

In Pursuit of the Natural Body:
Hemingway's Struggle with Conflicting Values in His Life and Works

Yasushi Takano

Contents

Abbreviations	v
Introduction	vii
I War and Disruption of Self: Representations of War Wounds	
1 War Stories after the Great War	3
2 A Soldier's Displaced Intestine	9
3 The Road to the Natural Body	17
II The Politics of Pain: Representations of the Anaesthetized Body	
4 "Her Screams Are Not Important"	33
5 "The Marvellous Thing Is That It's Painless"	41
III Countering Victorian Normalization: Representations of Sexuality	
6 Between the Puritan and the Libertine	61
7 The Wrath of God	67
8 That Awful Lust	77
IV Transgressing the Gender Boundary: Representations of Hair	
9 Pregnancy and Sterilization	89
10 In Pursuit of Femininity	95
Conclusion	105
Appendix — A Chronology of Hemingway's Works	107
Works Cited	113
Index	119

Abbreviations

ARIT	<i>Across the River and Into the Trees</i>
CSS	<i>The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway: Finca Vigía Edition</i>
DIA	<i>Death in the Afternoon</i>
FTA	<i>A Farewell to Arms</i>
FWBT	<i>For Whom the Bell Tolls</i>
GE	<i>The Garden of Eden</i>
GHA	<i>Green Hills of Africa</i>
MF	<i>A Moveable Feast</i>
NAS	<i>The Nick Adams Stories</i>
OMS	<i>The Old Man and the Sea</i>
SAR	<i>The Sun Also Rises</i>
SL	<i>Selected Letters: 1917-1961</i>
THHN	<i>To Have and Have Not</i>
TS	<i>The Torrents of Spring</i>
TAF	<i>True at First Light: A Fictional Memoir</i>

Introduction

At the beginning of the twentieth century, great upheavals were taking place all over the world, triggered by the First World War. Ernest Hemingway is one of many writers who participated in the war and started his career as a professional writer in the period of confusion after the war. This war, which was called “the war to end all wars,” and which was considered the most brutal in previous human history, exerted a crucial influence on the general view of the human body through two innovative technological developments: advancements in medical treatment and scientific improvements in the creation of weapons of mass destruction.¹ The former development was accelerated in order to treat wounded soldiers, while the latter was encouraged by the armament industry in order to kill soldiers as efficiently as possible. Both developments, though used completely for the opposite purposes, implanted in people’s minds a newly formed conception about the human body: by shattering soldiers’ bodies into pieces with mechanical weapons, and by mechanizing those soldiers’ bodies with various artificial devices, the latest technology of the age eventually incorporated into the technological ideology not only participants in the war but the general public who observed a great number of “broken” and then “repaired” soldiers during and after the war, forcing their views of the body to change completely. The first decades of the twentieth century, thus, can be characterized by this supremacy of technology, whereby people’s notion of the body were irrevocably altered.

In addition, the Great War also gave birth to various cultural movements that started around the turn of the century, of which we shall discuss two: the dress reform movement² and sexual liberation. As Stephen Kern states in his study of the Victorian view of the body, “During the latter half of the nineteenth century the call for reform of women’s clothing became steadily more vociferous as physicians, aestheticians, and physical culture advocates studied the destructive consequences of tight lacing” (*Anatomy* 13). Numerous suggestions and attempts were made to improve the sartorial condition, in the course of which women’s “unnatural” bodily state was gradually exposed to public attention. Though securely covered under elaborate and voluminous corsets and crinolines, the female body was always under discussion, women stripped of their clothes and examined from an anatomical point of view. Those attempts, however, had remained unsuccessful until the First World War. Kern remarks as follows:

The war also inaugurated changes in clothing which finally began to respond to the advocates of reform, who had been unheeded for the past half century. The exigencies of a wartime situation led to a reduction of interest

in high fashion. Shortages of materials forced designers to use less, and dresses began to shorten. In England dresses were six inches off the floor by February 1915. A shortage of manpower obliged women to take on jobs that had traditionally been reserved for men, with the result that women employed in factories in England were forced to abandon the corset, the petticoats, and the puffy leg-o-mutton sleeves and adopt safer clothing to work around the machines. The change in jobs followed a change in sex roles, which led to a masculinization of dress for women, so that by the end of the war women were seen wearing men's coats and ties and a variety of modified military and civilian uniforms. (*Anatomy* 16-17)

We can easily imagine the enormous impact on soldiers who had been familiar with women in traditional attire before the war and who went home to see every female acquaintance with her body inordinately exposed in the latest fashion.

What is more, the interwar period witnessed another radical change in women's appearance: their short hair. The sudden popularity of women's bobbed hair in the 1920s is attributed to various factors, yet necessity to "work around the machines" and "a change in sex roles" during the war certainly contributed to this revolution in women's hair.³

Hemingway was also aware of these differences as is seen in the following passage:

Most of them had their hair cut short. When he went away only little girls wore their hair like that or girls that were fast. They all wore sweaters and shirt waists with round Dutch collars. It was a pattern. He liked to look at them from the front porch as they walked on the other side of the street. He liked to watch them walking under the shade of the trees. He liked the round Dutch collars above their sweaters. He liked their silk stockings and flat shoes. He liked their bobbed hair and the way they walked. (*CSS* 112)

Their "sweaters and shirt waists" suggest that they have abandoned the traditional tight lacing, and their "silk stockings" indicate that they wear short skirts. Their "bobbed hair," which was a sign of loose morals ("girls that were fast") before the war, is now merely a fashion of their choice and widely prevalent in the town. This wide gap in the level of bodily exposure before and after the war — the exposure of bodily parts that people could never have seen in public in the prewar era — must have reawakened in the people's mind the apparent yet elusive fact that there is a body inside a garment.

In the age of sexual liberation, another social effect of the Great War, people certainly knew about the birds and the bees — what few people could have known in the previous century. As Michael Reynolds remarks, "During Hemingway's high-school years, sex education was the center of national debate."

Oak Park [Hemingway's hometown], conservative in behavior but usually progressive in education, accepted sex education as having some merit. Boys could learn a healthy Christian approach to their bodies at the Y.M.C.A. The First Congregational Church sponsored lectures for separate classes of boys and girls in their teens. (*Young* 119)

Of course, this "sex education" would have been different from what we are now familiar with. What young students were taught in this period was not so much the liberal instruction in sexuality as merely the regulation of information about this highly sensitive matter. It is very likely that sex education in Oak Park at the time was for the purpose of not only instructing young boys and girls but also suppressing desires unacceptable in society, for teaching what was regarded as taboo, and reshaping their desires in conformity with the social norm. We can find evidence of this supposition in Hemingway's remark:

Three things keep boys from promiscuous intercourse, religious belief, timidity, and fear of venereal diseases. The last is most commonly the basis of appeal made by the Y.M.C.A. and other institutions for clean living. (*DIA* 103)

The foremost purpose of sex education, we are told, was to "keep boys from promiscuous intercourse." This kind of sex instruction, typical of Victorian societies, was intended not to elucidate the mystery of sexual matters but to provoke an irrational fear so that children would be confined within the boundary of acceptable behaviors.

Yet it is clear from biographical evidence that Hemingway knew much more than what was taught in such education and maybe what the average youth in Oak Park at that time knew: "Growing up as he did in a house full of women and with his father's medical library on the shelves, he was fully aware of female anatomy. [...] What he learned in the army brothels in Italy and listening to soldiers talk, he supplemented with reading" (Reynolds, *Young* 120). Many biographers, however, argue that he could never have had "promiscuous intercourse" and, though posing as a libertine, he strictly observed old-fashioned regulations inscribed in his body since his childhood.⁴ Raised in the transition period in which the traditional rigidity about sexuality was gradually being replaced by the opening stage of our current leniency in the matter, he must have inherited the sense of repulsion toward the frankness of younger generations, and at the same time been initiated into advanced ideas about sexual matters.

Postwar America was an unstable period between the old set of values and a completely new mode of thinking — the romantic notion of the body was being supplanted by the mechanized view of the body, the traditional tight lacing by the latest fashions of shirt waists and short skirts, and the conservative and repressive view of sexuality by the progressive leniency about the matter — in short, Victorianism by Modernism. In the society in which mutually exclusive values conflicted with

each other, it is natural that both conflicting value systems were inscribed indelibly in Hemingway's body. His life and works, thus, at once reflected the confusion of turbulent social conditions and represented, as a cultural icon, emotional turmoil in a rapidly changing society. Though he pretended throughout his lifetime to be a person more sexually experienced than he really was, he, as most biographers argue, could never escape from the stern Victorian rigidity about sexual matters. In short, Hemingway was a Modernist in appearance, a Victorian at the core.

These contradictory values and their conflicts naturally appear in Hemingway's works, and the aim of this thesis is to show this cultural confusion through his various attempts to reconcile himself with changing values through writing stories. As we shall see below, these attempts offered him a great deal of creative energy. The first part, entitled "War and Disruption of Self: Representations of War Wounds," will demonstrate how one of the most enormous social upheavals in human history influenced the author's view of the body. Our reading of Hemingway's war stories will clarify the intriguing fact that these stories convey the shift of people's view of the body precipitated by the war. Hemingway participated in the First World War, and his exposure to numerous dead and wounded bodies deeply affected his view of the body. What is more, the technology of restoring the naturalness of such bodies totally fascinated him, and this motif is sublimated into the remarkably illuminating representation of "mechanotherapy." We shall make it clear that these stories describe protagonists' initiation into the corporeal nature of human existence, which, in the society before the war, had escaped from people's consciousness.

In the second part, "The Politics of Pain: Representations of the Anaesthetized Body," we will discuss further the technology that intervenes in the sphere of the body, taking up anaesthesia, the celebrated technological innovation of the nineteenth century. When first invented, anaesthesia was regarded as the most triumphant symbol of civilized society, as a great accomplishment indicating that humanity had at last overcome pain. Yet, at the beginning of the twentieth century and with the decisive influence of the war producing general disillusionment among the postwar generation, anaesthesia turned into a symbol of the paralyzed inertness of the era and came to be charged with negative values. We shall, in the first chapter, see completely different representations of anaesthesia — two Caesarean sections, one in "Indian Camp" and the other in *A Farewell to Arms*; the former is done without anaesthesia, while the latter is marked by much administration of laughing gas. And in the second chapter, we shall concentrate on the negative implication of the paralyzed state; and by looking chronologically at his depictions of the benumbed sensation from the earliest stories to those in the late 1930s, we will make it clear how Hemingway used the motif of non-sensation in his stories to overcome the period of his literary sterility and to restore his creative energy.

The third part, "Against the Victorian Normalization: Representations of Sexuality," will examine Hemingway's equivocal expression about sexual matters. By looking over representations of his fear of syphilis, we can recognize Hemingway's

ambivalent attitude toward sexual matters: he sometimes depicts the disease as a courageous feat for a libertine; while on another occasion he represents it as a feared result of sexual promiscuity. In this contradiction, we can detect both his desire for and inability to escape from Victorian morality. In this part, we shall explore his sense of guilt about his own sexual desire and his desperate attempt to escape from the dilemma.

The last part, “Transgressing the Gender Boundary: Representations of Hair,” will deal with the motif of hairstyle to investigate Hemingway’s peculiar concern with the hair of both women and men. Observing his protagonists’ attitudes toward hair, we can make it clear that he charged hair with a certain symbolical significance — a sign displaying the procreativity of its wearer. The attempt to crop women’s hair, which is often seen in his early stories, is a symbolic sterilization to deprive them of the reproductive ability. We can thus conclude that the recurrent motif of women’s haircutting reflects Hemingway’s reluctance to become a father in his early years. However, he later describes male characters transgressing the gender boundary through tonsorial experiments to acquire productivity, peculiar, in Hemingway’s mind, to women. In the course of this reconciliation with femininity, he shows under the surface of his masculine pose a curious disposition toward feminine quality: his gradual inclination toward femininity, his discovery of the rich possibility of transgressing the gender boundary, and his persistent desire to merge with femininity.

The body has always been vested with a certain significance particular to every age and every culture, and it is clear that the most dramatic change of the significance of the body in our recent history occurred in the first decades of the twentieth century. This thesis is an exploration of the relationship between such cultural contexts and one of the most influential cultural icons in America.

Notes

¹ See Stanley Cooperman’s *World War I and the American Novel* and Trudi Tate’s *Modernism, History and the First World War*.

² Elizabeth Kendall in her history of dance and American culture, describes the movement as follows: “Corsets were made for girls starting at about the age of three; a child could pass through fifteen or twenty graduated corset sizes before she became an adult. Of course not all mothers pressed corsets on their daughters, but even modified versions of this shape slowed children down. A Dr. Mary J. Safford-Blake described a visit to a city grammar school where twenty-nine out of the forty-two girls in the first class wore corsets, and none of the forty-two could raise their arms over their heads (the corresponding class of boys had no trouble doing this)” (22). The harmful influences of tight lacing on the female body were the common topic throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century.

³ For a fuller discussion of this topic, see Grant McCracken’s study of hair culture, *Big Hair: A Journey into the Transformation of Self*.

⁴ See, for example, Donaldson 179-81.

Part I

War and Disruption of Self: **Representations of War Wounds**

Chapter 1

War Stories after the Great War

With the rapid development of mechanized technology — including the extraordinary expansion of worldwide transportation, the spread of the mass media, and, of course, successive inventions of weapons aimed at mass destruction — the First World War was completely different from any previous war human beings had ever experienced, thus imposing an unparalleled influence on soldiers who participated in the war as well as civilians who observed it through the mass media. In the period of desolate and wasteful devastation, what people witnessed irrevocably changed how they experienced daily life, how they thought about humanity, and how they perceived the meanings of life: “In four years the belief in evolution, progress, and history itself was wiped out as Europeans were separated from the ‘pre-historic days’ of the prewar years by the violence of war” (Kern, *Time* 291). This radical separateness before and after the war must be represented in the war literature, and we shall investigate Hemingway’s texts against the background of this drastic change in people’s perception in the early part of the twentieth century.

To begin with, we shall briefly look at representations of wounded soldiers in the Civil War literature, which is characterized by what should be called the *degenerated* body. In almost all the war books before the First World War, wounded soldiers are described as atavistic figures degenerated into the state of primitive animals. The most striking evidence of this beast-like retrogression caused by wounding can be found in the finest story written about the Civil War, Ambrose Bierce’s “Chickamauga,” which depicts the horrible parade of black shadows creeping “by dozens and by hundreds”:

To him [a boy] it was a merry spectacle. [...] He now approached one of these crawling figures from behind and with an agile movement mounted it astride. The man sank upon his breast, recovered, flung the small boy fiercely to the ground as *an unbroken colt* might have done, then turned upon him a face that lacked a lower jaw — from the upper teeth to the throat was a great red gap fringed with hanging shreds of flesh and splinters of bone. The unnatural prominence of nose, the absence of chin, the fierce eyes, gave this man the appearance of *a great bird of prey* crimsoned in throat and breast by the blood of its quarry. [...] And so the clumsy multitude dragged itself slowly and painfully along in hideous pantomime — moved forward down the slope like *a swarm of great black beetles*, with never a sound of going — in silence profound, absolute. (316, emphases

are mine)

This mysterious herd is found to be remnants of a defeated army. The description of wounded soldiers described here is no less atrocious than what was produced after the First World War, yet there is a fundamental difference between the novels in both periods: these soldiers of the Civil War no longer belong to the realm of human beings, but to the realm of animals or insects. They are thus repeatedly described in metaphors and similes of nonhuman creatures as indicated in italics above.

The primary cause of this belittlement of the wounded soldiers can be located in the great prevalence of Social Darwinism in the latter half of the nineteenth century and, as a result, in the terror about the degeneration of the human race. If once a person is heavily disfigured — heavily enough to be deformed out of the ordinary human shape — the person should be, as it were, ostracized from the boundary of humanity.

The representation of wounded soldiers as something other than human is a familiar trope abounding in news articles and war literature in the age to convey the state of the sick and wounded. Even in the eyes of Walt Whitman, nursing in field hospitals during the Civil War and known to be so sympathetic to injured soldiers, deformed figures in the war appeared to him to be removed from humanity: “Then the camps of the wounded — O heavens, what scene is this? — is this indeed *humanity* — these butchers’ shambles? There are several of them. There they lie, in the largest, in an open space in the woods, from 200 to 300 poor fellows — the groans and screams — the odor of blood, mixed with the fresh scent of the night, the grass, the trees — that slaughter-house!” (746-47, emphasis is original). “the poor fellow, even when awake, is like some frighten’d shy animal” (749). “Can those be *men* — those little livid brown, ash-streak’d monkey-looking dwarfs? — are they really not mummied, dwindled corpses?” (789, emphasis is original).

