writes that, "Now, as he rode along the highway in the car and it was getting dark, Nick was all through thinking about his father" (*WTN* 238). Curious -- his father has not been referred to for some four pages, so why

does the narrator only now state that Nick has finished thinking of him? This is an unreliable statement, or an unfulfilled prophecy, for Nick returns to memories of Dr. Adams for another two pages. A partial, if indirect, explanation follows, one that unites the themes of violence and illicit sexuality, one way in which Hemingway creates his own legend of the fall.

Nicholas, we are told, "loved his father but hated the smell of him and once when he had to wear a suit of his father's underwear that had gotten too small for his father it made him feel sick," even though it had been "freshly washed" (*WTN* 239). Punished for lying about having lost the suit (he had actually submerged it in a creek), Nick goes to the woodshed, "his shotgun loaded and cocked," and looks at his father "sitting on the screen porch reading the paper." Nick thinks, "I can blow him to hell. I can kill him," and the narrator continues, "Finally he felt his anger go out of him and he felt a little sick about it being the gun that his father had given him" (*WTN* 240). Following sex with Trudy, "something inside Nick had gone a long way away," and now it is his anger that goes away, leaving him to feel "a little sick." Adolescence, this story shows, is a time of inchoate, ever-shifting emotions and desires whose connections are unclear; Nick feels a variety of discrete sensations, but never seems to tie them all together, and the paternal authority that might guide him is missing. The association of Nick's "loaded and cocked" shotgun to the male member is

unavoidable. Nick realizes that the "guns" that make him a man have come down through his father, and that he is, psychologically speaking, required to kill the older man and thus complete the necessary usurpation of his father's paternal authority, the Oedipal stage writ in the image of Nick in the woodshed, the very locale where Dr. Adams perhaps disciplined his son, whose guilt emerges from his desire to slay the father.

While Nick admires his father's eyesight, "he hated the smell of him"; indeed, "there was only one person in his family that he liked the smell of; one sister" (*WTN* 240). Sight is projected outward, cannot be sensed by another, can be controlled by the viewer himself; smell, on the other hand, is secreted, can be shared by another, cannot be controlled. Sight does not implicate another person, but smell cannot be so easily turned away from, for it is one's essence, a product of the body and not the mind, subject not to cognition but to body consciousness. One is hardly drawn to, or aroused by, excellent vision, but smell can trigger desire, and so Nick's family romance is complicated by the suggestion of incestuous desire for his sister, the same longing played out in two other stories, "Soldier's Home" and "The Last Good Country" (see chapter 4).

Nick is then "startled" when his son suddenly asks, "'what it was like'" when Nick was a boy and "used to hunt with the Indians." His son brings him back to himself, for Nick "had felt quite alone but this boy had been with him."

Note how the narrator does not refer to Nick's son as "his boy," but only as "this boy," as if he is unknown and unconnected to Nick, perhaps because his own boy is not unlike any other boy, including the child Nick himself had once been. Nick can only really tell his son that the Ojibways "'were very nice,'" and thinks to himself, "Could you say that she [presumably Trudy] did first what no one has ever done and better . . . the good taste of mouth, then uncomfortably, tightly, sweetly, moistly, lovely, tightly, achingly, fully, finally, unendingly, never-endingly, never-to-endingly, suddenly ended, the great bird flown like an owl in the twilight," another image of flight uniting sex (*le petit mort*) and death (*WTN* 241). Like his own father, Nick cannot or will not explain these emotions to his son. Doubtless his son would not appreciate these feelings, but Nick also avoids any explanation as scrupulously as his own father had avoided explaning "buggery" and "masher" to him years before. But it is not merely that Nick's son is too young to understand. Fear keeps Nick from even attempting to disclose to his son the mysteries of sex and sexuality, for once the recondite adult knowledge is revealed, "the great bird," which for Nick is an owl, renowned for its superior eyesight, is banished, or, more precisely, flies away of its own accord -- sexual knowledge expunges the father and permits the son to take his place.

Nick's son then asks how old he must be before he can "'get a shotgun and can hunt by myself.'" Nick tells him,

"'Twelve years old if I see you are careful'"; that is, at roughly the age of puberty, provided that Nick sees evidence of his son's care in handling manly tools. Immediately thereafter, Nick's boy asks about his grandfather and why they "'never go to pray'" at his tomb. Nick explains that Dr. Adams's tomb is "'a long way from here,'" and his son expresses the hope that when Nick is dead he will live close enough to visit his father's burial place. His son suggests they all be buried in France, but Nicholas, who has suddenly become "Nick," doesn't like the idea. His son then recommends that "'we all be buried out at the ranch'" so that he "'could stop and pray at the tomb of my grandfather on the way to the ranch.'" The boy adds that he doesn't "'feel good never to have even visited the tomb of my grandfather.'" The story concludes with Nick saying, "'We'll have to go . . . . I can see we'll have to go'" (*WTN* 243-44). A sense of continuity, if not outright connection, has been established not by Nick, but by Nick's young son.

2. The Novels

Harry Morgan of *To Have and Have Not*, the good man corrupted by the lure of big money, is the only Hemingway character with daughters, three of them. They play no significant role in the novel, however, other than to underscore Harry's diminished stature as a man. One of Hemingway's Fisher Kings, Harry is missing his arm, which functions both metaphorically and literally as a phallus. His

lack produces daughters rather than sons, and one need not read deeply to see this.

In a love-making scene, Marie, Harry's voluptuous, Molly Bloom-like wife, asks that Harry use his "flipper" in sex. "'Put it along there,'" she implores. "'Go on, I like it, true.'" Harry complies and Marie then establishes a link between Harry's "flipper" and bestiality, as well as to what they both seem to regard as corrupted sexuality, namely, black female sexuality. It is Harry who likens his stump to a "flipper on a loggerhead" (with the attendant pun on "log" and "head") and Marie wants to know if loggerheads "'really do it three days? Coot for three days.'" Harry answers, "'Sure,'" but adds, "'Listen, be quiet. We'll wake the girls'" (awaken them to sexual knowledge?). Harry asks that Marie "wait," but she presses on:

> "I don't want to wait. Come on. That's it. That's where. Listen, did you ever do it with a nigger wench?"
>
> "Sure."
>
> "What's it like?"
>
> "Like a nurse shark." (113)

While Marie has said that Harry's "no loggerhead," his sexual prowess and stamina are linked to the animal world of unbridled sex. The black woman is then directly associated with the amoral, mindless "cooting" of the huge turtles. The comparison to a nurse shark provides a dual image of black

female sexuality: she is both a "nurse" intended to service (white?) men, and she is a shark capable of killing men. Just as Harry's arm was shot off, so the black woman raises castration anxieties, the fearsome *vagina dentata* in the form of the shark's jaws, and the shark is always a villain in Hemingway (the shark, for example, destroys the noble marlin of *The Old Man and the Sea*). However much Marie loves Harry, Hemingway raises the spectre of debased sexuality through the turtles and nurse shark. The connection between blackness and illicit sexuality will be fully deployed in *The Garden of Eden*, just as the corrupting influence of women in general is seen elsewhere in *To Have and Have Not* (the wife of a successful novelist who cuckolds her husband), as well as throughout the Hemingway canon.

A little later in the novel, Harry, preparing to depart for his dangerous rum-running mission, reflects on his daughters: "Those damn girls. That's all that old woman and I could get with what we've got. Do you suppose the boys in her went before I knew her?" (127). What they've "got" is not enough to produce boys, which seemingly requires a whole man; girls, on the other hand, require less and may, in fact, be the result of a failing, a lack (his missing limb). Harry at first appears to share with Marie the blame for having only girls, as the pronoun "we" suggests. In the next sentence, however, he places the blame on Marie alone, for he wonders if "the boys in her went" before he knew her. How Harry arrives at this preposterous view of human sexuality is unclear;

indeed, it is not even clear what he means by "the male children in her having gone," though presumably his notion of reproductive biology holds that some predetermined number of male and female eggs exist within a woman, which in turn suggests that at one time Marie had been promiscuous, or had had at least a fair amount of premarital sex.

Hemingway lightly underscores Marie's culpability in producing strictly female progeny in the final chapter, when he has Marie say in her Mollyesque monologue, "The bastards that shot him [Harry]. Oh, the bastards. That's the only feeling I got. Hate and hollow feeling. I'm empty like a empty house" (257). The epithet "bastard" first of all implies illegitimacy, and while "hollow feeling" is a ubiquitous sensation in Hemingway, in this instance, through its association with an "empty house," becomes synonymous with "barren." A house, in the sense of a home, is, moreover, the domain of the woman, but without a man that domestic realm seems "hollow" -- girls, even her own daughters, count for little, for their presence is hardly felt; they cannot fill an "empty house." While pregnant, Marie may have been, in the vernacular, as big as a house, though now her womb, her house, her self, is "empty" and "hollow." Later in her soliloquy, Marie recalls how she had once laughed so hard at one of Harry's jokes that "it made my belly ache" (258). She then goes on to recount how "excited" and "choked" she was by her own appearance after having had her hair dyed blonde. Harry, she remembers, told her that she looked "beautiful" in a voice

that was "thick and funny" (259). "'You like me blonde?'" she had asked, and Harry had replied, "'Don't talk about it . . . . Let's go to the hotel'" (259). Sexual excitement is here located in, or displaced into, the throat: she was "choked" and Harry was "thick," which is precisely the same sensation experienced by Robert Jordan in his liaison with Maria in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (22, 67, 91, 378). It is interesting that Hemingway should situate sexual arousal in the mouth and throat, not as an indication of oral sex itself, but as suggestive of sex as orality (whether spoken or written), the etymological connection -- the Latin *lingua* -- between tongue and language. It is also notable that both Marie and Harry are turned on by her new hair color, and experience sexual excitement in much the same way. Hemingway thereby problematizes gender and sexuality: is Marie "choked-up" by her own image, and, if so, does this hint at latent homoerotic desire? Or is she perhaps so "choked" that she cannot bring forth males? Is Harry unable to "talk about it" because he is so aroused? Is he ashamed that he finds her beautiful, fearing that with her blonde hair he is attracted to another woman? Is the shock of the new all that can stimulate him? Could it be that with Marie's hair "high behind . . . [her] ears" (259) Harry feels he's about to have sex with a boy? This is not so far-fetched, for in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Robert Jordan, like a character out of Ibsen, is haunted by the ghosts of his father and grandfather, and, while in another country, falls in love with a girl who

resembles a boy.

Robert is proud of his grandfather's courage in battle, while his own father, a "coward" and suicide, inspires in him only pity and shame. Asked if his father committed suicide "'to avoid being tortured,'" Robert answers, "'Yes . . . To avoid being tortured'" (66-67), though not, as the context of the question clearly implies, by political enemies, but by his wife. Once again the domineering wife/mother is seen as having stripped the patriarch of his manhood, bullying him to death in the process. This is the cowardice Robert fears he will discover in himself at the decisive moment of his mission in the Escorel, the blowing-up of a bridge.

On the eve of battle, Robert wishes that his grandfather were present instead of himself, for his grandfather would surely know how to handle the situation. He remains unsure whether he is up to the challenge of the bridge or if he will run from it or otherwise shame himself like his father -- biology is, at least in some measure, destiny, though the question for Robert is whose make-up did he inherit, his father's or grandfather's? If his grandfather were present, Robert would take this opportunity to ask him about "a lot of things I would like to know," for his grandfather "sent me what little I have through the other one that misused the gun" (338). The "other one" is of course his father who, like Dr. Adams, failed to pass on certain "things" that Robert would now "like to know." The gun once again stands for fractured manhood: his father "misused" it, destroying his own body with

a symbol of masculine power. Robert longs for his grandfather because he "could have learned from him what the other one never had to teach" him (note that his father is "that one," while in "Fathers and Sons" Nick's son is "this boy"), though both he and his grandfather would be "acutely embarrassed by the presence of his father" (338).

This is the same kind of hereditary or historical curse placed on the sons of bullfighters. Robert wonders if his father, the *cobarde* (coward), could simply not escape his destiny, just as "the way second generation bullfighters almost always are [cowards]." He then says that he'll "never forget how sick" it made him to learn his father was a *cobarde*. "Go on," he tells himself, "say it in English. Coward. It's easier when you have it said and there is never any point in referring to a son of a bitch by some foreign term. He wasn't a son of a bitch, though. He was just a coward and that was the worst luck any man could have. Because if he wasn't a coward he would have stood up to that woman [Robert's mother] and not let her bully him" (338-39). His mother takes on the masculine signification of the bull: she bullies. (I would not even make this observation but for Hemingway's own reference to bullfighters less than one-half page earlier.)

To Dr. Adams's gun in "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife," Nick's own gun in "Fathers and Sons," the guns in the flatcar that Frederic enjoys so well, and Thomas Hudson's crude reference to his penis as a ".357 Magnum" (*Islands* 323), we

now add Grandfather Jordan's Smith and Wesson, a "single action, officer's model .32 caliber," which had the "softest, sweetest trigger pull you had ever felt and it was always well oiled and the bore was clean although the finish was all worn off and the brown metal of the barrel and the cylinder was worn smooth from the leather of the holster." Robert was permitted to "take the pistol out of the drawer and hold it," and he could "handle it freely," though his grandfather forbade him "playing" with it because it was a "serious weapon" (but are we still talking about a gun?). It turns out that this was the very gun Robert's father used to kill himself. The coroner gave it to Robert after the funeral (much like Hemingway's mother sent him the gun that Dr. Hemingway had used to kill himself), and Robert "had put the gun back in the cabinet where it belonged, but the next day he took it out" and disposed of it forever: "he climbed out on a rock and leaned over and saw his face in the still water, and saw himself holding the gun, and then he dropped it [as Nick disposed of his father's suit], holding it by the muzzle, and saw it go down making bubbles . . . and then it was out of sight" (336-37).

His grandfather, then, a courageous man and a "real" man, possessed of a gun that was "soft" and "sweet" and "well oiled," one which he used in the manly art of war (the U.S. Civil War). Robert's father, on the other hand, turned it on himself, and Robert, soon after severing his ties to the father, "watches" his own renunication of the patriarch -- by

disposing of the gun in the "clear water," where the earth/womb swallows it up. While Robert comes to understand his father and forgive him "everything," he remains to his death "ashamed of him" (340). Having been shot and mortally wounded, the novel ends with Robert on his deathbed of pine needles: "He touched the lower part of his leg and it was as though it were not a part of his body" (466-67). Robert dies "divorced" from his limb, his father, his father's gun. And the knowledge of life denied him by his father (the many "things" he would have liked to ask his grandfather) is the selfsame recondite knowledge of the adult world that only the father possesses.

Islands in the Stream, not unlike much of the other posthumously-published work -- *A Moveable Feast*, *The Garden of Eden*, and *The Dangerous Summer* -- takes the reader back to Hemingway's early days as a struggling young writer in Paris. While the novel itself is set in and around Bimini and Cuba, Thomas Hudson, a "good painter" (3-4) and the novels' hero, reminisces extensively and waxes poetic on his youth, both alone and in company of his three sons, and later, his first wife. Much of the novel is therefore a romantic and elegiac attempt to recapture lost time, and Hudson is obviously Hemingway, and his first wife and three sons correspond to Hadley Richardson and Hemingway's own boys (the younger two born to Pauline Pfiefer, just as in the novel they have a different mother from their eldest brother). In this sense,

Islands in the Stream is a family romance and represents yet another attempt on Hemingway's part to reimagine and rewrite the past. As Comley and Scholes suggest, "When Papa's sons were born he divorced their mothers and looked for another woman. And when he tried to write about being a good father in *Islands in the Stream*, he ended by killing off the sons" (17). While this establishes a cause and effect relationship between the birth of Hemingway's children and his divorces that cannot be fully established, it is nonetheless true that Hemingway was at best a part-time father and that paternity seesm to have represented to him a loss of self, as if offspring are literally fashioned from, and of, the body of the father. But let's move away from biography in order to examine anxieties surrounding fatherhood as they are played out in the novel itself.

Hudson, alone on his island paradise, realizes that he has "been able to replace almost everything except the children with work" (7) and therefore looks forward to the arrival of his three sons for summer holiday, Tom (the eldest, another "Schatz," described as "free and easy but polite"), David (the "smart" one), and Andrew ("the meanest"; all 101). One of the central incidents of their stay with Hudson is the loss of the fish David had for hours struggled against, a struggle similar to Santiago's in *The Old Man and the Sea*, for it, too, ends with no prize but for David's coming to "love" the fish, his nemesis (134). This love for the hunted, which its capture would not have diminished, prefigures Hudson's

loss of his three children. Hemingway kills off Hudson's sons just as he kills off the fictional "Old lady" (a maternal figure) in *Death in the Afternoon* (see chapter 5). The fish escapes, and later Tom's plane is shot down in World War II, David and Andrew are killed in a car accident (like the cat run over by a car; 195), and Hudson himself is mortally wounded while patrolling for Nazi survivors of a submarine. Violent death is not the fault of anyone; it is a *force majeure*, and coming to manhood also means having to confront eventual death.

Hudson recalls a long ago time with a baron in the French port town of Marseilles. After a scene in which they discuss plans for the future, Hudson returns to the present and says to himself, "And why go on with that . . . . The Baron was dead and the Krauts had Paris and the Princess did not have a baby" (218). In other words, the culture that he has in part "fathered" for his own now-dead children is dead as well. Rather than making Hudson responsibile for the legacy of his generation, Hemingway abdicates and has Hudson kill the next generation, thus ending his situational fatherhood. In a sense, Hudson is "sad" the way that "fairies" are sad (168-69): neither completely take on the responsibilities of fatherhood; they don't grow up. This affiliates Hudson with the male homosexual in ways that recall Jake Barnes (see chapter 5).

Fatherhood, so temporal for Hudson, is regarded as a kind of once-a-year performance, and masculinity itself is almost

always tied to some loss, even death. The phallic guns already discussed in relation to other Hemingway works first appear in *Islands in the Stream* as a girl: Hudson asks of his "pistol between his legs," "How long have you been my girl?" (317). Later, he dreams that "Tom's mother was sleeping with him and she was sleeping on top of him as she liked to do sometimes . . . . Then with one hand he moistened the .357 Magnum and slipped it easily and sound asleep where it should be" (322-23). Like the "pistol between his legs," which is assigned the female gender, he sleeps with his wife in the "submissive" or "feminine" position even while he possesses the .357 Magnum. Where, however, "should" his .357 Magnum be? Orthodox heterosexuality would say it "should" be in the vulva, but the passage is vague enough to allow for two other possibilities: it could be in her mouth or her rectum. At the same time, though, Hudson's manhood is "sound asleep," unable to rise to the occasion. Or is Hudson bored with the sex act? What's more, Hudson prepares to have sex not with his first wife, but "Tom's mother," who is herself "made of steel" (303), though not steely enough to prevent her wondering if it's "'wicked to make love after Tom's death'" (301). Perhaps it is, but his death serves to reunite the former couple, and it also appears to excite them both. A confused matrix of sexual and gendered signification emerges from the scene: the man relates to the woman as his deceased son's mother, she is astride him in the "masculine" position, his hefty Magnum is apparently flaccid (or he himself is). The novel closes with

the dying Hudson told by a shipmate that, "You never understand anybody that loves you" (435), while earlier in the novel, Hudson tells a friend, "The hell with love" (23). Love inevitably leads to loneliness and after sex one is spent, for the love object, if not love itself, is always lost.

If the theme of *The Sun Also Rises* is, as Hemingway declared, "promiscuity no solution," the message of this editorial assemblage known as *Islands in the Stream* seems to be "love no solution." It is always a risk, always a voyage into the unknown, and always ends in loss or betrayal. Only Hudson's youth in Paris is evoked without bitterness or irony, that period of life between adolescence and adulthood, when Hudson first made his gesture toward paternal responsibility. But he fled that adult role, escaping into other lives and other women, eventually isolating himself in a garden of eden dedicated to work, constructing, after Wallace Stevens, "propositions about life" (281) rather than living and building a life. Confined to his workaday garden, lonely in "island solitude, unsponsored, free" (Stevens 8), Hudson dies a solitary death, never quite understanding the connections between love, sex, and progeny. David Bourne, on the other hand, will at least come to share with his father "guilt and knowledge."

In *The Garden of Eden*, David, a young novelist from Oklahoma on honeymoon in the south of France, begins to write "a story that happens in Africa when I was about eight years old" (157), the tale of his father and himself on an elephant

hunt. In this story within a story -- a kind of ghost story -- Hemingway attempts once again to rewrite and so come to terms with his relationship to his father (dead for some thirteen years when he began *The Garden* in 1946) through his fictional counterpart, David Bourne. And once again a young son seeks to wrest the secret knowledge of the adult world from his father, an initiation into manhood which leaves David feeling betrayed by his father, who in David's mind kills an elephant in blood lust, an elephant David had come to love (197), just as David Hudson came to love his prey. The hunt ultimately results in David's coming to share his father's "guilt and knowledge" in respect to the white man's exploitation of both Africa and Africans.

David, however, achieves a more complete acceptance of his father than most of the other sons already discussed, even while the emphasis is placed on the "bad": "All your father found he found for you too, he thought, the good, the wonderful, the bad, the very bad, the really very bad, the truly bad and then the much worse" (129). David thinks these thoughts one morning after his writing for the day has been completed, when he comes out of his room and discovers a workman "putting up a mirror on the wall behind the bar" (129), for, like the paternal ghosts that haunt Robert Jordan, David's story brings him closer to his father, which brings both understanding of the older man even while arousing fears in David that he is, or will become like, his old man. Later in the novel, following another day's writing, David feels as

if "his father was with him still" and David "stood at the bar [with its new mirror] because that's where he would have found his father at that hour and . . . he missed him " (147). He gets closer to his father by seeing himself in the mirror behind the bar, which reflects his own image as well as a kind of intaglio of his father, as time past and time present are merged in the glass that reports the image of the self to the self. In thinking "what his father would have thought" in order to write the story, David eventually sees that his father dealt "lightly with evil" and "treated evil like an old entrusted friend," so much so that when "she [evil] poxed him, [she] never knew she'd scored" (146).

Like Robert Jordan and Nick Adams, David "had intended to ask his father about two things" (147), though they are not expressed. Instead, the "evil" of the elephant hunt is linked to the "evil" of adultery and homosexuality. His wife Catherine tells him that "'yesterday you made siesta with me and then you went to Marita's room but today you can just go there. But I've spoiled it now and what I wish is we could all just make siesta together'" (149). David resembles his father in the guilt and self-condemnation he suffers for having permitted the "evil" menage-a-trois to begin, which he realizes can only kill the love between Catherine and himself, just as the "butchery" (201) of the elephant he had begun to love killed not only the elephant and his "dignity" (201), but his respect for his father. When his father asks if he wants "to make peace," young David replies, "All right," but knows

"this was the start of never telling that he had decided on" (202) -- the son will now withhold himself from the father. A wall of silence therefore comes between father and son, a barrier that isolates David from his paternal lineage, but which becomes permeable once the boy grows into a man capable of dealing with the specter of his father. The wall that separates them becomes a mirror that reflects David's "guilt and loneliness" (201), the triangular father/son/elephant relationship now transfered to the David/Catherine/Marita entanglement. This is underscored when Catherine refers to David's African story as "horrible" and "bestial," and then accuses David of being a "monster" (157-58). Their gender transference has "corrupted" sexuality (which I explore in detail in chapter 6) and is connected to the evil that David discovers reflected and embodied in his father and the elephant hunt. Entrance into the adult world, Lacan's Symbolic or *nom du pere*, once again results in betrayal, for loss of innocence "wrongly" achieved -- whether through killing an elephant or transgressive gender play -- will result in banishment from the garden.

Chapter 4

"Adoptions" and Incest

> "There is always something like that that . . . . There is always something that there should not be . . . "
> -- Pilar in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, (154)

1. Brothers and Sisters

While actual parents, and fathers in particular, are prominent in Hemingway, other relationships in his fiction are structured along the lines of parent/child, mentor/protege, master/servant, with the first position in the binarism usually occupied by an older man and the second by a boy or girl. The Hemingway hero feels the urge of paternity, but often displaces the desire (or need) in familial configurations that mimic the father/child relationship even while they undermine it through the potential threat of erotic attachment. These are what I call Hemingway's "adopted" sons and daughters, often affectionate and loving relationships marked by a failure to draw appropriate boundaries between love and eroticism, which once again leads the characters into inhabiting an ambiguous "middle condition" in terms of culturally-prescribed roles. The demands of paternity and the expectations of fatherhood established by the culture (and

perhaps gleaned by Hemingway through his early reading and rearing) greatly trouble Hemingway's male characters and, in turn, threaten the stability of gender roles. The father/child (mentor/protege, master/servant) dyad, bordering on incest, frequently draws upon Tylee's "erotic myth of the fellowship of warriors" and at times recalls the ancient Greek paradigm of cross-generational homosexual relations.

In *For Whom the Bells Tolls*, Pablo has charge of a band of guerrillas in the mountains of Spain, but he is soon shown to be a cowardly, ineffectual leader whose wife, Pilar (a "pillar" of strength), a "woman of about fifty almost as big as Pablo, almost as wide as she was tall, in black peasant skirt and waist, with heavy wool socks on heavy legs, black role-soled shoes and a brown face like a model for a granite monument," calls him a "rotten drunkard" (30-31). Pablo's drunkenness, an egregious violation of the Hemingway code, soon interferes with his duty, so that Pilar usurps his role as leader of the partisan band and declares, "Here I command" (55). Seeing that Robert Jordan and the others are on her side, the shamed Pablo acquiesces (56).

Pilar and Pablo have themselves already taken on the role of protectors, of "parents" to Maria, a young girl with shorn hair they rescued from the fascists. Robert soons falls in love with Maria, which in this makeshift family transforms him into a kind of son-in-law to Pilar and Pablo. At the same time, however, Maria becomes Robert's sister: "Maria is my true love and wife. I never had a true love. I never had a

wife. She is also my sister, and I never had a sister, and my daughter, and I never will have a daughter" (381). Pilar herself observes, "'You could be brother and sister by the look,'" and Maria replies, "'Now I know why I have felt as I have. Now it is clear'" (130). A similarly ambiguous relationship that blurs the usual borders between family members exists between Pilar and Maria. While Pilar insists that she does not "make perversions" (150), she also admits that she is jealous of Robert: "'I have never wanted thee [Maria]. But I am jealous.'" Maria replies that Pilar has already explained that,'" adding that, "'I love thee and he can have thee, I am no *tortillera* but a woman made for men. That is true. But now it gives me pleasure to say thus, in the daytime, that I care for thee'" (154-55). Just as Catherine Bourne in *The Garden of Eden*, in insisting that she is both a boy and a girl, takes on the dual signifying power of male and female, so the Robert/Pilar/Maria triad points to the fluidity of both gender categories and familial relations. Maria is Robert's wife, sister, and daughter; Pilar is her mother and would-be lover; and Robert is therefore both Pilar and Pablo's son-in-law and brother.

Robert describes Maria as moving "awkwardly as a colt moves, but with the same grace as of a young animal" (25). Her hair, he says, "'grows now all over thy head the same length like the fur of an animal'" (345). On other occasions, she is a "colt" (137), a "kitten" (68), but more often than not, a "rabbit" (71, 73, 156, 346). This Kenneth Lynn sees as

a "fitting complement to her animal-like devotion" to Robert, adding in a footnote that rabbit is also "one of the more vulgar Spanish terms for a woman's sex organ" (486). Robert must also teach her how to get into a sleeping bag (69) and how to kiss (71-72), so that the older man is seen to initiate his wife/sister/daughter into the mystery and pleasure of sex; he gives birth to her maturity, or is sex merely a valuable trick he teaches his pet? While this is perhaps rather too literal, Robert's continual association of Maria with animals suggests that sex, if not love, is something primitive and bestial, a link that will be more fully forged in *The Garden of Eden*, but one we have already seen in the Nick Adams stories. And Maria is just one female character in the Hemingway canon compared to animals: Marie in *To Have and Have Not* is an "ox" (176), Catherine Barkley is called "Cat," just like the young wife in "Cat in the Rain," while "Hills Like White Elephants" affiliates the unborn child with the elephant of the title.

Even while their relationship is not between equals owing to Robert's age and experience, his gender and place in the partisan group, there is yet the desire to merge or swap identities. Just as Pilar finds that Robert and Maria "could be brother and sister by the look," so Robert suggests that after the war they "'go together to the coiffeur's and they could cut it [Maria's hair] neatly on the sides and in the back as they cut mine and that way it would look better in the town while it is growing out.'" Maria replies that she would

then look more like Robert and "'never would want to change'" (155). At another point -- this time after a night of lovemaking in Robert's sleeping bag -- Maria declares, "'I am thee and thou art me and all of one is the other'" (00). This is, as we have already seen, exactly what Catherine wants in *A Farewell to Arms*, and the very same androgynous undifferentiation longed for by Catherine Bourne. Inasmuch as sex and gender are figured as the site of subjectivity, the romantic union of two souls/bodies can be best (perhaps only) achieved through merging their gendered identities. As for sex itself, it momentarily allows the lovers to transcend both time and space -- or, like the bodies of the lovers, unites time and space: following their first encounter in the sleeping bag, "time [was] absolutely still and they were both there, time having stopped and he felt the earth move out and away from under them" (159). Like Frederic and Catherine, who make a "separate peace," and David and Catherine, who reject towns for the more "primitive" pleasure of France's Edenic Grau de Roi, Robert and Maria attempt to construct a world for themselves in which they are both the same (look alikes who are part of the same family) and different (male and female). Has their love "moved" the earth to the extent that alternative genders are now possible?

Maria is not, however, Hemingway's only eroticized "daughter" or "sister." In "Soldier's Home," for example, a young man named Harold Krebs, returning home to Oklahoma

(David Bourne is also from Oklahoma) after two years at war in Europe, attempts to reintegrate himself into American society. The only real solace he finds, however, is with his "best sister" (*IOT* 96). As Krebs seeks to carve out an emotional space for himself at home, the family unit is shown to be a source of confusion and angst; his family is no more stable than those portrayed in the Nick Adams stories, and once again the source and object of the young man's affections are ambiguous and dislocated.

The reader is first of all presented with a family whose father is absent. While he lives at home, he does not appear in the story and only brief references are made to the family patriarch, none of which particularly flattering. While Kreb's mother tells him that she "'had a talk'" with his father and that his father is "'willing'" to allow Krebs "'to take the car out in the evenings,'" he can't believe that his father decided this on his own. "'I'll bet you made him,'" Krebs tells his mother, but she neither confirms or denies his suspicions (*IOT* 95). Later, while he reads the *Kansas City Star*, his mother admonishes him not to "'muss up the paper. Your father can't read his Star if it's been mussed'" (*IOT* 96). At the end of the story, Krebs decides against going "down to his father's office" and chooses instead to "go over to the schoolyard to watch Helen [his sister] play indoor baseball" (*IOT* 101). The father is thus at a remove from the emotional life of the family and his ghostly presence is felt only through the mother. The father is not connected to Krebs

or his family, but is a kind of sovereign in abstentia. It might be thought that Kreb's father is the person most able to assist him in reentering American society, but he seems more concerned with his car and the paper. Once again the patriarch emerges as ineffectual and distant, communicating primarily through the mother, and thinking perhaps that a car is all Krebs requires to steer him into maturity and manhood.

Krebs's real affections are directed toward his sister Helen and his mother. He finds that during his absence, "nothing was changed in the town except that the young girls have grown up," and while he "would have liked to have a girl," Krebs "did not want to have to spend a long time getting her. He did not want to get into the intrigue and the politics. He did not want to have to do any courting. He did not want to tell any more lies. It wasn't worth it." Indeed,

> He did not want any consequences. He did not want any consequences ever again. He wanted to live along without consequences. Besides he did not really need a girl. The army had taught him that. It was all right to pose as though you had to have a girl. Nearly everybody did that. But it wasn't true. That was the funny thing. First a fellow boasted how girls mean nothing to him, that he never thought of them,

> that they could not touch him. Then a fellow boasted that he could not get along without girls, that he had to have them all the time, that he could not go to sleep without them.
>
> That was all a lie. It was a lie both ways. You did not need a girl unless you thought about them. He learned that in the army. Then sooner or later you always got one. When you were really ripe for a girl you always got one. You did not have to think about it. Sooner or later it would come. He had learned that in the army. (*IOT* 92-93)

For Krebs, "getting" a girl calls for "intrigue," "politics," and "lies," much the same machinations required to wage successful warfare and perhaps necessary to nation building as well (and how exactly did he learn in the army to "get along without girls" -- by learning abstinence or by learning how to reroute his desires into same-sex unions?). The public and private realms are thus merged in Krebs's mind, and the world is seen as an unsafe place, replete with continuous conflict, whether waged on the battlefront or homefront, and their consequences are what Krebs most wishes to avoid. Since his desire to live "without consequences" must surely derive from his time as a solider, where the greatest consequence is

death, Krebs links the possible result of having a girl as virtually tantamount to losing one's life. And what, precisely, are the consequences, the price a man must pay to have a woman? The answer -- "intrigue," "politics," and "lying" -- may also be found, at least in part, in his own family, where the father is isolated from the emotional life of his wife and offspring. His mother's fervent religiosity may be her own emotional compensation for the "loss" of her husband, or it may be (like "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife") the cause of his separation from her and the family. Whatever the case may be, Krebs feels no more connected to his mother than to his father. When she tells him how she has prayed for him during the war and how his father is also "'worried'" that he has lost his ambition and hasn't "'got a definite aim in life'" (*IOT* 99), Krebs is unmoved. Seeing this, his mother asks, "'Don't you love your mother, dear boy?'" Krebs replies simply, "'No'" (*IOT* 100). When she begins to cry, however, he assures her that he doesn't "'love anybody,'" but "it wasn't any good . . . . he couldn't make her see it." Krebs then apologizes and insists that he does love her, but cannot bring himself to kneel and pray with her (*IOT* 100-01).

Krebs "had tried to keep his life from being complicated. Still, none of it had touched him" (*IOT* 101). Of course this is highly ironic, for "it" has all "touched him," as we see in his decision to "go to Kansas City and get a job" so that his mother will "feel all right" (*IOT* 101). What is interesting

here is that in describing Krebs's emotional state, Hemingway employs a variation of the phrase "could not touch him" on two occasions. This is the same expression used by the narrator in "The Mother of a Queen" to describe homosexuals: "You can't touch them. Nothing, nothing can touch them" (*WTN* 96). The "queen" of the story is specifically "untouched" (unmoved) by pleas to "make arrangements for the continuing of his mother's grave" (*WTN* 89). The presumably heterosexual Krebs is thus linked to the homosexual, for, like a typical "queen," he is not wholly responsive to his mother's affections (neither was Hemingway). The "queen" withholds money (Hemingway did help to support Grace following Dr. Hemingway's suicide), Krebs withholds love, which thus forges a link between financial and emotional transactions, and the exchange in both cases seems unequal. The consequences of an emotional exchange, however, strikes Krebs as altogether too high a price to pay. (This connection between financial exchange and "corrupted" forms of sexuality is more fully explored in chapter 5.) If we push this connection a bit more, we see a surprising contiguity between the gay man and the code hero, for both are stoic in respect to being unmoved or "untouched" -- at least in the overt expression of emotion -- and like the gay man, who is regarded by the culture as always (and always already!) an adolescent, so here the code hero, in the person of Krebs, remains silent and detached.

The person who moves Krebs most is his sister -- the gay man/straight women relationship? -- though Krebs does not

perceive the possible consequences of an erotic love for his sister, who tells all her friends that Krebs is her "beau":

> "Aren't you my beau, Hare [she asks]?"
>
> "You bet."
>
> "Couldn't your brother really be your beau just because he's your brother?"
>
> "I don't know."
>
> "Sure you know. Couldn't you be my beau, Hare, if I was old enough and if you wanted to?"
>
> "Sure. You're my girl now."
>
> "Am I really your girl?"
>
> "Sure."
>
> "Do you love me?"
>
> "Uh, huh."
>
> "Will you love me always?"
>
> "Sure." (*IOT* 97)

Whereas in most erotic pairings in Hemingway the relatively passive female is linked to animals, here it is Krebs who is a "hare" and his sister who aggresses. Helen also may see eroticism as issuing from the blood tie, for Krebs can be her "beau" either in spite of their being siblings or because of it, for Helen's phrase "just because" in the passage above can be read as "in spite of" or as "therefore"; that is, "because" in the sense of cause and effect. Age seems to Helen the only

real problem. The constancy of the brother/sister pairing justifies both being "touched" and paying whatever consequences may result from sibling love, and the only consequence the reader sees as stemming from this relationship is that Krebs will have to watch her play baseball (*IOT* 101). Giving his love to his sister while withholding it from his parents appears to be the only "safe" and unconditional love available to Krebs. His father is absent, his mother consumed by religious fervor, and girls bring too many problems. Love, erotic or otherwise, is therefore rechanneled into the one unthreatening and lasting object, his sister.

A similar flirtation with childhood sibling incest, mixed with gender dissatisfaction, occurs in the long unfinished story "The Last Good Country" (first published in 1972 in *The Nick Adams Stories*). In this version of Hemingway's ongoing family romance, Nick Adams, like Huck Finn, escapes the confines of parental authority and other civilizing influences, here represented by Nick's parents and the other adult members of their northern Michigan town, in order to make off for the woods alone. Nick's sister Littless -- she is less than little? she has lost her own littleness? -- pleads with her older brother to allow her to accompany him on his adventure, saying, "'I'd go like a boy . . . . I always wanted to be a boy anyway. They couldn't tell anything about me if my hair was cut'" (*NAS* 57). Soon thereafter, she says, "'Take me, Nickie. Please take me,'" and the unnamed third-person narrator adds that, "She kissed him and held onto him

with both her arms. Nick Adams looked at her and tried to think straight" (*NAS* 58). The sexual double entendre -- "take me" -- while presented only three pages into the story comes as no surprise, for the narrator has already described Littless, and her relationship to Nick, through Nick's eyes:

> His sister was tanned brown and she had dark brown eyes and dark brown hair with yellow streaks in it from the sun. She and Nick loved each other and they did not love the others. They always thought of everyone else in the family as others. (*NAS* 56-7)

Tanning in the Hemingway canon is frequently associated with adult sexuality and often to "debased" forms of sexuality in both genders (see chapter 6), and once again we have, as we do in *A Farewell to Arms* and *The Garden of Eden*, a young "couple" desirous of a "separate peace."

As the story progresses, however, an odd role reversal begins to take place as Littless assumes more and more of the leadership role in their great escape. She encourages Nick not to become "'weak and indecisive,'" carries their .22 rifle, declares she can keep up with Nick because her "'feet are tough from going barefoot all summer,'" and tells him, "'I'm too happy to be tired'" (*NAS* 67-69). When she asks if it's "'always this nice when you run away from home,'" Nick replies that, "'usually it's lonesome,'" which causes Littless

to worry that he'll become loneseome even with her. Nick says that he will not. Littless continues,

> "You don't mind you're with me instead of going to Trudy [his dark Indian girlfriend]?"
>
> "What do you talk about her for all the time?"
>
> "I haven't been. Maybe you were thinking about her and you thought I was talking."
>
> "You're too smart," Nick said. "I thought about her because you told me where she was and when I knew where she was I wondered what she was doing and all that."
>
> "I guess I shouldn't have come."
>
> "I told you that you shouldn't come."
>
> "Oh, hell," his sister said. "Are we going to be like the others and have fights? . . . " (*NAS* 69-70)

While Littless suspects that Nick would rather be with Trudy, she yet compares herself to his girlfriend, naturally enough wanting Nick's esteem and affection, as well as his consideration of her as an equal. Still, the "proper" place

of the sister, the "appropriate" way for male/female siblings to relate, is called into question, and psychologically threatens the border between sibling affection and intimacy on the one hand, and sexual desire and eroticism on the other. That Nick confuses what he has been thinking with what he has said -- the speech/silence, disclosed/undisclosed dichotomies -- suggests not only that silence must be understood as a form of discourse inseparable from speech, but also that with greater intimacy comes undifferentiation. It is a union both desired and feared: one wishes to become a part of the desired other, but must resist being swallowed-up (especially by the fearsome womb) by maintaining discrete identity. While Catherine Barkley wants her identity to become "all mixed up" with that of Frederic's, "The Last Good Country" implies that whether desired or not, the union of identities issues naturally from intimacy -- those in love, or those who love, cannot maintain complete independence; the self in love is compromised, blurred into the subjectivity of another. Two individuals do not sacrifice a part of themselves for the higher good of a loving relationship, but must completely efface themselves for it -- at least the woman must. In Hemingway, intimacy threatens the primacy, the integrity of the individual, and the longing for spriritual, emotional, or psychological union with another necessitates the virtual erasure of authentic and unique selfhood.

Indeed, Littless, like the two Catherines (Barkley and Bourne), soon completely renounces her gendered identity in

order to become more like the object of her affection (as well as to avail herself of male prerogatives). As usual in Hemingway, this is attempted by cutting her hair short, and she declares that, "'It's very exciting . . . . Now I'm your sister but I'm a boy, too. Do you think it will change me into a boy?'" Nick tells her no, she says that she wishes it would, and Nick replies that she's crazy. Littless next asks if she looks like an "idiot boy" (*NAS* 95), the possible outcome for a child born of an incestuous sexual encounter. The excitement that Littless experiences derives from her paradoxical "middle condition" -- a sister who is a boy -- which allows her to occupy two seemingly contradictory spaces at once. Nick and Littless continue their conversation with Nick saying,

> "I don't want to trade you for a brother."
>
> "You have to now, Nickie, don't you see? It was something we had to do. I should have asked you but I knew it was something we had to do so I did it for a surprise."
>
> "I like it," Nick said. "The hell with everything. I like it very much."
>
> "Thank you, Nickie, so much. I was laying trying to rest like you said. But all I could do was

> imagine things to do for you. I was going to get you a chewing tobacco can full of knockout drops from some big saloon in some place like Sheboygan."
>
> "Who did you get them from?" Nick was sitting down now and his sister sat on his lap and held her arms around his neck and rubbed her cropped head against his cheek. (*NAS* 96)

The first question I have is why Littless's gender change was something they "had to do"? Is it, as Barbara Sheldon says in the unpublished manuscript of *The Garden of Eden*, a "necessary danger" (K422.1-6) 1 for those who wish to make the public private? Is Littless, in other words, "outing" herself, Nick, and/or the unspoken subtext of their relationship? It certainly seems so, for Nick tells her "the hell with everything," by which he surely means, the hell with social rules and the expectations of others. As devoted as Maria is to Robert, Littless passes the time not resting, but attempting to "imagine things to do" for Nick; indeed, it was "all" that she could do. The motivation, the ostensible motivation at any rate, for getting "knockout drops" is so that Nick could use them on the boys with whom he is having a dispute, but it also suggests, within their erotically-charged conversation, that she might also covertly desire to knock

Nick out. She could then have her way with him. Their playful banter continues with Littless pretending that she's a "'whore's assistant,'" one of "'humble origin.'" When Nick asks about her own "origin," Littless replies that she's "'the sister or the brother of a morbid writer and . . . delicately brought up. This makes me intensely desirable to the main whore and to all of her circle'" (*NAS* 96-7). Delicacy seems conceived in terms of gentility, as it is in *A Farewell to Arms* (see chapter 2), a sign of class privilege, which attracts those who, like the "whore," are immoral and/or of "humble origin."

A little later, Littless spends time "practicing being a boy," which, she says, "'would be easy if there was some boy my own age to copy.'" Nick tells her to copy himself, which she finds the "natural" thing to do since they "'have the same shoulder and the same kind of legs'" (*NAS* 98). Masculinity, the story implies, is a performance; to embody the signifying power of the masculine all one need do is "copy" an appropriate signifier, in this case, Nick. The Adams siblings thus anticipate contemporary theories of gender performance!

When Littless insists that she's going to marry Nick (*NAS* 103-04), does she imagine a male homosexual relationship, or does she conceive of a heterosexual union between a man and a woman who both sign masculinity? The story is remarkable, and remarkably contemporary, on at least three counts: (1) gender, an important cultural marker of identity, is seen as fluid; (2) masculinity, and, by implication, femininity, is purely

performative and may reasonably issue from other the male or female; and (3) sex and gender are not collapsed, but remain, however ambiguous the relationship, contiguous, for Littless's proposed marriage can be conceptualized as either gay or straight, irrespective of the genders involved. That she plans to marry under the "Unwritten Law" underscores their remove from, and disinterest in, mainstream culture and modern society, the same yearning expressed by the Bournes; that is, the longing to return to a "primitive" or primeval state which predates recorded history (the Logos of written law). The story ends soon thereafter, with Littless, like so many Hemingway characters, "hungry," though it's unlikely that food is the sustenance she seeks. When the story concludes, Nick promises to read *Wuthering Heights* aloud to her, which returns us to the idea of forbidden passion and the romantic union of two souls (*NAS* 113-14).

Another instance of the incest theme in Hemingway (which I will return to in chapter 5) occurs in *Death in the Afternoon*, where Hemingway reports that when Raymond Radiguet "wearied of the tenuous, rapturous and querulous society of his literary protector, Jean Cocteau . . . [he] spent the nights at an hotel near the Luxembourg Gardens with one of two sisters who were then working as models in the quarter. His protector was greatly upset and denounced this as decadence saying, bitterly, yet proudly of the late Radiguet, 'Bebe [sic] est vicieuse [sic] -- il aime les femmes'" (71). Insasmuch as Cocteau purportedly viewed Radiguet's

heterosexual encounters as "decadence," Comley and Scholes read this as "implying homosexuality as the classic norm from which Radiguet deviated" (122), but this is too fixed a reading to accomodate all the possibilities (and besides, is it Hemingway or Cocteau who does the "implying"?), for they assume that Cocteau's denunication of Radiguet is based on his erotic object choice. It seems to me, however, that the above passage is ambiguous enough to provide for, and support, at least two other readings: (1) Radiguet is decadent because he is unfaithful to Cocteau, and/or (2) Radiguet is decadent because he sleeps with one of his sisters. Hemingway shocks with his (post-)modernity: he seems to accept bisexuality as a very real alternative on the sexual continuum, while even in our time bisexuality is often dismissed (by heterosexuals and homosexuals alike) as just another closet in which those too timid to declare themselves homosexual may hide. Sexuality (whether appropriate or not, as incest perhaps is not) is, therefore, a fluid construct. Radiguet can also be read as a woman: "il [masculine] est vicieuse [feminine]"; and why is he "vicieuse"? -- because he "aime les femmes," because he is unfaithful, because he is bisexual, because he sleeps with his sister? Or all of the above?

2. People of Color

I have already discussed male homosocial bonds and bonding in *A Farewell to Arms*, which give rise in that text to ambiguous gender affiliation, displaced paternal authority,

and rerouted homosexual eroticsm. I now wish to look at three other examples of male bonding, and homoeroticism, in Hemingway that are constructed around the binarisms mentor/protege, powerful/powerless, master/servant; in short, variations on the father/son paradigm. In many of Hemingway's buddy stories, the relationship between men often borders on the homoerotic or at least the subject of homosexuality is broached by one or more of the charcters. The three stories I have in mind are "A Simple Enquiry," "The Battler," and "The Light of the World," works in which father/son-like relations both reveal and conceal the homoerotic base upon which they are constructed.

In "A Simple Enquiry," an Italian major asks in so many words if his orderly is homosexual, and in the end it turns out to be simply an enquiry and nothing more. The story opens with the major working "at a table against the wall," and the third-person narrator tells us that "his face had been burned and then tanned and then burned through the tan," yet another instance of tanning/darkening as a sign of "bent" sexuality. In order to ease the pain of his sunburn, the major spreads oil "over his face, touching it very gently with the tips of his fingers . . . and after he had stroked his forehead and his cheeks, he stroked his nose very delicately between his fingers." The major then decides "to take a little sleep" (*MWW* 162-63). It is as if the major has, like a courtesan, made himself up for bed, and insasmuch as tanning in Hemingway is often linked to "corrupted" sexualities, it may also be

that the oil is an attempt to "heal" the major of his erotic proclivities even as it suggests a sexual lubricant. Because a tension between depth and performance exists throughout Hemingway's work, I also read this surface gesture -- spreading the oil -- as an effort to perhaps effect some submerged quality, namely homosexuality. In *The Sun Also Rises*, male homosexuality is seen as a performance, while female homosexuality, it is suggested, resides "under the skin" (see chapter 5); in *The Garden of Eden*, darkening the skin is clearly associated with several forms of non-normative sexuality as well as with black, Indian, or "primitive" sexualities and cultures (see chapter 6).

Soon after the major lies down, he hears his orderly enter the outer room. He calls to his adjutant to send in his orderly, Pinin -- pencil? penis? a penis in him? someone who will have an accusation pinned on, or in, him? Pinin is himself a "dark-faced boy," and the major lies in his bunk with his own "long, burned, oiled face" looking at him (*MWW* 164). His "long" face recalls the androgynous figures of El Greco, hailed in *Death in the Afternoon* as "El Rey de los Maricones" (205). The major then asks his nineteen-year-old orderly if he has "ever been in love":

> "How do you mean, signore maggiore?"
>
> "In love -- with a girl?"
>
> "I have been with girls."
>
> "I did not ask that. I asked

> if you had been in love -- with a girl."
>
> "Yes, signore maggiore."
>
> "You are in love with this girl now? You don't write her. I read all your letters."
>
> "I am in love with her," Pinin said, "but do not write her."
>
> "Are you sure of this?"
>
> "I am sure." (*MWW* 164-65)

That Pinin first requires an explanation for "in love," and then seems to deliberately avoid answering the question, suggests that he is either too young to understand the distinction between love and lovemaking, or that he has something to hide, perhaps both. The major, who reads all of Pinin's letters -- one may wonder whether he reads all letters written by subordinates or just Pinin's -- doubts the voracity of the orderly's answer: "are you sure of this?" he asks, though the orderly has an "out," for their exchange is semantically ambiguous. Is Pinin saying that he is "sure" he is in love with his girl, or "sure" that he does not write to her? The "enquiry" continues:

> "Tonani," the major said [to his adjutant] in the same tone of voice, "can you hear me talking?"
>
> There was no answer from the next room.