As is seen in the following quotation, many of these illustrations transforming the wounded into animals are primarily to attack their enemies who can treat human beings as if they were brutes, namely to impose brutality on their enemies who kill and injure “our” soldiers: “[...] at last they brought carts into which they huddled our sick and wounded and dashed off, jolting and jostling them as they drove recklessly over the rough pavement very much *after the manner of a butcher with a load of calves*” (“In the ‘Libey’ ” 122, emphasis is mine). “[The photographs portraying rebel cruelty] is the work of desperate and infuriated men whose human instincts have become inbruted [sic] by the constant habit of outraging humanity. There is no civilized nation In [sic] the world with which we could be at war which would suffer the prisoners in its hands to receive such treatment as our men get from the rebels; and the reason is, that none of them are slaveholding nations, for nowhere are human life and human nature so cheap as among those who treat human beings *like cattle*” (“Rebel Cruelty” 387, emphasis is mine). However, the simile representing wounded soldiers as so many animals functions as a double-edged symbol:

the brutality charged on enemy soldiers is irresistibly passed to their fellow soldiers; accordingly, they are treated as brutes, and look like brutes because of their injury. After all, it is always the wounded who are compared with animals. The lately discovered diary of a private, Robert Knox Sneden records, when he was in an enemy stockade, the animal-like situation that soldiers were in. They never talk but just utter “shrieks, oaths and moans,” and “because some would make much noise while dying those sleeping near would kick them in the side or head saying ‘why don’t you die quietly you!’ ” (249). They never walk yet “crawl all the way to the gates on hands and knees — many of the lame and crippled hobble along on crutches made out of tent poles — while hundreds cannot go at all — being too weak to walk there or get there any how” (251). After all “The sick there lie or wallow *like hogs* in the sand which is teeming with lice and maggots by the million!” (228, emphasis is mine) and “They resemble a lot of *wild animals*, though half of them are sent back without any help” (231, emphasis is mine).

In contrast, the literature of the Great War abounds with images of the fragmented body rather than the degenerated. As Trudi Tate states in his study of World War I and war literature, fiction of the Great War is marked by the wide prevalence of the fragmentation of the body:

Perhaps the most enduring image of the Great War [in war books] is of the male body in fragments — an image in which war technology and notions of the human body intersect in horrible new ways. Developments in weapons technology made it possible for unprecedented numbers of men to be blown apart in battle; many more were witness to such sight. (78)

Not only did modern technology shatter numerous bodies of soldiers but also helped them recover from heavily wounded states. The rapid progress of medical technology in the first decades of the century allowed doctors to treat with much hope to save the lives of soldiers suffering from hitherto untreatable wounds, so that medicine seemed to laymen almost omnipotent, fixing the disfigured body. In Faulkner’s *Soldiers’ Pay*, for instance, Robert Saunders says that “Doctors can do anything these days” (109).¹ In people’s conception in those days, in fact, doctors took charge of repairing the human body as if it were a kind of machine; thus the body could be divided into small parts, reassembled into a whole, and replaced by artificial devices such as wheelchairs, artificial bones, or prostheses.²

The difference between the fragmented body and the degenerated body is a problem more important than it seems at a glance; leading not merely to the mode of representing the wounded body, but to the very definition of humanity — the problem whether or not the wounded are human. The answer in each age to this problem can be seen if the wounded are given a voice of their own. As the soldier who lost his chin in Bierce’s passage quoted earlier (“a face that lacked a lower jaw”) typically symbolizes, deformed and beast-like beings in the Civil War had no voice of their

own. As primitive animals, they never talk but utter only a growl, a groan, or a roar. This hideous spectacle is thus dominated by “silence profound, absolute.”

The image of mouthless animals is indeed a recurrent motif in Civil War literature. Without the firsthand experience of soldiering, Stephen Crane inherits this tradition in his classical war novel, *The Red Badge of Courage*:

The orderly sergeant of the youth’s company was shot through the cheeks. Its supports being injured, his jaw hung afar down, disclosing in the wide cavern of his mouth a pulsing mass of blood and teeth. And with it all he made attempts to cry out. In his endeavor there was a dreadful earnestness, as if he conceived that one great shriek would make him well. (91)

In the nineteenth century, indeed, the mouth or the jaw was a common part of the body injured in war. “Receiving no answer, he stooped down and discovered that a bullet had entered the poor fellow’s mouth and gone out at the back of his head [. . .]” (“The Fourteenth at Gettysburg” 747).

Obsessed by the terror of degeneration, people in the nineteenth century had no generosity to give deformed figures the right to speak. What separates Civil War literature from Great War literature is not the degree of cruelty of depiction nor of the deformation of the body, but the distance between the narrator and the wounded represented. Hopeless of recovering at the time prior to the dawn of technological innovation in medical science, the wounded, already doomed to death, were not the object of sympathy but of fear. In short, the wounded were always the others in the nineteenth century.

On the contrary, the remarkable development of medical technology ushered in a completely different way of treating the wounded. Many wounded soldiers in the novels of the Great War, provided with their own voice, describe their bodily state to understand what exactly has happened to them. Since a wound itself is the mirror reflecting the total violence of mass murder, it must be delineated as a testimony by the injured soldier himself. Some of the wounded in the Great War could survive by virtue of medical technology, and the experience of being wounded granted them the right to speak out about the unprecedented atrocity of technological warfare. As a result, even the protagonist most severely wounded in the whole literary history, Joe Bonham — whose arms and legs are cut off, and whose ears, eyes, nose, and mouth are forever lost, who is thereby incapable of the least movement, and completely deaf and dumb — in the tradition of World War I literature, desperately conveys to the reader what he is feeling and thinking. In fact, he is so talkative in delivering his speech in a stream-of-consciousness manner that the speech is sometimes irritatingly lengthy:

He thought here you are Joe Bonham lying like a side of beef all the rest of your life and for what? Somebody tapped you on the shoulder and said come along son we’re going to war. So you went. But why? In any other

deal even like buying a car or running an errand you had the right to say what's there in it for me? Otherwise you'd be buying bad cars for too much money or running errands for fools and starving to death. It was a kind of duty you owed yourself that when anybody said come on son do this or do that you should stand up and say look mister why should I to get out of it in the end? But when a guy comes along and says here come with me and risk your life and maybe die or be crippled why then you've got no rights. You haven't even the right to say yes or no or I'll think it over. There are plenty of laws to protect guys' money even in war time but there's nothing on the books says a man's life's his own. (Trumbo 142-43)

Donald Mahon in *Soldiers' Pay* is in a similar situation, though the degree of bodily deformation is much less. Having lost his eyesight and suffering from amnesia as well as physical damage, Donald lives in the same darkness as that which shrouds Joe. Donald, unlike Joe who desperately wants to communicate with the outside world, no longer shows interest in anything around him, and this general indifference keeps him fairly reticent throughout the novel. However, the narrator records from the viewpoint of Donald the memory retrieved just before the death of this "grown child" (Faulkner 97); the whole eighth section of chapter eight is devoted to his reverie about what happened to him when he was injured. Donald finally recovers his voice on his deathbed. Writers who wrote war stories after the Great War were, in a sense, much more sympathetic to the wounded than their predecessors had been.

The fragmentation of the body gave rise to an important change in the definition of humanity: a human being could be seen as human even if the body of the person was crucially deformed. Of course people have lost their limbs or other bodily parts since as early as humanity began, yet those who were heavily disfigured were excluded from the fellowship as we have seen in Civil War fiction. On the other hand, people after the First World War were in great danger in constructing their identity: in the nineteenth century, people's identity was based on the body in normal shape, while, after watching this large-scale butchery of soldiers, people could no longer confirm their identity by the shape of their body. In short, a prerequisite condition to being human was now, because of the innovative progress of medical technology, no longer found in the realm of corporeality but somewhere else between the body and the spirit. One of the primary concerns for modernist writers was the quest for the place where this "somewhere else" is.³ Hereafter, we shall see how Hemingway captured and conveyed the confusion when people in the time of this great turbulence faced the unprecedented atrocities and suffered from a severe identity crisis.

Notes

- ¹ Joe Bonham in *Johnny Got His Gun* is a little critical of the medicine at the time: “The doctors were getting pretty smart especially now that they had had three or four years in the army with plenty of raw material to experiment on. If they got to you quickly enough so you didn’t bleed to death they could save you from almost any kind of injury” (Trumbo 109-10).
- ² We can find many examples of the dividable, combinable, and replaceable body in the twentieth century literature. Clifford Chatterley is described to return from war “more or less in bits,” yet “the bits seemed to grow together again. For two years he remained in the doctor’s hands. Then he was pronounced a cure, and could return to life again, with the lower half of his body, from the hips down, paralysed for ever” (Lawrence, *Chatterley* 5). *Soldiers’ Pay* also records the general perception of the body in those days: “the human machine can only be patched and parts replaced up to a certain point” (Faulkner 129). This perception is reflected in Hemingway’s first novel, *The Torrents of Spring*, which describes a heavily fragmented character, an Indian who “got both arms and both legs shot off at Ypres.” With artificial limbs, the Indian, we are told, plays pool much better than able-bodied Yogi Johnson. Though caricaturally described, this character represents how people in the postwar years thought about the war and technology.
- ³ As to the philosophical questioning of the concept of the body among men of letters at the modernist period, see Kern, *Love* 61-88.

Chapter 2

A Soldier's Displaced Intestine

In the early part of *A Farewell to Arms*, we see a curious scene in which Frederic, whose duty is to transport the sick and wounded on the battlefield, meets a soldier dragging his intestine. The soldier has a hernia, and, as he later admits, has deliberately removed his truss to be released from further military service.

“What’s wrong with your leg?”

“It’s not my leg. I got a rupture.”

“Why don’t you ride with the transport?” I asked. “Why don’t you go to the hospital?”

“They won’t let me. The lieutenant said I slipped the truss on purpose.”

“Let me feel it.”

“It’s way out.”

“Which side is it on?”

“Here.”

I felt it.

“Cough,” I said.

“I’m afraid it will make it bigger. It’s twice as big as it was this morning.” (34)

The most striking aspect of this scene is Frederic’s response to this soldier: “Let me feel it.” This request to touch the intestine protruding from its normal position produces a bizarre impression on the reader. What purpose does the scene serve for the overall effect of the novel? We can never answer this question, unless we realize that this novel intends to show a changing perception of the human body during the first mechanized war.¹

During and after the Great War, numerous war novels were produced to describe the devastatingly atrocious ravages of new scientific weapons of mass destruction. This new mode of technological and indiscriminate killing, widely different from the former romantic and chivalrous face-to-face confrontations repeatedly told and retold by Civil War veterans, must have forced one to observe the body as something different from what it had been previously thought of. People in those days must naturally have been influenced by the butchery of soldiers, and their former views of the body must have been irrevocably shattered once and for all. In this great turbulence in the people’s view of the human body, this novel conveys the sense of collapse of the conception that had been safely retained until the war broke out. The

close look at the vicissitudes of Frederic's view of the human body will make it clear that *A Farewell to Arms* is a story intending to describe the vast influence of the Great War on those who participated in it and on their general views of the body.

People's conception of wounds and the human body before the Great War is eloquently expressed in Catherine's romantic notion of helping her fiancé: "[...] I remember having a silly idea he might come to the hospital where I was. With a sabre cut, I suppose, and a bandage around his head. Or shot through the shoulder. Something picturesque" (20). For her, the wound is "something picturesque" and does not have the weight of the reality as observed in the real battlefield. Her fiancé in her imagination retains the totality of his body and his body is by no means divisible. What she had wanted to nurse before she participated in the war was not the body of her fiancé, but his total being abstracted from everyday experiences of him. At this stage, she had not been aware of the corporeality of the human body.

According to George Orwell, simply being on a field of battle would exert an influence on one's view of the body. In his essay on the Spanish Civil War, *Homage to Catalonia*, he states as follows:

You always, I notice, feel the same when you are under heavy fire — not so much afraid of being hit as afraid because you don't know *where* you will be hit. You are wondering all the while just where the bullet will nip you, and it gives your whole body a most unpleasant sensitiveness. (44-45, emphasis is original)

Since the body, under ordinary circumstances, somehow escapes becoming the object of our attention, Orwell's hypersensitivity to his own body, generated even before he sees the dead or the wounded, must naturally bring into consciousness the corporeality of his existence. The battlefield is, as it were, the arena of the embodiment of what is normally repressed. Exposed to the danger of being hit by a bombardment as an ambulance driver, Frederic also must have felt the same sensation, being in the vicinity of the front.

Witnessing wounded and dead bodies leads to the further awareness of one's bodily existence and forces one to realize a vast gulf yawning between the previous notion of the body and the reality one observes. Hemingway records this realization in "A Natural History of the Dead," which was first published as a part of his essay, *Death in the Afternoon*. Recounting his own experience as an ambulance driver when he witnessed numerous dead bodies for the first time in a Milan munitions factory, he points out two unexpected peculiarities that attracted his attention.² First, he notices "inversion of the usual sex of the dead" for "it is a fact that one becomes so accustomed to the sight of all the dead being men that the sight of a dead woman is quite shocking" (CSS 336). Then, he concludes the episode with the comment: "the human body should be blown into pieces which exploded along no anatomical lines, but rather divided as capriciously as the fragmentation in the burst of a high

explosive shell” (CSS 337). Both peculiarities effectively remind us of the difference between the reality of actual killings he witnessed and the presumption about the dead body he had had in mind. The man and the woman being equally susceptible to mortal danger, being incapable of conceiving of the death of the latter should be regarded as too romantic a notion, as is Catherine’s imagination about the wound of her fiancé. Moreover, the anatomical line, originally invented for the purpose of dividing the body into arbitrary categories to help people understand the bodily construction, somehow came to be perceived as a natural principle binding each bodily part into a whole. Having had those presumptions beforehand, the narrator and other soldiers involved are forced to think that the incident is paradoxically charged with “the quality of unreality” (CSS 337). It is, in fact, the bodies in their notion that lack the quality of reality. These unusual peculiarities caught in their mind expose the essential inadequacy of Western perception of the body which people had taken for granted before this butchery of the human body; thus, functioning as a defamiliarization of our automatized sense of what we are made of. In short, soldiers in this war discovered the simple fact that they were made of flesh and blood, bones and intestines, and were not an assemblage of bodily parts tied together along the anatomical line.

However, the soldier’s protruding intestine in *A Farewell to Arms* tells us more: that it is uncontrollability and deformation of the body that devastatingly damage our previous view of the body. If every part of one’s body is well controlled and posited, the bodily foundation of our existence will be hidden from our eyes and remain in the realm of unconsciousness; while a wound or an illness immediately reminds us of our highly susceptible nature to bodily limitations. For Frederic, the soldier with the rupture, as an exemplar of such uncontrollability and deformation, gives rise to the sense of the hitherto unnoticed corporeality of human beings. His request to touch the intestine displaced from its appropriate position is nothing but a manifestation of the impact which lead to the collapse of his solid, stable, and sound view of the body he retained up to that point.

Later in the story, Frederic also experiences this same uncontrollability and deformation when he is badly wounded by an Austrian mortar shell. This wound must completely destroy his previous view of the body, and we shall hereafter focus on the wound and the process of his recuperation from his disabled state. Recovering consciousness after the bombardment, he first notices Passini, his subordinate, beside him:

His legs were toward me and I saw in the dark and the light that they were both smashed above the knee. One leg was gone and the other was held by tendons and part of the trouser and the stump twitched and jerked as though it were not connected. (55)

Passini’s and Frederic’s fear is not merely that of pain and death, but of the anxiety

that the body is helplessly deformed, devastatingly deviated from its normal shape, and no longer managed by his will — the fear that the body, which has been without any doubt nothing but his own, is no longer his own. His identity has been heretofore based, though unconsciously, on a secure view of the body; however, once he loses that guarantee, he can no longer keep his identity intact.

Below is Frederic's narrativization of his identity crisis caused by the enormous impact of his disfigured body:

My legs felt warm and wet and my shoes were wet and warm inside. I knew that I was hit and leaned over and put my hand on my knee. My knee wasn't there. My hand went in and my knee was down on my shin. I wiped my hand on my shirt and another floating light came very slowly down and I looked at my leg and was very afraid. (55-56, emphases are mine)

We should notice here that he uses the word "my" eleven times in no more than four lines. Though this frequency of first person pronouns is not especially unusual in English, what he is doing here could be considered a desperate attempt to reaffirm that the body is surely his own. His knee, disconnected from the place to which it belongs, not only causes him inordinate pain, but also reminds him of his corporeality, giving rise to the awareness of his existence as a bodily substance, and frightening him by the danger of losing his identity.

Though Frederic, who is the narrator as well, has been reticent throughout the novel about his mental condition since he was wounded, we can surmise in the following quotation that the shock of this tragic event has had a lasting effect:

Afterward it was dark outside and I could see the beams of the searchlights moving in the sky. I watched for a while and then went to sleep. I slept heavily except once I woke sweating and scared and then went back to sleep trying to stay outside of my dream. I woke for good long before it was light and heard roosters crowing and stayed on awake until it began to be light. I was tired and once it was really light I went back to sleep again. (88)

Frederic wakes up from a nightmare, presumably caused by a nervous breakdown following the experience of being hit by the bombardment. Failing in the attempt to avoid the nightmare, he has to lie awake till the sky brightens. A similar trouble in sleeping in the dark is recognizable in the Nick Adams stories written around the time of *A Farewell to Arms*. For example, "Now I Lay Me" reads thus:

I myself did not want to sleep because I had been living for a long time with the knowledge that if I ever shut my eyes in the dark and let myself go, my soul would go out of my body. I had been that way for a long time, ever since I had been blown up at night and felt it go out of me and go off

and then come back. I tried never to think about it, but it had started to go since, in the nights, just at the moment of going off to sleep, and I could only stop it by a very great effort. So while now I am fairly sure that it would not really have gone out, yet then, that summer, I was unwilling to make the experiment. (CSS, 276)

This sense of the soul going out of the body suggests that his identity is seriously threatened. In Hemingway's works, the aftereffects of a physical wound are always represented by insomnia in dark places, as is seen in the quotation above. On the simplest level, Frederic seems to live a happy life in the hospital, looked after by the selflessly devoted Catherine. There is, however, no denying that he stays up all night and goes to sleep after the day breaks, even if he pretends that this vigil is for the purpose of seeing Catherine alone at night. These clandestine meetings might be interpreted as a result of insomnia from which he is still in the process of recovering. Bearing this possibility in mind, we might reconsider their romantic love affair as vital therapy for Frederic to recuperate from the nervous damage of the bombardment. It is very likely that he has an acute need to be blindly in love with Catherine to repress the reality of his mental state.