> "He can not hear," the major said. "And you are quite sure that you love a girl?"
>
> "I am sure." [He has had time to make himself sure.]
>
> "And," the major looked at him quickly, "that you are not corrupt?"
>
> "I don't know what you mean, corrupt."
>
> "All right," the major said. "You needn't be superior." (*MWW* 165)

The unnamed major -- a generic homosexual perhaps -- first makes certain that his room functions as a private space (a closet!) before pursuing his interrogation. "Corrupt" is of course an obvious euphemism for homosexual, and when the major tells Pinin that he "needn't be superior," Jake Barnes's complaint against both homosexuals and Robert Cohn, the feminized Jew of *The Sun Also Rises*, is recalled, for Jake denounces both the male homosexuals and Robert for their "superior" --that is, aristocratic -- manner (20, 96).

Pinin then "looked at the floor," which calls his manhood into question, for, as discussed previously, turning away from reality unmans the man, at the same time as "the major looked at his brown face, down and up him, and at his hands." Hemingway once again underscores Pinin's darkness and now, too, his hands, commonly looked to for signs of homosexuality

(limp-wristed or soft; that is, unused to labor). Recall, for example, that Littless feels she must master her hand movements before she is comfortable and convincing as a boy (*NAS* 99); and the gay men in *The Sun Also Rises* are described as having "white hands, wavy hair, white faces" (20), while the homosexual in "The Light of the World" "puts lemon juice on his hands" to keep them white" (*WTN* 30). Hands and gloves are also signifiers of sexuality and gender affiliation in *A Farewell to Arms* (see chapter 2).

The major then says, "'And you don't really want -- " and "Pinin looked at the floor [again],'" which indicates he now surely understands what the major is talking about. The major continues, but as quoted above, cannot quite get out the rest of his question, "'That your great desire isn't really -- '" Pinin continues to look at the floor, while the major "leaned his head back on the rucksack and smiled. He was really relieved: life in the army was too complicated." The major then tells his orderly that he's a "'good boy,'" warning him not to be "'superior,'" and to be "'careful some one else doesn't come along and take you.'" Pinin continues to stand near the major's bunk. "'Don't be afraid,'" the major said. His hands were folded on his blankets. 'I won't touch you'" (*MWW* 165-66). The major has "outed" himself, Pinin perhaps, and certainly the nature of his "enquiry."

Pinin then departs momentarily, "leaving the door open," and when he returns, the "adjutant looked up at him as he walked awkwardly across the room and out the door." Pinin

returns with wood for the major's stove and he is now "flushed and moved differently." The "flush" can either express his embarassment, his "real" sexuality rising to the surface, or both. The major, meanwhile, gazes upon "his cloth-covered helmet and his snow-glasses that hung from a nail on the wall" while listening to Pinin "walk across the floor." And in the final line of the story, the major thinks, "The little devil . . . I wonder if he lied to me" (*MWW* 166-67). The major has exposed his own "true" identity, for his "masks" are off and hang, as if impaled, on a nail, at some distance; the surface, or performance, has been stripped away to reveal the major's otherwise concealed identity. The major then describes Pinin as a "devil," just as David Bourne calls his gender-bending wife a "Devil," and just as the aging Colonel Robert Cantwell of *Across the River and into The Trees* continually refers to his daughter/love, the Countess Renata, as a "Devil."

This story is notable for what it is not, namely, an indictment of homosexuality. While the tone of the narrative is mildly ironic, Hemingway's attitude toward the major is not in the least censorious; indeed, if anyone is condemned for anything, it is Pinin, gently chastised as a "devil" for perhaps having lied to the major. What's more, Hemingway avoids demonizing the major, and by extension, all gay men, by refusing to draw the stereotypical portrait of the homosexual as a predator on the young. While the major might at least attempt to avail himself of the privilege and power conveyed upon him by virtue of his military rank, he chooses not to

exercise his authority to manipulate Pinin beyond his "simple enquiry." This is not, therefore, a homosexual seduction tale: the major does not so much attempt to seduce his orderly as "out" him. The story offers no evidence that even had Pinin a "great desire" for same-gender sex that the major would have tried to force him into actualizing it, for, if anything, the major is "relieved" he needn't take his "enquiry" any further. If the "wood for the stove" which Pinin brings in represents the boy's masculinity (like the logs in "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife"), then it is a masculinity freely offered, as if in sacrifice, without the major's having asked for it. Pinin thus serves the major's comfort -- as a good nurse, "interne," mother, or orderly will -- even while he perhaps stokes the fires of the major's desire. By the end of the story, Pinin cannot look the major directly in the face -- he is still closeted, or, at the least, uncomfortable with homosexual desire -- though the major can now tell him to leave his own door open (*MWW* 166).

Gerry Brenner finds that the "Nick-on-the-road stories," two of which I will presently discuss, "fit the 'family romance' pattern that Freud found common to fairy tales, heroic myths, fiction, and most children's development: the search for the 'true' father" (18). Though I'm not quite sure what Brenner means by the "'true' father," Hemingway's "Nick-on-the-road stories" are not only family romances, but, like all such stories, quite obviously quest tales, and I would

agree with Brenner only if he understands Nick's quest as a "search" for masculine identity, an identity which, as we have already seen, is not provided by Dr. Adams. The relationship between Ad and Bugs in "The Battler" is indeed structured on a master/servant paradigm, and in this case, the portrait of their homoerotic friendship is delineated in loving and affectionate terms. Their relationship may, in fact, demonstrate to Nick, who is so often a spectator in these stories, how to love rather than how to consolidate a traditional masculine identity.

In "The Battler" Nick comes upon a punchdrunk prizefighter named Ad Francis whose homosexual black cook is named Bugs. In this instance, the washed-up (has his manhood been washed-out?) fighter's last name is androgynous, while the cook's name plays off the term "buggery," recalling Nick and his father in "Fathers and Sons." That the fighter had once married a woman wrongly thought to be his sister (*IOT* 77) puts us in mind of Radiguet and his sister, as well as Krebs and Helen, and Nick and Littless. Bugs's blackness both intensifies the master/servant nature of their relationship while again linking "corrupted" sexuality to the darker races. And here, too, Nick plays the role of witness or spectator to their relationship, emphasizing the performative aspect of (homo)sexuality as well as Nick's voyueristic interest in it -- the performance of gender and/or sexuality is a spectator sport.

Nick approaches Ad and Bug's campsite cautiously, for he

has recently been assaulted by a brakeman when attempting to hop a passing train. Nick is angry with himself for having "fallen for" the brakeman's lure: "'Come here, kid . . . . I got something for you.'" Falling for such a ruse, Nick believes, was a "lousy kid thing to have done," and he's certain that, "They would never suck him in that way again" (*IOT* 65). The brakeman's cruelty and Nick's childlike belief that he really had "something" for him -- an incident that contrasts innocence/experience -- establishes the brutal nature of the world and the abuse younger men sometimes suffer at the hands of their elders. The brakeman's promise that he has "something" for Nick might also be read as a kind of sadistic seduction of Nick, the possibly erotic undercurrent indicated by the phrases "fallen for" (fall in love) and "suck him in" -- is it too much to also suggest that Nick's masculinity has been undermined, not just by getting beat-up, but by having been thrown away from the phallic train?

Nick discovers, however, that there is little to fear from the man at the fire, who calls him over and asks about his "shiner." When Nick tells the man that he'll "'get him [the brakeman],'" Ad replies, "'You're a tough one, aren't you?'" Nick says no, but Ad insists that, '"All you kids are tough,'" though both men agree that that's the way "it has to be" (*IOT* 68). Depending on how one "hears" the line, "You're a tough one, aren't you," it can be interpreted as a simple observation of fact, a mildly upsetting prospect, or a sexual turn on. Nick may perceive Ad as homosexual, but the reader

is certainly pointed to such a conclusion by Hemingway's use of the word "queer" to describe him: "he had queer shaped lip," and his face was "queerly formed and mutilated" (*IOT* 68).

Ad then removes his cap and shows off one side of his head: "Where the other ear should have been there was a stump," another Hemingway character who is missing a part of his body. Ad goes on to tell Nick that he's "'not quite right,'" that he is, in fact, "'a little crazy,'" though it is unclear if this relates to his sexuality and/or if his battles in the ring have somehow altered his sexual identity, which is implied by the phrase "not quite right," a variation of Rinaldi's claim that Frederic is "a little that way" (*Farewell* 65). Soon Bugs is heard in the clearing, and from his voice and "the way he walked," Nick knows that he is a "negro." Bugs, returning to cook for Ad, is, according to Ad, "crazy, too." When Bugs hears that Nick is not, he replies that Nick has "'got a lot coming to him'" (*IOT* 77). "Crazy" of course removes one from the society of "normal" men as homosexuality divorces one from "normal" heterosexuality. Is it then isolation from normative society that Nick has "coming to him," or is it simply a throwaway comment? In either case, Bugs seems confident that Nick will in future go crazy.

Bugs, the black servant, member of a maligned race and one which is often conceived of, in America anyway, as violent, backward, and primitive, is here portrayed as polite and gentle: he addresses Nick as "Mister Adams" and Ad as

"Mister Francis" (*IOT* 73). While this points to the hierarchy of the races, such politesse may also be intended to signify homosexuality, the formal address as a "superior," or aristocratic, affectation that belies Bugs's servant status. But he is more than a mere servant; Bugs is also a kind of nurse to Ad. When for no reason Ad goes a little crazy and challenges Nick to a fight, Bugs knocks Ad out with a "cloth-wrapped blackjack" and then "laid him down gently." Bugs then apologizes to "Mister Adams" (*IOT* 75). While Ad is unconscious, Bugs explains that what made Ad crazy was '"too many beatings'" and the sister Ad had run off with and married, which made for "'a lot of unpleasantness.'" We then learn that in fact "'they wasn't brother and sister no more than a rabbit'" (though rabbit suggests fecundity, as well as the female genitalia), but still, Ad's wife "looked enough like him to be twins" (*IOT* 77).

It turns out that Bugs first met Ad in jail, when Ad was in for "'busting people all the time'" and Bugs for "'cuttin' a man,'" the same expression Hemingway uses in *A Moveable Feast* (18) to describe the appropriate heterosexual response to homosexual advances, and prison is of course figured as a primary site of situational homosexuality. Bugs then "smiled, and went on soft-voiced," saying that, "'Right away I liked him [Ad] and when I got out I looked him up. He likes to think I'm crazy and I don't mind. I like to be with him and I like seeing the country and I don't have to commit no larceny to do it. I like living like a gentleman . . . . He's

got money,'" which, Bugs explains, is sent to him by his ex-wife, whom, he repeats, "'looks enough like him to be his own twin'" (*IOT* 77-78), another instance of lovers-as-siblings that speaks to the desire to contain gendered oppositions within one androgynous body, most specifically recalling Pilar's observation of Robert and Maria. The clue that Bugs likes Ad "that way" is the line about Bugs's smiling and speaking "soft-voiced" when he explains how they met. That Bugs looked up Ad suggests that Bugs was the aggressor in their relationship, but that financial gain was also involved, thus aligning Bugs with the miserly "queen" of "The Mother of a Queen," as well as with the stingy gay matadors maligned in *Death in the Afternoon* (see chapter 5). Bugs is not, moreover, "crazy," but allows Ad to continue to think that he is. I wonder, then, if "crazy" is intended to be read as "homosexual," and, if so, whether Ad is the "real" gay man.

Another of Hemingway's rough stories, "The Light of the World," makes a similar connection between homosexuality and financial transactions. The story begins when the unnamed narrator (doubtless Nick Adams) and his friend Tom enter an unfamiliar bar. Mistaking them for gay, the bartender "reached over and put the glass covers on the two free-lunch bowls." Soon thereafter (though not without provocation), he calls them "punks" (*WTN* 27-28). The bartender apparently knows that homosexual men ("punks") are always looking for a free handout (like gold diggers marrying for money). The narrator and Tom then remove to the train station where they

meet "five whores," "six white men," one of whom is homosexual, and "four Indians." One of the "white men" tells the narrator that the homosexual "puts lemon juice on his hands . . . . He wouldn't get them in dishwater for anything. Look how white they are" (*WTN* 30). 2 His white hands affiliates him with the "peroxide blonde" prostitute, whose lightened hair is manufactured to suggest added femininity, as well as to the gay men in *The Sun Also Rises*, for when they are not tanned, homosexual men are bleached, or drained, of their manhood. What's more, one of the prostitutes in "The Light of the World" is named Frances, like Ad, Robert Cohn's domineering fiancee in *The Sun Also Rises*, and the cowardly husband in "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber." The color of skin -- whether light or dark -- functions in Hemingway as a free-floating signifer of homosexuality and other non-normative sexualities.

The connection between prostitution and male homosexuality is also forged and strengthened by their (presumed) promiscuity. And, finally, the prostitute and gay man are united by their (again, presumed) predatory instinct, for the prostitute is forever attempting to "seduce" potential clients, just as the male homosexual is constantly attempting to "convert" or initiate others into his "perverted" way of life. Joseph M. Flora may be indulging in a bit of wishful thinking when he writes that, "'The Battler' and 'The Light of the World' are similarly structured. In each story, Nick -- seeking for light and fellowship after harsh treatment from a

stranger -- comes into 'grotesque' company to find in that company new insight about the nature of love" (85), but even if this statement is only partially true (and it is at least that), what a surprise to find such openness in Hemingway, who continues to exist in the popular imagination as a cultural icon of traditional masculine values.

Chapter 5

Performance Art

> "Are you gay?" she asked me gently, but I couldn't bear such honesty. Not exactly, I said evasively, just terribly ambiguous and fucked up. I made it sound like one of those obscure war wounds in Hemingway.
> -- Paul Monette, *Becoming a Man* (225)

> I'm not a lesbian. I just loved Thelma.
> -- Djuna Barnes (qtd. in Field 99)

In her 1993 memoir, Diana Trilling wonders if "the lack of family and social roots in the people of whom Hemingway writes is perhaps not unconnected with whatever it is that robs him of the literary stature of Proust or Joyce or Thomas Mann or D.H. Lawrence" (15). While this formulation may at first appear wrong-headed -- after all, modernism was in part about alienation and rootlessness -- Trilling is on to something when she points to the "lack of family and social roots" in Hemingway (it may be surprising to recall that no Hemingway novel, save *To Have and Have Not*, is set on native ground). We have already seen how Hemingway, whose characters are so often Americans abroad, constructs a number of makeshift families that undermine concepts of the traditional family; how, too, those families are marked by erotically-charged relationships and anxieties over the place of the

father in the family structure. And while we can argue over Hemingway's "literary stature," what is virtually beyond dispute is Hemingway's desire to regain for his characters some measure of stability and "social roots" in a cultural waste land where "the center cannot hold," where the old values, when not rejected outright, are the source of profound dis-ease. The families already discussed are all, in a sense, ready-made: Frederic Henry and Robert Jordan join pre-existing wartime "families," and Nick Adams and other youthful protagonists reconfigure their biological families by emotionally or psychologically reimagining them. In the case of *The Sun Also Rises*, however, no ready-made family of any sort exists for Jake Barnes, and so his circle of friends provides what "social roots" and emotional connections are possible for a "lost generation." This chapter will therefore address itself in part to questions of national identity and how such identity is configured and consolidated within the Hemingway text, a discussion that will continue in chapter 6 on *The Garden of Eden*, where Hemingway returns both to the France of his youth and the themes that occupied him early in his career.

Masculine signification -- that is, masculinity as a performance of gendered identity -- will, however, be the primary focus of this chapter, for *The Sun Also Rises* makes the strongest case in Hemingway for the idea that identities are produced and performed in a largely public space. And it is in the bullring, and the bullfight proper, that shifting

significations of masculinity find their most acute, complex, and problematic expression.

1. Jake Barnes and Masculine Signification

In *The Sun Also Rises*, Brett Ashley wears the costume of the Modern Woman, "a slipover jersey sweater and a tweed skirt, and her hair was brushed back like a boy's. She started all that." Whatever is meant by "all that," Brett, a "damned fine-looking" woman, (22) evokes androgyny and gender ambiguity both in physical appearance (her hair) and attire (her jersey). Her "look" is then contrasted to the homosexual men Jake observes at a *bal musette* with her. Jake's attitude toward the homosexuals -- how they are degraded and cast as his own rivals -- reveals the extent to which sexual categories and gender roles are cultural constructions. As Judith Butler maintains,

> [t]he heterosexualization of desire requires and institutes the production of discrete and asymmetrical oppositions between "feminine" and "masculine," where these are understood as expressive of "male" and "female." (17)

This in turn suggests that "the gendered body is performative," and, in fact, "has no ontological status apart from the various acts which constitute reality." In as much as "the inner truth of gender is a fabrication," so "genders

can be neither true nor false, but are only produced as the truth effects of a discourse of primary and stable identity." The notion of a "primary and interior gendered self" is, therefore, a cultural construction which creates the "illusion" of such a disguised self. That gender is itself a kind of "performance of drag . . . . *reveals the imitative structure of gender itself -- as well as its contingency*" (Butler's emphasis 136-37)

With respect to the "crowd of young men, some in jerseys and some in their shirt sleeves" (20) that Jake encounters at the *bal musette*, external signs -- that is, behavioral or performative acts -- lead Jake to "read" the men as homosexual. The various signs by which their homosexuality is made known are these: their "jerseys" and "shirt-sleeves," their "newly washed, wavy hair," their "grimacing, gesturing, talking" (20). While it may be argued that performativity ("grimacing, gesturing, talking") is here elided with the homosexual as a morphological "type" ("newly washed, wavy hair"; "white hands" and "white faces") created by a congenital condition, I maintain that what may at first seem to be morphological is in fact performative: these men are "types" not owing to naturalized physical features, but rather because they have created themselves as a "type" in order to enact (perform) the role of homosexual.

Their casual dress and careful grooming suggest a "feminine" preoccupation with physical appearance, a "womanly" concern with primping and self-presentation. Their hair

appears to be styled ("wavy"), like a woman's, while their "white hands" suggest delicacy, their "white faces," make-up or powder. 1 Just as the feminized Jew of the novel, Robert Cohn, is later denigrated for his excessive barbering (99), so the homosexual is scorned for a similar concern with appearance. Rather than exhibiting the reticence and rigidity associated with masculinity, they are overly, and overtly, expressive, uninhibited in the use of their bodies and voices. Jake's "diagnosis" is confirmed, his own masculinity momentarily consolidated, by the policeman near the door of the bar, who, in a gesture that bonds the two "real" men, while marginalizing the homosexuals as other, looks at Jake and smiles (20).

But what is it, really, that Jake "reads?" It is not the sexual orientation of the men, but rather a set of signs, a visual (and aural) field -- the body -- upon which is inscribed, and through which is enacted, their otherwise concealed sexuality. The young men have their homosexuality "written" on their faces and on their bodies. They "perform" their sexuality through facial expressions and physical gestures. Just as Jake's wound remains unnamed, so homosexuality/homosexual is never mentioned; both are instead disclosed through what Arnold and Cathy Davidson call "sexual and textual absences." The reader, like Jake, "must read the ostensible sexual preference of the young men from the various signs provided and thereby decode covert private sexuality from overt public sociability" (Davidson 89). Homosexuality

is therefore not simply a matter of erotic object choice and same-gender sex. It is also a way of being, for the performativity of the young men indicates -- is, in fact, predictive of -- their bedroom behavior.

What Jake "reads" is not, therefore, sexuality, but gender. In Butlerian terms, Brett's companions are "imitating" the "wrong" gender. Sexual identity can thus be determined through careful observation of behavior, and sex and gender thereby collapse into a self-same "truth" manifest in appearance. The "feminine," regarded as the exclusive province of the female, is seen as inscribed within/on the female body. Its appropriation by the male constitutes a gender transgression which in and of itself becomes the knowable sign of homosexuality. The homosexual reveals himself through a performative "error," and, by this logic, the feminine, effeminate, or feminized man is always homosexual, for boys will be boys only if they act like boys; when boys act like girls -- that is, do not conform to gender/ed expectations -- then they are acting, in public or in private, in ways "not adequate to reality" (Foucault, *Herculine* x-xi).

Jake objects not so much to homosexual behavior (which is unseen), but to "femininity" expressed through the "wrong" body. Gender-crossing -- a "feminine" sign adapted by a man -- is what troubles Jake; the rupture betwen a culturally-determined signifier (the male body) and signified (the female gender) disrupts the very notion of the male/female binary.

But what if the young men had not crossed the gender line? What if their behavior were "in accord" with their sex? If they, in short, acted the way Jake expects men to act? He would then not have the "signs" of their homosexuality available to him.

The perception that the young men are enacting the "wrong" gender leads to the conclusion that they are themselves inauthentic, that the projection of a "feminine" persona is merely a parody, a send-up of the female's "proper" role. Just as their presumed sexual deviation is a "deviation from the truth," a behavioral "error," so the way they act in public is a deliberate "deviation" from the "truth" of their gender. Although one can argue that the men are indeed "camping" in order to destabilize the very notion of fixed (naturalized) gender characteristics -- that theirs is a conscious deployment of gender to strategic political ends -- Jake cannot allow for the possibility that they might truly *be* the way they *act*. He cannot believe that these men are *really* like that ("feminine") because they are male.

When Jake sees one of the men dancing with Georgette, the prostitute he picked up earlier in the evening, he describes her "tall blonde" partner as dancing "big-hippily, carrying his head on one side, his eyes lifted as he danced" (20). In other words, he danced like a woman, for "big-hippily" evokes the maternal body, or perhaps the "bump-and-grind" of a "loose" woman who wishes to call attention to her genital area. That his head is carried "on one side" implies that a

pose has been struck, that he is unbalanced, somehow "off." His gaze, moreover, is not where it should be -- on the female object -- but somewhere else, an indication that he is not firmly grounded or well-focused, but given to wandering (sexual promiscuity?). "Eyes lifted," he stares dreamily into space, like a screen beauty in a seductive Hollywood photograph. Indeed, Hollywood erotica, magazine "glamour shots," and even Christian iconography depict the female as exposed, inviting, and passive through the position of her head, which is often pictured thrown back in ecstasy/agony. This same receptivity and vulnerability is recalled in the homosexual's dancing, his head turned "on one side." And when the music stops, "another one of them" asks Georgette to dance, and Jake knows that "they would all dance with her," for "[t]hey are like that" (20).

Just what he means by "like that" remains ambiguous; he neither explains, nor reflects upon, what precisely they are "like" or why they might be that way. I take Jake to mean, however, that homosexuals enjoy flirting with what they perceive as the exotic or marginalized, for the prostitute represents yet another form of "deviant" desire or "perverted" sexuality. She is, moreover, like all women, alien to the homosexual's erotic life, just as the homosexuals are foreign to the conception of manhood expressed in the novel.

Homosexuals, then, enjoy sporting with, or teasing, the "fallen" woman. Her own "corrupted" sexuality provides them with a non-threatening plaything which they are able to trade

among themselves (as they presumably trade sexual partners, hopping from one bed to another). While Georgette is unaffiliated with the homosexual men in terms of their sexuality, she is aligned with them because of her own professional promiscuity. What's more, her very name, a feminized version of George (where the masculine is taken for the universal), suggests that she is a feminized man -- another "performance of drag" that underscores *male* promiscuity.

Brett uses the homosexuals in a similar manner -- "when one's with the crowd I'm with, one can drink in such safety" (20) -- and this (perhaps the only wholly unambiguous response to these men, as well as the determining line that they are in fact gay) does not seem to greatly disturb Jake. What offends him is rather the deployment of the female body as an item of exchange. While Georgette is present owing entirely to his transaction with her, in his own case, she would be used "properly" -- that is, for sexual exchange -- if only he could do so. The very fact that he cannot, however, appropriate her body for the "manly" purpose for which she is intended affiliates Jake himself with the homosexuals. Although his desire is normative, his body prevents him from actualizing his "manhood." Jake's inability to perform sexually corresponds to the homosexual's inability to perform his "correct" gender. Jake's sexual inadequacy and the homosexual's gender transgression are therefore conjoined: neither can properly signify "masculinity."