After a successful operation on his knee, Frederic undergoes "treatments at the Ospedale Maggiore for bending the knees, mechanical treatments, baking in a box of mirrors with violet rays, massage, and baths" (117). Though the details of these "mechanotherapy treatments" are left unexplained in this novel, similar treatments are mentioned in another of Hemingway's war stories, "In Another Country." The protagonist undergoing a mechanical treatment is described thus:

My knee did not bend and the leg dropped straight from the knee to the ankle without a calf, and the machine was to bend the knee and make it move as in riding a tricycle. But it did not bend yet, and instead the machine lurched when it came to the bending part. (CSS 206)

The therapy we find here is typical of the age during and after the Great War. Modern technology blew soldiers into pieces on an unprecedented scale, while the very same technology could revive numerous patients who would have died in the previous age. Helped by the latest technology, such as wheelchairs, artificial bones, and prosthetic devices, terrible scars left on the bodies of soldiers easily became signs showing the great potential of mechanical technology. A scar, as Hemingway himself made use of in his real life, sometimes functions as a decoration for one's deed; or sometimes it is branded as a sign of mechanized civilization, as is seen in Clifford Chatterley in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. As Donald Mahon in Faulkner's *Soldiers' Pay* clearly shows us, a soldier who recovered from a severe wound is a spectacle in which others can see only what they want to see — such as fear, honor, stigma, and the like.

In the course of undergoing such treatments and being constantly shown their effects — "photographs [...] of all sorts of wounds before and after they had been

cured by the machines” (CSS 210) — patients gradually acquire a new view of the body: the view that the human body is an assemblage of dividable segments, which could be replaced by artificial artifacts.³ In short, patients are incorporated into the mechanical ideology of modern medicine; and likewise Frederic’s once disfigured body is reshaped through the body-as-machine view.⁴

Frederic afterward goes back to the front, and the Italian army is decisively defeated at the battle of Caporetto. In the confusion of the retreat, Carabinieri, to whom Frederic refers as “battle police,” executes officers for absurd reasons. Frederic also is sentenced to death, but has a narrow escape diving into the Tagliamento River. After he secures his safety, he contemplates his body as follows:

Lying on the floor of the flat-car with the guns beside me under the canvas I was wet, cold and very hungry. Finally I rolled over and lay flat on *my* stomach with *my* head on *my* arms. *My* knee was stiff, but it had been very satisfactory. Valentini had done a fine job. I had done half the retreat on foot and swum part of the Tagliamento with *his* knee. It was *his* knee all right. The other knee was *mine*. Doctors did things to you and then it was not *your* body any more. The head was *mine*, and the inside of the belly. It was very hungry in there. I could feel it turn over on itself. The head was *mine*, but not to use, not to think with, only to remember and not too much remember. (231, emphases are mine)

We should notice again articles and genitive case pronouns attached to parts of the body. The repetition of the pronoun “my” as is seen in the second line in this quotation is similar to what we observed in Frederic’s frightened meditation on the state of his wound shortly after the bombardment. However, the very important difference between both passages is that, here in this case, we can find his recuperation from the identity crisis once so keenly felt. His rewording from “my knee” in the second line to “his knee” in the fourth line, and his insistence that, once taking a doctor’s treatment, the part treated no longer belonged to the former owner of the part but to the doctor who treated it; these statements — the notion of the replaceable body — indicate that Frederic has already reshaped his view of the body to overcome his identity crisis. He was, in a sense, both physically and mentally mechanized. According to the newly assumed view, it is not he but “the inside of the belly” that is hungry. Not he as a total being, but each part gathered together into his whole body moves, eats, and thinks. The genitive case pronouns in the first half of the quotation are naturally replaced by definite articles in the latter half. These two scenes of Frederic’s meditation on his body are of great importance in that they record the shift of his view of the body. In the course of his hospitalization over several months, Frederic recovers his identity shaped through the body-as-machine view.

At the end of the novel, however, he cannot sustain this notion of the body when he observes the Caesarian section Catherine undergoes. Her operation is carried out in

“the bright small amphitheatre,” into which nurses are running to watch the operation, laughing: “We’re just in time. Aren’t we lucky?” (324). Having an operation with her privacy lost, she is treated not as a human being, but as a thing — as a machine: thus, the operation is charged with the peculiar aspect of repairing the machine. At first, Frederic cannot go into the amphitheatre to watch the operation, but he finally observes the last stages of it.

I thought Catherine was dead. She looked dead. Her face was gray, the part of it that I could see. Down below, under the light, the doctor was sewing up the great long, forcep-spread, thick edged, wound. Another doctor in a mask gave the anæsthetic. Two nurses in masks handed things. It looked like a drawing of the Inquisition. I knew as I watched I could have watched it all, but I was glad I hadn’t. I do not think I could have watched them cut, but I watched the wound closed into a high welted ridge with quick skilful-looking stitches like a cobbler’s, and was glad. (325)

His sense of security in looking at the doctor’s “quick skilful-looking stitches like a cobbler’s” indicates his body-as-machine view. The sight of this operation might remind him of the soldier’s intestine he witnessed at the front. Catherine’s womb was also displaced from her belly no more than a few minutes ago, and the deviation from normalcy is being fixed by the hand of medicine.

At the end of the novel, Frederic unsuccessfully bids farewell to his dead lover: “It was like saying good-by to a statue” (332). As long as he shares the mechanized view, the dead Catherine is no more than a lifeless “thing,” or the assemblage of machine parts. As perhaps we might notice in his rejection of a doctor’s offer to ride him to the hotel (331-32), and of nurses’ presence in Catherine’s room — “You get out [. . .]. The other one too.” (332) — it is very likely that Catherine’s death in effect might produce in him some hesitation to take for granted what once fixed and shaped the foundation of his identity — medical ideology. While the soldier’s intestine protruding from his body triggered Frederic’s reconceptualization of the body, Catherine’s womb removed outside of her body evokes his skepticism about the medical view because of this unacceptable reality of Catherine’s death. The intestine out of the body once disturbed Frederic’s automatized view lacking a full awareness of his own corporeality, whereas the womb here subverts the body-as-machine view, into which he has been initiated through the course of the mechanotherapy.

It should be concluded, from what has been said above, that the soldier’s intestine in the early part of the novel foreshadows Frederic’s initiation into a recognition of the body’s corporeality, followed by the incorporation into the medical ideology. Frustrated at the end of the novel, Frederic represents the general perplexity of the transition period in which the view of the body completely changed. That Frederic’s physical and emotional rehabilitation eventually reaches a standstill portrays values conflicting one another in the appalling devastation wrought by the Great War and in

the rapid progress of medical science. *A Farewell to Arms* is a story of a backward glance from more than ten years after the war. In the period of the confusion and disorder, people were completely at a loss what to do to sustain their identity threatened in the overwhelming turbulence of the war and thereby the violent shift of values.

Notes

- ¹ Indeed it is gradually coming to be accepted that this novel focuses on Frederic's view of the human body as a central theme, as we can see from the fact that many critics of *A Farewell to Arms* have recently attached greater importance to the motif of the body. See, for example, Michael Reynolds, "A Farewell to Arms: Doctors in the House of Love."
- ² Hemingway had a similar experience to Frederic's in the First World War. Both participated in the war as ambulance drivers, and were severely injured in a bombardment. Though based considerably on the author's wartime experience, the fictional character in *A Farewell to Arms* should clearly be distinguished from Hemingway himself. See the introductory essay by James Nagel in *Hemingway in Love and War: The Lost Diary of Agnes von Kurowsky*.
- ³ The doctor from Atlanta in *Soldiers' Pay* well represents this view: "[...] the human machine can only be patched and parts replaced up to a certain point" (Faulkner 129).
- ⁴ We should notice later in the story that, looking into a mirror, Frederic states an impression of his own image as "looking like a fake doctor" in a doctor's white gown (319). He also substitutes for a doctor when giving Catherine anesthesia (317-23). All these details are of course out of necessity, yet, on a deeper level, they might symbolize the fact that Frederic has been inscribed in medical ideology.

Chapter 3

The Road to the Natural Body

As we have seen in the previous chapter, the First World War is characterized by images of bodily fragmentation: numerous representations of war cripples, whose limbs were dismembered and forever lost, whose corporeality was radically emphasized by disfigurement and alienation from the conceptual normality of the body, and whose lost bodily parts were technologically compensated for by prosthetic devices. These damaged bodies of soldiers and artificial repairs of them to recover the “natural body” were widely observed during the war, and the application of this technological advance was extended to the bodies of a broader range of people in the interwar period as a mode of cosmetic re-forming of the body. According to Tim Armstrong in his impressive work on the relationship between Modernist writers and technology intervening the body, *Modernism, Technology, and the Body: A Cultural Study*, post-war societies incorporated the body not only of soldiers who had participated in the war but also of civilians into the system in which the body was prosthetically conceived.

The bodily part is knitted into a system of virtual prosthetics: a system which both exposes and remedies defects, implying a “whole” body which can only be achieved by technology; a whole which is constantly deferred. One practice which mediates between the negative prosthetics of replacement and the advertising / cosmetic system is cosmetic plastic surgery, developed between the wars with experience gained from battlefield cases. Rather than replacing a lost part, cosmetic surgery works on a “natural” body which it has declared inadequate, misshapen, or past its prime. (100)¹

As Elizabeth Haiken argues, the technological development of cosmetic surgery was suddenly accelerated after the First World War, based on numerous case studies accumulated during the war to reconstruct soldiers’ bodies.² Still despised by many as a means of fulfilling one’s vanity by doing harm to a healthy body, the surgery to reshape the innately wholesome body to acquire a more “natural” and desirable appearance became gradually and steadily accepted and more widespread after the war. The sensational news that Fanny Brice, a famous comedienne and singer, had her nose straightened by the hand of a traveling quack shocked the public and at the same time made this doctor famous as a reputable beauty doctor, in spite of his poor medical career and background. Brice later said about this doctor: “I was the beginning of this guy’s career [...]. I posed for him for ‘before and after’ pictures. He

made a big nose on the ‘before’ picture. He was crazy. . . . He’d cut you if you had dandruff” (Haiken 44). This “before” picture embodies the newly conceived view of the body that saw the body untouched by technology as “abnormal”; while the “after” picture showed a normative body established in society.

In a sense, the 1920s was a decade that considerably limited people’s unique individuality.

And as they moved toward a definition of plastic surgery that incorporated the cosmetic work patients desired, surgeons began to think about terms like *deformity* in new ways. Throughout the 1930s, surgeons used the term to denote an increasingly wide variety of conditions. “Bulbous, prominent nasal tips” were deformities, according to one surgeon. Another listed the conditions of “humpnose, pendulous breast, abnormally prominent ears, receding chin, moles or other small nevi of the face, lines and wrinkles about the eyes, jowls and neck.” According to another, “wrinkled forehead, baggy eyelids, donkey’s ears, wrinkled face, double chin, and various deformities of the nose, the most common being the hump and hook nose with or without the twist, and saddle nose” were all “deformities or disfigurements.” (Haiken 122)

The variety that once everyone naturally had had was regarded in this period as a deviance from the newly established normality. Unlike the rich variety with strong personality before the war, people in the interwar period all looked alike, pursuing the same ideal figure.³ Krebs in “Soldier’s Home” records this sudden uniformity of people’s appearance in an American town: “Most of them had their hair cut short. [. . .] They all wore sweaters and shirt waists with round Dutch collars. It was a pattern” (CSS 112). Americans for the first time discarded Victorian morality to acquire a beautiful appearance regardless of an inner moral state. “During the decades bridging the turn of the century, American culture was transformed from ‘Protestant Victorianism to a secular consumer culture,’ and American ideas about beauty changed accordingly. Although Victorian culture had held that beauty derived solely from internal qualities of character and health, by 1921 most Americans (and particularly American women) had come to understand physical beauty as an external, independent — and thus alterable — quality, the pursuit of which demanded a significant amount of time, attention, and money” (Haiken 18-19).

Hemingway was heavily wounded in the war and underwent a series of highly advanced medical operations, and he observed the gruesome prevalence of those technological inventions and improvements. It is no wonder that he had a keen awareness of the prosthetic conception and the mechanical view of the body in the 1920s and 30s when writing many war stories; in those stories, characters reminding us of their creator are repeatedly depicted when they are wounded in the battlefield and repaired through technological interventions into the body. We shall, in this chapter, look

at the influence of technology on Hemingway's works and, moreover, the relationship between his works and the wide popularity of a burgeoning medical branch of cosmetic surgery.

The prosthetic conception of the body is distinct in *A Farewell to Arms* when Frederic Henry declares that the leg that was operated on by a doctor is no longer his own but the doctor's (231). His view of the body at this point of the story has been reshaped in the course of medical treatment: the bodily parts can easily be removed and replaced in the age of mechanized medical treatment. This new view of the body developed during the war, and gave rise to a normalizing force binding people to desire a "natural body." By this term, I do not mean the innate body unmolded into any socio-culturally defined normative shape. In that sense, the body cannot be natural, for any human body cannot help receiving the influence of the ideal figure generally conceived as the most desirable in that culture. The "natural body" in my argument is the very concept of that desirable shape accepted in the society — the body that looks natural to the public eye. And remarkably conspicuous representations of this ideological drive in the 1920s are found in the scenes describing mechanotherapy in *A Farewell to Arms* and in "In Another Country."

The doctor went to his office in a back room and brought a photograph which showed a hand that had been withered almost as small as the major's, before it had taken a machine course, and after was a little larger. The major held the photograph with his good hand and looked at it very carefully. (CSS 207)

The before-and-after photograph described here was a familiar strategy of cosmetic advertisement in the interwar period as is seen in Brice's comment quoted above, and the "after" photograph is the normal body, which everyone in society felt forced to pursue. The two distinct photographs and the technology intervening between them point out at once the defect in the major's body and the possible body that he might obtain in the future.

In the view of the body after the outbreak of the Great War, the body "unnaturally" distorted, disfigured, or dismembered should be reincorporated into the naturalness. And the naturalness is socially defined, following images of the ideal bodies of cultural icons (like Hemingway later in his life), actors and actresses of beautiful figures, successful athletes, or war heroes (again like Hemingway when he, as a youth, returned from the war to receive an enthusiastic welcome from people in his hometown). Hemingway's heroes, to function as heroes, must possess this naturalness; and especially to function as war heroes, they must not only *retain* the naturalness but also *recover* it, helped by medical technology. Their bodily parts are patched together to form the newly developed "natural body," authorizing them as ideal heroes: their injured and mutilated parts are above all else the sign of their masculine behavior, the sign indicating how harsh a reality they had lived through. The

depiction of wounded soldiers in *A Moveable Feast* clearly exhibits Hemingway's adoration of prosthetic technology as well as those who suffer from physical loss in battle:

There were other people too who lived in the quarter and came to the Lilas, and some of them wore Croix de Guerre ribbons in their lapels and others also had the yellow and green of the Médaille Militaire, and I watched how well they were overcoming the handicap of the loss of limbs, and saw the quality of their artificial eyes and the degree of skill with which their faces had been reconstructed. There was always an almost iridescent shiny cast about the considerably reconstructed face, rather like that of a well packed ski run, and we respected these clients more than we did the *savants* or the professors, although the latter might well have done their military service too without experiencing mutilation. (82, emphasis is original)

Whether or not the soldier is competent as a soldier, it is a wound he received in battle that is considered worth respect. This adoration for the recovered body is advocated by the doctor in "In Another Country":

My knee did not bend and the leg dropped straight from the knee to the ankle without a calf, and the machine was to bend the knee and make it move as in riding a tricycle. But it did not bend yet, and instead the machine lurched when it came to the bending part. The doctor said: "That will all pass. You are a fortunate young man. You will play football again like a champion." (CSS 206-207)

In the present condition, the protagonist is far from "natural," for his body is disfigured ("without a calf") and cannot be well controlled ("My knee did not bend"). Yet, he is indeed "fortunate" because he can *recover* the natural body, and it is because he *recovers* that he will be "like a champion" — an ideal figure everyone desires.

However, bodily technology, by which the deformed body could be reshaped into a normal state, is a double-edged symbol: it fixes defects of the body, reshapes the body as desired, and sometimes decorates wounds as a sign of bravery; yet, at the same time, it always points out that the body is lacking something, that the body needs further reshaping, and that the body is not perfect. Armstrong argues thus:

Modernity [. . .] brings both a fragmentation and augmentation of the body in relation to technology; it offers the body as lack, at the same time as it offers technological compensation. Increasingly, that compensation is offered as a part of capitalism's fantasy of the complete body: in the mechanisms of advertising, cosmetics, cosmetic surgery, and cinema; all prosthetic in the sense that they promise the perfection of the body. (3)

Technology posits the natural body as the norm of which everyone must make a model; thus, at once degrading and restoring the authentic status of the body. As is seen with the boy with “a black silk handkerchief across his face because he had no nose then and his face *was to be rebuilt*” (CSS 207, emphasis is mine), the body, deviated from a norm that is firmly established within socio-cultural values, must primarily be fixed and re-incorporated into a “normal” state, whether it is possible or not. In the case of this boy, the normative body is defined by his family’s social standing, and we are told that his body could never meet the demand of the normalizing force of his culture: “They rebuilt his face, but he came from a very old family and they could never get the nose exactly right” (CSS 207). Technology, for this boy, represents an ideological evaluative power over bodily status; even though technological advance succeeds in restoring his nose to a certain degree, we should admit that the very same technology humiliates the present state of his body, always pointing out his being different from the “natural body” of the society to which he belongs.

According to Joseph Slade, American writers before 1945 could not discard negative values pressed upon machines.⁴ Needing the help of medical technology when wounded in the battlefield, soldiers nevertheless could not help feeling antipathy toward their benefactors as well as gratitude for them. This ambivalence toward technology is well represented by descriptions of the major’s body in “In Another Country.” His diminished hand “like a baby’s” (CSS 207) can never function as an honorable sign of a brave soldier. He believes in neither bravery nor the machines he uses in his treatment, though he never fails to receive the daily course of mechanotherapy: “The major came very regularly to the hospital. I do not think he ever missed a day, although I am sure he did not believe in the machines” (CSS 208). He is in a sense trapped by the mechanized ideology like other soldiers in the story, in the sense that he is forced to take the treatment even though he is unable to find any hope in it. To undergo the treatment — to make an effort to acquire a “natural body” — is the foremost demand of society, and, in that sense, in this society machines control human behavior.

The major’s obsession with mechanotherapy reminds us less of the wartime medical situation than of the wide popularity of bodily re-formation at the postwar period, in which mechanical technology was all but omnipresent and ostensibly omnipotent. Advertising campaigns constantly attempted to invoke and exploit the anxiety about possible defects in the body untouched by technology. Numerous names of derivative bodily diseases were coined for the first time in the 1920s to precipitate anxious feelings about the possibility that people’s body deviated somewhat from naturalness:

A new pharmacopoeia of “diseases” appeared: halitosis (bad breath), body odor (“b.o.”), bromodosis (odiferous feet), homotosis (furniture in “bad taste”), acidosis (sour stomach), dandruff, constipation, and others. (Green 24)

“In Another Country” was written and published in this period of general fear of bodily defects, and thus it is very likely that the situation described in the story is intended to evoke the nationwide popularity of cosmetic bodily re-forming. The protagonist, indeed, narrates this story after the war — possibly in the mid 1920s in which the story was published — and sees the events from the vantage point of a decade later. When he says that “There was a time when none of us believed in the machines” (CSS 208), his statement suggests, on the simplest level, that their disbelief in the machines was only temporary, and that at least to a certain degree the machines worked out to fix their body like the boy with the black handkerchief, if not restoring “naturalness.” If we seek for a deeper significance in the statement, however, the protagonist’s statement refers to the period in which the narrator narrates the story, conveying to the contemporary reader the social milieu at the time in which technology in a matter-of-course manner intervened in the human body under the name of salvation to help people acquire the desirable body. The narrator implies that *now* everyone believes in, or at least recurses to, the fascinating effects of medical technology.

At the end of the story, we find the following sentence: “there were large framed photographs around the wall, of all sorts of wounds before and after they had been cured by the machines. In front of the machine the major used were three photographs of hands like his that were completely restored” (CSS 210). The before-and-after photographs, which exemplify the overarching ideology about the human body, were the most frequently adopted strategy in the advertisement of cosmetic surgery in the interwar period. The story thus, using the backdrop of the wartime hospital, dramatizes the mechanized culture of the postwar years rather than the time that the story describes. And the sad point of the story resides in the major’s being unable to escape from the trap of the ideology of technology, even if he knows that he can never be cured of the lack in his body and, more pathetically, of the lack in his heart caused by his wife’s death. His tragedy would have been certainly shared by many contemporary readers. Deeply immersed in everyday advertisements concerning possible bodily defects and the reshaping of them, they must have projected their own situation onto that of the major during the war, and regarded his body dominated by the machines as somewhat like their own, entrapped by the insatiable and inescapable desire to acquire the perfect body that technology promised to give them.

The relationship between technology and the body is a recurrent motif throughout Hemingway’s works, and his insistent attempt to dramatize it culminated in the writing of “A Way You’ll Never Be.” Although the story “deserves a place among Hemingway’s major stories” and is “One of his most original, even daring fictions,” as Paul Smith argues, “The critical history of ‘A Way You’ll Never Be,’ with next to nothing between 1963 and 1982 and little since then, is something of an embarrassment” (*Reader’s Guide* 275). The primary reason for this critical neglect resides in the seemingly ambiguous and incoherent structure of the story as shown in Nick’s hallucinations. In the same way that Sheldon Grebstein calls this story “the rhetoric

of hysteria" (118),⁵ critics, who generally have yet to notice the carefully wrought structure, confuse the narrative of the story and the hysteric tone of the protagonist's hallucinations. If we look more carefully at the first paragraph, we can appreciate a variety of elements foreshadowing the later development of the story and intertextually connecting to Hemingway's other war stories. The first paragraph reads thus:

The attack had gone across the field, been held up by *machine-gun fire* from the sunken road and from the group of farm houses, encountered no resistance in the town, and reached the bank of the river. Coming along the road on a bicycle, getting off to push *the machine* when the surface of the road became too broken, Nicholas Adams saw what had happened by the position of the dead. (CSS 306, emphases are mine)

To reword the bicycle as "the machine" is rather curious; for, despite the fact that the bicycle functions as a vehicle without any problem, it is seen not from a functional but from a structural viewpoint (and "the vehicle," of course, should be the most appropriate word for substitution). The choice of this word reminds us of the tricycle in "In Another Country," by the use of which the protagonist attempts to reshape his deformed body; moreover, at the same time, correlating with "machine-gun fire"⁶ above to invoke an association between mechanical weapon, medical technology, and the reshaping of the body.

Riding through the trace of battle, Nick gets off the bicycle before entering the town, and advances to the headquarters on foot. Though we are not given a clear reason, the bicycle (=the machine) somehow cannot enter the town, just as machine guns stop the counterattack in the town. At the end of the story, this bicycle reappears in Nick's last words: "I'd better get to that damned bicycle [. . .]. I don't want to lose the way to Fornaci" (CSS 315). On the simplest level, this statement means that "the way to Fornaci" is too long to walk; yet, on a deeper level, it conveys an impression that without this machine Nick cannot move into and out of the town of Fossalta, a sanctuary into which machines cannot enter.

For Nick, the meaning of the town of Fossalta is primarily the place of his wounding, and his return journey to the place, as most critics accept, has two meanings: one is an actual trip to the lines ostensibly to show the American uniform he wears. If soldiers see the uniform and believe the coming of American troops, their morale might be boosted. And at the same time, this is Nick's return journey deep in his own mind that has been badly damaged by the wounding.⁷ The story on the surface depicts Nick's duty to the front, yet under this virtual action it really represents his psychic journey to find his identity which has been seriously threatened since the wounding. If these two journeys correspond with each other at a metaphorical level, Nick's inner psyche, which is, as we shall see later in the story, terribly damaged by the wounding and crazed out of rational thinking, must be metaphorically projected to the place of his wounding. We can find a correspondence between Nick's mind

and the town in his conversation with Paravicini, his old-time friend and superior in the army:

“How are you really?”

“I’m fine. I’m perfectly all right.”

“No. I mean really.”

“I’m all right. I can’t sleep without a light of some sort. That’s all I have now.”

“I said it should have been trepanned. I’m no doctor but I know that.”

“Well, they thought it was better to have it absorb, and that’s what I got. What’s the matter? I don’t seem crazy to you, do I?”

“You seem in top-hole shape.”

“It’s a hell of a nuisance once they’ve had you certified as nutty,” Nick said. “No one ever has any confidence in you again.” (CSS 309-10)

According to Paravicini, Nick’s head, which was caved in when he was wounded, “should have been trepanned” — that is, a hole should have been made in his skull to release the pressure of hemorrhage lest it should damage the brain. Instead, the doctors who treated him considered that they should wait for the blood naturally to be absorbed without any surgical intervention. The correspondence is evident between Nick’s brain (the mind) — the place into which medical technology did not enter — and the town of Fossalta — the place into which machines (bicycles and machine guns) cannot enter. If this is the story of “Nick’s journey back into the recesses of his mind” (DeFalco 118) as many critics have accepted, the mind is, in Hemingway’s conception, placed at an opposite end of the body. Moreover, while the body in disorder radically and repeatedly undergoes technological treatment, the mind (or the brain), on the contrary, remains intact however severely it is damaged.

Without the help of medical technology, the landscape of Nick’s mind is thoroughly devastated. As many critics argue,⁸ Nick’s unstable identity is repeatedly emphasized throughout the story. The often-quoted passage in which Nick is challenged by a young second lieutenant attracts our attention to Nick’s determination not to relinquish the tessera, his credentials proving his identity.

“Who are you?”

Nick told him

“How do I know this?”

Nick showed him the tessera with photograph and identification and the seal of the third army. He took hold of it.

“I will keep this.”

“You will not,” Nick said. “Give me back the card and put your gun away. There. In the holster.”

“How am I to know who you are?”

“The tessera tells you.”

“And if the tessera is false? Give me that card.”

“Don’t be a fool,” Nick said cheerfully. “Take me to your company commander.” (CSS 307-308)

More intriguing in this scene is that, even with the tessera, Nick cannot establish who he really is, failing to answer the second lieutenant’s question, “if the tessera is false?”

It is primarily Nick’s ostensible duty that threatens his identity. The duty he engages in is to wear the American uniform to make Italian soldiers believe that the American troops are shortly coming: he is, as it were, living propaganda. Yet his uniform, as he himself repeatedly insists, is just an imprecise reproduction (“The uniform is not very correct.” “Look at the uniform. Spagnolini made it but it’s not quite correct.” “Fix your eyes on the uniform. Spagnolini made it, you know” [CSS 311-12]). That he reveals the falsity of the uniform and emphasizes its Italian designer evidences the essential meaninglessness of his duty and annuls the significance of his presence. Even Paravicini, later in the story, declares that “There’s nothing here for [Nick] to do” (CSS 313). His insignificant role is prefigured early at the beginning of the story. Among Nick’s meticulous enumeration of the debris of war, we see the description of another kind of propaganda:

[. . .] propaganda postcards showing a soldier in Austrian uniform bending a woman backward over a bed; the figures were impressionistically drawn; very attractively depicted and had nothing in common with actual rape in which the woman’s skirts are pulled over her head to smother her, one comrade sometimes sitting upon the head. There were many of these inciting cards which had evidently been issued just before the offensive. (CSS 306)

Like these postcards, however Nick’s uniform is “impressionistically” and “attractively” designed, it has “nothing in common with” the actual uniform of the American troops; thus, Nick’s existence itself is imbued with an impression of a fictional construction like an Austrian soldier in the postcards.

Interestingly, it seems as if Nick wants to underline his falsity and fictionality. Not only does he expose the fact that the uniform is incorrect, but also he defines the American as what he is not in his speech to the adjutant:

“Americans twice as large as myself, healthy, with clean hearts, sleep at night, never been wounded, never been blown up, never had their heads caved in, never been scared, don’t drink, faithful to the girls they left behind them, many of them never had crabs, wonderful chaps.” (CSS 311)

What he is trying to do here is to fictionalize himself. We know that he is not “healthy,” cannot “sleep at night,” was seriously “wounded” when being “blown up,”

had his head “caved in,” and, as he admits, was “scared” enough not to participate in battle without “drink.” Extrapolating from this what-he-is-not list, we can justifiably assume that he has been to a brothel (thus, not “faithful” to his girlfriend if he has one) and suffered from syphilis (“crabs”). He is in short not an American by his own definition. Thus, when the adjutant, immediately after this speech, questions him about his nationality (“Are you an Italian?” “A North or South American?”), Nick feels “it coming on now” (CSS 311), that is, a symptom of his insanity has set in. This is obviously because the questions put him in a fairly contradicting position that he is an American by nationality yet nevertheless out of the normative figure of the Americans.

What is more, considering the similarity between propaganda and advertisement, we can find another “before-and-after” advertising strategy of ideological bodily reformation. The American troops depicted in Nick’s speech is an ideal norm every American must pursue; while Nick’s body is a damaged, defective product to be repaired. With this before-and-after scheme applied to the structure of the story, Nick symbolizes a “before” photograph against the image of an “after” he recreated in his own speech to describe American soldiers. We are told that Nick is afraid of “a low house painted yellow with willows all around it and a low stable” and “the different width of the river” (310-11). These images have mystified critics, yet seemingly cryptic descriptions can be explained by the state of Nick’s mind before and after the wounding. The landscape of Nick’s mind, unaltered without medical intervention, keeps the image of Fossalta as it had been before he was wounded, but the landscape of Fossalta is irrevocably changed as the yellow house no longer exists and the width of the river is different possibly because of bombardment. Likewise, Nick’s view of the body remains unchanged as we can see from the fixed image of Fossalta in his mind, while that of the general public is dramatically replaced by the mechanical (prosthetic) view. Nick is now left behind these enormous changes of society. Realizing this fact at the end of the story, Nick hurries back to the realm of carnality that is dominated by technological ideology.

Nick here is aware of the necessity of mechanized technology, yet he does not seem so optimistic about the prosthetic view of the body unlike the author who celebrates the technological advancement to treat the wounded in *A Moveable Feast*. Hemingway, when writing this story, was rather ambivalent about mechanical interventions into the body — the possibility of substituting the lost bodily parts with mechanical devices. *Across the River and Into the Trees* is almost a story to tell this contradictory feeling toward the prosthetic view of the body. The narrator of this novel persistently and ostentatiously exposes the disfigured hand of Colonel Richard Cantwell, a veteran of both World Wars (“the Colonel extended his own hand, which had been shot through twice, and was slightly misshapen” [58]; “[...] and gave the *Gran Maestro* his crooked hand” [66]; “[...] looking at the misshapen hand with distaste [...]” [82] to cite but a few). And the most intriguing point is that Renata, an 18-year old Italian contessa, and the love of 50-year old Cantwell, incessantly and

stubbornly assures him that the hand is “all right” (82). While Cantwell detests his own hand (“It’s so damned ugly and I dislike looking at it”); Renata repeatedly feels his scarred hand, insisting that “You don’t know about your hand” (95) and that “I love your hand and all your other wounded places” (133). It seems as if the author was obsessed with the ugliness of his body and tried to vest the body with the positive value of an honorable wound in battle.

We can find a similar example in Hemingway’s last novel, *The Old Man and the Sea*. Santiago’s body is deformed with age and cannot be controlled as he wishes — his body is, as it were, “unnatural.” The beginning of the novel describes his body as follows:

The old man was thin and gaunt with deep wrinkles in the back of his neck. The brown blotches of the benevolent skin cancer the sun brings from its reflection on the tropic sea were on his cheeks. The blotches ran well down the sides of his face and his hands had the deep-creased scars from handling heavy fish on the cords. But none of these scars were fresh. They were as old as erosions in a fishless desert. (9-10)

The body described here is far from what people pursue as an ideal, but is rather eaten away by illness and wounds. Even Manolin, a faithful disciple of the old man, worries about the decline of his bodily state, asking: “are you strong enough now for a truly big fish?” (14).

After eighty-four days without a fish, the old man goes fishing as usual, finding out that he hooked a giant marlin. He struggles hard to catch the fish, but it is too big even to draw an inch. The fight against the marlin lasts three days and three nights. The old man suffers from numerous wounds in his face and palms with the cord drawn by the marlin, and finally he is seized with cramp in his left hand, which is “almost as stiff as rigor mortis” (59). The old man contemplates his left hand thus: “[A cramp] is a treachery of one’s own body. It is humiliating before others to have a diarrhoea from ptomaine poisoning or to vomit from it. But a cramp, he thought of it as a *calambre*, humiliates oneself especially when one is alone” (61-62, emphasis is original). What the cramp in the old man’s hand exposes is the uncontrollability of his body; and his body, as we can conclude from this fact, is far away from the “natural body” not only because of the decline with old age but also because he can no longer control his own body.

During the fight against the giant marlin, Santiago meditates on Joe DiMaggio, a famous baseball player, as an exemplar. Throughout the whole career as a player, he suffered from bone spurs in his both legs as well as other many bodily defects, and despite the handicap he kept playing as a major leaguer with high achievement. As shown in the following quotations, Santiago fights to demonstrate the indomitable will that his role model has: “[. . .] I must be worthy of the great DiMaggio who does all things perfectly even with the pain of the bone spur in his heel” (68). “Do you

believe the great DiMaggio would stay with a fish as long as I will stay with this one? he thought. I am sure he would and more since he is young and strong” (68). “[...] I think the great DiMaggio would be proud of me today. I had no bone spurs. But the hands and the back hurt truly” (97). “I wonder how the great DiMaggio would have liked the way I hit him in the brain? It was no great thing, he thought. Any man could do it. But do you think my hands were as great a handicap as the bone spurs?” (103-104). It is not uncommon to make a respectful figure a model for appropriate behaviors, yet what these quotations make clear is that he identifies the defects in his body with DiMaggio’s bone spur. In other words, the essential reason that Santiago put DiMaggio in the place of the role model is DiMaggio’s conquest over his bodily defects — the acquisition of the “natural body.”