When the men first enter the bar, Jake overhears a part of their conversation which relates to Georgette:

> One of them saw Georgette and said: "I do declare. There is an actual harlot. I'm going to dance with her, Lett. You watch me."
>
> The tall dark one, called Lett, said: "Don't be rash."
>
> The blonde one answered: "Don't worry, dear." (20)

Their theatricality and the staginess of the scene itself is underscored by the dramatic presentation of their dialogue, for the colon is a formalistic device borrowed from the drama (and is employed in the novel only in this instance). Their mannered speech also sounds theatrical and declamatory. The imposition of "do" in "I declare" strikes one rather as an archaism out of the studied drawing rooms of the nineteenth century. Reminiscent of upper-class speech patterns, whose diction itself represents a kind of cultural power, the archaic form of address also recalls the stereotypical Southern Belle, whose inflection feeds into the construction of the Southern woman as artificial and insincere. Like the Belle of the Old South, the homosexual affects an aristocratic pose which is both arch and pretentious, for both exhibit a "superior, simpering composure" (20). That the blonde "declares" that he sees an "actual" harlot intensifies the the split between the "real" and the "feigned," the "true" and the

"untrue." Georgette's reality is, in Jake's mind anyway, a titillation for the men, a contrived danger (like Brett's relationship to the homosexuals) that poses no threat. That which is termed "rash" is "rash" only insofar as it unites the authentic (a "real" female) with the inauthentic (a "falsified" female -- the homosexual). But even this is not a real danger, for both the prostitute and homosexual are thought to be poor copies of an original (authentic) female. The very existence of the gay man -- "feminine" desire expressed through the male body, "feminine" behavior enacted by a man -- calls into question not only naturalized sex/ gender roles, but such oppositions as seen/unseen, disclosed/ undisclosed, real/illusory as well.

It is also notable that "it is not Brett who elicits Jake's obvious and immediate attraction" (Davidson 89) when she enters the bar, but rather her homosexual companions:

> I was very angry. Somehow they always made me angry. I know they are supposed to be amusing, and you should be tolerant, but I wanted to swing on one, any one, anything to shatter that superior, simpering composure. (20)

The urge to physically assault the homosexual man -- a forerunner to what we now call "gay bashing," which itself, many theorists argue, constitutes an attack on the "feminine" and is therefore rooted in misogyny -- quite clearly

derives from Jake's anger, though what, precisely, is he so angry about? The source of his rage stems in part from his frustration at being unable to categorize the homosexual within the male/female binary. That these men represent, and enact, gender non-conformity violates the cultural boundaries established to demarcate appropriate social and sexual behavior. Any attempted remapping of these culturally agreed-upon borders exposes the arbitrariness of their frontiers, which in turn calls for a rethinking of the ontological groundwork of sex/gender itself. At the same time, his anger is self-hatred displaced onto the homosexual, for Jake has lost (physically and psychologically) his signifying phallus. What's more, the tolerance he knows he should have for the homosexuals may also be the same tolerance he hopes Brett will have for him and his sexual failing.

In a cultural system which authorizes a single mode of self-presentation for each gender, transgressing the binary law of male/female constitutes a crime. Just as homosexuality is often constructed as "a crime against nature," so this crime, or sin, against naturalized gender performance must be punished: Jake wishes "to shatter that superior, simpering composure," which is understood to be a homosexual or "feminine" trait. Robert Cohn's manner is also described as "superior" (96), which is, as Gay Wilentz notes, ironic because "it is the outwardly emasculated Cohn who can perform" (188), and this is also true, as we shall see, of the gay men as well. To whom or what the homosexual is "superior" is not

expressed, but Jake apparently believes that they are, or think that they are, "superior" to him. He is also disturbed by their "simpering composure," though one may wonder whether it is their "composure" itself which troubles Jake, or the "simpering" nature of that "composure." In either case, the ostensibly heterosexual man here feels threatened by the homosexual's acceptance, and assertion, of his presumably "incorrect" gender behavior. If he is "superior" to Jake, then it becomes axiomatic that Jake is inferior to him, for Jake himself hopes that he signifies what he is not, namely, the potent and powerful heterosexual male.

What Jake is unable or unwilling to acknowledge (disclose) is that his relationship to women resembles the homosexual's. Though for different reasons, both Jake and the homosexual man do not relate to women in accordance with the demands of a heterosexual(-ist) culture. What Jake desires but cannot do is to perform sexually with women, the very performance rejected by the homosexual. While the homosexual rejects heterosexual performativity, he does so in favor of an alternate performativity -- like Robert, he *can* perform. Jake, on the other hand, is bound by a "masculine" signification and desire which is "untrue" -- he cannot do what his appearance suggests he can do. The homosexual signifies differently, Jake not at all, and so the homosexual is seen as "superior."

Jake's body stands, as it were, between himself and his desires; the homosexual's "perverse" desire, however,

circumvents the "natural" physical act. It is, therefore, not the homosexual denial, or disinterest, in women which offends Jake, but the renunciation of naturalized male desire. When he looks at the homosexual man what Jake sees, then, is the body of a male that does not perform as a "man"; when he regards himself what he sees is the body of a male that lacks the sign of "manliness."

For Hemingway the homosexual is corrupted by his "perverse" desires and behavior. This is just one instance of how the nineteenth-century medical model of homosexuality, which regarded same-gender sex as a congenital abnormality, absorbed the previous centuries-old construction of homosexual behavior as "a sinful and evil practice . . . [and consequently] the older conception remained active within the new" (Dollimore 46). Jake, then, can only account for the homosexual man by associating him with aristocratic pretensions or with "femininity," which Jake perceives in the gay man's "superior," Southern Belle-like manner.

In the following chapter, Jake's affiliation with the homosexual and with gender reversal is even more pronounced. While undressing for bed, he sees himself in the mirror:

> Undressing, I looked at myself in the mirror of the big armoire beside the bed. That was a typically French way too, I suppose. Of all the ways to be wounded. I suppose

> it was funny. I put my pajamas on
> and got into bed. (30)

While the digression concerning the armoire might at first appear to be an attempt to avoid seeing himself, or talking about what he sees, it is actually a symbolic corollary of Jake's wound. Just as the armoire represents "a typically French way to furnish a room," so the penis is "typical" of the male body. Whereas the armoire is "practical," however, Jake's member is not (at least in relation to his sex life); rather, it is all "furnishing." In respect to the female, the homosexual's sex is similarly "furnishing." That Jake regards his wound as "funny" also recalls his earlier observation that homosexual men "are supposed to be amusing" (20), but clearly neither are a source of much humor. Both are instead ironic objects of derision. What Jake sees in the mirror is that which has come to be mere physical ornamentation. That which is present signifies absence, not of desire but of ability. The mirror reflects appearance; it does not reveal essence. At the same time, however, the "external signs" which it presents can, if "read" correctly, provide the clues necessary to apprehend "inner truth." In Jake's case, that "truth" is his fractured sense of masculine identity. In holding the mirror up to himself, what Jake discovers is his close affiliation to the homosexual men (the use of mirrors in Hemingway is more fully explored in chapter 7). What Thomas Strychacaz calls this "displacement of self into seeing" -- in chapter 2 of *The Sun*, Jake admits to the "rotten habit of

picturing the bedroom scenes of my friends" (13), and recall that in "The Battler," Nick as Narcicuss gazes into the water at himself -- points to the bullfight as a "drama of evaluatory watching" (Strychacaz 258). This "drama" is also enacted outside the bullring, when Jake "pimps" for Brett at a cafe (another public space) by introducing her to the handsome young matador Pedro Romero, "the best-looking boy" Jake had "ever seen" (163). Indeed, Pedro is "nice to look at" (184) and Jake himself focuses throughout on Pedro's body, his brown skin (185) and his "very fine" hand with its "small" wrist (185), which, inasmuch as "Pedro's body, a body that, like Brett's blends the masculine with the feminine," leads Debra A. Moddelmog to assert that "the moment when Jake brings together Pedro and Brett is also the moment when the text reveals its inability to separate heterosexual from homosexual desire within the desiring body" (196). Like the bullring, the presence of an "audience" transforms the cafe into a kind of arena where "spectators" judge the performance of others, and in this case, Jake, having violated the "code of *aficion*" by distracting Pedro before a big fight, is figuratively booed off the stage by the "real" *aficion*, the hotel proprietor Montoya.

Inasmuch as Jake considers himself to be heterosexual, the novel therefore posits the site of sexuality in gendered desire rather sexual behavior. What distinguishes Jake from the homosexual men is gender performance and erotic object choice. By this logic, it follows that sexuality is determined by gender identification rather than actual sexual activity.

Jake's sex can no longer penetrate a woman (and so all sexual relations are apparently ruled out), but he remains heterosexual by virtue of his desire. If the men from the bar discontinued same-gender sex, they would presumably remain homosexual, just as Jake continues to be heterosexual in spite of his now-celibate life. Sexual identity therefore issues not from the sex act itself, but from covert desires or overt social behavior. When Jake finally gets into bed, his "head started to work," and he again thinks how his was a "rotten" way to be wounded, and "on a joke front like the Italian" at that -- another unfunny joke (31).

As mentioned earlier, his wound is an accident which cannot be named, just as homosexuality is the love that dare not speak its name. Jake has "given more" (31) than his life, for his manhood has been sacrificed, or at least compromised, and with it the potential for offspring: his link to the future has been severed. The scene continues:

> I lay awake thinking and my mind jumping around. Then I couldn't keep away from it, and I started to think about Brett and all the rest of it went away. I was thinking about Brett and my mind stopped jumping around and started to go in sort of smooth waves. Then all of a sudden I started to cry. Then after a while it was better and

> I lay in bed and listened to the heavy trams go by and way down the street, and then I went to sleep. (31)

This is a highly problematic passage owing not only to the ambiguity of the language (what precisely is "it"?), but also to the uncertain signification assigned Jake. If we regard these lines as a masturbatory fantasy either for Jake or for a projected male reader, the "it" that he "couldn't keep away from" may be taken to refer to the body itself, the part with which Jake is most preoccupied. Once he focuses his attention on "it" -- and nothing suggests that his thoughts alone are what he "couldn't keep away from" -- he "started to think about Brett and all the rest of it went away." Now the "it" may be the wound and his reflections on his injury, but he may also be talking about his wounded sex itself, where "sex" is understood to be the male member. That is to say, what "went away" might be the maimed part of himself, leaving Jake free to fantasize that his wound has been healed, his body restored to wholeness, health, and a "correct" masculine morphology, even while his mind is linked to female sexuality ("smooth waves" and tears). If, on the other hand, what "went away" is the male member itself, then Jake imagines himself in the female subject position. In this case, his body has not been restored (even psychologically), but reinscribed.

The trams, a variation on the familiar phallic image of the penis as a powerful, forward-moving train, are, like Jake's

own maleness, removed from himself, detached and no longer a function of his body, but outside of himself and "way down the street." Kenneth Lynn goes so far as to suggest that Jake is a man "whose dilemma is that, like a lesbian, he cannot penetrate his loved one's body with his own" (323). While this in part betrays Lynn's lack of understanding of lesbian sexuality, it is nevertheless an acute observation as it pertains to Jake's ruptured sense of male identity. In this particular it remains unclear, however, whether his masculinity is in question because of the lost body part (morphology) or because of his inability to express (perform) what is regarded as masculine -- that is, heterosexual performativity. This loss is later seen in relation to homosexuality itself, when Jake's wound is directly linked to homosexual identity.

This linkage occurs about midway through the novel, during the fishing trip Jake takes with his friend Bill Gorton prior to the start of the fiesta. The fishing episode represents one of Hemingway's "pastoral interludes, in which his male characters seek relief from social tensions," part of a tradition in American fiction "that begins with Cooper and Brackenridge and extends through Hawthorne, Melville, and Twain" (Martin 49). This "pastoral interlude" is also something of a "set piece" profoundly colored by a homoerotic element. Like the Arcadian adventures described in more specifically "gay texts" -- the fishing trip in Forster's *Maurice*, for example -- Jake and Bill's "relief from social

tensions" represents as well a "relief," or escape, from the bonds of mainstream morality. Maurice's "greenwood" of erotic possibilities has its flip side in another kind of "set piece" found in Anglo-American literature, the man-to-man combat which features two males as signifiers of the "masculine," the most famous example being perhaps the "Gladiatorial" chapter in Lawrence's *Women in Love*. In *The Sun* the physical battle between male rivals is most overtly expressed in the bullfight, where two such signifiers are the man and the bull. And just as Jake is a spectator at the bullfight rather than a participant, so he can only look on as other men (Robert Cohn, Mike Campbell, Pedro Romero) compete for the affections of Brett Ashley. The arena where "real" men compete -- whether the bullring or the bedroom -- is for Jake another foreclosed area of emotional and psychic involvement.

Whether "greenwood," bullring, or, for that matter, battlefield, these are intense moments of male bonding, which for Mario Mieli (and I concur) is always an expression of a "paralysed and unspoken homosexuality, which can be grasped, in the negative, in the denial of women" (34). While alone and apart from the world, Bill teases Jake by asking him if he knows what his real "trouble" is:

> You're an expatriate [Bill explains]. One of the worst types . . . You've lost touch with the soil. You get precious. Fake European standards have ruined you.

> You drink yourself to death. You become obsessed by sex. You spend all your time talking, not working. You are an expatriate, see? You hang around cafes. (115)

Jake's association with the old world casts him in the shadow of European decadence, which is seen as a performance, a role unbecoming to him. That he has "lost touch with the soil" suggests that Jake is estranged from enduring values, for "the earth abideth forever."[1] Jake has become "precious," "ruined" by "[f]ake European standards," so that his very identity has been compromised, if not corrupted, by foreign, or outside, influences. Similarly, Jake's body has been corrupted by a foreign object, perhaps a mortar shell. This has in turn transformed his corporeal existence into something foreign, or other -- not quite a "whole" man, but certainly not a woman. "Precious" and given to "fake" standards, Jake now wears the mask of decadence; he is given to excessive drink, obsessing about sex, and hanging around cafes talking too much. Jake has come to inhabit the *demi-monde*, the world of the outcast, the lost, the homosexual -- the decadent other *par excellence*. What's more, like Lawrence, Hemingway's "anxieties about homosexuality were conjoined with class antagonism" (Dollimore 268) -- his antipathy for the rich, the aristrocracy, the "mincing gentry."

Jake, like the homosexual, is a *habitue* of cafes, where one "does" very little except talk, and the homosexual, the

female, and the Jew are constructed as overly-discursive. Talking/telling is unmanly, for it is not "doing"; it is passive rather than active. The gay man, however, is like a woman in that he "hangs around" and doesn't work much. His only "work" is nightwork related to sex, just as the "proper" work for a woman is to serve her man, in both the kitchen and the bedroom. Even Brett, the independent Modern Woman, exists only in relation to men -- Jake, Mike, Robert, Pedro, Count Mippipopolous, the homosexuals.

Bill goes on to say that Jake doesn't work, after all, and that while some claim he is supported by women, others insist that he's impotent (115). A man who is supported by women is of course not thought to be a "real" man, but what Bill means by "impotent" is ambiguous. He may believe that Jake is sexually impotent, or that as a decadent American who has adopted "fake" European standards, he is psychically impotent. In either case, the link between non-normative sexuality and decadence is made clear.

Jake replies to Bill's statement of his impotence by contradicting Bill: "'I just had an accident'" (115). But Bill tells Jake

> Never mention that . . . . That's the sort of thing that can't be spoken of. That's what you ought to work up into a mystery. Like Henry's bicycle. (115)

Once again, just as homosexuality is the love that dare not

speak its name, so Jake's "accident" should not be voiced. Silence should prevail, and the "accident" remain shrouded in mystery. "Henry's bicycle" is an obvious reference to Henry James and the enigmatic "obscure hurt" that he suffered while a teenager -- a physical wound which rendered him incapable of sexual performance, or a psychic "hurt," that is, the realization of his own homosexuality. 2 The failure to perform in the culturally-prescribed way (that is, heterosexually) is therefore figured as "de-masculinizing."

Jake and Bill then banter about whether Henry's wound was suffered while riding a bicycle or a horse, with attendant puns on "joy-stick" and "pedal" (116). When Jake "stands up" for the tricycle, Bill replies that "'I think he's a good writer, too.'" He adds that Jake is "'a hell of a good guy'" as well:

> Listen you're a hell of a good guy, and I'm fonder of you than anybody on earth. I couldn't tell you that in New York. It'd mean I was a faggot. That was what the Civil War was about. Abraham Lincoln was a faggot. He was in love with General Grant. So was Jefferson Davis. Lincoln just freed the slaves on a bet. The Dred Scott case was framed by the Anti-Saloon League. Sex explains it all. The Colonel's Lady and Judy O'Grady are

Lesbians under the skin. (116)

That Jake opts for the tricycle over the horse as the instrument of Henry's "unmanning" implies that the modern world of the machine has had a negative, disruptive effect on traditional male/female roles. When Bill acknowledges that Henry, in spite of his wound, was "'a good writer'" (that is, he could still perform as an artist), he is also reassuring Jake that he can still perform as a good friend and "proper" man -- fishing, eating, drinking. Just as Henry's wound does not prevent him from being "'a good writer,'" so Jake's affliction -- his ambiguous sex/gender status -- does not prevent him from being "'a good guy.'" Jake will not be banished from the homosocial realm where all "good guys" go to escape the debilitating influence of women.

While Jake may now occupy an uncertain place between the genders, Bill continues to be "'fonder'" of him than anybody. Defending himself from any potential "'charge'" of homosexuality, Bill quickly adds that had they been in New York, he wouldn't be able to voice his affection for Jake without being a "'faggot'" -- European decadence makes it possible to speak the unspeakable. Not to put too fine a point on Bill's mock history of the Civil War, we should nonetheless remark that "'[s]ex explains it all,'" that Lincoln and Davis were rivals for the love of Grant, and that, "'[t]he Colonel's Lady and Judy O'Grady are Lesbians under the skin.'" The "truth" of the self is thus submerged after all within the depths of the individual, and homosexuality (in this instance,

lesbianism) is inscribed in the body, concealed "'under the skin.'" While male homosexuality may be "read" in external signs, it appears that lesbian sexuality is not similarly marked by gender non-conformity, that any hint of her concealed identity cannot be discerned through observing her performance, but only by unmasking that which is hidden in her body, under her skin. This seems to suggest that lesbianism is somehow congenital, while male homosexuality is performative.

The novel concludes with the justly-famous scene of Jake and Brett together in a cab:

> "Oh, Jake," Brett said, "we could have had such a damned good time together."
>
> Ahead was a mounted policeman in khaki directing traffic. He raised his baton. The car slowed suddenly pressing Brett against me.
>
> "Yes," I said. "Isn't it pretty to think so?" (247)

Earlier in the novel, Georgette presses against Jake while in a cab (15), and now, at its conclusion, Brett is thrown against the body of a man who desires more than he can do; he wants not just "pressing," but penetration. Once again the symbolic policeman is present, but this time he isn't smiling; he and Jake are no longer members of the same "club." This time his raised baton is a rebuke. The policeman, moreover, a "manly" authority figure, is not only "mounted" (and perhaps "well-

mounted") on a horse (suggesting a "stud" or "stallion" while recalling Henry's "accident"), but also a uniformed presence whose "raised" baton is suggestive not only of an erect phallus but also of the conductor's baton and the military officer's baton, two who orchestrate the performance of others (musicians and soldiers), though Jake can no longer perform.

The sun itself, almost always figured as "male" (and which, in most Indo-European languages, is of the male gender), "ariseth" and "goeth down," as does a male. The earth, on the other hand, a female/maternal signifier, is that which "abideth forever," and "the soil," it will be recalled, is what Jake has "lost touch" with (115). As Arnold and Cathy Davidson note, "Jake's last words readily devolve into an endless series of counter-statements that continue the same discourse: "'Isn't it pretty to think so?' / 'Isn't it pretty to think isn't it pretty to think so?'" This "negation" closes the novel and returns us to its title, for "only the earth -- not heroes, not their successes or their failures -- abideth forever" (Davidson 103-4). The use of so "feminine" a word as "pretty" further underscores Jake's mixed gender identification as well as the "feminine" qualities of life which "abideth forever."

If there is hope for Jake -- that is, for those confined by their culture's "rigid gender classifications" -- it may be found, paradoxically enough, in the image of the homosexual man and the "feminized" male, in the "possibility of a consciousness integrating both the masculine and feminine," in the recognition that "patriarchy as a cultural phenomenon

. . . can destroy a man's ability to develop his fullest potential" (Grace).

2. *Pasos Atras*: The Bullfight as Homoerotic Spectacle

> *Paso atras*: step to the rear taken by the matador after profiling to kill in order to lengthen his distance from the bull, while giving the impression he is profiled very close, and give him more time to dodge as he goes in to kill . . .
> -- *Death in the Afternoon* (432)

When *Death in the Afternoon*, Hemingway's "'big book with wonderful pictures'" (Baker, *Life Story* 269), was first published in 1932, *In Our Time*, *The Sun Also Rises*, and *A Farewell to Arms* had already firmly established his reputation as one of the foremost writers of his generation. This first collection of stories and the two novels were almost universally praised, so that Hemingway had yet to feel the sting of negative reviews. But all that was about to change. *Death in the Afternoon* was greeted with a largely hostile critical reception, and most strident in his denunciation was Max Eastman, whose belated *New Republic* review was entitled, as if intended to provoke Hemingway's wrath, "Bull in the Afternoon."

Eastman found an "unconscionable quantity of bull . . . poured and plastered over what he [Hemingway] wrote about bullfights." Hemingway's acceptance of the bullfight as a ritual and tragedy was "sentimental poppycock," not unlike the

pronouncements of "those Art nannies and pale-faced professors of poetry whom he [Hemingway] above all men despised." The source for all of Hemingway's "bull" could be located in the "commonplace that Hemingway lacks the serene confidence that he *is* a full-sized man" (Eastman's emphasis), and in *Death* employs "a literary style, you might say, of wearing false hair on his chest" (qtd. in Baker, *Life Story* 309-10; Lynn 399-402; Mellow 419-20; Meyers 232-34). As in so much of Hemingway's own work, hair for Eastman functions as a marker of gender identity; in this case, of course, chest hair signifies masculinity, and it's reasonable to infer that the more hair the more masculine.

Eastman therefore reads the man, not the page, and in privileging biography over textuality concludes that Hemingway writes "bull" because he "lacks the serene confidence that he is a full-sized man." (Note, too, how Eastman's language itself speaks to the body, the male sex specifically: "lack" and "full-sized" -- perhaps he has mistaken Hemingway for Jake Barnes.) That Eastman links prose to masculinity suggests that Hemingway's failings as a writer are reflected in, and, perhaps the direct result of, his failings as a man, for his "literary style," like his chest, is barren. At the same time, however, that Hemingway "poured and plastered" "bull" over his work on the bullfight imples that at some submerged core the writing is not "bull" at all, for what is "poured and plastered" is surface, not essence; what exists below the surface of the text -- its subtexts or silences -- is the real thing, something

other than mere "bull." Eastman's own rhetoric (likely unbeknownst to him) thus points to the performative nature of both masculinity and writing.

I quote Eastman's unkind review in order to demonstrate that Hemingway's presumed macho posturing was not lost on the critics, or, for that matter, the general public. Unfortunately, critics could do little more than point an accusing finger at Hemingway and, like Eastman, affiliate him with "Art nannies and pale-faced professors of poetry," intellectual types who were, like Hemingway, less than "real" men (recall, too, Hemingway's own connection between extremes of skin color -- pale and dark -- and homosexuality). In Hemingway's case this was not in spite of, but because of, his macho self-presentation (another performance of identity). This machismo -- real, feigned, imagined, but always constructed -- was an easy target, but what the critics missed entirely, or refused to address, in respect to *Death in the Afternoon* are the two relatively long (about a page each) discussions of homosexuality, one two-page anecdote about homosexual seduction, an account of the painter El Greco's androgynous figures, a glossary of terms which includes definitions of both *maricon* ("faggot") and *cojones* ("balls"). We might say that the critics lacked the theoretical tools necessary to address issues of homosocial/homoerotic tension in any meaningful way. Such critical absences, or blind spots, however, were not overcome until recently, when critics began to look at Hemingway through the lens of critical discourses

of gender and sexuality.

Comley and Scholes alert us to the connection in the "Hemingway Text" between money and homosexuality, though more generally their analysis of *Death in the Afternoon* examines how "the framework of the bullfight and its culture . . . allowed Hemingway to attend to many aspects of male homosocial desire" (108-09). What they do not make explicit, however, is that in *Death in the Afternoon* the connection between male sexuality and the bullfight is owing to the performative mode of each; when writing is included, we have an overlapping triad of performitivity: namely, sexuality, the bullfight, and prose composition. But sexuality is not quite precise, for here, as in *The Sun Also Rises*, we have an unspoken presumption that the performance of gender -- how one acts in public -- is in fact predictive of bedroom behavior and/or sexual orientation. I therefore attend mainly to questions of gender, or, more specifically, masculinity, rather than sexuality, even if Hemingway (like Comley and Scholes) tends to conflate the gendered and sexual selves. I focus on gender, then, not because it holds a privileged place as an analytic category, but because *Death in the Afternoon* is structured more around public performance than bedroom acts, even if that performance itself blurs the border between gender and sexuality. Two related issues are therefore of immediate concern: (1) the ways in which the Hemingway aesthetic, which affiliates the writer and matador, reveals Hemingway's view of the male homosexual as "untrue" to his masculinity, and (2) how Hemingway employs

his own version of the matador's *paso atras* in order to distance -- closet -- the text (and its author) from the homoerotic and feminine. First I examine Hemingway's view of the bullfight as a drama and establish the links between the matador and the writer. I then attempt to demonstrate how the author employs his own version of the matador's paso atras and, in effect, "steps to the rear"; that is, he ultimately "dodge[s]" a forthright exploration of homoeroticism through overt diversions and textual digressions.

For the matador, "dishonest" fighting, which itself leads to "the decadence of bullfighting" (85), is often precipitated by the loss of his "aesthetic vision" of the "sculptural art of modern bullfighting" (13). Hemingway therefore writes with disdain of one matador who was "subject to fits of cowardice, altogether without integrity, who violates all the rules, written and unwritten for the conduct of the matador" (13). The good matador, on the other hand, provided he "knows his profession," should actually increase the danger he faces in the ring, but only "*within the rules provided for his protection*" (and what are "the rules," we may wonder, that Hemingway uses to protect himself from appearing overly-concerned with homoeroticism and femininity?). Outside such "rules," the bullfighter's action begin "to smell of the theatre," and "[m]uch of his work is tricked" (Hemingway's emphasis 167). Just as the "code of *aficion*" in *The Sun Also Rises* helps Jake to know how to live, so the writer and matador

must perform their respective arts within the prescribed rules. Likewise, a man must peform "within the rules" authorized by the culture in order to properly signify masculinity. Aesthetic "tricks," whether attempted by the writer or matador, cannot cover "cheating" or redeem a "hollow" work. Like the fathers who "cheat" their sons of adult knowledge in the early stories, and like the lovers in Hemingway who always feel "hollow," so the writer and matador who violate (rape?) "the rules provided for his protection" undermine their own masculine identity. The very language Hemingway employs suggests the performativity of art and masculinity -- "aesthetic vision," "fits of cowardice," "violates all the rules," "the conduct of the matador," "the rules provided," the "smell of the theatre."

"The formal bullfight," Hemingway writes, "is a tragedy not a sport, and the bull is certain to be killed" (20), and both tragedy and sport are not dissimilar performances. At the heart of this ritualized drama is the conflict between two male rivals, two masculine signifiers, the matador and the bull. The script of this spectacular death pageant calls first for the seduction, and then the penetration and death of the bull. For the drama to end as planned, the matador must entice the bull into death; if the tragedy ends badly, the matador is the one penetrated, wounded, and possibly killed. As Kenneth Lynn suggests, in order "to conquer a bull, a matador must . . . first encounter a host of fears, including the fear of sexual violation and the loss of his manhood" (213). The ritual of

the bullfight is therefore a choreographed dance of death, complete with prescribed "steps," which must be followed in order not only to bring about the desired result (the death of the bull, the glory of the matador), but also to conduct the tragedy in a suitable manner, the appropriate performance mode.

Like a figure out of costume drama, the matador, in his tight-fitting, heavily brocaded outfit, his *traje de luces* (suit of lights), teases the bull with his *muleta* (a scarlet cloth) and cape; he then plays hard to get, manipulating the bull in a kind of ceremony of foreplay before the climactic moment -- the bull's penetration and likely death at the tip of the matador's sword, which Hemingway describes as "a tapered wooden stick equipped with a sharp steel point" (423). As Comley and Scholes point out, the bullfighter "is so macho and so narcissistic that he turns himself into an object of the gaze, so much a man that he feminizes himself" (139).

But the matador is not "an object" alone; he is also a subject, and as the Davidsons maintain, in the "peculiar drama" of the bullfight, "males take all the parts -- seducer/seduced, actor/observer, animal/human, male/female. The bullfighter's conquest over the ultimately compliant and submissive bull is, consequently, totally self-referential: the male as signifier and signified, the male as object and subject of his own desire" (96). In order to eventually penetrate his male rival, therefore, the matador must first assume the "feminine" role. He initially plays a seductive "come hither" part in the drama,

inviting the bull to take him on. The closer he can entice the bull into coming, the more intimate their physical encounter, the more effective the performance and the worthier, and more highly-esteemed, the matador. The bull is of course being lured to his death. Ultimately, then, their roles are reversed; "while giving the impression he is profiled very close," in the end the matador drops his pose (or at least switches roles) as the seducer and reveals himself to be the aggressor. He reverts to his "true" identity as both male and masculine, while the bull takes on the feminine signification -- he (she?) is penetrated. It's worth recalling here as well that at least in respect to the summer fiesta in Pamplona, "the dead bull stands in for a living woman . . . which itself reenacts an ancient fertility drama" (Davidson 96).

Inasmuch as the bullfight is a "tragedy," what we have is a kind of life and death performance art of the sort largely unknown to the American. It is life as art, a spectacle in which one, or perhaps both, of the central participants (the matador and the bull) will be unable to take his final bow. At the climax of the drama as scripted, the antagonist (the bull) will discover that the artiface is his reality; the art/life margin collapses and the blood that spills onto the sandy stage is real. Hemingway was surely fascinated not only by the life/death symbiosis of the bullfight, but also by its ability to actualize, to physicalize, the relationship between art/life. This is the same intensity of experience that attracted him to the *theatre* of war.

While Thomas Strychacz rightly maintains that, "The physical characteristics of the ring shape the rituals enacted there, providing necessary boundaries within which potentially chaotic action may reveal a comprehensible structure" (245), the bullfight itself also blurs the borders of art/life, and blunts the distinction between masculine/feminine and male/female. This holds especially true for the American, unaccustomed to the spectacle of the matador in his *traje de luces* and *coleta* (pigtail), for this icon of masculinity is represented as an aesthetic object. In his very appearance -- his costume and hair -- the matador is, to the American eye, a feminized man, decked-out in aristocratic-like finery, a dandy flirting with death, for American culture lacks such an intricate performance ritual.

And so the ambiguous signifying power of the bullfight and the matador himself become problematic, for the shifting signs of the matador and the bull represent in symbolic form the mutability of sexual categories and gender roles. They also say much about individual identity and subjectivity, for at the climactic moment of the bullfight, the artist/matador can, and should, merge his identity with that of the bull, just as we have seen lovers in Hemingway attempt to merge their identities. Such an artist is, for example, Pedro Romero in *The Sun Also Rises*:

> The bull charged as Romero charged.
> Romero's left hand dropped the
> muleta over the bull's muzzle to

> blind him, his left shoulder went forward between the horns as the sword went in, and for just an instant he and the bull were one . . . (218)

Just as intense and prolonged struggles between hunter and hunted in Hemingway form a close bond between them, so the matador becomes one with his rival, just what so often occurs -- or is desired by -- characters in Hemingway who fall in love. This dissolution of discrete identity, where identity is understood to be located at the nexus of sexuality and gender, suggests the possibility (preferability?) of a gender-neutral or androgynous subjectivity, as well as the instability of gendered categories in performance.

Hemingway denounces several male homosexual writers in *Death*, with Raymond Radiguet singled out for special ridicule: he "knew how to make his career not only with his pen but his pencil." Hemingway also attributes to Radiguet's lover, Jean Cocteau, the "decadent" complaint that "'Bebe [sic] est vicieuse [feminine form] -- il aime les femmes'" (71). Gide ("prissy" and "aunt-like"), Wilde ("conceited"), and Whitman ("sentimental") all come under attack later in the book, as do "all the mincing gentry" (205). Only the painter El Greco escapes Hemingway's contempt: "Viva El Greco El Rey de los Maricones" (205). 3

While Hemingway claims in *Death* to have read "many books"

on bullfighting, none managed to "convey" the sense of violent death which he was after; they had instead "only produced a *blur* . . . because either the author had never seen it [violent death] clearly or at the moment of it, he had physically or mentally shut his eyes" (my emphasis, 2). The true artist -- whether writer or matador -- cannot "blur" or "shut his eyes" to "the real thing." A "blurred" sexual and/or gendered affiliation may, however, be "the real thing" for any given individual (El Greco is perhaps one). The text at any rate allows for this possibility and remains open to it. The "worrisome undercurrent in Hemingway's relationship with men in his life and in his work" (Mellow 409) may not be a direct outcome of his presumed homophobia, but may rather arise from anxieties surrounding his own power and potency as an artist, a topic that I explore more fully in chapter 7 (in connection especially to Hemingway's "Old lady").

When discussing a matador Hemingway does not "care for," he admits the possibility that he and his fictional interlocutor, the "Old lady," are talking "horseshit" (95). When the "Old lady" says that she would "like to know" about the "love life" of matadors, Hemingway replies, "Madame, you have come to the right man" (120). The "right man," Hemingway takes his interest in homosexual men so far as to count the number of matadors he thinks may be gay; "two of them among the forty-some matadors de toros," he writes in his glossary under *maricon* (417-18).

When it appears that Hemingway has veered from his subject

to discuss how calves are born, how bulls mate, and polygamy/monogamy in beast and human, the "Old lady" asks, "What has this to do with bulls, sir?" Hemingway replies, "Nothing, Madame, nothing at all, it is only conversation to give you your money's worth" (120-22). While the "Old lady" apprehends that something is amiss, she is allowed only to sense, not fully comprehend, what is going on, what specifically leads Hemingway from the "love life" of bullfighters to more global issues surrounding sexuality and sexual conduct. The double denial -- "Nothing, Madame, nothing at all" -- indicates that Hemingway is fully aware that he is not up to nothing.

The "Old lady" complains later that Hemingway's tale, "A Natural History of the Dead" (reprinted as a short story in *Winner Take Nothing*), "is not amusing." Hemingway, who has now assumed the title "Author" in his dialogue with her, replies, "Stop reading it then. Nobody makes you read it. But please stop interrupting" (137). When at the end of the story she expresses disappointment that it was not, as promised, "like John Greenleaf Whittier's *Snow Bound*," Hemingway responds by saying, "Madame, I'm wrong again. We aim so high and yet we miss the target" (144). The irony here is two-fold: first, there would be no "Old lady" at all, much less one to interrupt, if Hemingway had not created her and had her interrupt; and, second, it is Hemingway who does most of the interrupting in the book. Much of it (including the ten-page "Natural History") in fact constitutes a *corpus interruptus*,

for the majority of Hemingway's digressions have very little to do with explaining the bullfight to an English-speaking audience, the purported purpose of the book. These digressions are, however, the places where the link between sexuality and the bullfight are most closely forged. Hemingway's diversionary tactics make sense only when we realize that the bullfight itself invites one to consider homoeroticism.

The conceit of the "Old lady" also provides Hemingway with the opportunity to move -- or at least give the impression of moving -- beyond his own subjectivity, to enter into role reversals similar to those his fictional creations undergo. This is done not only as justification to explore the homoerotics of the bullfight, but also to allay his own anxieties in respect to female power.

In *Death*, the relatively young author (he was thirty-one when he wrote the book) lectures an older, though less experienced and less knowledgeable person, on the bullfight, but also on such topics as those already discussed - writing, decadence, and sexuality. Mark Spilka likens this "Old lady," sometimes called "Madame" (slippage back to the prostitute perhaps), to another "tough old lady," P.O.M., or Poor Old Mama, of *Green Hills of Africa*, a fictionalized version of Hemingway's second wife, Pauline Pfeiffer (Spilka 228-29). Both creations, but especially the "Old lady," allow Hemingway to upend traditional power relations between mother/son and teacher/student. For I read the "Old lady" as a literary hybrid not only of the wives in, respectively, "The Snows of

Kilimanjaro" and "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber" (who were, after all, variations on Pauline), but also of his mother, Grace Hall Hemingway, and his first (and most important) literary mentor in Paris, Gertrude Stein. While there is no direct textual evidence to support such a position, it seems quite plausible that Hemingway delighted in the opportunity to turn the tables on his mother and his mentor for once to tell *them* "the true gen."

Hemingway never got on well with his mother, and she must have been much on his mind during the writing of *Death*, for while working on the book his father committed suicide, which Hemingway always blamed on Grace (Mellow 19, 412). She had, he often claimed, dwarfed his father, and his father's presumed impotence in the face of her towering personality is what, Hemingway maintained, drove him to take his own life. As for Stein, Hemingway tried over and over to rewrite her influence on him (see chapters 2, 3, and 13 of *A Moveable Feast*, for instance). The idea of turning his mother/mentor into a querulous "Old lady" he could instruct must have been quite satisfying for a man with a taste for (usually literary) revenge.

Perhaps as justification and/or apology for his usurpation of authority, Hemingway transforms himself into someone with "inner searching Viennese eyes peering out from under the shaggy brows of old Dr. Hemingstein" (54). Obviously meant to suggest Freud, this description of himself also evokes the ghost of his father, a medical doctor, as well as one of those

"pale-faced professors" (that is, doctors of philosophy) Eastman attacks. The "stein" unites Freud and Gertrude Stein, while suggesting Jewishness in general; and the Jewish man is often constructed as a feminized man (Robert Cohn, for instance). If "Dr. Hemingstein" is linked to Hemingway's father (and it cannot really be otherwise), the writer's lecturing and then "killing off" (190) the "Old lady" may be regarded as a kind of revenge fantasy on behalf of Dr. Hemingway. Hemingway gets rid of the "Old lady" as he probably would have liked to get rid of his mother and/or Stein, summarily and once and for all.

I have already mentioned the connection in Hemingway between money and non-normative sexualities, and Comley and Scholes attend to this issue as well, pointing out that in an earlier, more extensive glossary entry under *maricon*, Hemingway describes two bullfighters who are gay. "One is miserly, graceful, and cowardly," write the critics, "and the other is spendthrift, clumsy, and brave. Both men are described in terms of the same three qualities -- and each man is the opposite of the other on all three counts." This, they claim, tends "to counter the kind of statement often made by Hemingway himself or one of his characters to the effect that it is easy to tell homosexual males by some quality that they all have in common" (107-8). Hemingway's attention to gay matadors and their handling of money can also be extended to other instances in which Hemingway implies that all male homosexuals are overly

concerned with personal finance, and, as I have already discussed, Hemingway frequently links prostitution and male homosexuality, which suggests that these two "corrupted" forms of sexuality (or sexual behavior) are structured in significant measure by systems of economic exchange.

In "The Undefeated," the disgraced and dying bullfighter is about to have his *coleta* cut off, but the man wielding the scissors is stopped at the last moment and claims he was only "joking" (*MWW* 56). Once again in Hemingway, hair becomes symbolic of gender; if a matador does not measure up, his suggestive *coleta* is threatened, just as in defeat the bull's tail may be cut off and awarded to the triumphant matador. In the case of the bull, the symbolic phallus is dangerously close to the forbidden rectum as well.

While the matador of "The Undefeated" is not homosexual, he disgraces himself in the bullring, which feminizes him; he very nearly loses -- has severed -- his *coleta*. Thus it is that feminization, either through behavior or failure to perform in accordance with the code, like a "real" man, results in the loss of something; it is by its very nature a diminution of the self. The prostitute and the younger, or "submissive," homosexual man must "sell" themselves (where selves are conceived as bodies alone), whether through a strictly financial exchange (the prostitute) or by some other means (serving another man, as in "The Battler," or by giving over his youth, as in the *Death* anecdote). Rarely, however, does Hemingway portray male homosexual relationships as between

equals. Such relationships are seen as hierarchical, like that between a prostitute and her "employer," a mentor and his protege, a "real" man and his servant, an officer and an enlisted man.

Chapter 6

In Search of Lost Time: *The Garden of Eden*

1. Bodies in Crisis

The themes of gender, sexuality, and national identity reach their apotheosis in *The Garden of Eden*, a text saturated with anxieties created by what Marjorie Garber calls a "category crisis"; that is, "a failure of definitional distinction, a borderline that becomes permeable, that permits a border crossing from one (apparently distinct) category to another" (16). While Garber is writing specifically about cross-dressing, I maintain that the same observation holds for any cultural "anxiety" which finds its primary sign and symbol in the corporeal body. An unstable text, the body is today in question, and crisis. AIDS -- as a political crisis, as a health-care crisis -- has made, in Allen Barnett's phrase, "the body and its dangers" an important site of cultural discourse, just one more reason why Hemingway has again become central to cultural and literary discussion, for *The Garden of Eden* can be said to be about categories in crisis, most especially the binarisms light/dark, native/foreign, innocence/corruption, maculine/feminine, and heterosexual/homosexual.

Our own moment permits, even demands, that we read *The*

Garden of Eden, itself a fractured body/text, as a commentary on the uses, abuses, and various constructions of the body and its borders. For *The Garden* enacts our own "category crisis," particularly as it relates to gender and race. We can see, too, how we make our own bodies, and how others were made. And it is AIDS and queer theory which permit our various readings of the body -- how it is constructed and represented in the culture.

Much has already been written about how characters in *The Garden* attempt to swap, or merge, their identities by cutting their hair the same length and/or dyeing it the same color. What has received scant attention, on the other hand, is the racial meaning of Catherine's obsessive tanning and its significance within the larger framework of the novel, a border few critics have even attempted to cross. For just as altering the length and color of hair is symbolic of gender mutability, so Catherine's nearly-religious devotion to tanning, to seeing how dark she can become, uncovers the impulse to cross racial and/or ethnic lines in order to create a taboo subjectivity and national identity. Read within the contemporary critical discourse of primitivism and modernism -- I'm thinking of the recent work of Marianna Torgovnick, Paul Gilroy and Mae Henderson, to name a few -- the question of race and its construction in Hemingway's unstable *Garden* becomes particularly intriguing, especially since Hemingway's own identity, and public persona, was so closely connected to Africa and the image of Papa, Great White Hunter. The Garden

also resonates with, and sheds light on, the figure of the Indian in the early Nick Adams stories, where dark skin, nature, and primitive cultures are connected. 1 My own reading of *The Garden* will take as its starting point Toni Morrison's *Playing in the Dark*. She is, in fact, one of the few critics to have taken up the issue of racial identity in *The Garden of Eden*. A few preliminary remarks are, however, in order.

Not only was *The Garden of Eden* left unfinished at the time of Hemingway's death, but the published version of the text follows only one of three plot lines that make up the 1,500-page manuscript. Tom Jenks edited the work for Scribner's, and while he managed to construct a readable novel, *The Garden* is a hugely unstable text, one whose very authorship is in question. I will therefore summarize the published plot and the two connected plots that remain in manuscript only.

The novel as we know it follows David Bourne, a writer from Oklahoma, on honeymoon with his wife Catherine in France's Edenic Grau du Roi. While David writes the memoir/story of his boyhood adventure on African safari with his father, Catherine must amuse herself, which she largely does by having her hair done, shopping, swimming, and tanning. When she encounters an exotic young woman named Marita, she brings her "home" to David and a *menage a trois* ensues, further complicating the gender games that Catherine had already initiated in her marriage. Increasingly isolated by, and jealous of, David's writing and his relationship with Marita, Catherine, in an *auto-da-fe* writ

small, burns the manuscript David had long labored over, thereby destroying his literary corpus rather than his physical body.

Early on, Catherine warns David that she's "the destructive type," and that she will in fact "destroy" him (5). Just as Frederic Henry declares that "doctors did things to your body and it wasn't you body anymore" (*Farewell* 231), so David finds that his body of work -- the word made "flesh" -- can likewise be altered by another. Catherine's destruction of his manuscript recalls how Ibsen's Hedda Gabler burns her former lover's sensational new book -- the child they never had. While Hedda may have been on Hemingway's mind when writing the manuscript-burning episode in *The Garden*, he was more likely remembering the time when his first wife, Hadley Richardson, lost all of his manuscripts on a train (an episode recounted in *A Moveable Feast* 73-74). Comley and Scholes also point out that in "Now I Lay Me," the young Nick Adams remembers how after his grandfather's death, the man's possessions were "thrown in the fire, and how they popped in the heat" (*MWW* 222). Jenks closes the novel on a more upbeat note than Hemingway seems to have intended: David has resumed his writing, and "there was no sign that any of it [the story] would never cease returning to him intact" (247), suggesting that Catherine's psychological troubles, as well as gendered differences and racial boundaries, will also return "intact."

As for the rest of *The Garden* manuscript, which Scribner's chose to abort, there are two narrative strands. One such

narrative concerns Nick Sheldon (Nick again), a painter friend of the Bournes from Paris, and his wife Barbara (who barbers). As Catherine has persuaded David to cut his hair to match hers, so Barbara has convinced Nick to let his hair grow to shoulder length like her own. When the couples meet in Biarritz, the Sheldon's gender games are already well underway. Catherine is especially curious about them, while Barbara admits to being infatuated with Catherine.

The other plot centers on Andrew Murray, someone from Barbara's past, who, like David, is a serious writer. Andy meets the Bournes in Spain, and, later, at Hendaye, encounters the Sheldons. Barbara attempts to get Andy to let his hair grow, encourages him to write the story of their threesome (Andy, Barbara, and Nick), suggests that she illustrate the book with photographs (as Catherine wants to illustrate David's book with her own drawings), and eventually seduces him. Later, foggy with absinthe -- a drink that changes color when water is added, and which, as Barbara tells Catherine, can make one "think things you wouldn't think without it" (K422.1-4) 2 -- she denies the seduction ever took place, but ends up sleeping with him again. Upon learning that Nick has been killed in a car accident, Barbara virtually collapses. She later commits suicide in Venice, a city associated with death and the carnivalesque. "These incidents," Robert Fleming correctly reports, "form the background for a tragic conclusion in a draft ending Hemingway had labeled 'Provisional Ending' that Jenks ignored in his editing" ("Endings" 131). 3

These shadow plots not only represent a duality in themselves -- that between the published and unpublished, the disclosed and the undisclosed -- but a doubling of characters as well, for the Bournes cut their hair to merge their identities, while the Sheldons grow theirs to dissolve gendered difference. It is also worth noting that Hemingway, always meticulous in selecting character names, uses the names Catherine, Nick, Barbara, and Bourne; that is, Catherine Barkley is here "reborn" as Catherine Bourne, Nick Adams resurfaces as Nick Sheldon, and Barabara is the one who insists on barbering Nick, and this in a laborious passage (partly excised by Hemingway) which seems more about castration anxiety than barbering:

> "Do you think we're brave enough to do it? [Barbara asks in respect to cutting his hair]"
>
> "I'll do it."
>
> "Not just night talk?"
>
> "No."
>
> "Let me feel again. Nickie it's so long. How could it be so long and I not know it?" (K400.91-4).

2. "Blackening-Up" and "Whiting-Out"

Let's now focus on the published text by allowing Toni Morrison to establish the playing field. Morrison first of all

writes that "Catherine well understands the association of blackness with strangeness, with taboo -- well understands also that blackness is something one can 'have' or 'appropriate'" (87). In what she calls the novel's "ideological Africanism," we therefore find "the festishizing of color, the transference to blackness of the power of illicit sexuality, chaos, madness, impropriety, anarchy, strangeness, and helpless, hapless desire" (80-81).

Catherine's compulsion to become as dark as possible represents the desire, or need, to refashion identity in the image of the "other," while not precisely becoming the "other." While one cannot alter the reality of race/ethnicity, the text suggests that it is yet possible to minimize, if not completely wipe-out, the difference -- the color of one's skin, like the length and color of one's hair, can at least be temporarily altered. In that racial/ethnic signs can be manipulated suggests that individual identity, notably as it relates to, and effects, group identity, is subject to change and, to some degree, individual control.

Just as putting something into the body -- food and drink -- is an attempt to fill an inner void -- and the characters repeatedly complain of feeling "hollow" or "empty" (13, 45, 113, 149, 164, 216, 219), the same word the lovers Frederic and Catherine use in *A Farewell to Arms* to describe their condition -- so putting something on the body (suntan lotion and the sun's rays) can, or is at least an attempt to, feed that same void, the *nada* of modern existence.

Tanning may also represent for white Euro-Americans the attempt to recover the lost primeval garden, the central theme of the novel. For darkness evokes "primitive" peoples and cultures, as well as the primal need for food, drink, and sex, themselves rites and rituals in the Hemingway canon -- and these are the subjects the central characters of the novel obsess over and talk about endlessly. The sun itself, and the "worship" of the sun by continually lying out in it, further suggests pre-Christian or pagan religions, the yearning to return to an earlier stage of innocence, the kind of innocence associated with pre-history and with Africa, whose art, sculpture in particular, both inspired and fascinated the moderns. Since Africa was in Hemingway's time (and to a large extent remains) the continent from whose bourne no traveller returns unchanged, so the journey into Africa's heart of darkness is also a journey back in time, a time before modern civilization. The attempt to recover such a lost epoch indicates the inability, or unwillingness, to live within the confines of Western culture, the desire to live outside the regulatory social rules and roles which govern, among other things, gendered behavior and racial identification. Such dissatisfaction with social standards leads to the attempt to tan oneself into another body, another culture. The connection to Africa and the darker races further links the characters, Catherine in particular, to an unbridled, licentious, unlicensed sexuality.

Race intersects with class here as well, for it was the

working class -- peasants, farmers, and others who work outdoors -- that was more often than not tanned, and Hemingway's affiliation, feigned or not, for workers, "regular folks," was well-known. Women, and upper-class men in England and France did not tan, unless they stayed on the polo or cricket field too long. The desire to darken oneself indicates an anti-metropolitan stance. France and its African colonies further underscore the Afro-European connection, as does the relatively more hospitable climate for African-Americans in twenties Paris. It also recalls the muscular outdoorsy homosexuality of Whitman, Forster's "greenwood," the Provincetown of James's *Bostonians* (as well as contemporary P-Town and Hemingway's old haunt, Key West), and *fin de siecle* Capri, a lesbian and gay counterpart to today's gay mecca of Mykonos.