Santiago finally killed and caught the marlin, and through the fight with the fish he comes to feel inseparably fused with the marlin’s beautiful body. But when he goes back to the village with the body of the giant fish bound to the side of the skiff, they are attacked by a horde of sharks. In the course of the first attack, a part of the marlin’s meat is eaten away. After driving away the sharks, he contemplates the marlin’s body:

He did not like to look at the fish anymore since he had been mutilated. When the fish had been hit it was as though he himself were hit. (103)

It is clear from this quotation that Santiago desires the “natural body.” To use the expression “mutilated” to refer to the bitten-away body of the marlin indicates that he has regarded the perfect body of the marlin as an ideal body that he desires. Once the perfectness is impaired, Santiago can no longer look at the marlin’s body; for the mutilated body symbolizes his totally collapsed desire, his unfulfilled desire to acquire the “natural body.”

These novels, published in his fifties, most crudely convey Hemingway’s response to the new view of the body after the war, especially because, when writing the novels, his body had been totally disfigured from advanced age and the after-effects of injuries sustained in many accidents in his forties. To adjust himself to the fact that he no longer could achieve the natural body because of the decline of his health, he sublimated his bodily anxiety into characters who essentially deserve to be called a “hero,” yet who need a guarantee of it from another person.⁹ What makes *Across the River and Into the Trees* a total failure among Hemingway’s whole oeuvre and *The Old Man and the Sea* a parody of writings in his youth is mainly this excessive self-consciousness to describe the protagonist. He was so obsessed by fear of the decline of his own body that he could not distance himself from the aged protagonist on the pages. Yet, on the other hand, it is this failure that tells us how forcible the bodily ideology was.

Notes

¹ Regarding the relationship between bodily advertisements and representations of wounded soldiers, see also Thomas Richards, *The Commodity Culture of Victorian England: Advertising and Spectacle 1851 – 1914*; Roland Marchand, *Advertising the American Dream: Making Way for Modernity, 1920 – 1940*; and Charles Goodrum and Helen Dalrymple, *Advertising in America: The First Two Hundred Years*.

² According to Haiken, “Although French, British, and American surgeons worked together during the war, plastic surgery grew after the war only in the United States. [...] American surgeons [...] returned from the war eager to build the specialty (and by the beginning of World War II would claim about sixty practicing plastic surgeons — more than ten times as many as Britain, and almost twice as many as the rest of the world combined)” (34-35). About the rapid development of plastic surgery in the interwar period, Colonel Cantwell in Hemingway’s *Across the River and Into the Trees* indicates through his own body: “He [Cantwell] looked at the different welts and ridges that had come before they had plastic surgery, and at the thin, only to be observed by the initiate, lines of the excellent plastic operations after head wounds” (107).

³ Pauline’s letter to Hemingway quoted below shows us that she was under this influence of social normalization of the “natural” body: “Am having large nose, imperfect lips, protruding ears and warts and moles all taken off before coming to Cuba [...]” (Kert 247).

⁴ “Antipathy to technology, by and large covert in the nineteenth century, emerged openly in the next — aggravated by the seismic forces of economics, the standardization of industry, the urbanization of the countryside, the realignment of class structure, and the widening distance between science and letters” (27).

⁵ See, for other examples, Rovit, S. Baker, and Waldhorn.

⁶ We should notice here that machine guns were used almost for the first time in the Great War. According to *The Encyclopedia Americana*, “The Browning machine gun [one of the first machine guns put to practical use] and Browning automatic rifle (BAR), although perfected by 1900, were not produced in sufficient quantity to see extensive use in World War I. [...] An estimated 92% of all World War I casualties were inflicted by machine guns.”

⁷ It is Joseph DeFalco who initially discovered this double meaning of Nick’s journey. He says that the purpose of Nick’s coming to the front is “a clarification of the processes of life and death and the role the individual must play” (118). Sheldon Norman Grebstein also laconically summarizes the story thus: “two journeys are being made concurrently: one toward the geographic setting, the actual scene of the fighting that caused Nick’s wound; the other an inward journey toward a confrontation with the crippled psychic self produced by the physical wound” (18).

⁸ According to Paul S. Quick, “the psychological anxiety that Nick exhibits stems from his loss of identity and his inability to secure a stable sense of self after his wounding” (30).

⁹ *To Have and Have Not* also represents Hemingway’s ambiguous feeling toward the disfigured body. Harry Morgan openly insists that he does not mind the loss of his arm:

“The hell with my arm. You lose an arm you lose an arm. There’s worse things than lose an arm. You’ve got two arms and you’ve got two of something else. And a man’s still a man with one arm or with one of those. The hell with it,” he says. “I don’t want to talk about it.” Then after a minute he says, “I got those other two still.” (97)

This long-winded sentiment about his lost arm rather indicates his painful realization of the irrevocable loss: here he desperately tries to focus not on the loss but on what he still has. He has to avert his eyes from the loss.

Harry later asks his wife very much worriedly about his lost arm: "Listen, do you mind the arm? Don't it make you feel funny?" (113). Looking at the wife's monologue shortly after the question ("I'm glad it was a [sic] arm and not a leg. I wouldn't like him to have lost a leg. Why'd he have to lose that arm? It's funny though, I don't mind it. Anything about him I don't mind"), we should rather conclude that Hemingway, by having her utter these sentiments, tries to conform to the newly spread view of the body: in that view, any lost parts can be prosthetically compensated for.

Part II

The Politics of Pain: **Representations of the Anaesthetized Body**

Chapter 4

“Her Screams Are Not Important”

In the United States, as Wertz and Wertz argue (109-77), the field of obstetrics to date has undergone two great changes, one of which is doctors' intrusion into childbirth. Until the end of the nineteenth century, women had been helped by midwives, who were mostly women specializing in the technique of delivery; hence, the whole process of childbearing had had no relation to medical institutions. At the end of the nineteenth century, however, doctors began to take the place of midwives, and consequently childbirth has since been incorporated into a branch of medicine. The second change is the shift of places of parturition from the houses of women in labor to hospitals, a change which took place in the 1920s and which coincides with the composition and publication of “Indian Camp.” Both changes can be ascribed to the progressive development of medical science that rapidly took the primary position in maintaining the psychosomatic health of people. These changes, however, have recently been exposed to severe criticism by feminists saying that the process of achieving the sovereignty over the female body in pregnancy on the part of doctors reflects the age-old male chauvinism which has been dominating the other sex throughout recorded history. Despite that reproduction is a natural process, female procreative capacity, from the medical viewpoint, was considered to be abnormal on the grounds that no equivalent capacity can be found in the male body, for the male body was the central norm of medical knowledge at that time. Unnatural in the eyes of doctors, childbirth was the object of medical treatment as if it were a certain manifestation of sickness. What is more, women in labor in the first decades of the twentieth century were treated without any consideration to their privacy when they delivered, regarded as if they were machines, and undergoing “repairs” as such.¹ Barbara Rothman states in her feminist criticism of the male-centered view of this hospitalized childbirth:

The source of the pathology orientation of medicine toward women's health and reproduction is a body-as-machine model (the ideology of technology) in which the male body is taken as the norm (the ideology of patriarchy). From that viewpoint, reproductive processes are stresses on the system, and thus diseaselike. (36-37)

The age in which Hemingway was born and raised witnessed this unprecedented prevalence and dominance of these two medical ideologies.

Biographical evidence shows that Hemingway was in the position to observe

these ideologies and perhaps noticed the problematical aspects as discussed above. In his high school days, he watched in a hospital a woman's childbirth delivered by his father, who was an obstetrician. Marcelline Sanford, Hemingway's sister, records this incident as follows:

[...] Ernie watched an operation. Dressed in a white gown, he was permitted to stand at the top rear of the operating theater at the hospital where Daddy was on the staff as head of obstetrics. Ernie was interested, but he sat down when he felt faint and he did not go again. (134)

Given the fact that all of his brothers and sisters were delivered in their home with their mother being cared for and helped by family members, this obstetrical operation observed by strangers was for Hemingway somewhat too shocking an experience, too inhumane compared to the case of his mother. It thus seems reasonable to suppose that he associated medical assistance for childbirth with a technological intrusion into the natural process of delivery.

If so, the childbirth in "Indian Camp" might be heavily charged with this ideological conflict between the residual and emergent cultural modes. This thematic presumption is supported by the composition history of the story. The source for "Indian Camp" has been generally sought in the author's experience in the Greco-Turkish War: Nick Adams, the implied author and the semi-autobiographical protagonist of the series of short stories declares in a deleted part of "Big Two-Hearted River" that "Of course he'd never seen an Indian woman having a baby. That was what made it good. Nobody knew that. He'd seen a woman have a baby on the road to Karagatch and tried to help her" (NAS 238).² Yet, given the similarity between the story and the incident in his high school days presented above — first, both concern a boy's experience of watching childbirth; second, both are delivered by the boy's father; and third, both boys feel sick watching the delivery — it is very likely that he borrowed the genesis of the story from his traumatic witnessing of childbirth in his youth. If this is the case, it is richly suggestive that the stage for "Indian Camp" is set not in a hospital but in a primitive, uncivilized heart of darkness, the place hardly accessible to scientific technology; since the clear contrast is highly accentuated between nature and Western medical technology. "Indian Camp" well captures the technological invasion of white civilization into the realm of nature.

The story shows the experience of three people — a little boy named Nick Adams, his father Dr. Adams, and Uncle George. They are camping in the forest, and, later in the night, summoned to an Indian camp to help a woman's childbirth. Arriving at the camp, they find that the woman, unable to deliver the child, has been screaming for three days. Dr. Adams, after examining her condition, decides to perform a Caesarean section on her with a jackknife and gut leaders without anaesthetic. The operation is successful so that the doctor becomes highly elated by his own achievement. The doctor tries to tell her husband, who has been in the upper

bunk of the wife's bed because of his badly cut foot, that both the mother and the child have survived the operation; however, he is found dead with his throat cut from ear to ear. Feeling distressed about bringing Nick to the camp and allowing him to see the bloody spectacle of suicide, the father rows a boat back to their place in the early morning with his son sitting in the stern. Nick then has a sudden conviction that he will never die.

As can easily be inferred from the discussion of Hemingway's experience of watching his father's operation, the medical perception of patients' suffering is by no means described positively.

"Listen to me. What she is going through is called being in labor. The baby wants to be born and she wants it to be born. All her muscles are trying to get the baby born. That is what is happening when she screams."

Just then the woman cried out.

"Oh, Daddy, can't you give her something to make her stop screaming?" asked Nick.

"No. I haven't any anæsthetic," his father said. "But her screams are not important. I don't hear them because they are not important." (CSS 68)

The doctor's disregard for the woman's pain is typical of medical functionalism as represented in the doctor's explanation of childbirth: the screams of the Indian woman are a physiological manifestation of the process helping to make muscles more flexible to facilitate her delivery. "Her screams are not important," for they are caused not by pain and suffering but by an appropriate mechanism of the body.

The general neglect of pain on the part of the doctor is partly caused by what Rothman calls the ideology of technology, which regards the human body as a machine.³ Yet, considering the repeated depiction of the doctor's detached attitude (Not only his indifference to the woman's pain quoted above, but also his elation after the operation with paying no attention to the patient is emphatically depicted: "That's one for the medical journal, George" [69]), the direct cause of his indifference toward the Indian woman lies more likely in the widespread prevalence of primitivism, which created "the myth of painless Indians." Primitivism at the turn of the century ostensibly praised the purity of primitive people who were believed to be immune from harmful influences of corrupt civilization; thus, the sense of pain originally being caused (in the primitivist theory) by the indulgence of such convenient civilization, the "savages" in the eyes of the Westerners are essentially pain-free.⁴

Medicine in the story is by no means fully equipped to advocate its own efficacy. This lack of preparation on the part of the doctor can be explained not only by the emergent abruptness of the summons but by the author's unconsciously held assumption that anaesthesia had been from the very beginning of its "invention" considered to be *for civilized races*. Oliver Wendell Holmes, who coined the term anaesthesia, sent the following letter to the alleged inventor of the technique, William T. G.

Morton:

[...] Everybody wants to have a hand in the great discovery. All I will do is give you a hint or two as to names, or the name, to be applied to the state produced, and to the agent. [...]

The state should, I think, be called *anæsthesia*. This signifies insensibility, more particularly [...] to objects of touch. [...]

I would have a name pretty soon, and consult some accomplished scholar such as President Everett, or Dr. Bigelow, Sr., before fixing upon the terms which *will be repeated by the tongues of every civilized race of mankind*. (Warren 79, emphases are original)

The possibility that anaesthesia might be used by Indians would have been in the first place excluded from Holmes's mind. The blessings of "the great discovery" would have been considered to be received only by "every civilized race of mankind," and among "every civilized race of mankind," Native Americans would not have been included.

The contrast is too extreme to be overlooked between this Indian woman and Catherine in *A Farewell to Arms*, who also undergoes a Caesarean section yet is heavily anaesthetized during her painful childbirth. The latter case, though it takes place in a highly advanced hospital in Switzerland unlike in the former case, shows us that her pain is above all else what has to be suppressed, controlled, and finally removed. As Stephen Kern argues, after the invention of anaesthesia, the whites could no longer stand their own pain as they had done before once they knew the possibility of removing pain.⁵ Though it is ironically not the Indian woman but Catherine, treated by fully equipped medical technology, who dies after the operation, what we observe when noticing the asymmetry between both operations is that the white race is too fragile and sensitive to pain to be left untreated while, as we can see from the detached attitude of Dr. Adams, Indian women can easily be considered as merely a system mechanically functioning to sustain life, and hence tough to physical pain.

This prejudice that Indians were insensible to pain had been so widely spread among the whites that white readers of the story can never understand why the husband in the story kills himself despite that the wife has survived the operation. Meyers, for example, in one of the most influential studies of this story, is strongly dissatisfied by the explanation that the Indian killed himself because he could not bear his wife's screams. Meyers argues that "Despite his badly cut foot, he could have limped or been carried out of range of the screams, if he had wished to, and joined the other men" (300). However, it was widely believed at the beginning of the twentieth century that in the Indian's world view the boundary between the self and others was highly ambiguous unlike in the case of white people.⁶

[Natural piety] is a mode of feeling and thought that is profoundly at one with the natural world, that accepts human life as part of that world, and

therefore does not question the moral propriety of the cosmic order. It does not, or cannot, adopt that kind of philosophic detachment. (Bell 11)

Here explained is “natural piety,” a characteristic believed to be generally shared by Native Americans. Not distinguishing themselves from the environment surrounding them, they share various perceptions and sensibilities with each other, for they all belong to the same natural environment and thus are part of nature; hence, the difference between the pain of the self and that of another is far less distinctive than in the case of the whites.

If Indians were highly capable of sympathizing with another’s pain and thus susceptible to the sufferings of their neighbors,⁷ the death of the husband is never a mystery to begin with. When looking in front of his eyes at his wife’s agonizing predicament of the brutal operation — in which she is cut in the abdomen with a jackknife, the uterus pulled out of the body, and the gash sutured by gut leaders — and perceiving her felt experience of pain *as his own*, how could the Indian husband wish to escape from the shanty to “out of range of the screams”? The pain of his wife should be too inconceivable a brutality to share as his own, so that it is rather natural that the husband attempts to stop the extraordinary pain by shutting down his own life — a means to which the wife cannot recourse under the circumstances.

If, as Meyers argues, the Indian husband wants to make a protest against white men’s intrusion into the ritual of *couvade*, or if he merely could not stand his wife’s suffering, his suicide can be read certainly as an attack on the Western medical technology represented by Dr. Adams, who cannot sympathize with the Indian woman’s suffering. Looking at the scene in which Dr. Adams is humiliated when finding himself feeling too elated not to notice the husband’s agony during the operation, it is safely said that Hemingway, at least when writing this story, sympathized more with the Indian’s plight than with the father of the protagonist. In this line of argument, Hemingway seemingly attacks the technological invasion of the natural life of Indians, yet, in fact, around pain and anaesthesia, he wavers between the positive view of medical technology and the negative view of it: not only does he attack the presence of technology, but also he criticizes the absence of it, the absence of anaesthesia, the highest achievement of Western civilization. Despite that he deeply sympathizes with the painful situation of those who live in nature out of the reach of pain-killing technology, or because of the sympathy, he cannot allow the lack of benefit of technology.

Hemingway’s ambivalent feeling toward medical technology is evident in Frederic’s response to Catherine’s treatment in *A Farewell to Arms*, with which we are hereafter concerned. Looking at her pain and suffering, he earnestly gives her anaesthesia in place of a doctor. We can observe no negative connotation in the representation of anaesthesia when Catherine undergoes the prolonged delivery. Far from negating the technology, he desperately needs it in place of Catherine, acutely sympathizing with her pain, or rather we should say identifying himself with her body by

feeling her pain as his own.

“[...] I’m almost done, darling. I’m going all to pieces. *Please give me that.* It doesn’t work. *Oh, it doesn’t work!*”

“Breathe deeply.”

“I am. Oh, it doesn’t work any more. It doesn’t work!”

“Get another cylinder,” I said to the nurse.

“That is a new cylinder.”

“I’m just a fool, darling,” Catherine said. “But it doesn’t work any more.” She began to cry. “Oh, I wanted so to have this baby and not make trouble, and now I’m all done and all gone to pieces and it doesn’t work. Oh, darling, it doesn’t work at all. I don’t care if I die if it will only stop. Oh, please, darling, please make it stop. *There it comes. Oh Oh Oh!*” She breathed sobbingly in the mask. “It doesn’t work. It doesn’t work. It doesn’t work. Don’t mind me, darling. Please don’t cry. Don’t mind me. I’m just gone all to pieces. You poor sweet. I love you so and I’ll be good again. I’ll be good this time. *Can’t they give me something?* If they could only give me something.”

“I’ll make it work. I’ll turn it all the way.”

“Give it to me now.”