A significant passage relating to the issue of tanning is presented early in the published text and is worth quoting in full. The relevant exchange begins when David suggests to Catherine that they leave le Grau du Roi for Spain:

> "You can't swim in Spain the way we do here [David tells her]. You'd get arrested."
>
> "What a bore. Let's wait to go over there then because I want us to get darker."
>
> "Why do you want to be so dark?"

"I don't know. Why do you want anything? Right now it's the thing I want most. That we don't have I mean. Doesn't it make you excited to have me getting so dark?"

"Uh-huh. I love it [David replies]."

"Did you think I could ever be this dark?"

"No, because you're blond."

"I can because I'm lion color and they can go dark. But I want every part of me dark and it's getting that way and you'll be darker than an Indian and that takes us further away from other people. You see why it's important."

"What will we be?"

"I don't know [Catherine says]. Maybe we'll just be us. Only changed. That's maybe the best thing. And we will keep on won't we?"

"Sure. We can go over by the Esterel and explore and find another place the way we found this one."

"We can do that [Catherine

> suggests]. There are lots of wild places and nobody is there in the summer. We could get a car and then we could go everywhere. Spain too when we want. Once we're really dark it won't be hard to keep unless we had to live in towns. We don't want to be in towns in the summer."
>
> "How dark are you going to get?"
>
> "As dark as I can. We'll have to see. I wish I had some Indian blood. I'm going to be so dark you won't be able to stand it. I can't wait to go up on the beach tomorrow." (30-31)

We see first of all that society, whose regulatory social codes and laws differ from culture to culture, limits the freedom of the individual; Catherine may "get arrested" in Spain should she swim "the way we do here" in France; that is, naked. This possibility strikes her as "a bore," which in the Hemingway text is very near to being a sin. For David, "bore" is "the one damned word in the language I can't stand" (41), while for Catherine being a girl is also "a bore" (70). In *The Sun Also Rises*, Robert Cohn is mocked and denounced for expressing his fear that he may be bored at his first bullfight (162), and in *Death in the Afternoon* the same reaction by a purportedly real

spectator elicits Hemingway's censure: "get out of here" (467).

Although Catherine cannot, or will not, explain why she wants to be "so dark," she refuses to censor or otherwise deny her desires; that she wants it is enough. She does, however, hint at the possibility that she craves being dark simply because she isn't. Any absence is therefore lack, and works to create the very void she can never completely fill, since there will always be something "we don't have." At the same time, however, Catherine "can only compare her obsession for tanning, which she insists is like 'growing something' -- a female phallus we might presume? -- to her obsession for hair cutting," so that tanning and hair cutting become a fetish, which, "as a marker of both absence and presence, is an inherently parodoxical, unstable object" (Eby 110). The "hollowness" the characters feel is likely the hunger that food can never satisfy, the thirst that drink can never quench, for they are, the text implies, only temporary solutions for the *nada* of modern life; they can at best provide only a momentary sense of ful*fill*ment.

But David is "excited" that Catherine is "so dark," and soon he "won't be able to stand it." Her darkness is then affiliated with the untamed world of nature ("I'm lion color"). In an earlier episode, David asks a waiter if he thinks Catherine would like gazpacho: "'Try her,' the waiter said gravely as though he were speaking of a mare" (51); and while in bed, David describes "the fair tawny head close and smooth lying as a small animal" (47), not unlike Maria, the "rabbit"

of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, or the cat-like wife in "Cat in the Rain." David's own darkness is not associated with animals, but "primitive" peoples ("you'll be darker than an Indian"); and a bit later, Catherine tells him, "I wish I had some Indian blood." This recalls Hemingway's early Nick Adams story, "Indian Camp," in which Nick is initiated into the mystery of birth and death in a setting which contrasts the modern and the "primitive." Nick's father, the white doctor/savior (like David Bourne's father, the white hunter/savior), the representative of modern Western science and medicine, can only save the pregnant Indian woman in the story; her husband, unable to stand her pain, or the interference of another culture in the birth of his own progeny, kills himself before the child is born into the world by the white doctor.

Just exactly what Catherine means by suggesting she'll become so dark that David "won't be able to stand it" is obscure -- he'll be beside himself with the "exotic" pleasure of having a dark woman, or he won't be moved by it at all. Catherine elsewhere claims that she'll be his "African girl" (29), and in the unpublished manuscript Catherine tells Marita that David almost married "a beautiful Oklahoma oil Indian squaw" (K422.1-17), which is followed by a long discussion of Somali sexuality (K422.1-17). Such darkness can, however, effectively move them "further away from other people"; that is, their skin will place them at a physical remove from others of their culture and race, while at the same time distancing them from the culture itself, for, as Morrison maintains,

Catherine "comprehends how this acquisition of blackness 'others' them and creates an ineffable bond between them within [their] estrangement" (87), which, I would add, is a desired "estrangement." Darkness will also move them outside and beyond time, and into the prelapsarian timelessness of the garden. That's why tanning is "important," and that's how the body can be made to signify. The desire to darken oneself into another body, to possess "Indian blood," returns us to Nick Adams and the other youthful protagonists who long for a tanned sister/lover.

David wonders what they will then "be," and Catherine confesses to not knowing the answer, though she suggests that "Maybe we'll just be us. Only changed." This is the keynote of the entire text, the paradoxical desire to be this but not this, that but not that -- full and empty at one and the same time; a boy who is not a boy, but a girl; a girl who is not a girl, but a boy; queer but not queer. In the unpublished manuscript, after having seen the Rodin sculpture variously called Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, *Daphne and Chloe* (though both figures in Rodin are women), and *Volupte*, David imagines himself as one of the lesbian lovers. While this may be a variation of the male heterosexual fantasy of watching two women having sex, it more strongly suggests that David identifies with a stony, or sterile, sexuality, a non-procreative sexuality that forecloses the possibility that he will become a father.

Both the character of Catherine and the text as a whole

exist -- indeed, are structured -- along this faultline of subjective identity, in the space created by the tension of being X while also being not X. To be the way that they are, "only changed," implies that some core identity is beyond timely changes, that they can possess the sense of self they now have, and so remain forever young and in love. The garden might, on the other hand, be recaptured if they cast off the trappings of culture (which is understood as an overlay on the "real" self, and as a force which Catherine at any rate does not reckon as having effected who they are now) by entering into the "primitive" or prehistoric. Adolescence, if not primitive (in the sense of undeveloped), is at least a phase one will outgrow, as a primitive or underdeveloped culture will eventually "progress" to modern industrialization, as homosexuals will "grow out of" their immature sexuality. Homosexuality is therefore figured as pre-heterosexuality; homosexuals are children, heterosexuals are grown-ups and parents. Outward appearance can transform the inside into something else after all, into something "wild," which is just the sort of place they wish to be -- far from the tumult of towns (civilization).

That tanning is connected in Hemingway's work on homosexuality suggests that homosexuality is also "primitive" or "wild," licentious and unsponsored. In *The Sun Also Rises*, Jake finds Romero to be "a damned fine-looking boy" (00), while in the manuscript of *The Garden*, a bullfighter at a cafe is described as having "a very brown face" (K422.1-6). In a draft

of "A Simple Enquiry," the object of the major's interest is described as "a good looking boy with a weak face," which Hemingway then changed to "a dark faced boy" (K422.1-6). In the first draft of *The Sun Also Rises*, Jake himself is said to wear "shirt-sleeves," the same as the gay men, but Hemingway disaffiliated Jake from the gay men by crossing out that line (K422.1-6). And in the published *Garden*, the Colonel tells Catherine that she looks "extraordinarily beautiful," but "must try to get darker." Catherine then reveals to David that she hadn't "change[d] back to be a girl for lunch," suggesting that the Colonel was attracted to her performance of a well-tanned boy (64-5).

Chapter 3 of *The Garden* closes with David left wondering, "how dark can she become . . . how dark will she ever really be" (31). He cannot mean, however, how well-tanned can she become or "will ever really be," for the answer to that is, or will become, apparent. He means rather how far can darkening the outside darken the inside; if one fills the skin with color will it seep inside? And if it does, will they be themselves, "only changed," or not themselves? Does racial signification and/or identification alter the stability of core subjectivity? Is it possible, David wonders, to be *rebourne* into the garden?

While working on *The Garden* manuscript, Hemingway himself asserted that the theme of his novel-in-progress was "the happiness of the Garden that a man must lose" (qtd. in Baker, *Life Story* 583). If le Graud du Roi represents the garden, as

it surely must, then it cannot help but evoke the infancy of the human race. Like the infancy of the Bourne marriage (in which two individuals are reborn into a couple), what we have in the text is a youthful, perhaps even child-like, attempt to recapture lost innocence, the prelapsarian harmony of such polarities as male/female and light/dark, a concordance of opposites that precede the "fall" into time and the manifestation of such dualities in the field of time. After having eaten from the tree of knowledge, it was, after all, gendered difference that made itself known first; and, soon thereafter, national identity was lost, for humankind was exiled from its home and sent to live east of eden. It is only after sex with Marita that Catherine feels "grown-up" (120).

The so-called old world is therefore a suitable site for the enactment of Freud's polymorphous perverse, for Europe is figured as a sort of playground for, and of, the self, a place where racial/national identity can be played with, and perhaps consolidated, in part by measuring the distance between the European and the American, the Euro-American and the African. When Catherine sees Nick and Barbara with their matching haircuts for the first time, she tells David that, "Every one was like that in the middle ages. It was just seeing handsome healthy looking tanned people out of the middle ages that upset me" (K422.1-6). The link between the modern and medieval periods is also made by Jackson Lears in *No Place of Grace* (104-07), and several critics have also pointed to the modern/medieval connection in Hemingway, especially in respect

to *The Sun Also Rises* and *Across the River and Into the Trees.* 4 Hemingway had in fact considered calling *The Sun Also Rises* *A New-Slain Knight*, a phrase from the medieval balled "The Two Cobies" (Baker, *Life Story* 215); while Fitzgerald (wisely) abandoned a similar project -- *Philippe, Count of Darkness* -- in which the central character was to be based on Hemingway (Meyers 159).

The young Bourne couple, in the infancy of their life together, must in any case rehearse that life, must establish the rules and roles for their new identity as a couple. For David, the struggling writer (though with one published novel under his belt), Europe in general, and le Grau in particular, represent a trial period of exile in which he can attempt to fashion his artistic identity, just as he and Catherine can experiment with irresponsibility before returning home to take up the duties of raising a family (the very duties the homosexual does not perform, leading some to stereotype lesbians and gays as irresponsible and adolescent). Perhaps one reason why Catherine feels "hollow" is because she has not yet taken up her "true" role as wife and mother; women's "real" work is the body, her "real" creative potential is in producing offspring. We should also note that David has already "given birth" to a novel, and that "hollow" and "empty" are nearly-synonymous with "barren." Physical or literary (re)production is not necessarily enjoyable, however. We are admonished by the Christian ethic to procreative sex, but the homosexual's sex is for pure enjoyment. Pleasure is not one of our cultural

values.

For the American, national identity -- especially as manifest in terms of race -- is as unstable as the Hemingway text itself, for the self-invented American is a product of racial, ethnic, and cultural cross-pollination. This theme resonates in the text in the mixed desires to become and/or dissolve the differences between the Euro-American and the American Indian, the Euro-American and the African, the eroticism of the once-light Catherine and the dark, "Javanese" (236) pigmentation of Marita, as well as in all the gender games the characters play -- yet another instance of Edenic playfulness. Such mixed blood is mirrored in -- and the novel is full of mirror imagery -- Catherine's attempt to wipe-out gendered differences and the desire to be both a boy and a girl at the same time. This desire also confounds sexual behavior, for in reversing gender roles, the characters also upend sex roles, so that Catherine becomes the dominant, aggressive "man," and David the submissive, passive "woman" (84).

I would like to take Toni Morrison's idea that Catherine "appropriates" blackness a step further to suggest that, as a kind of writing, coloring the body also violates Levitical law. As Jane Marcus has argued in reference to another modernist text that raises similar issues, Djuna Barnes's *Nightwood*, "writing on the body . . . is breaking a powerful patriarchal taboo for the inheritors of the Judeo-Christian ethos in which the possession of the Logos is indicated by writing on holy

tablets. Making human skin into a page or a text violates the symbolic order." She goes on to remind us that "Levitical taboos [also] include incest and homosexuality and mark out any aberrant or physically blemished person as unpleasing to God." If "Leviticus is about separation," then *The Garden*, like *Nightwood*, "is about merging, dissolution, and, above all, hybridization" ("Leviticus" 222-23). Comley and Scholes also suggest that David's "tale of the elephant hunt is a story about separation from the father, just as David's new erotic experiences are about the rejection of 'Hebrew laws or tabus [sic]'" (102).

Many American men and women of our time are, therefore, violating the "Levitical law" most often deployed against gay sexuality by tatooing or otherwise decorating the body. They are playing God by refashioning the body that was cast out of Eden, not to play, but to work. In Catherine's case, her tanning transgresses laws intended to keep the body, inside and outside, "clean" and "pure." Catherine "appropriates" not only blackness, then, but the Logos which "rightly" belongs to man, in the present case, David, himself a writer. That Catherine takes control of her body -- its color and its uses -- threatens the primacy of man in the patriarchal order. For a female character to control anything in Hemingway is unusual enough, for it is the man who must adhere to the code of *aficion*, but for her to take some measure of control over a man's body -- its colors, uses, and construction -- is unique. Catherine is an artist of the corporeal world.

3. Body Art

Just as David writes an "Africanized Eden" on the page, so Catherine strives to write a gendered/racial identity on her body, however much she relies on "Africanism" to do so. She is, therefore, a kind of artist whose raw material is her corporeal existence. Her attempt to move beyond the dualities of male/female, black/white, heterosexuality/homosexuality is similar to the fiction writer's requisite ability to move into other subject positions -- those of his/her characters -- to possess (after Teresias, Coleridge and Woolf), the "androgynous mind" necessary to create believable characters of either, and both, genders.

While the literary artist may create and portray any number of characters, Catherine has only one with which to work -- herself. Limited to a single subject, she is thus compelled to portray a kind of Cubist vision of her own identity, what Kathy Willingham calls her "diffused subjectivity" (60). Catherine has, in fact, "atomized her identity to include such labels as 'sister,' 'brother,' 'husband,' 'boy,' 'girl,' and 'Peter.' She adamantly despises being assigned a set identity, as indicated when she tells David that being a 'girl' exclusively is 'a god damned bore[,]'" which, as far as David is concerned, transforms her into a "Devil" (Willingham 60). "Atomized" and "Adam-ized," Catherine can now name/not name at her pleasure, for she has taken over Adam's taxonomic privilege in the garden.

That so many of these "labels" infantalize the characters

-- they also take naps like "good children" (5) -- is not terribly surprising in a novel which seeks to recapture lost innocence, a time when gendered differences may not even be recognized. Catherine's refusal to name, or "set" once and for all her identity also calls to mind the heroine in Hemingway's short story "The Sea Change." In that story, the woman about to leave her male lover for another woman rejects her boyfriend's description of her lesbianism as a "vice" and "perversion," telling him that, "You don't have to put any name on it," for, "We're made up of all sorts of things" (*WTN* 57-58).

That Catherine also distrusts language, or at least senses her "inadequacy" in respect to its employment, forces her "to legitimize her creativity . . . by using her physical body" (Willingham 47). Such "inadequacy" may issue from what Willingham calls the "patriarchal dominance of the arts" (47), represented in the novel in the person of David. The text may therefore be seen to enact Lacan's Symbolic and Imaginary, where the *nom du pere* initiates the subject into the realm of culture and language (the Symbolic). Blocked from full participation in the Symbolic, or patriarchal, order by virtue of gender, Catherine turns to the body to "legitimize her creativity." She tells David, for example, that she would be "happy" simply to look at him, even if he "never said a word" (11); and in order for David to know her, she feels she must "put on one of my tight shirts so you can tell what I think about things,'" as today there are those who "put on" muscles

and tattoos so that we can tell what *they* think about things. Bodies are therefore the "hard copies" of interior identity.

When the conflict between the Bournes reaches the breaking point, Catherine attacks David on his own territory by assailing his facility with language. As she explains to Marita, "'I thought he was wonderful . . . until I found he couldn't write even a simple note correctly . . . . He speaks very idiomatic French but he can't write it at all. He's really illiterate'" (216). This remark is a denunciation of both David's "manhood" and his skills as a writer, for the two are always linked in Hemingway; in order to be "complete," one must perform competently at the writing desk and in the conjugal bed. Recall that in *Death in the Afternoon*, Hemingway sneers that gay writer Raymond Radiguet, "knows how to make his living with both his pen and his pencil" (71).

In taking on the identity of others -- "'I am you [David] and her [Marita] . . . .I'm everybody'" (196) -- Catherine attempts to claim for herself the power others possess, in this case, the patriarchal authority of the artist. Artistic performance and sexual performance are in fact closely connected in *The Garden*, and the act of writing and the act of sex are often seen to produce the same or similar sensations in their wake. The "insatiable longing, always for something or someone else" which the characters experience -- their "hollow" feeling -- is, as Gerald Kennedy maintains, "experienced most intensely after writing or intercourse" (189):

> . . . he [David] felt empty and hollow from making love. (13)
>
> *
>
> David had finished writing and he was empty and hollow-feeling . . . (164)

That both writing and sex "employ the same vitality" raises anxieties in David that "[t]oo much sexual activity might make him artistically impotent" (Fleming, *Mirror* 154). This fear of wasting the seed of creativity, like squandering the seed of life in fornication, is a leitmotif in Hemingway's work. In *The Garden* apprehensions about too much sexual activity also raise fears about becoming "too African," and perhaps "too gay" -- for both black men and gay men (not mutually exclusive categories) are in large measure defined by their sexuality and/or sexual behavior.

That too much sex might make David/Hemingway "artistically impotent" also speaks to the other -- the often debilitating influence of women on men, especially when the woman has money and the man is an artist. For however much Hemingway may celebrate sensate experience, sex and sexuality are often shown to corrupt a man's well-being, to sap the strength better preserved for other purposes, just as wealth interferes with his discipline and ability to concentrate on his work. What's particularly intriguing about the link between money and corruption is that, as we have already seen, Hemingway often

links money to "corrupted" forms of gender and sexuality, specifically prostitution (*The Sun Also Rises*), male homosexuality (*Death in the Afternoon* and "The Mother of a Queen"), man's feminization (*To Have and Have Not*, "Kilimanjaro," and "Francis Macomber"). Wealthy tourists also corrupt the integrity of other Hemingway "gardens": the fishing community in *The Old Man and the Sea*, Bimini in *Islands in the Stream*, Paris itself in *A Moveable Feast*. One cannot maintain artistic integrity if soiled by money, just as one cannot write and have sex, for one possesses energy (and perhaps skill) enough to create either literature or life, either art or bodies.

Marita serves as a kind of witness (audience/reader) to the Bourne relationship, for, it may be argued, art only exists at the point where the work and its audience/readership meet, as identity becomes "real" only when it is acknowledged by another, or, in *The Garden*, when it is reflected (objectified) in the mirror behind the bar, in the bedroom, or in the hand. More importantly, perhaps, Marita becomes a participant in the Bourne's story. As such, she helps to write their life together, not on the page, but on the body. Both Catherine and Marita are artists of the physical -- are they rehearsing motherhood? are the bodies of women and gay men their very identity? -- and in terms of sexual knowledge and the willingness to experiment with objects of desire the text reveals the body triumphant. Deeds -- sexual behavior, gender performance, darkening -- create the doer.

Chapter 7

Art and Anxiety

> Frontiersmen were never afraid of poetry. It was Big Business with its fear of femininity, it was the eunuchoid clergy capitualting to vulgar masculinity that made religion and art sissy things.
>
> -- Saul Bellow, *Humboldt's Gift* (26)

> L'ecrivain est quelqu'un qui joue avec le corps de sa mere.
>
> -- Roland Barthes, *Le Plaisir du text* (60)

1. The Flesh and the Word

Just as Catherine, and then David and Marita, become sexual heretics, so the writer in the Hemingway text is himself a kind of sexual heretic, or, as Robert Fleming has convincingly argued, in some measure "perverse," for he relies on, or "uses" ("appropriates"), the lives of others to create art. Such "exploitation," Fleming writes, "is a major sin of the writer" (*Mirror* 145). This further affiliates the writer with "corrupted" forms of sexuality, notably the prostitute and the male homosexual. For the prostitute trades ("uses") her body as an item of exchange, while the gay man in Hemingway is often presented as overly concerned with money (figured as either a spendthrift or a miser, as Comley and Scholes point out, which

suggests that erotic relations between men is always, or often, based on economic exchange or an alternative power-based arrangement).

This underscores Fleming's related contention that "Catherine's habit of peering into mirrors complements David's obsession with his reflected image. Not capable of producing art herself, Catherine nevertheless can emulate the self-absorption of the true artist" (*Mirror* 139). While I take exception to the idea that Catherine is not a "true artist" -- or at least *some* kind of artist, as argued above, one who can "make the dark magic of the change" (*The Garden* 20) -- I agree that thematically she and David share an intense interest in the "reflected image." It is of course the writer's job in some way to reflect what s/he sees in the world within or without. As David creates, or recreates, on the page the lives of himself and others, which produces a *physical* reality (the text), Catherine transforms David into a complementary image of herself through the alchemy ("dark magic") of her own specialized body art. She adds art onto life, inscribing her own vision of David on David's body: "'Just look at me,'" she tells him. "'That's how you look'" (177). Like a fictional portrait of an actual person, David is unsure that his life has been "used" honestly, if what he sees (reads) in the mirror is authentic and true-to-life; or has he become what we might call a "corrupted text"?:

> The he sat on the bar stool and
> looked into the mirror and lifted

> the tall drink. I do not know if I'd have a drink with you or not if I'd met you four months ago, he thought. (133)

When the writer in "The Sea Change" ("see" change? "she" change?) is abandoned by his girlfriend, he similarly gazes into a mirror and sees "he was really quite a different looking man . . . he saw that this was quite true" (*WTN* 60). Jake Barnes also looks for himself in a mirror in order to determine if he remains what he once was -- a "real" man -- and he is now found wanting, for his genital wound has rendered his sex useless; it is mere furnishing, just as the "big armoire beside the bed" ("amour"? "armor"?) is more decorative than functional (30).

When David "looked at his face in the mirror with one side shaved," he sees core identity made visible. His visage is where he makes his identity, signing interiority through hair and skin. David is "composing" himself in the mirror, or "making face," as the Spanish say, by which they mean, "creating identity." 1 But his half-shaved face (the "beardless youth" who in some cultures may function without censure in the "passive" feminine sexual role) also marks a split in identity, a fragmentation or bifurcation of the self, a metaphor for the dualities of race, gender, and sexuality that recalls Frederic Henry's "separate peace," itself a pun on the separate pieces of a shattered battlefield body; the *In Our Time entr'acte* fragments; and even the birthing posture.

Again, however, such splits -- that is, fractured identity -- are not seen to issue from within, but from without; fractures in core identity are not the "fault" of the man/writer, but the woman. Devotion to art can heal David:

> He had not known just how greatly he had been divided and separated because once he started to work he wrote from an inner core which could not be split nor even marked or scratched. (183)

The "real man" is, as the expression goes, "together"; nothing can spilt, mark, or scratch him, or so he would like to believe.

But looking at oneself and constantly checking on one's appearance is also frequently viewed as a feminizing gesture. That David becomes the object of his own gaze places him in the "seductive," "passive," or "feminine" position. That he is also the *subject* of his own specular fascination makes little difference, for a woman is conceived of as both the object of others and of herself. Her presumed narcissism -- her concern for physical appearance and appeal -- is also a quality typically assigned to the male homosexual (now reinforced by the body/health cult): the homosexual is too self-absorbed (and too childish and irresponsible to dedicate himself to raising a family). Like the narcisstic matador or the gay men in *The Sun Also Rises*, with their "newly washed, wavy hair" (20), attention to appearance is feminizing and potentially

homosexualizing. In the unpublished manuscript of *The Garden*, Barbara suggests that to make the private public -- that is, to reflect through gendered appearance, such as the style and length of hair, internal sexual preferences -- constitutes the "necessary danger" of transgressing social norms (K422.1). This is not unlike those who claim to support lesbian/gay rights, but who don't understand why lesbian and gay men must "flaunt" their sexuality. A similar "danger" may be the production of literature, for once a writer's work enters the public realm, the "body" of society is, however minutely, altered, just as the writer him/herself may be changed by making the private public. What's more, the writer's work, and, by extension, the writer him/herself, becomes the object of the reader's gaze.

While women do not tell stories in Hemingway -- only Pilar possesses the power of the word, for she relates the story of Maria's humiliation at the hands of the fascists -- and rarely narrate their own lives -- Marie Morgan's monologue is the exception here -- Catherine (like Barbara) is an active agent in the narrative. She, in fact, advances the plot, while also making the sexual advances, which further destablizes traditional gender roles, as well as perceived ideas in respect to the Hemingway hero. Too many critics, Jerry Varsava rightly claims (citing Jeffrey Meyers, Robert Jones, and Malcolm Magaw), are "burdened . . . by the habitual notion of the Hemingway hero . . .[and therefore] the events of the novel are viewed from David's point of view in an unwaveringly

sympathetic fashion" (116), as if he were the exemplar of truth and authenticity. Carol Smith similarly maintains that the crucial significance of *The Garden* when set against much of Hemingway's other work is that here Hemingway "creates characters struggling against the unrelenting strictness of their own ideals. They find it difficult to live up to the rigid demands of sexuality" (142-43). I would only amend this to read that they are more precisely "struggling against the unrelenting strictness" of societal "ideals" in respect not only to sexual categories, but to gender and racial classifications as well. Just as Catherine "invents" (48) new forms of sexuality, and, by extension, subjectivity itself, so the text raises the possibility that "male and female are less than absolute conditions" (Updike 88); so, too, race, ethnicity, and culture.

If one can be an artist, or a writer without a pencil, then one can also be something other than outward appearance might indicate. The use of mirrors (including mirror images, the doubling of identity and plot, and reflections of the self and others) is one of the objective correlatives Hemingway calls upon to explore the mutability of identity. If Catherine's experiments in altering identity make her a "Devil" and signal a form of corruption, then David's literary efforts to transform life into art may also be regarded as "devilish." The metamorphosis of identity, its potential plasticity in terms of sex, gender, and race, lies coiled within the body of the garden's serpent, an evil creature which sheds its skin

only to create itself anew, endlessly, seasonally. Having gained the forbidden knowledge of good and evil, Catherine willingly sets out to recast these concepts -- the true is the good (gender mutability), the evil is the untrue (gender fixity).

Hemingway's posthumously-published work -- *A Moveable Feast*, *Islands in the Stream*, *The Garden of Eden*, and *The Dangerous Summer* -- all return him, and us, to the places of his youth: toward the end, his eye was on the beginning; and after his death, we are in large measure reading his youth. His own attempts to recapture lost time, and "the happiness of the Garden that a man must lose," is played out in these late works, most especially in *The Garden*.

A novel which seeks to regain the Western idea of the garden must necessarily draw upon the imagery of the Biblical, or mythical, garden, when racial and gendered distinctions were not yet manifest or produced by various cultural inflections. For the American, an invented race, national identity always relies on negotiating the tension between different cultures and races. Just as Catherine attempts to blur or blot-out gender categories, so the text as a whole, however much it relies on "discursive Africanism" to do so, deconstructs race itself by pointing to the mutability of the body in terms of its racial signification.

The task of the writer is to reflect life and transform it into art. The job Catherine sets for herself is much the same, only her powers are directed at metamorphizing individual

identity by breaking down, or crossing over, strict boundaries. The potential fluidity of self-identity is what makes *The Garden of Eden* such an astonishing work, and one which calls for a reevaluation of the Hemingway corpus itself. And so Hemingway's body of work continues to grow, though the man has been gone thirty-some years. And just as we reinterpret what *that* body means, so we are continually constructing and reconstructing what the corporeal bodies around us mean.

2. Potency and Prolificacy

Returning to *Death in the Afternoon*, we find that Hemingway expresses uncertainty in respect to his own abilities as a writer, quite often in the language of size and measurement, revealing the suspicion that his skills are not great or large enough. Toward the end of the book, for example, Hemingway writes, "If I could have made this enough of a book it would have had everything in it" (270). A page later, he nearly apologizes for having had to omit telling the reader about a particularly exciting year for the bullfight, for his book is "not enough of a book" (271). The penultimate sentence of the text returns to this theme, and Hemingway employs the same phrase as before: "It is not enough of a book . . . " (278).

The specter of artistic impotence is raised on six separate occasions, first in conversation with the "Old lady":

> Old lady: If you please, sir, I do
> not care for all this discussion of

> words. Are we not here to be instructed about the bulls and those who fight them?
>
> If you wish, but start your writer talking of words and he will go until you are wearied and wish he would show more skill in using them and preach less of their significance. (71)

This is a curious passage on several counts. First, the "Old lady" recognizes that Hemingway's "discussion of words" is a digression from the stated topic, "the bulls." What she fails to see, however, is the oblique connection between "the bulls" (that is, the art of the bullfight) and "words" (the art of fiction). However skilled Hemingway may be, he suggests that he should "show more skill" still in "using" words than he perhaps does. To "preach" is not to do; talking about literature is not the same as creating literature. Those who fail to perform -- at the writing desk, in the ring, or in the bed -- are not "full-sized" men. If, on the other hand, Hemingway were to "go on" about words, unable to "stop" writing (talking) about them, then this shows a lack of discipline, which itself is "decadent," for the inability to control one's output violates the aesthetic of omission and stating things "simply." Such a writer resembles the matador who has lost sight of his "aesthetic," which invariably leads to "the decadence of bullfighting" (85). The link between artistic and

sexual potency is forged soon thereafter, when Hemingway claims, as previously noted, that Radiguet "knew how to use" both "his pen" and "his pencil" (71).

Hemingway, speaking directly to the reader rather than through the intermediary of the "Old lady," asks that the reader "remember" that "all bad writers are in love with the epic" (54) -- again, a matter of size. And again a matter of output: he tells the "Old lady" that "you can't go wrong on Faulkner. He's *prolific* too. By the time you get them [his books] there'll be new ones out" (my emphasis, 173). Since Hemingway did not consider himself a "bad writer," it may be assumed that he was not "in love with the epic"; on the other hand, it may also be that some, if not all, good writers are also "in love" with it. Whatever he might have felt about writers who aspire to the epic, two decades later he was writing and bragging about his own three-part epic of "the land, sea and air" (Baker, *Life Story* 620-21; 625-27). 2 While he tells the "Old lady" with bitter irony, "you can't go wrong on Faulkner," he also maligns Faulkner's work by implying that his books come out too quickly to be of high quality. Hemingway in fact viewed Faulkner as his chief literary rival and his constantly shifting appraisals of his competitor's work are more reflective of Hemingway's mood and confidence at any given time than the actual merits of Faulkner's fiction. Hemingway seems never to have fully resolved what he felt was the conflict between his male identity and the identification of art with the feminine.

Hemingway's reservations about his artistic potency are not, however, confined to *The Garden of Eden* or for that matter to *Death in the Afternoon*. Just a year before he took his own life, when his physical and creative abilities were indeed in question, he made (as he had in *Death*), a kind of apology to the reader in the Preface to *A Moveable Feast*: "It would be fine if all these [events just described] were in this book but we will have to do without them for now." The fear of emptiness is, as already discussed, most often articulated in Hemingway's work in a character's feeling either "hollow" or "hungry."

"Hollow" is also the word used to describe the results of a writer "who omits things because he does not know them" (*Death* 192). In "A Clean, Well-Lighted Place," emptiness is expressed in a parody of the Lord's Prayer: "Our nada who art in nada, nada be thy name thy kingdom nada thy will be nada in nada as it is in nada" (*WTN* 23). The dying writer in "The Snows of Kilimanjaro" regrets not having written of the rich, having planned to "leave it" until he was certain he "knew what he was writing of." He waited too long, however, and as he lay dying he knows that "he would never do it, because each day of not writing, of comfort, of being that which he despised, dulled his capacity and softened his will to work at all." The writer in "Kilimanjaro" attempts to keep himself from blaming his wealthy wife for having "destroyed his talent" because she has "kept him well" (*SOK* 10-11). Being "kept," allowing himself to be seduced by the rich, becoming soft, comfortable,

dulled -- this is what he "despised." Impotence and paralysis are also evoked in "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber," where another rich woman undermines her husband's courage; in *The Sun Also Rises*, where Jake Barnes's genital wound has rendered him incapable of erection, and where Robert Cohn is kept under wraps by his consort Frances; and in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, where the drunken Pablo is ineffectual beside his lusty wife, Pilar.

The feminine presence is likewise often seen in Hemingway's life to have had (to his mind anyway) a debilitating effect on men, especially artists: as already noted, Hadley, his first wife, once lost all of his manuscripts; Pauline, his wealthy second wife, was, like the wife in "Kilimanjaro," often blamed for corrupting his work by providing too well for him; third wife Martha Gellhorn's career in journalism was, Hemingway claimed, a constant distraction from his own (more important) work; and it was of course Zelda who destroyed Scott Fitzgerald's talent (*Feast* 174). And when Hemingway's young friend A.E. Hotchner asked Hemingway's opinion of his plans to give up journalism and move to Paris to pursue a strictly literary career, Hemingway purportedly answered, "'Nobody knows what's in him until he tries to pull it out. If there's nothing or very little, the shock can kill a man'" (61). A prophetic statement if actually made!

The writer can also be seen as entering into a (public) transaction with his/her readership; the literary artist, like any artist, must give up (or at least share) something of

him/herself with the public to do with as it pleases. The writer entertains, amuses, in some form pleasures a paying audience (so, too, the matador and prostitute). Such an audience, like the "Old lady" in *Death*, desires its "money's worth." But in order to satisfy the public, the author must often "use" others for his/her own ends. In "The Sea Change," Hemingway's story of a woman about to leave her male lover for another woman, Fleming sees "an effective metaphor for the writer's perverse willingness to use others for the sake of his art" (*Mirror* 50). The writer in the story, "wants the woman to come back and tell him 'all about' her sexual experiences" in order, Fleming maintains, "to furnish the raw materials that he needs for his writing" (*Mirror* 49; *WTN* 53-60). So not to prostitute his/her art, the writer must in some sense prostitute the lives of others.

Financial gain may also tempt the writer to sell out, and, "after one piece of dishonest writing he [sic] is never the same again" -- artistic decadence is the result. The inability to meet the demands of "reality," where this is understood to mean "normalcy," undermines the "truth" of individual identity, for like the homosexual, the "dishonest" writer "blurs" "the real thing"; s/he is "not adequate to reality," or at least "not adequate" to representing reality.

Afterword

Alienation and loss, the great void, the dark abyss, the *nada* of modern existence, the hollow heart of darkness, the anxiety of uncertainty: these are at the core of the Hemingway corpus, the very fears which the code is meant to neutralize but ends up naturalizing, for in the final analysis, the code cannot liberate one from the harsh realities of life. Against chaos even the Hemingway hero contends in vain.

While the code is never meant to save the world, it certainly is intended to save the Hemingway hero from a world of violence and treachery, ambiguity and emptiness. But what is the fate, or likely fate, of the code hero? Jake may never find lasting companionship; Frederic may end up without progeny; Santiago loses his marlin; Robert Jordan, Harry Morgan, Harry of "Kilimanjaro," and Robert Cantwell die; and Francis Macomber's life, however happy, is also quite short. The point is that a man "can be destroyed but not defeated" (*The Old Man and the Sea* 103); living well is not the best revenge -- dying well is. Still, one must live.

In spite of it all, Hemingway characters do indeed live; they can't go on, they go on. Nick struggles with insomnia in "Now I Lay Me," and with shellshock in "A Way You'll Never Be" and "Big Two-Hearted River." The one-armed major in "In

Another Country" attempts to overcome his wife's death and his own war injury, and seeks to replace the war (in the form of the rehabilitation equipment -- the machines -- he uses) with humaneness; part machine himself, he desires the wholeness of the body and of his humanity, both scarred and nearly destroyed by battle. The young protagonist of "God Rest You Merry, Gentlemen" ask that surgeons castrate him in order, the story implies, to escape sexual desire (they do not, he does not). And in three stories -- "Mr. and Mrs. Elliot," "Cat in the Rain," and "Out of Season" -- images of hollowness and emptiness are expressed in terms of sterility, both literal ("Mr. and Mrs. Elliot") and figurative.

The "separate peace" so many Hemingway characters attempt to make with the world most often fails. Two is not enough to effect "peace," though sometimes three succeeds. Indeed, the many triangulations in Hemingway represent the desire for wholeness, for completion, which often seems to depend on the presence of a third party, either as an active participant in the life of a couple or as a spectator introduced into that life in order to validate it. The shifting signification of the third party -- like that of pale/dark, for instance -- can result in some measure of domestic bliss -- which is the case in "Mr. and Mrs. Elliot," where the arrival of the wife's lesbian lover solves the Elliot's problems: she has her sex life, he has his poetry -- but more often ends in further trauma or total destruction. This is the "pilot fish" of *A Moveable Feast*, the shark (and the tourists, themselves

"sharks") of *The Old Man and the Sea*, Marita of *The Garden of Eden*. Beyond the formalist necessities of plot and conflict, these third parties are also, like food, drink, and sex, the presences by which characters attempt to fill the nada; the observer who validates and completes, who, it is hoped, can forestall non-being in the living. Who, or what, then, is this seemingly necessary angle in Hemingway's triangulations? One may be tempted to say the patriarch, the father/liar (and art is also a "lie") who consolidates his own primacy in the cultural order by denying the other (specifically, the Indian), and by failing to prepare and intiate his own progeny into the adult world. But as I hope my argument has also implied, the father is the self, the instrument through which males in Hemingway attempt to consolidate their masculine identity. In other words, what's often missing in the intimate relations between men and women is the stable, centered man who is confident in his own identity, his independent subjectivity and agency. It is the self, the self of authentic feeling, emotion, thought, and desire; it is the self released from the bondage of cultural imperatives, freed from the chains of the code.

From the early Indian stories to the primitivism of *The Garden of Eden*, the drive for gendered/sexual identity (a struggle complicated by anxieties over paternal authority) appears inextricably linked to the consolidation of a national identity. The Hemingway hero always desires to recapture "the happiness of the Garden that a man must lose," and such

happiness is sought through the performance of a "primitive," or non-normative, sexuality, the drive for androgynous undifferentiation between the genders, and the longing for a "homeland" unsoiled by the "decadence" of modern civilization. The figure who best represents these struggles is not, however, the Hemingway hero, but the object of his spiritual and erotic desires, namely, the elusive fantasy/fetish of the dark girl who resembles a boy -- Nick's Trudy who grows up to be David's Catherine and Marita. Unlike Jake Barnes, they have decidely not "lost touch with the soil."

The code of *aficion*, like the cloak of Papa, was so tightly woven that it became a straightjacket that both informed and bound the Hemingway hero's self-identity. The central tension in Hemingway is therefore a continual tending in two directions at once, an unresolved battle of binarisms that continues to affect our culture, and which results in a perpetual tug-of-war between the unstable terms masculine/feminine, heterosexual(ity)/homosexual(ity), art/labor, European/ American, modern/primitive. And out of this crucible comes the richly ambiguous work of that deeply-conflicted American modern, Ernest Hemingway.

Notes

Complete bibliographical information for works mentioned below may be found in Works Cited and Consulted.

Chapter 1

1 Moddelmog's "Reconstructing Hemingway's Identity: Sexual Politics, the Author, and the Multicultural Classrom"; the Davidson's "Decoding the Hemingway Hero in *The Sun Also Rises*"; and Martin's "Brett Ashley as New Woman in *The Sun Also Rises*."

2 For Foucault, the "species" homosexual first appeared in 1870, with the publication of Carl Westphal's *Archiv fur Neurologie*.

3 In his discussion of "The Anxiety of Emptiness and Meaninglessness" in *The Courage To Be*, Paul Tillich sees one typical strategy for overcoming "meaninglessness" as the attempt to "break out" of "the isolation of his individual self" by identifying with "something transindividual, to surrender his separation and self-relatedness." The consequence of this, Tillich argues, is that, "Meaning is saved, but the self is sacrificed" (49). This is precisely the result of strict adherence to the code: life has a sense of meaning for the character in question, but at the price of his "real" self, his individuality.

4 McAlmon may also have been the first to introduce Hemingway to the bullfight. For more on the brief, though intense, relationship between the two men, see the Baker, Lynn, Mellow, or Meyers biographies. Hemingway also had much to say to, and about, "Mac" in his personal correspondence (see Baker's *Selected Letters*). McAlmon provides his own take on their relationship in *Being Geniuses Together*.

5 Short story collections are abbreviated as follows: *IOT* for *In Our Time*, *MWW* for *Men Without Women*, *WTN* for *Winner Take Nothing*, *NAS* for *The Nick Adams Stories*, *SOK* for *The Snows of Kilimanjaro and Other Stories*.

Chapter 2

1 Robert Jordan also has two first names and Jake Barnes's name may derive from lesbian salon hostess Natalie Barney, Djuna Barnes, or the rue Jacob/Hotel Jacob, where many Americans stayed upon first arriving in Paris in the twenties. As for Frederic Henry and Catherine Barkley, Kenneth Lynn traces the source of their names to one Barklie Henry ("the husband of a Whitney heiress") whose wife was to have "a rough time giving birth to their first child" (Lynn 239, 297-98).

2 Intimate male bonding is ubiquitous in war novels. In Remarque's *All Quiet on the Western Front*, what is often thought of as a companion piece to *A Farewell to Arms*, Paul Baumer and a comrade cook a stolen goose together: "We don't talk much, but I believe we have a more complete communion with one another than even lovers have . . . . I love him, his shoulders, his angular stopping figure . . . " (60-61). For a like-minded analysis of wartime intimacy, see Jane Marcus's Afterword to Helen Zenna Smith's "response" to the Remarque novel, *Not So Quiet . . .*

3 Carlos Baker on the ambulance driver as servant: "After hours, the *tenente* sometimes carried cigarettes, candy, and post cards to the men in the lines" (*Life Story* 60).

4 As Paul Fussell writes, "The language of military attack -- *assault, impact, thrust, penetration* -- has always overlapped with that of sexual importunity" (Fussell's emphasis 270). He also writes that one "index of the prevailing innocence [of the pre-war period] is a curious prophylaxis of language. One could use with security words which a few years later, after the war, would constitute double entendres. One could say intercourse, or erection, or ejaculation without any risk of evoking a smile or a leer. Henry James's innocent employment of the word tool is as well known as Browning's artless misapprehensions about the word twat . . . . Indeed the literary scene is hard to imagine. There was no *Waste Land*, with its rat's alleys, dull canals, and dead men who have lost their bones: it would take four years of trench warfare to bring these to consciousness. There was no *Ulysses*, no *Mauberley*, no *Cantos*, no Kafka, no Proust, no Waugh, no Auden, no Huxley, no Cummings, no *Women in Love* or *Lady Chatterly's Lover*. There was no 'Valley of Ashes' in *The Great Gatsby*" (23). We might also add that there was no *Son at the Front* (Edith Wharton), no *Backwash of War* (Ellen LaMotte), no *Non-Combatants and Others* (Rose Macaulay), no *Forbidden Zone* (Mary Borden), no *Despised and Rejected* (Rose Allatini), no *We That Were Young* (Irene Rathbone), no *Testament of Youth* (Vera Britain), no *Not So Quiet . . .* (Helen Zenna Smith), and of course no *Mrs. Dalloway* or *To the Lighthouse*. For a more thoroughgoing list of "significant women writers and their main

works in response to World War I," see Appendix I in Tylee.

5 Kenneth Lynn on the subject of wounds: "In the course of his [Hemingway's] convalescence in Milan he had visited a genito-urinary ward in another hospital . . . . There he had talked to a number of soldiers who had suffered genital injuries, and as a result of wondering about their plight he had come to imagine Jake Barnes's. The only item of significance that was missing [in subsequent accounts of his stay in Milan] . . . was a convincing explanation of why Hemingway had been so interested in the wounded in that particular ward" (Lynn 86; also see Meyers 199).

6 As Jackson Lears maintains, the "crisis of cultural authority" and how it manifest itself in gender rules and roles were already evident in turn-of-the-century America, where "Puritans and republicans alike had been haunted by fears of the urban 'effeminacy' and 'luxury' produced by material progress" (4). American republics, Lears writes, "inveighed tirelessly against urban corruption; they imagined effeminate fops on the street corners, potential canaille in public squares . . . . [and] a nagging anxiety persisted that European corruption might yet be imported" (27). Evidence of the fears which circulated around the sites masculine/feminine and American/European can be seen, for example, in H.H. Boyesen's attack on the female reader of novels as "the Iron Madonna who strangles in her fond embrace the American novelist" (497), as well as Weir Mitchell's complaint that "the monthly [magazines] are getting so lady-like that naturally they will soon menstruate" (qtd. in Earnest 174). During roughly the same period, Walt Whitman was insisting that American culture had become "too dandified, too European," and Theodore Roosevelt declared that Americans "should not be ashamed of their provincialism but should wear it proudly as an emblem of their freedom from aristocratic foppishness" (qtd. in Lears 27). In *Maggie: A Girl of the Streets* (1893), Stephen Crane (one of Hemingway's favorite short story writers) writes that for Jimmie, "fine raiment was allied to weakness, and all good coats covered faint hearts" (139). Alan Sinfield has also shown how at the 1895 trial of Oscar Wilde, elements such as "effeminacy, leisure, idleness, immorality, luxury, insouciance, decadence and aestheticism" were united and deployed against Wilde (12). In post-war Britian similar links were made between femininity and decadence: "voices from the Right and the Left [began] calling the Bloomsbury Liberals effeminate and blaming them for the 'feminisation' of British culture" (Marcus, "Taking the Bull" 147). Even H.D. noted this "aristocratic langour" in *Bid Me to Live* (114), and by 1930, *The New Republic* was denouncing the "pansies" and "poseurs" of modernism (qtd. in Rabinowitz 22), while in *Absalom, Absalom!* (1936), Faulkner writes of a "metropolitan gallant's foppish posturing" (128). The connection between the aristocracy and femininity/homosexuality is not far to seek,

and in recent years has been explored in Jonathan Goldberg's *Sodometries*, Alan Bray's *Homosexuality in Renaissance England*, a number of works by Randoph Trumbach on the eighteenth century," and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's *Between Men*, among others.

7 This metaphorical relationship was suggested to me bys an anlysis of a primitive cave painting presented in William Irwin Thompson's *The Time Falling Bodies Take to Light* (111).

8 *He Who Gets Slapped*, presumably after Leonid Andreyev, was just one of the titles Hemingway considered for his novel (see Reynolds 196).

Chapter 4

1 Citations that begin with the letter K refer to Hemingway manuscripts at the John F. Kennedy Library in Boston. The number immediately after the K identifies the catalogue number; the second number indicates the folder. I want to thank the Kennedy Library/Hemingway Foundation for a grant that enabled my research in the library's Hemingway Room.

2 In Sherwood Anderson's short story "Hands," the uses and condition of the central character's hands are the overt sign of his homosexuality, and hands become a metaphor for both femininity and homosexuality. Also see Hemingway's "The Light of the World" (chapter 3).

Chapter 5

1 The pallor of the young men evokes the familiar vampiric construction of the gay man and lesbian, figures of the night who prey on innocents and who, by sucking their blood, convert them to their perverted way of life. The fear of homosexual contamination (especially contamination/ conversion of the young) is a typical homophobic strategy that relies on the homosexual's ability to pass as heterosexual in mainstream society. The idea of the homosexual as carrier of moral and physical disease was fully deployed during the McCarthy period and during Anita Bryant's anti-gay "Save the Children" campaign of the seventies. Today's so-called Religious Right follows in the footsteps of such ignoble movements. See Adams, D'Emilio and Freedman, and Levin. For a discussion of the "polluted body," see Douglas, and for an examination of how these concepts and stereotypes function in relation to the AIDS pandemic, see Patton, Watney, and Sontag. For an exploration of the reemergence of the vampire legend in popular culture, see Broeske.

2 See R.W.B. Lewis's *The Jameses* (117).

3 Three points are worth noting in brief: (1) as Comley and Scholes observe, "it is interesting that he [Hemingway] takes Whitman's [homosexuality] for granted at a time when many would have denied it fiercely" (120-21); (2) soon after the publication of *Death*, Lawrence Leighton linked Hemingway, Dos Passos, and Fitzgerald to Radiguet in a *Hound and Horn* essay, which Hemingway countered with a satiric letter to the editor (Baker, *Selected Letters* 368); and (3) Radiguet is the unnamed subject of "The Grande Malade," a short story by Djuna Barnes that Hemingway pronounced "excellent," though he wondered why Barnes hadn't made Radiguet a writer in the story. This obfuscation, he claimed, "is what McAlmon always does and then he blurs them to make them unrecognizable and not being an artist he usually blurs them to the reader also. Still," he concluded, "Djuna's is a hell of a good story" (Baker, *Selected Letters* 186-87).

Chapter 6

1 One of the few public discussons I have heard on the subject of black gay sexuality took place on an episode of the *Donahue* show with Phil Donahue (see "The Relationship Between Black Gays and the Black Community"). A recent exhibit at the Whitney Museum of American Art in New York, "Black Male: Representations of Masculinity in Contemporary Art," also explored the image of the black man in terms of sexuality and masculinity. Also see Kimmelman. Yet another book on the Clarence Thomas/Anita Hill hearings appeared during my work on this chapter; see Mayer and Abramson.

2 See note 1, chapter 4.

3 A more detailed summary of the plots omitted may be found in Robert E. Fleming's "The Endings of Hemingway's *Garden*."

4 While many critics have pointed to this connection, especially as it relates to the code of *aficion*, two of Kim Moreland's articles are of particular interest: "Courtly Love in America: Ernest Hemingway and F. Scott Fitzgerald Present the Lady and the Vamp," and "Hemingway's Medievalist Impulse: Its Effects on the Presentation of Women and War in *The Sun Also Rises*.