I turned the dial all the way and as she breathed hard and deep her hand relaxed on the mask. I shut off the gas and lifted the mask. She came back from a long way away.

“That was lovely, darling. Oh, you’re so good to me.” (322, emphases are original)

As far as we see these lines, anaesthesia seems certainly a salvation to remove the gnawing sensation of pain. However, once Catherine goes into “the bright small amphitheatre of the operating room” with many nurses watching the operation (“The other [nurse] laughed, ‘We’re just in time. Aren’t we lucky?’ They went in the door that led to the gallery” [324]), the situation undergoes a sudden change. Turned into the object of everyone’s gaze, Catherine under anaesthesia is associated with the image of death:

I thought Catherine was dead. She looked dead. Her face was gray, the part of it that I could see. Down below, under the light, the doctor was sewing up the great long, forcep-spread, thick-edged, wound. Another doctor in a mask gave the anæsthetic. Two nurses in masks handed things. It looked like a drawing of the Inquisition. I knew as I watched I could have watched it all, but I was glad I hadn’t. I do not think I could have watched them cut, but I watched the wound closed into a high welted ridge with quick skilful-looking stitches like a cobbler’s, and was glad. (325)

We can see the gradual change of Frederic's perception of the medical intervention into Catherine's body. At first, Catherine, who is put under anaesthesia, appears to be a dead person ("She looked dead"); then, her body objectified by doctors and nurses seems to be punished for heresy, to be a target of unreasonable attack ("like a drawing of the Inquisition"); yet, seeing the skillful movement of the doctor's hands ("like a cobbler's"), he soon feels relieved ("was glad"). His strong sympathy with Catherine's pain causes this representation that mingles contradictory perceptions of medical technology.

Hemingway's representation of medical technology about anaesthesia is by no means consistent throughout the story. Sometimes anaesthesia is an indispensable benefit to kill pain; sometimes it is a period of unconsciousness causing sickness afterward:

When I was awake after the operation I had not been away. You do not go away. They only choke you. It is not like dying it is just a chemical choking so you do not feel, and afterward you might as well have been drunk except that when you throw up nothing comes but bile and you do not feel better afterward. (107)

This should be the most neutral description of anaesthesia in the novel, seen through the eyes of those who are put under anaesthesia. Since Frederic was unconscious when he was operated on, he cannot appreciate the benefit of the technology. It is only when a person sees others under anaesthesia that the technology becomes charged with various values. After Catherine's operation he meditates on the dead baby with "The cord [...] caught around his neck": "Maybe he was choked all the time. Poor little kid. I wished the hell I'd been choked like that." Here, the choking experience of anaesthesia when he was operated on seems associated with the dead baby choked by the umbilical cord. This association, separated by as many as over 200 pages, might be perhaps accidental, yet it is very likely that seeing the dying Catherine provided the negative view of anaesthesia despite that he desperately attempted to give it to Catherine when she screamed in pain just before the operation.

From the mere choking sensation to the preliminary stage of death, Hemingway as well as Frederic wavers between two extremes from the total acceptance to the relative rejection. His statements are always inconsistent when he attempts to describe medical technology: it is sometimes an unwanted intruder into nature; a benefit of civilization; a salvation relieving the loved one from pain; or the state analogous to death. We have seen in this chapter the representation of pain through the technological advancement of anaesthesia. In the next chapter, we shall look at the depiction of pain through the non-sensation as exemplifying the tendency of the interwar period.

Notes

- ¹ As accurately depicted in *A Farewell to Arms*, surgical operating rooms were generally constructed like amphitheaters with a place for observation attached: “There were benches behind a rail that looked down on the white table and the lights” (324).
- ² There are some other opinions about the origin of the story. Kenneth Lynn states that “‘Indian Camp’ came from a less obvious cluster of emotions, all of which had been generated by the circumstances surrounding the birth of John Hadley Nicanor [Hemingway’s first son]” (229). Or more recently, according to William Adair, Hemingway’s injury in the First World War is another source for the story. See “A Source for Hemingway’s ‘Indian Camp.’”
- ³ Doctors are generally known to disregard patients’ complaints about pain: “physicians do not trust (hence, hear) the human voice, that they in effect perceive the voice of the patient as an “unreliable narrator” of bodily events, a voice which must be bypassed as quickly as possible so that they can get around and behind it to the physical events themselves” (Scarry 6). Morse and Mitcham state that medical workers have to learn the attitude of neglecting patients’ pain: “they have to deliberately detach themselves from the reality of another’s pain” (653).
- ⁴ See David Morris’ *The Culture of Pain*. “The prevailing Enlightenment thinkers on primitivism celebrated the *pain-free state of the natural savage*, who supposedly did not suffer the debilitating illnesses and nervous disorders of the *‘hypersensitive’ European races*. Thus the widely published observations of sophisticated travelers and amateur anthropologists lent credence to the white man’s belief that his own pain was somehow special. ‘In our process of being civilized,’ wrote S. Weir Mitchell, the famous nineteenth-century American neurologist, ‘we have won, I suspect, intensified capacity to suffer. The savage does not feel pain as we do’” (39, emphases are mine).
- ⁵ “[...] the possibility of alleviating physical pain profoundly altered the going view of the ‘value’ of pain and lowered the estimation of asceticism. Christian asceticism has often maintained that suffering ennobles life. [...] In an essay on pain, Jules Rochard concluded that following the introduction of anesthesia to reduce pain, Europeans had grown to fear pain more than death and had become less able to endure suffering” (*Anatomy* 78).
- ⁶ According to Scarry, “Whatever pain achieves, it achieves in part through its unsharability, and it ensures this unsharability through its resistance to language” (4).
- ⁷ Morse and Mitcham propose the new concept of “compathy” by which they mean “an involuntary distress response in the caregiver that mirrors patient distress” (649). “Compathy [...] refers to the sharing not so much of an emotional as a physiological state. While theories of sympathy and empathy aim to account for the sharing of emotional responses (i.e. feelings), the experiences of shared physical distress responses are seldom included. Here the argument is for recognition of a new physiological dimension of empathy, that is, for the communication or ‘contagion’ of physical responses from one individual to another” (650). And according to them, “Couvade is not restricted to exotic cultures; males in western cultures are sometimes affected by symptoms similar to the physical discomforts of pregnancy and labour. Despite the chronological coordination of pregnancy with the occurrence of symptoms which are ‘mimicked in a manner that is quite remarkable,’ the relationship between these events may nevertheless not be perceived by expectant fathers” (652). Of great importance here is that the symptoms of couvade is perceived not in the West but only in “exotic cultures.” That the somatic phenomena of “compathy” are exclusively recognized in primitive societies is a clear evidence of Eurocentric primitivism.

Chapter 5

“The Marvellous Thing Is That It’s Painless”

James Joyce once beautifully captured the moral malaise of citizens in an Irish town in his short story collection, *Dubliners*. Paralysis is the term which most fully expresses the central motif of the stories:

[Father Flynn] had often said to me: *I am not long for this world*, and I had thought his words idle. Now I knew they were true. Every night as I gazed up at the window I said softly to myself the word *paralysis* [. . .]. But now it sounded to me like the name of some maleficent and sinful being. It filled me with fear, and yet I longed to be nearer to it and to look upon its deadly work. (1, emphases are original)

Though all the subsequent stories in this collection also, in one way or another, depict the suffocating impasse of paralyzed people,¹ the lines above from “The Sisters,” which contain the single appearance of the word “paralysis” in the volume, elucidate what it is like to be paralytic; thus, introducing the underlying theme of the following stories. However hard he tries “to be nearer to [paralysis],” the boy narrator throughout the story can never distinguish it from death or from Father Flynn’s “stupefied doze” (4). During his futile attempt to comprehend his friend’s death, the boy’s concept of death wanders over the limbo in which death, paralysis, and slumber intersect with each other. The characters in this collection are all trapped in this limbo and are desperately struggling to escape from it in vain.

Though the boy in “The Sisters” is by no means morally corrupted, another example from “Eveline” more appropriately explicates the social malaise of Dublin. Courted by a sailor who wants to leave the city with her and wanting to get out from the paralyzed society and her family, Eveline nevertheless cannot decide whether to go with him or not. Clinging to a railing of the station at the last instance before they get on board the boat, she forever shuts out of her own accord the possibility of escaping to a new life, not because she decided to stay but because she could not decide to go. When she is left behind on the quay, her state of mind is clearly characterized by paralytic non-sensation, completely passive to anything around her:

He rushed beyond the barrier and called to her to follow. He was shouted at to go on but he still called to her. She set her white face to him, passive, like a helpless animal. Her eyes gave him no sign of love or farewell or recognition. (34)

Yet, this malaise of the emotional stasis was neither exclusively detected in the city of Dublin nor merely a volatile peculiarity caught in the sensibility of a genius, but was observed all but universally in the first decades of the twentieth century. Rapid industrialization and the extremely high mechanization of society, which had advanced at the turn of the century, brought about the sense of repulsion in the people's mind against mechano-science; and anaesthesia, a representative technology of the nineteenth century's high achievement of science, was no longer the target of celebration, but a negative indication that people lived in the corrupt society wandering far away from nature. This retrogressive tendency aspiring to the preindustrialized state is most conspicuously advocated in the works of D. H. Lawrence, whose attack on modern civilization and whose devotion to nature worship and primitivism can be seen in many of his essays and fictions. In *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, he conveys the dehumanized and morally modern mind paralyzed because of the influence of technological advancement, attacking severely though rather too simplistically the current of the time. In Clifford's social circle in Wragby Hall, people discuss the mechanization of the future society, in which "babies would be bred in bottles, and women would be 'immunized.'" According to Lady Bennerley, "if the love-business went, something else would take its place. Morphia, perhaps. A little morphine in all the air. It would be wonderfully refreshing for everybody" (74). We can grasp in this passage that Lawrence, who praised highly above all else human communication through bodily contact, is keenly aware of the imminent crisis that technological achievement might disrupt all human relationships. Highly celebrated as it was in the nineteenth century as a goal of modern science as we have seen in the previous chapter, the evaluative view of anaesthesia, or the lack of sensation, as is eloquently expressed in Lawrence's criticism of modern civilization, gradually through the development of mechanization and the proportional repulsion against it, turned into its opposite — an object of fear, a despicable state of mind, and, as it were, a mode of social disease. Paralysis, or the lack of sensation, in its both literal and figurative senses, is a key to understanding the first half of the twentieth century.

In Lawrence's conception from the earliest stage of his career, morphine was never a benevolent salvation to relieve a patient from pain, but what trapped him/her into a state of living death — the state in which the patient, unable to accept his/her death, seeks refuge and remains oblivious to the coming of death, satisfied by a comfortable insensibility to pain. He wrote the passage of Mrs. Morel's deathbed thus: "She thought of the pain, of the morphia, of the next day; hardly ever of the death. That was coming, she knew. She had to submit to it. But she would never entreat it or make friends with it. Blind, with her face shut hard and blind, she was pushed towards the door" (*Sons* 430).

Similar examples are abundant. We should clearly remember that Prufrock's monologue depicting the lethargic and spiritless quality of the age begins with the passage: "Let us go then, you and I, / When the evening is spread out against the sky / Like a patient etherised upon a table" (Eliot 3). Or we can recognize the echo of Lady

Bennerley's opinion about morphine in Fitzgerald's short story, "The Swimmers": one of Henry Marston's "strange speeches" in his delirium ("how all the population of Paris was becoming etherized by cheap gasoline" [497]) never conveys a favorable impression of anaesthesia. These metaphorical uses of anaesthesia suggest that, up to the early twentieth century, this technological achievement of nineteenth century medicine had no longer fascinated people's minds as a positive benefit that should be enjoyed by every civilized citizen.

Edith Wharton, accordingly, used for her rendering of morally corrupt upper class people in New York a most appropriate metaphor of anaesthetized childbirth, which she also used as the title of the novel — *Twilight Sleep*. Mrs. Manford declares to her expectant daughter-in-law: "Of course there ought to be no Pain . . . nothing but Beauty . . . It ought to be one of the loveliest, most poetic things in the world to have a baby" (18). Absorbed in spiritual healing, philanthropy, beauty treatment, and other leisured-class engagements, Mrs. Manford embodies the age in which people are deprived of their ability to feel sensation, used to the lack of perception, and comfortable in the numbness of their emotional activities.

[...] all her life she had been used to buying off suffering with money, or denying its existence with words, and her moral muscles had become so atrophied that only some great shock would restore their natural strength . . . (261)

Paralysis, stupefaction, twilight sleep, and atrophy — such pathological metaphors are found in abundance in literature representing the undercurrent of the age. Ernest Hemingway was no exception. In the nihilistic milieu of the first decades of the twentieth century, the Lost Generation is a generation keenly aware of the emotional stasis after the great storm having swept across the European Continent. The fear of non-sensation, the fear of a numbing of his perception obsessed him and led him to the description of paralyzed characters in order to distance himself from his contemporaries trapped in the limbo between life and death.

Take "On the Quai at Smyrna" to begin with. As Louis H. Leiter clarifies, this story "dramatizes the gradual numbing of human responses through repeated horrors" (139). The story describes horror and brutality in war through the eyes of a speaker, who tells seven episodes to the narrator. Yet, after commenting that the first three are "strange," "unimaginable," and "the worst" (CSS 63), "it is impossible for the speaker's mind to respond to horror any longer" (Leiter 138). Reaching the bottom, the speaker's emotional line somehow goes upward from the fourth to the seventh episode: the last four are referred to as "extraordinary," of man's being "a bit above himself," "surprising," and "a most pleasant business" (CSS 63-64). This anaesthetization of the soldier is a familiar example of a psychological defense mechanism against horrible experiences that are beyond one's capacity.

"A Natural History of the Dead," in a part of which the seventh episode of "On

the Quai at Smyrna” is retold, also presents the narrator who attempts to fortify himself with the strategy of posing as a detached observer among numerous dead bodies. By contrasting the crude and unvarnished rendering in presenting dead bodies in the battlefield with the humanist discourse of past naturalists, the story parodies and satirizes such humane attitudes of those who did not participate in war: facing unprecedented brutalities, a human soul could never maintain Christian-oriented sympathy toward those who were injured and dead. As in “On the Quai at Smyrna,” the narrator ostensibly seems to take pleasure in conveying gloomy and dismal spectacles in war, assessing them, for instance, as “it being *amazing* that the human body should be blown into pieces [. . .]” (CSS 337, emphasis is mine). Once thrown among numerous dead bodies which have been blown apart into bits and fragments, one has to take as detached an attitude as possible to sustain one’s mental stability, shutting out humanist sympathy toward fellow beings under tremendous atrocity; just like a doctor must become insensitive to his/her patient’s pain.

This preference of the practical over the humane attitude in combat is repeated in the struggle between an army surgeon and an artillery officer at the latter half of the story. The doctor is represented as an exemplary figure surviving in the battlefield, and the officer blames him in a dressing post for his doing nothing for a dying soldier with his head “broken as a flower-pot may be broken, although it was all held together by membranes and a skillfully applied bandage now soaked and hardened [. . .].” The officer first makes a suggestion to “give him an overdose of morphine,” which is answered by the doctor: “Do you think that is the only use I have for morphine? Would you like me to have to operate without morphine? You have a pistol, go out and shoot him yourself.” The officer declares at last: “I will shoot the poor fellow [. . .]. I am a humane man. I will not let him suffer.” After a fight between the two, blinded by a saucer full of iodine flung at his eyes by the doctor, the officer screams: “You have blinded me! You have blinded me!” The doctor calmly orders a sergeant to hold him tight, saying at the concluding passage: “He is in much pain. Hold him very tight” (CSS 339-41).

The officer is indeed going through the pain that the doctor never feels in his profession, since he is not allowed to feel another’s pain however pained the patient looks and however much his insensibility seems callous and cruel to another’s eyes. Too much detachedness, if not in such a violent situation, might of course result in a serious tragedy as can be seen in the case of Doctor Adams in “Indian Camp”; yet to be deprived of the ability to share pain with another, to be, as it were, a doctor-like observer rather than a positive participant during the war is the only way to save oneself from psychic damage one might receive when confronting unimaginable calamities and brutalities. Morphine should thus be administered not to the dying soldier but to the officer’s mind.

Frederic Henry’s remark that “At the start of the winter came the permanent rain and with the rain came the cholera. But it was checked and in the end only seven thousand died of it in the army” (*FTA* 4) has been considered a typical example of

Hemingway's "hard-boiled" style of narrating events from a distance, yet in view of these repeated dramatizations of the process of gradual numbing of soldiers' perception, it is highly probable that Frederic also has to detach himself from the stark realities of war to a psychically safe distance. As Samuel Hynes argues, "in the presence of such multitudes the psychic defense called numbing quickly sets in" (xii). Seven thousand should simply be beyond the capacity of which Frederic can conceive. Here he protects himself from inconceivable brutalities by becoming insensible to the pain of others.

Harold Krebs in "Soldier's Home" defends himself in a like manner. The omniscient narrator's remark that Krebs "had done the one thing, the only thing for a man to do, easily and naturally" has hitherto been considered as a reference to his courage in war,² yet there appears no mention in this story of a word in whatever way related to his bravery. The intention of the above sentence should rather be sought in the defense mechanism employed by soldiers.³ It is very likely that Krebs had shut out his sense of fear in the face of numerous dead colleagues and his possible death imminent in the situation; otherwise, he might have lost his mental stability under tremendous atrocity that was yet unheard of.

But when talking about the war with another soldier, "he fell into the easy pose of the old soldier among other soldiers: that he had been badly, sickeningly frightened all the time." This act of *lying* causes him critical damage, since to tell that he felt fear in the war is to be stripped of the only protection available whereby he has guarded his right mind. "Krebs found that to be listened to at all he had to lie, and after he had done this twice he, too, had a reaction against the war and against talking about it. A distaste for everything that had happened to him in the war set in because of the lies he had told" (CSS 111-12). The "distaste" which arises here is the belated sensation he ought to have received in combat. By reliving his fear after many months, the armor of imperception, of being paralytic at a critical moment, with which Krebs has enshrouded himself, becomes finally cracked apart. Knowing this danger, he feels an urgent necessity to stop talking about the war, to stop having relations with others, and to crawl back again into his comfortable protection of indifference to everyone and everything around him. He finally switches off all of his nerves so as to receive no more shocking influences.

When he was in town their [girls'] appeal to him was not very strong. He did not like them when he saw them in the Greek's ice cream parlor. He did not want them themselves really. They were too complicated. There was something else. Vaguely he wanted a girl but he did not want to have to work to get her. He would have liked to have a girl but he 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.

He did not want any consequences. He did not want any consequences

ever again. He wanted to live along [sic] without consequences. (CSS 112-13)

He does not want to have a girlfriend, though he is sometimes sexually aroused when looking at girls (“He did not want them *themselves really*.” “*Vaguely* he wanted a girl [...]”); for, if he tried to have, he would undertake all the possibility of being shocked, injured, and mentally damaged, and accepting its “consequences.” Hemingway well knew how painful such consequences were when he returned from the war and received a letter from Agnes von Kurowsky, his nurse and girlfriend in a Milan hospital, to tell him that they should break off the relationship.

We have discussed the psychic self-defense of soldiers to cope with traumatic experiences of war. We shall hereafter discuss two means employed by Hemingway’s characters to bring about intentionally such a paralytic state of mind to avert confronting various emotional stresses — alcohol and self-deceptive illusion. “The Three-Day Blow” is a good example to start with. The first two thirds of the story just describe a room in which Nick, the protagonist of the story, and his friend Bill are drinking alcohol and enjoying conversation about baseball and their favorite writers. The content of their idle talk is totally unrelated to what the story intends to show. Indeed most of the story seems at first meaningless and at best a lengthy recording of young boys’ idle talk except for the last few pages in which we for the first time notice Nick’s hidden distress about his lost love. The ostensibly insignificant conversation, however, has an important role in the story to convey how deeply Nick has been remorseful of his conduct — his jilting Marjorie, the details of which we learn in “The End of Something” placed immediately before “The Three-Day Blow” in *In Our Time*. The long description of his heavy drinking and his seemingly aimless talking, if seen against the background of this recent break up with his girlfriend, suddenly become an account of his attempt to anaesthetize the painful feelings about what he has lost, the attempt to forget about the “Marge business,” with his head occupied by other trivial concerns. But this attempt fails only when Bill takes up the problem; Nick suddenly falls reticent (“Nick said nothing. [...] Nick said nothing. [...] ‘Sure,’ said Nick. [...] ‘Yes,’ said Nick. [...] Nick nodded. [...] Nick sat quiet [...]” [CSS 90]), and Bill, on the contrary, keeps persuading him that Nick did right in breaking it off with her. And we know that Nick’s anaesthetic has completely worn off at this stage.

Nick said nothing. The liquor had all died out of him and left him alone. Bill wasn’t there. He wasn’t sitting in front of the fire or going fishing tomorrow with Bill and his dad or anything. He wasn’t drunk. It was all gone. All he knew was that he had once had Marjorie and that he had lost her. She was gone and he had sent her away. That was all that mattered. He might never see her again. Probably he never would. It was all gone, finished. (CSS 91)

The “Marge business” suddenly flows into his thoughts, and flushes away everything which they have talked about, every other favorable subject and comfortable intoxication, and even Bill’s existence itself.

Yet, he finds another emotional outlet when the possibility occurs to him that he can resume the relationship with Marjorie. This self-consoling imagination is the second way of anaesthetizing the painful feelings, the way that “made him feel better” (CSS 92). Hemingway well captures the gradual numbing of the pain he has felt:

Nick had not thought about that. It had seemed so absolute. That was a thought. That made him feel better.

.....

He felt happy now. There was not anything that was irrevocable. He might go into town Saturday night. Today was Thursday.

.....

He felt happy. Nothing was finished. Nothing was ever lost. He would go into town on Saturday. He felt lighter, as he had felt before Bill started to talk about it. There was always a way out.

.....

Outside now the Marge business was no longer so tragic. It was not even very important. The wind blew everything like that away.

.....

None of it was important now. The wind blew it out of his head. Still he could always go into town Saturday night. It was a good thing to have in reserve. (CSS 92-93)

The anaesthetic seems successful on the surface. However, the simple repetitive nature of these sentences gives us the impression that he is trying desperately to persuade himself that he *really* feels happy, that the Marge business is *really* not irrevocable, and that they can *really* reunite on Saturday — the impression that, at the bottom of his heart, Nick knows the possibility of resuming the relationship is merely an illusion, just a temporary “way out.” Yet he has to guard his mental stability from coping with too much damage, and the only means to which he can find recourse here is to avert his eyes from the distasteful reality. After all, only to kill pain even without taking appropriate treatment of a wound should still be “a good thing to have in reserve.”

The Sun Also Rises is almost a catalog of paralyzed people helplessly trapped in an idle and unproductive atmosphere of the age and living a life of Joycean limbo. They simply cannot escape from the situation, and also do not attempt to escape from the present situation. Robert Cohn, to illustrate, deeply absorbed in a fantastic

novel of “splendid imaginary amorous adventures,” persists in going to the place in which the novel is set, but he “can’t get started,” only to complain that he “can’t stand it to think [his] life is going so fast and [he is] not really living it” (17-18). His desire to flee from reality most eloquently explicates the nature of post World War I expatriates: they can never be satisfied by the status quo and are endlessly seeking refuge in one country after another. Francis, about to be deserted by Cohn, complains to Jake of her situation, yet does not ask any advice or help: “‘And of course there isn’t anything I [Jake] can do.’ ‘No. Just don’t let him [Cohn] know I [Francis] talked to you. I know what he wants’ ” (55). Even in the face of such an unpleasant reality, any means to prevent the reality is totally beyond her conception.

These characters in paralysis invariably find recourse in alcohol and improbable and self-deceptive imaginations as Nick in “The Three-Day Blow” did to avert his eyes from the pain in his heart: anaesthetization without treatment. Jake Barnes is no different, yet in his case, the wound itself is represented as a form of paralysis — a paraplegic genital inflicted in the war. Paralysis itself is the cause of pain for him, and to get rid of the pain he repeatedly recurses to heavy drinking as almost every character in the novel does. Jake and Brett Ashley love each other, but they cannot consummate their love because of Jake’s impotence. Unable to live away from each other because of their affection, and at the same time unable to live together because of the wound, they can go nowhere except just wandering through the dark streets of Paris riding in a taxicab, not knowing what to do about their aroused sexual desire. The quotation below follows Jake’s attempt to commit some sexual act that is rejected by Brett:

“Isn’t there anything we can do about it?”

She was sitting up now. My arm was around her and she was leaning back against me, and we were quite calm. She was looking into my eyes with that way she had of looking that made you wonder whether she really saw out of her own eyes. They would look on and on after every one else’s eyes in the world would have stopped looking. She looked as though there were nothing on earth she would not look at like that, and really she was afraid of so many things.

“And there’s not a damn thing we could do,” I said. (34)

There is always nothing they can do about their relationship. Caught by his carnal needs toward Brett, possessed by the desire aroused by her presence, Jake desperately seeks in vain whatever way he can ease the desire while he is poignantly aware of the difficulty preventing them from achieving ordinary sexual intercourse. Brett, on the contrary, is rather calm in her attitude, or at least not provoked by sexual desire as Jake is. The situation is, in short, under her control, and it is Jake who is objectified by her gaze, the gaze invested with the peculiar features of being ever-continuing (“[Her eyes] would look on and on after every one else’s eyes in the world would

have stopped looking”) and horrifyingly impartial (“She looked as though there were nothing on earth she would not look at like that”) eyes. Jake thus turns into “nobody” to her, for he is sexually impotent; he continues to be “nobody” ever after, for there is no possibility for him to be cured.

Shortly after the conversation above, Jake leaves Brett in a cafe and goes back home. To avert his eyes from the failure to consummate his sexual desire, he deals with the trivialities of daily life, such as reading letters and newspapers, or keeping the record of expenses, yet, in the middle of the trivialities, flashes of thought sometimes slip into his mind to remind him of the relationship with Brett (“There was a crest on the announcement. Like the Zizi the Greek duke. [. . .] Brett had a title, too. Lady Ashley. To hell with Brett. To hell with you, Lady Ashley”), and the wound he suffers (“[The mirror of a big armoire] was a typically French way to furnish a room. Practical, too, I suppose. Of all the ways to be wounded. I suppose it was funny”). In spite of his effort to fall asleep, his “head started to work.” In this “old grievance,” he broods over a fantastic idea to console his misfortune, to imagine that he was never in trouble: “Probably I never would have had any trouble if I hadn’t run into Brett when they shipped me to England” (38-39).

Brett, at first glance, lives a self-indulgent life, following her unchecked desire; yet, she is also locked in a paralyzing situation when she says “I’m not going to be one of these bitches that ruins children” (247). On being asked by a young bullfighter Pedro Romero to marry him, she takes flight from the only possibility of escaping from the life of drinking and promiscuity in a way not unlike Joyce’s Eveline. At the novel’s ending when Brett and Jake talk about the outcome of her affair with Romero, despite that she suggests four times that she does not want to talk about the affair with Romero (“[. . .] let’s not talk about it. Let’s never talk about it.” “Oh, let’s not talk about it.” “Don’t let’s ever talk about it. Please don’t let’s ever talk about it.” “But, oh, Jake, please let’s never talk about it” [245-47]), she constantly and immediately returns to the subject by her own will. And she declares: “I’m going back to Mike. [. . .] He’s so damned nice and he’s so awful. He’s my sort of thing” (247). Mike, who is her ex-fiancé and was deserted when she went away with Romero, is another figure who indulges in heavy drinking and aimless talking. She is completely trapped by this vicious circle of paralyzing malaise in the age. Everything forces her to return to the old group of culturally dislocated expatriates.

At the end of the novel, however, Jake is at least aware of this claustrophobic binding force that holds him and his friends, of the situation in which they continue to wander and from which they can never escape. Brett and Jake ride in a taxicab, as they did in Paris at the beginning of the novel as quoted earlier. However, the power relationship between Jake and Brett is completely reversed: in this case, it is Jake who controls the situation. The famous last passage is thus:

“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?” (251)

Here Jake clearly refuses to indulge in the same fantastic and self-deceptive idea with Brett, the idea that is “pretty to think.” To imagine that they “could have had such a damned good time together” might console and anaesthetize their hurt feelings, yet to picture the *if* in which they can consummate their love is merely an imagination. Jake, by articulating the possibility in the form of a negative question, suggests the unproductive result of such an attempt to avert their eyes from the harsh reality.

In 1931, Hemingway rendered “the study in pain” from his experience of a car accident and the subsequent hospitalization: “The Gambler, the Nun, and the Radio.”⁴ The story is about three persons — Cayetano Ruiz, the gambler who is shot twice in the abdomen and brought to the hospital; Sister Cecilia, the nun who takes care of patients in the hospital; and Frazer, the writer from whose point of view the story is told. Cayetano is described as a highly courageous and persevering figure in that he never tells who shot him to the detective sergeant asking questions about the incident, and that he never cries when suffering severe pain in the course of the medical treatment and afterward. Sister Cecilia highly praises this silent endurance of the patient:

He was so uncomplaining she said and he was very bad now. He had peritonitis and they thought he could not live. Poor Cayetano, she said. He had such beautiful hands and such a fine face and he never complains. The odor, now, was really terrific. He would point toward his nose with one finger and smile and shake his head, she said. He felt badly about the odor. It embarrassed him, Sister Cecilia said. Oh, he was such a fine patient. He always smiled. (CSS 357)

Even in this critical moment, he “never complains” about pain, and, what is more, is “embarrassed” by his inability to maintain decency. Frazer, on the contrary, cannot endure his pain (both physical and psychological) without the consolation of listening to the radio possibly to distract his consciousness away from the harsh reality of the present condition of his wound. For Frazer, the radio is the anaesthetic — or to borrow the words used in the story, “the opium” — a means to escape from the painful situation. Though the radio does not work well during the day, “all night it worked beautifully and when one station stopped you could go farther west and pick up another” (CSS 358). In this manner, by picturing people in distant places far away from the hospital, he tries to avert his eyes from his wound in the leg, from which to completely recover it will take “A long, long time” (CSS 357). When Frazer’s nerves go bad, he increasingly depends on listening to the radio not to think about his plight: “Mr. Frazer had been through this all before. The only thing which was new to him was the radio. He played it all night long, turned so low he could barely hear it, and

he was learning to listen to it without thinking” (CSS 363). This obsession with the radio reminds us of Clifford in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, who is absorbed in the radio to make up for the lost communication with his friends.⁵ Like many characters of other Hemingway’s stories as discussed above, he completely relies on illusions that the radio creates in his mind, and these illusions are the last resort for him to escape from the reality (another familiar method of escape in Hemingway’s texts — alcohol is of course frequently mentioned throughout the story).

Sister Cecilia also cannot directly confront the reality and takes recourse in praying to God. Even when a football team with the name of “Our Lady,” Notre Dame, is to play a match, she cannot listen to the radio broadcast for she would “be too excited” and remains in the chapel to pray “For Our Lady,” namely, for the victory of the team (CSS 359). In the opinion of one of the “friends of he who wounded” Cayetano — one of the Mexicans whom the police send to the hospital so that Cayetano has some visitors — “Religion is the opium of the poor,”⁶ and thus Sister Cecilia seems to him “a little crazy” (CSS 361-62). If not crazy, she is at least a person who indulges in the opium, recurses to the anaesthetic without facing reality.

As most critics agree, Cayetano exemplifies the so-called code-hero.⁷ He is depicted as independent of self-deceptive illusions unlike Frazer and Sister Cecilia or other paralytic characters in Hemingway’s stories. In the case of Jake Barnes, who also has a paralyzed bodily part like Cayetano, his paraplegic genital requires him to take whatever means to ease the pain in his life; while in the case of Cayetano, with the leg paralyzed, he nevertheless needs no anaesthetical flight from the distressing situation. Unlike Frazer, he can endure his pain without the radio or any other form of consolation — without, in a word, opium.

When Frazer meets Cayetano coming into his room in a wheelchair, the former asks the latter, “What about the pain? [...] She tells me you never made a sound.” Cayetano is humble enough to insist that it is because there are “So many people in the ward” that he did not give a shout. He states that “If [he] had a private room and a radio [he] would be crying and yelling all night long” (CSS 364-65).⁸ What is shown in this conversation is not only Cayetano’s silent fortitude but his humility not to be proud about his spiritual strength. He pretends that he is ranked with ordinary people and tries to expose and emphasize his weakness, yet this very condescending blame on himself, if seen from the eyes of an actually weaker person, is naturally shifted onto the weaker — in this case, onto Frazer. Cayetano even calls himself “the victim of illusions” by which he means his absorption in the gamble: knowing that he is “completely without luck,” he never stops to be “a professional gambler” and does just “Continue, slowly, and wait for luck to change” (CSS 365-66). Yet, given this calm understanding of his own way of living, “the victim of illusions” is the name not suitable for Cayetano but what should be attributed rather to Frazer who always imagines daily lives of strangers in strange places in the radio.

After the conversation with Cayetano, Frazer realizes that he is dependent on “the opium,” by which to avert his eyes from the reality. As we can infer, it is because of

this realization that he suddenly begins to fix his eyes on other patients staying in the same ward and lists the condition of their wounds:

In that ward there was a rodeo rider who had come out of the chutes on Midnight on a hot dusty afternoon with the big crowd watching, and now, with a broken back, was going to learn to work in leather and to cane chairs when he got well enough to leave the hospital. There was a carpenter who had fallen with a scaffolding and broken both ankles and both wrists. He had lit like a cat but without a cat's resiliency. They could fix him up so that he could work again but it would take a long time. There was a boy from a farm, about sixteen years old, with a broken leg that had been badly set and was to be rebroken. There was Cayetano Ruiz, a small-town gambler with a paralyzed leg" (CSS 366).

The conditions of his fellow inmates here enumerated being apparently severer than that of Frazer, his attempt to describe them in detail shows his acute realization that there exist people suffering in a more depressing situation: they either have difficulty in returning to the former jobs because of their injuries, or have to go through still more painful ordeals to recover their health completely.

Frazer's awareness of this abundance of sufferers around him leads his thought to the social situation of the age even though "Usually he avoided thinking all he could." His almost philosophical meditation reads thus:

Religion is the opium of the people. He believed that, that dyspeptic little joint-keeper. Yes, and music is the opium of the people. Old mount-to-the-head hadn't thought of that. And now economics is the opium of the people; along with patriotism the opium of the people in Italy and Germany. What about sexual intercourse; was that an opium of the people? Of some of the people. Of some of the best of the people. But drink was a sovereign opium of the people, oh, an excellent opium. Although some prefer the radio, another opium of the people, a cheap one he had just been using. Along with these went gambling, an opium of the people if there ever was one, one of the oldest. Ambition was another, an opium of the people, along with a belief in any new form of government. What you wanted was the minimum of government, always less government. Liberty, what we believed in, now the name of a MacFadden publication. We believed in that although they had not found a new name for it yet. But what was the real one? What was the real, the actual, opium of the people? He knew it very well. It was gone just a little way around the corner in that well-lighted part of his mind that was there after two or more drinks in the evening; that he knew was there (it was not really there of course). What was it? He knew very well. What was it? Of course; bread was the opium of the people. Would he remember that and would it make sense in the daylight?