Chapter 7

1 I learned of this expression from Gloria Anzaldua's book title.

2 While a traditional epic concerns national identity and nationhood, oftening involving a war story (who won, who lost), Hemingway probably means only a lengthy book.

Works Cited and Consulted

Anderson, Sherwood. "Hands." 1919. *The Portable Sherwood Anderson*. Ed. Horace Gregory. New York: Viking, 1963: 43-50.

Aiken, Conrad. "Expatriates." *The New York Herald Tribune Books* 30 Oct. 1926: 4.

Adams, Barry D. *The Rise of a Gay and Lesbian Movement*. Boston: Twayne-G.K. Hall, 1987.

Anzaldua, Gloria. *Making Face, Making Soul -- Hacienda Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Women of Color*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Foundation, 1990.

Austen, Roger. *Playing the Game: The Homosexual Novel in America*. Indianapolis and New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1977.

Babuscio, Jack. "Camp and the Gay Sensibility." *Gays and Film*. Ed. Richard Dyer. London: British Film Institute, 1987.

Backman, Melvin. "Hemingway: The Matador and the Crucified." 1955. *Hemingway and His Critics*. Ed. Carlos Baker. New York: Hill and Wang, 1961. 162-179.

Baker, Carlos. *Ernest Hemingway: Critiques of Four Major Novels*. New York: Scribner's, 1962.

---. *Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story*. 1969. New York: Bantam, 1970.

---, ed. *Ernest Hemingway: Selected Letters, 1917-1961*. New York: Scribner's, 1981.

Barlowe, Jamie. "Review of *Hemingway's Genders: Rereading the Hemingway Text*, by Nancy R. Comley and Robert Scholes." *The Hemingway Review* 14:1 (Fall 1994): 84-87.

Barnes, Djuna. "The Grande Malade." 1923. *Selected Works of Djuna Barnes: Spillway, The Antiphon, Nightwood*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1962. 21-28.

---. *Nightwood*. 1937. New York: New Directions, 1961.

Barnett, Allen. *The Body and Its Dangers and Other Stories.* New York: St. Martin's, 1990.

Barthes, Roland. *Le Plaisir du texte.* Collection Tel Quel. Dirigee par Philippe Sollers. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1973.

Beach, Joseph Warren. "How Do You Like It Now, Gentleman?" 1951. *Hemingway and His Critics.* Ed. Carlos Baker. New York: Hill and Wang, 1961. 227-44.

Beegel, Susan F. *Hemingway's Craft of Omission: Four Manuscript Examples.* Ann Arbor: U of Michigan Research P, 1988.

Bellow, Saul. *Humboldt's Gift.* 1975. New York: Avon, 1976.

Benstock, Shari. "Expatriate Sapphic Modernism: Entering Literary History." *Lesbian Texts and Contexts: Radical Revisions* Ed. Karla Jay and Joanne Glasgow. New York: New York UP, 1990. 183-203.

---. *Women of the Left Bank, Paris 1900-1940.* Austin: U of Texas P, 1986.

Bergman, David. *Gaiety Transformed: Gay Self-Representation in American Literature.* Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1991.

Borden, Mary. *Forbidden Zone.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1930.

Bowlby, Rachel. *Just Looking: Consumer Culture in Dreiser, Gissing, and Zola.* New York: Methuen, 1985.

Boyesen, H.H. "Why We Have No Great Novelists." *Forum* 2 (Feb. 1887): 147.

Braudy, Leo. *The Frenzy of Renown: Fame and its History.* New York: Oxford UP, 1986.

Bray, Alan. *Homosexuality in Renaissance England.* London: Gay Men's Press, 1982.

Brenner, Gerry. *Concealments in Hemingway's Works.* Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1983.

Brian, Denis. *The True Gen: An Intimate Portrait of Hemingway By Those Who Knew Him.* New York: Grove, 1988.

Brittain, Vera. *Testament of Youth: An Autobiographical Study of the Years 1900-1925.* New York: Macmillan, 1933.

Broer, Lawrence R. *Hemingway's Spanish Tragedy*. University: U of Alabama P, 1973.

Broeske, Pat. "Hollywood Goes Batty for Vampires." *The New York Times* 26 April 1992: late ed., sec. 2: 15+.

Burgess, Anthony. *Ernest Hemingway and His World*. New YOrk: Scribner's, 1985.

Butler, Christopher. *Early Modernism: Literature, Music, and Painting in Europe 1900-1916*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Cheatham, George. " Androgyny and *In Our Time*, 'Chapter VII.'" *The Hemingway Review* 14.1 (Fall 1994): 67-71.

Comley, Nancy R. and Robert Scholes. *Hemingway's Genders: Rereading the Hemingway Text*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1994.

Cowley, Malcolm. *Exile's Return: A Literary Odyssey of the 1920s*. 1951. New York: Viking-Compass, 1956.

Crane, Stephen. *Maggie: A Girl of the Streets*. 1893. *The Great Short Works of Stephen Crane*. New York: Perennial-Harper and Row, 1968. 127-189.

Craik, Dinah. *John Halifax, Gentleman*. New York: Lovell, 1890.

Davidson, Arnold E. and Cathy N. "Decoding the Hemingway Hero in *The Sun Also Rises*." *New Essays on The Sun Also Rises*. Ed. Linda Wagner-Martin. New York: Cambridge UP, 1987.

D'Emilio, John and Estelle B. Freedman. *Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America*. New York: Perennial-Harper and Row, 1988.

Dollimore, Jonathan. *Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucalt*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.

Donaldson, Scott. *By Force of Will: The Life and Art of Ernest Hemingway*. New York: Viking, 1977.

Doolittle, Hilda [H.D.]. *Bid Me to Live*. New York: Dial, 1960.

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. Boston: Routledge-Keegan Paul, 1969.

Dyer, Gwynne. *War*. New York: Crown, 1985.

Eby, Carl. "'Come Back to the Beach Ag'in, David Honey!': Hemingway's Fetishization of Race in *The Garden of Eden* Manuscripts." *The Hemingway Review* 14:2 (Spring 1995): 98-117.

Eagleton, Terry. "Capitalism, Modernism and Postmodernism." *Against the Grain*. By Eagleton. London: Verso, 1986. 131-48.

Earnest, Ernest. *Silas Weir Mitchell, Novelist and Physician*. Philadelphia: Publisher, 1950.

Eksteins, Modris. *Rites of Spring: The Great War and the Birth of the Modern Age*. 1989. New York: Anchor-Doubleday, 1990.

Eliot, T.S. "The Hollow Men." 1925. *T.S. Eliot: Collected Poems, 1909-1962*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1970.

Elshtain, Jean Bethke. *Women and War*. New York: Basic, 1987.

Farnsworth, Clyde H. "Finding Hemingway's 'Lost' Articles." *The New York Times* 9 March 1992, late ed., C:16.

Faulkner, William. *Absalom, Absalom!* 1936. New York: Vintage, 1972.

Fiedler, Leslie A. *Love and Death in the American Novel*. Rev. ed. New York: Stein and Day, 1966.

Field, Andrew. *Djuna: The Life and Times of Djuna Barnes*. New York: Putnam's, 1983.

Fitzgerald, F. Scott. *The Great Gatsby*. 1925. New York: Scribner's, 1970.

Flanner, Janet (Genet). *Paris Was Yesterday (1925-1939)*. New York: Popular Library, 1972.

Fleming, Robert. "The Endings of Hemingway's Garden." *American Literature* 61 (May 1989): 261-70.

---. *The Face in the Mirror: Hemingway's Writers*. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 1994.

Flora, Joseph M. *Hemingway's Nick Adams*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1982.

Forster, E.M. *Maurice*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1987.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*. Trans. Robert Hurley. 1976. New York: Doubleday-Vintage, 1980.

---. Introduction. *Herculine Barbine: Being the Recently Discovered Memoirs of a French Hermaphrodite*. Trans. Richard McDougall. New York: Pantheon, 1980.

Freud, Sigmund. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Works of Sigmund Freud*. London: Hogarth, 1966-74.

Friedman, Susan Stanford. "Psyche Reborn: Tradition, Re-Vision, and the Gooddess as Mother Symbol in H.D.'s Epic Poetry." *Women's Studies* 6 (1970): 147-60.

Fuentes, Norberto. *Hemingway in Cuba*. Trans. Consuelo E. Corwin. Ed. Larry Alson. Seacacus, NJ: L. Stuart, 1984.

Fuss, Diana. *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature, and Difference*. New York: Routledge, 1989.

Fussell, Paul. *The Great War and Modern Memory*. 1975. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1977.

Gallop, Jane. *Thinking Through the Body*. New York: Columbia UP, 1988.

Garber, Marjorie. *Vested Interests: Cross Dressing and Cultural Anxiety*. New York: Routledge, 1992.

Gilbert, Sandra M. and Susan Gubar. *No Man's Land: The Place of the Woman Writer in the Twentieth Century*. 3 vols. New Haven: Yale UP, 1988-94.

Gilroy, Paul. *Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1990.

Goldberg, Jonathan. *Sodometries: Renaissance Texts, Modern Sexualities*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1992.

Grace, Nancy McCampbell. "The Feminized Male Character in Twentieth-Century Fiction: Studies in Joyce, Hemingway, Kerouac and Bellow." *DAI* 48 (1988): 2334A. Ohio State U.

Greenberg, David F. *The Construction of Homosexuality*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988.

Griffin, Peter. *Less Than a Treason: Hemingway in Paris*. Oxford: Oxford UP. 1990.

Hassan, Ihab Habib. *The Dismemberment of Orpheus: Towards a Postmodern Literature*. New York: Oxford UP, 1971.

Hemingway, Ernest. *Across the River and Into the Trees.* 1950. New York: Scribner's, 1900.

---. *Collected Poems.* 1900. San Francisco: Pirated Edition, 1960.

---. *The Dangerous Summer.* New York: Scribner's, 1985.

---. *Death in the Afternoon.* 1932. New York: Lyceum-Scribner, 1960.

---. *A Farewell to Arms.* 1929. New York: Scribner Classic-Collier Macmillan, 1986.

---. *For Whom the Bell Tolls.* 1940. New York: Scribner's, 1968.

---. *The Garden of Eden.* New York: Scribner's, 1986.

---. *Green Hills of Africa.* 1935. New York: Scribner's, 1970.

---. *To Have and Have Not.* 1937. New York: Scribner's, 1970.

---. *In Our Time.* 1925. New York: Scribner's, 1970.

---. *Islands in the Stream.* 1970. New York: Bantam, 1972.

---, ed. *Men at War: The Best War Stories of All Time.* 1942. New York: Bramhall, 1979.

---. *Men Without Women.* 1927. New York: Scribner's, 1970.

---. *A Moveable Feast.* 1964. New York: Bantam, 1979.

---. *The Nick Adams Stories.* 1972. Ed. Philip Young. New York: Bantam, 1973.

---. *The Old Man and the Sea.* 1952. New York: Scribner's, 1970.

---. *The Snows of Kilimanjaro and Other Stories.* 1933. New York: Scribner's, 1970.

---. *The Sun Also Rises.* 1926. New York: Scribner's, 1954.

---. *Winner Take Nothing.* 1932. New York: Scribner's, 1970.

Hemingway, Mary Welsh. *How It Was.* 1976. New York: Ballantine, 1977.

Henderson, Mae, ed. *Borders, Boundaries and Frames.* New York: Routledge, 1995.

Herbst, Josephine. *The Starched Blue Sky of Spain and Other Memoirs*. New York: HarperCollins, 1991.

Hoffman, Frederick J. *The Twenties: American Writing in the Postwar Decade*. 1955. New York: Free Press, 1965.

Hotchner, A.E. *Papa Hemingway: A Personal Memoir*. 1966. New York: Bantam, 1967.

Hovey, Richard B. *Hemingway: The Inward Terrain*. Seattle: U of Washington P, 1968.

Huston, Nancy. "The Matrix of War: Mothers and Heroes." *The Body in Western Culture: Contemporary Perspectives*. Ed. Susan Rubin Suleiman. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1986.

Ibsen, Henrik. *Hedda Gabler*. 1884. *The Wild Duck* [and] *Hedda Gabler*. Trans. Michael Meyer. New York: W.W. Norton, 1977.

James, Henry. *The Bostonians*. 1886. New York: Signet, 1979.

---. *The Portrait of a Lady*. 1881. New York: Oxford UP, 1991.

James, William. *The Principles of Psychoanalysis*. 3 vols. Ed. Fredson Bowers. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1981.

Jameson, Fredric. "Postmodernism and Consumer Society." *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays in Postmodern Culture*. Ed. Hal Foster. Seattle: Bay Press, 1983. 111-25.

Joyce, James. "The Dead." *Dubliners*. 1914. New York: Penguin, 1984: 175-223.

---. *Ulysses*. 1922. New York: Vintage, 1966.

Kashkeen, Ivan. "Alive in the Midst of Death: Ernest Hemingway." 1956. *Hemingway and His Critics*. Ed. Carlos Baker. New York: Hill and Wang, 1961. 162-79.

Kazin, Alfred. *Bright Book of Life: American Novelists and Storytellers from Hemingway to Mailer*. Boston: Atlantic Monthly-Little, Brown, 1973.

---. *On Native Grounds: An Interpretation of Modern American Prose Literature*. 1942. New York: Anchor, 1956.

Kennedy, Gerald J. "Hemingway's Gender Trouble." *American Literature* 63.2 (June 1991): 187-207.

Kert, Bernice. *The Hemingway Women*. New York: Norton, 1983.

Killinger, John. *Hemingway and the Dead Gods*. Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 1960.

Kimmelman, Michael. "Constructing Images of the Black Male." *The New York Times* 11 Nov. 1994: C1+.

Lacan, Jacques. *Ecrits: A Selection*. 1966. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Norton, 1977.

---. *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*. 1973. Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Norton, 1981.

Lam, Robert Paul. "The Love Song of Harold Krebs: Form, Argument and Meaning in Hemingway's 'Soldier's Home.'" *The Hemingway Review* 14:2 (Spring 1995): 18-36.

LaMotte, Ellen. *The Backwash of War: The Human Wreckage of the Battlefield as Witnessed by an American Hospital Nurse*. New York: Putnam's, 1916.

Lawrence, D.H. *Lady Chatterly's Lover*. 1928. New York: Bantam, 1971.

---. *The Rainbow*. 1915. New York: Penguin, 1989.

---. *Women in Love*. 1922. New York: Bantam, 1969.

Lears, T.J. Jackson. *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920*. 1983. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1984.

Levin, James. *The Gay Novel in America*. New York: Garland, 1991.

Lewis, R.W.B. *The Jameses: A Family Narrative*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1991.

Lipking, Lawrence. *Abandoned Women and Poetic Tradition*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1988.

Lottman, Herbert. *The Left Bank: Writers, Artists, and Politics from the Popular Front to the Cold War*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1982.

Lynn, Kenneth S. *Hemingway*. New York: Fawcett Columbine, 1987.

Marcus, Jane. "Laughing at Leviticus: *Nightwood* as Woman's Circus Epic." *Silence and Power: A Reevaluation of Djuna Barnes*. Ed. Mary Lynn Broe. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1991. 221-60.

---. "Sapphistry: Narration as Lesbian Seduction in *A Room of One's Own*." *Virginia Woolf and the Languages of Patriarchy*. By Marcus. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987.

---. "Taking the Bull." *Virginia Woolf and Bloomsbury: A Centenary Celebration*. Ed. Marcus. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987.

"Marital Tragedy." Rev. of *The Sun Also Rises*. *The New York Times Book Review* 31 Oct. 1926: 7.

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

McAlmon, Robert and Kay Boyle. *Being Geniuses Together*. San Francisco: North Point, 1984.

McCaffery, John, ed. *Ernest Hemingway: The Man and His Work*. Cleveland: World Publishing, 1950.

McCarthy, Harold T. *The Expatriate Perspective: The American Novel and the Idea of America*. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1974.

Meisel, Perry. *The Myth of the Modern: A Study in British Literature and Criticism After 1850*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1987.

Mellow, James R. *Hemingway: A Life Without Consequences*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1992.

Meyers, Jeffrey. *Hemingway: A Biography*. New York: Perennial-Harper and Row, 1986.

Meyerson, Robert. "Why Robert Cohn?: An Analysis of Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises*." *Liberal and Fine Arts Review* 2:1 (1982): 57-68.

Mieli, Mario. *Homosexuality and Liberation: Elements of a Gay Critique*. 1977. Trans. David Fernbach. London: Gay Men's Press, 1980.

Morris, Lawrence S. "Warfare in Man and among Men." *The New Republic* 22 Dec. 1926: 142-43.

Moddelmog, Debra A. "Reconstructing Hemingway's Identity: Sexual Politics, the Author, and the Multicultural Classroom." *Narrative* 1 (Oct. 1993): 187-206.

Moreland, Kim. "Courtly Love in America: Ernest Hemingway and F. Scott Fitzgerald Present the Lady and the Vamp." *Selected Papers on Medievalism, I and II, 1986 and 1987*.

Ed. Janet E. Goebel. Indiana: Indiana U of Pennsylvania P, 1988. 19-32.

---. "Hemingway's Medeivalist Impulse: Its Effects on the Presentation of Women and War in *The Sun Also Rises*." The Hemingway Review 6:1 (Fall 1986): 30-41.

Morrison, Toni. *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1992.

Nagel, James, ed. *Ernest Hemingway: The Writer in Context*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1984.

North, Michael. *The Dialect of Modernism: Race, Language, and Twentieth-Century Literature*. New York: Oxford UP, 1994.

Owen, Wilfred. *The Collected Poems of Wilfred Owen*. Ed. C. Day Lewis. New York: New Directions, 1964.

Patton, Cindy. *Inventing AIDS*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Pieri, Michael, ed. Hemingway section. *The Toronto Star* 1 March 1992: F1-F8.

Rabinowitz, Paula. *Art and Labor: Women's Revolutionary Fiction in Depression America*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1991.

Rathbone, Irene. *We That Were Young: A Novel*. New York: The Feminist P at the City U of New York, 1989.

"The Relationship Between Blacks, Gays and the Black Community." *Donahue*. WNBC, New York. 4 Nov. 1994.

Remarque, Erich Maria. *All Quiet on the Western Front*. 1928. New York: Fawcett Crest, 1958.

Reynolds, Michael. *Hemingway's First War: The Making of A Farewell to Arms*. New York: Basil Blackwell, 1987.

Robinson, Lillian. *Sex, Class and Culture*. Bloomington: Indiana UP. 1978.

Rovit, Earl and Gerry Brenner. *Ernest Hemingway*. Rev. Ed. Twayne's United States Authors Series. Ed. Kenneth Eble. Boston: Twayne-Hall, 1986.

Russo, Vito. *The Celluloid Closet: Homosexuality in the Movies*. New York: Harper and Row, 1981.

Sachs, Maurice. *The Decade of Illusion: Paris, 1918-1928*. New York: Knopf, 1933.

Sassoon, Siegfried. *The War Poems of Siegfried Sassoon.* London: Heinemann, 1919.

Scarry, Elaine. *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World.* New York: Oxford UP, 1985.

Scott, Bonnie Kime, ed. *The Gender of Modernism: A Critical Anthology.* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire.* New York: Columbia UP, 1985.

---. *Epistemology of the Closet.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1990.

Sensibar, Judith L. "'Behind the Lines' in Edith Wharton's *A Son at the Front*: Rewriting a Masculinist Tradition." *Journal of American Studies* 24 (1990): 187-98.

Showalter, Elaine. *Sexual Anarchy: Gender and Culture at the Fin de Siecle.* New York: Penguin, 1990.

Sinfield, Alan. *The Wilde Century: Oscar Wilde, Effeminacy and the Queer Moment.* New York: Cassell, 1994.

Smith, Carol H. "Women and the Loss of Eden in Hemingway's Mythology." *Ernest Hemingway: The Writer in Context.* Ed. James Nagel. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1984. 129-44.

Smith, Helen Zenna. *Not So Quiet . . .* 1930. New York: The Feminist P at the City U of New York, 1980.

Sontag, Susan. *Illness as Metaphor and AIDS and Its Metaphors.* New York: Anchor-Doubleday, 1989.

Souhami, Diana. Introduction. *Three Lives*, by Gertrude Stein. New York: Bantam, 1992. vii-xx.

Spilka, Mark. *Hemingway's Quarrel with Androgyny.* Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1990.

Stein, Gertrude. *Three Lives.* 1909. New York: Bantam, 1992.

---. *Look at Me Now and Here I Am: Writings and Lectures, 1909-1945.* Ed. Patricia Meyerwitz. New York: Penguin, 1971.

---. *Wars I Have Seen.* London: Batsford, 1945.

Stevens, Wallace. *The Palm at the End of the Mind: Selected Poems and a Play.* Ed. Holly Stevens. New York: Vintage, 1972.

Strychacaz, Thomas. "Dramatizations of Manhood in Hemingway's 'In Our Time' and *The Sun Also Rises*." *American Literature* 61:2 (May 1989): 245-60.

Suleiman, Susan Rubin. *Subversive Intent: Gender, Politics and the Avant-Garde*. Cambridge: Harvard UP. 1990.

Tate, Allen. "Hard-Boiled." Rev. of *The Sun Also Rises*. *The Nation* 15 Dec. 1926: 642-44.

Thompson, William Irwin. *The Time Falling Bodies Take to Light: Mythology, Sexuality, and the Origins of Culture*. New York: St. Martin's, 1981.

Tillich, Paul. *The Courage To Be*. 1952. New Haven: Yale UP, 1966.

Torgovnick, Marianna. *Gone Primitive: Savage Intellectuals, Modern Lives*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1990.

Trilling, Diana. "Intellectuals in Love: My Speak-Easy Romance with Lionel Trilling." *The New York Times Book Review* 3 Oct. 1993: 15.

Trumbach, Randolph. "London's Sodomites: Homosexual Behavior and Western Culture in the Eighteenth Century." *Journal of Social History* 11 (1977): 1-33.

---. "Sodomitical Subcultures, Sodomitical Roles and the Gender Revolution of the Eighteenth Century: The Recent Historiography." *Eighteenth-Century Life* 9 (1985): 109-21.

Tylee, Claire. *The Great War and Women's Consciousness: Images of Militarism and Womanhood in Women's Writing, 1914-64*. New York: Macmillan, 1989.

Tyler, Lisa. "Passion and Grief in *A Farewell to Arms*: Ernest Hemingway's Retelling of *Wuthering Heights*." *The Hemingway Review* 14:2 (Spring 1995): 79-96.

Updike, John. "Sinister Sex." Rev. of *The Garden of Eden*. *The New Yorker* 30 June 1986: 85-88.

Van Leer, David. "Hem, him and her." Rev. of *Hemingway's Quarrel with Androgyny*, by Mark Spilka, and *Hemingway's Genders: Rereading the Hemingway Text*, by Nancy R. Comley and Robert Scholes. *Times Literary Supplement* 1 Sept. 1995: 23.

Varsava, Jerry A. "En-Gendered Problems: Characteral Conflict in Hemingway's *Garden*." *LIT* 3.2 (1991): 115-35.

Villard, Henry and James Nagel. *Hemingway in Love and War.* Boston: Northeastern UP, 1989.

Vonnegut, Kurt. *Fates Worse Than Death: An Autobiographical Collage of the 1980s.* New York: Putnam's, 1991.

Wagner-Martin, Linda, ed. *Ernest Hemingway: Six Decades of Criticism.* East Lansing: Michigan State UP, 1987.

---. *"Favored Strangers": Gertrude Stein and Her Family.* New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1995.

Watkins, Floyd. *The Flesh and the Word: Eliot, Hemingway, Faulkner.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1981.

Watney, Simon. *Policing Desire: Pornography, AIDS and the Media.* Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1989.

Wharton, Edith. *A Son at the Front.* New York: Scribner's, 1923.

White, Edmund. Foreword. *The Faber Book of Gay Short Fiction.* Ed. White. London: Faber and Faber, 1991: ix-xviii.

Whittier, John Greenleaf. *Snowbound: A Winter Idyl.* Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1868.

Whitman, Walt. *Leaves of Grass.* 1855. New York: Signet Classic-New American, 1958.

Williams, Wirt. *The Tragic Art of Ernest Hemingway.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1981.

Wilentz, Gay. "(Re)Teaching Hemingway: Anti-Semitism as a Thematic Device in *The Sun ALso Rises.*" *College English* 52:2 (Feb. 1990): 186-193.

Willingham, Kathy. "Hemingway's *The Garden of Eden*: Writing with the Body." *The Hemingway Review* 12.2 (Spring 1993): 46-61.

Wilson, Edmund. *The Wound and the Bow.* 1941. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1978.

Woolf, Virginia. *Three Guineas.* 1938. New York: Harvest-Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1966.

---. *To the Lighthouse.* 1927. New York: Harvest-Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1989.

---. *Mrs. Dalloway.* 1925. New York: Harvest-Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1990.

Wylder, Delbert. *Hemingway's Heroes*. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1969.

Wyss, Dieter. *Depth Psychology: A Critical History, Development, Problems, Crises*. New York: Norton, 1966.

Young, Philip. *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1966.