Bread is the opium of the people. (CSS 367)

In this grand philosophical reverie, the list of opiums includes most forms of human consolation and support for life. Frazer seems to argue that almost everyone in the age has been paralyzed by opiums of various forms, that no one really sees anything in the world without relying on whatever means of mitigation to absorb the direct shock of undiluted reality. Considering morally trapped citizens numbed by the social order, he realizes that if he were to evade this trap of opiums, he would never have any consolation in the daily course of living. Totally at a loss what to do once he acquired this dismal world view, he seeks desperately for any opinion from the Mexican, who told him that religion is the opium of the people, only in vain.

“Listen,” said Mr. Frazer. “Why should the people be operated on without an anæsthetic?”

“I do not understand.”

“Why are not all the opiums of the people good? What do you want to do with the people?”

“They should be rescued from ignorance.”

“Don’t talk nonsense. Education is an opium of the people. You ought to know that. You’ve had a little.” (CSS 367-68)

People who are “operated on without an anæsthetic” means those who are living without depending on fake consolation to alleviate the painful sensation, someone who is like Cayetano. In Frazer’s newly acquired philosophy, to live is to endure the pain.⁹

In addition, Frazer’s attack on the social institution of education and the fact that he repeatedly borrows from Marx the expression, “the opium of the people” (actually one of the Mexicans who visit Cayetano uses the expression first), lead us to see him as a Marxist, yet he is never in accord with Marxist theory of the time.¹⁰

Revolution, Mr. Frazer thought, is no opium. Revolution is a catharsis; an ecstasy which can only be prolonged by tyranny. The opiums are for before and for after. He was thinking well, a little too well. (CSS 368)

In his view, a political system silently dominates people by way of numbing their sensation to deprive them of the power of resistance, giving them various modes of consolation to avert their eyes from problems of the social order. However, the opiums are also “after” the revolution. According to Frazer, thus, whether or not a revolution breaks out, whether or not it succeeds in overthrowing the system, the world will never change its fundamental structure, continuing to anaesthetize people. He is thus not going to go through personal revolution, for, when the sound of Cucaracha, a revolutionary song played by Mexicans, stops, he is going to return to his pet opium: “Then he would have a little spot of the giant killer and play the radio,

you could play the radio so that you could hardly hear it" (CSS 368). Despite that he could reach the profound understanding of life, he could choose the comfortable place deeply immersed with the opium.

Because of a prolific literary career in the 1920s, Hemingway could keep some distance from the lethargic social milieu after World War I. Since the publication of *In Our Time* in 1925, he had published three books and two short story collections in less than five years. However, the 1930s was for him a decade of creative slump; while extremely active in his real life, going on safari or absorbed in bullfighting, nevertheless (or therefore?) the 30s, except for a short story collection, *Winner Take Nothing*, produced in book form only *Death in the Afternoon*, *Green Hills of Africa*, and *To Have and Have Not*, none of which has been much celebrated either by critics or readers in general. In this period of literary sterility, writing about paralytic characters naturally means to take a critical attitude toward himself. In the previous decade, he might have been in the middle of the social stagnancy surrounded by paralytic contemporaries, yet he transcended such lifeless inertness by writing about them; whereas now he himself could be ranked along with those paralytic for he could not write enough to be exempt from being charged with moral stasis. It is at this time that he wrote "The Snows of Kilimanjaro," which depicts most harshly the non-sensation of the protagonist.

The story is certainly Hemingway's purgatorial rendering of his own paralytic situation, centering on a man's sense of pain in the past and now. Harry, the protagonist, dying of gangrene yet without pain, is a paradigmatic character who has gone numb in wealthy laziness. The first lines of the story indicate that the central theme is insensibility to pain:

"The marvellous thing is that it's painless," he said. "That's how you know when it starts."

"Is it really?"

"Absolutely. I'm awfully sorry about the odor, though. That must bother you." (CSS 39)

We cannot overlook the stark contrast between the passage above and Cayetano enduring his pain yet being embarrassed by the odor. Painless yet reeking Harry on the one hand, and painful and reeking Cayetano on the other; these two characters created at the beginning and the height of Hemingway's infertile period are placed at the opposite extremes. Cayetano is a vigorous character who recovers from the injuries from which everyone thinks he dies; while Harry is an effete character who yields to the approaching death without any attempt to resist it. Harry is a typical character who is trapped by the paralytic malaise of the age.

So now it was all over, he thought. So now he would never have a chance to finish it. So this was the way it ended, in a bickering over a drink. Since the gangrene started in his right leg he had no pain and with the pain the

horror had gone and all he felt now was a great tiredness and anger that this was the end of it. For this, that now was coming, he had very little curiosity. For years it had obsessed him; but now it meant nothing in itself. It was strange how easy being tired enough made it. (CSS 40-41)

Here, it is clear that the lack of pain is correlated with “being tired enough” — being in the Joycean limbo between life and death, in which even death no longer interests him. In this situation, he, like many of Hemingway’s characters, recurses to drinking, drinking in order to kill sensation. To Helen’s admonition, “Darling, please don’t drink that. We have to do everything we can,” he replies “You do it [. . .]. I’m tired” (CSS 41). This is a typical example of anaesthesia without treatment abundantly found in many of Hemingway’s stories.

The italic parts of the story are concerned with Harry’s reminiscences he has saved to write, and it is curious that many of the episodes displayed one after another without much logical connection are about his painful experiences of the past and brutalities inflicted upon other people. A notable example of this in the first italic section is Barker’s bombing of a leave train:

But he had never written a line of that, nor of that cold, bright Christmas day with the mountains showing across the plain that Barker had flown across the lines to bomb the Austrian officers’ leave train, machine-gunning them as they scattered and ran. He remembered Barker afterwards coming into the mess and starting to tell about it. And how quiet it got and then somebody saying, “You bloody murderous bastard.” (CSS 42, emphases are original)

Like the speaker in “On the Quai at Smyrna,” Barker’s perception of other people’s pain has been completely numbed as he has observed many atrocities during the war.

Harry’s paralysis, however, is not due to the self-defense system which protects the mind. His gradual loss of perception is conveyed in the often quoted passage as follows:

He had destroyed his talent by not using it, by betrayals of himself and what he believed in, by drinking so much that he *blunted the edge of his perceptions*, by laziness, by sloth, and by snobbery, by pride and by prejudice, by hook and by crook. (CSS 45, emphasis is mine)

Harry’s paralysis is, in short, caused by not writing. By not using his sensory nerves, his ability to feel pain has been unwittingly destroyed. As Nick Adams, Hemingway’s semi-autobiographical character, claims in “Fathers and Sons” (“He had gotten rid of many things by writing them” [CSS 371]), to write is the only means to escape from the emotional stasis caused by some traumatic event, yet, nevertheless, Harry has renounced the will to write leading an idle life with rich people who have enough

money to sustain his life. In the face of his imminent death, he feels belatedly the need to write, the need to purge his deadlock situation in which he has been lying comfortably for so many years. This acute need emerges most keenly at the end of the second italic part.

But he had always thought that he would write it finally. There was so much to write. He had seen the world change; not just the events; although he had seen many of them and had watched the people, but he had seen the subtler change and he could remember how the people were at different time. He had been in it and he had watched it and it was his duty to write of it; but now he never would. (CSS 49, emphases are original)

The expression of his belated feeling of remorse for not writing what he should have written constantly appears throughout the story, but he no longer has any means to write down what should be written. Though he exclaims, “ I want to write” after the quotation above, Helen does not let him. We see here the structure of a sexually inverted “The Yellow Wall Paper,” in which the desire of the male protagonist to write is restricted and repressed by a woman character who attends to him.

The most important part of the story comes before the often quoted sequence as a central image: Harry’s illusion of rising upward toward the snow covered top of Kilimanjaro. Before his imagined salvation, we see a triad of two sections and an italic part interposed between them in which the central motif of the story is clearly presented.

All right. Now he would not care for death. One thing he had always dreaded was the pain. He could stand pain as well as any man, until it went on too long, and wore him out, but here he had something that had hurt frightfully and just when he had felt it breaking him, the pain had stopped. (CSS 53)

At first, he has been afraid of suffering pain rather than death, and in the face of his actual death, “the pain had stopped” as he has wished. However, the primary reason for him to dread pain is that it wears him out, and, as we have seen, at this stage he has already been worn out enough to lose interest in his own life. In short, his painless death reflects that he has already been dead since he lost his sensation.

The last italic part immediately following the quotation above stands in clear contrast to Harry’s death, conveying a most extreme example of painful death.

He remembered long ago when Williamson, the bombing officer, had been hit by a stick bomb some one in a German patrol had thrown as he was coming in through the wire that night and, screaming, had begged every one to kill him. He was a fat man, very brave, and a good officer, although addicted to fantastic shows. But that night he was caught in the wire, with

a flare lighting him up and his bowels spilled out into the wire, so when they brought him in, alive, they had to cut him loose. Shoot me, Harry. For Christ sake shoot me. They had had an argument one time about our Lord never sending you anything you could not bear and some one's theory had been that meant that at a certain time the pain passed you out automatically. But he had always remembered Williamson, that night. Nothing passed out Williamson until he gave him all his morphine tablets that he had always saved to use himself and then they did not work right away. (CSS 53, emphases are original)

This kind of violent death is also frequently seen in Hemingway's texts. In such texts, pain is represented as a test of manhood for those who are facing their imminent death. Looking at these two modes of death, Harry's and Williamson's, we can conclude that pain is linked to life itself, the evidence that one is certainly alive, and the essential sensation one has to cling to. Witnessing this dreadful dying of a fellow soldier, he afterwards becomes fearful about suffering such prolonged pain at his death, and prematurely keeps administering morphine or alcohol and self-deception. Killing pain completely and losing sensation, he has lost his proof of life and especially as a writer, been dead for a long time before his actual death.

After the reminiscence about Williamson, sensing that death is coming closer to him, he speaks abruptly to Helen: "You know the only thing I've never lost is curiosity" (CSS 54). But as we have already seen a few pages earlier, "For [his death] [...] he had very little curiosity. For years it had obsessed him; but now it meant nothing in itself" because of "being tired enough." Then it should be appropriate to suppose that his sudden insistence of retaining curiosity is caused by his belated realization that he has already died, by a remorseful illusion that he is still alive, and above all else by his wish to survive and write all he has saved for a long time.

By writing Harry's painless death, and by projecting his own literary fruitlessness into the fictional character, which, certainly for a writer like Hemingway, requires a painful effort and self-examination, he did attempt to purge his sterile paralysis and retrieve his once fruitful creativity. Very much lamentable is the fact that even after this literary attempt to resurge as a prolific writer he could never be as productive as in those miraculous years of the 1920s.

Notes

¹ See *Selected Letters of James Joyce*, ed. Richard Ellman (London: Faber and Faber, 1992), p.83.

² See, for example, Azevedo. "Harold Krebs, the boy 'who had been a good soldier' and 'had done the one thing, the only thing for a man to do, easily and naturally,' is able to retain his integrity during the war" (102).

³ It is richly suggestive that Krebs Friend, from whom the protagonist's name was borrowed and

whom Hemingway met in Chicago after the war, was “a badly shell-shocked vet” (Reynolds, *Paris* 189).

⁴ In his letter to Ivan Kashkin, August 19, 1935, Hemingway explains how he conceived the story: “The only trouble, to me, is that it ends with me as Mr. Frazer out in Billings Montana with right arm broken so badly the back of my hand hung down against the back of my shoulder. It takes five months to fix it and then is paralyzed. I try to write with my left hand and can’t. Finally the musculo-spiral nerve regenerates and I can lift my wrist after five months. But in the meantime one is discouraged. I remember the study in pain and the discouragement, the people in the hospital and the rest of it and write a story *Gambler, Nun and Radio*” (SL 418, emphasis is original).

⁵ “Connie was a good deal alone now, fewer people came to Wragby. Clifford no longer wanted them. He had turned against even the cronies. He was queer. He preferred the radio, which he had installed at some expense, with a good deal of success at last. He could sometimes get Madrid or Frankfurt, even there in the uneasy Midlands” (110).

⁶ To this sentiment, Frazer answers that “I thought marijuana was the opium of the poor” (CSS 362). This matter-of-fact opinion exhibits a striking contrast to his philosophical reverie which he later cultivates about “the opium of the people.” We can infer from this that he has gone through some transformation in his evaluation of anaesthesia.

Another importance of this sequence is that this Mexican will not drink alcohol for “it mounts to [his] head” (CSS 361). His will to keep his head clear means that he regards alcohol also as the opium.

⁷ As a rare exception, Earl Rovit condemns Cayetano as an “inadequate father image” (70).

⁸ It is curious that “a radio” is mentioned here. Cayetano possibly notices that any form of consolation leads to weakening the power to endure pain.

⁹ A similar expression is found in *To Have and Have Not*. Meditating on the difficult situation into which he and Richard Gordon are driven, Professor MacWalsey says to himself that “why must all the operations in life be performed without an anaesthetic?” (221). We can thus surmise that the comparison of life to an operation without anaesthesia is at least to a certain extent shared by the author himself.

¹⁰ About Marxism, see Edward Stone, “Hemingway’s Mr. Frazer: From Revolution to Radio.”

Part III

Countering Victorian Normalization: Representations of Sexuality

Chapter 6

Between the Puritan and the Libertine

From its emergence in the sixteenth century, syphilis was always one of the most dreadful diseases in Western societies. Because of its virtual incurability, syphilis was regarded as the wrath of God against promiscuity, a punishment caused by perverted sexual intercourse, and a symbol of immoral vice against society. Thus syphilis with its immoral implication was held in secrecy and closeted under the genteel surface of Victorian society. However, improvement in medical knowledge from the middle of the nineteenth century gradually exposed the biological aspects of this disease, if not presenting an effectual remedy. The fear of as well as the sense of guilt resulted from contracting this stigmatic disease produced various kinds of discourses — both fictive and factual. According to Claude Quétel, the propaganda campaign against syphilis was for the purpose of “maintaining the public in a state of alert by keeping syphilis continually in the news,” and consequently “In 1926 alone, 15,000 articles in the popular press were recorded” not to mention “numerous scientific journals” (183). Fictive discourses as well proliferated at the turn of the century. As Elaine Showalter shows us, literature about syphilis at the end of the nineteenth century was divided into two types: one is a women’s version, which describes syphilis as a punishment for lust, “the most unforgivable of the sins of the fathers” and as “a punishment unjustly shared by innocent women and children”; the other is a men’s version, in which “women are the enemies, whether as the *femmes fatales* who lure men into sexual temptation only to destroy them, the frigid wives who drive them to the brothels, or the puritanical women novelists, readers, and reviewers who would emasculate their art” (“Syphilis” 88).

Indeed, this generation was obsessed by the notion that syphilis was everywhere, and frightened by the fact that there was no way of knowing if one had contracted syphilis or not. Stephen Kern refers to this situation as follows:

The fear of syphilis in particular was so acute that it generated an independent derivative disease, a special kind of hypochondria called “syphilophobia.” People suffering from this disorder manifested a variety of psychosomatic symptoms of real syphilis and generally suffered from the obsessive thought that they had contracted it, no matter how thorough their precautions. And since the medical theories on the causes of venereal diseases included infection from contaminated towels, beds, drinking glasses, pipes, toothbrushes, razors, pencils, musical instruments, tattooing and kissing — even kissing the Bible — the potential syphilophobe had no end of precau-

tions to make to feed his obsessive fears. (*Anatomy* 42)

Susan Sontag argues that illness is charged with *metaphor*, or the invented and punitive value pressed upon pure physical state, and that “the most truthful way of regarding illness — and the healthiest way of being ill — is one most purified of, most resistant to, metaphoric thinking” (3, emphasis is original). Among other diseases, syphilis, whose cause of infection was attributed to the most guilt-laden activities in the first decades of the twentieth century, carried the worst overtones. Indeed, venereal disease at the turn of the century was used “as a symbol for a society characterized by a corrupt sexuality” (Brandt 5).

As Allan M. Brandt states in his social history of venereal disease, “we must examine venereal disease not only as a biological entity, but as a disease that has engaged certain attitudes and values; beliefs about its causes and consequences that in turn affect responses to the problem.” In other words, venereal disease, as well as other diseases, is shaped as both biological and cultural construction. In the paradigm of medicine at the beginning of the twentieth century, “disease is defined as a deviation from a biological norm,” and attracts various symbols and images beyond the field of medicine, which “reflect social values — patterns of judgment about what is good or bad that guide perceptions and practice.” Thus venereal disease had been used, since the middle of the nineteenth century throughout the twentieth, “as a symbol for a society characterized by a corrupt sexuality,” as “a symbol of pollution and contamination,” and as “a sign of deep-seated sexual disorder” (3-5).¹

After due consideration of this situation as above mentioned, we shall assume that the social attitude toward syphilis is an outer manifestation of the normalization of sexuality, which leads to the view that patients of this disease are deviants from the society’s common assumption about sexuality; thus “discovering” that premarital or extramarital sexual intercourse, mainly with prostitutes, was a “perversion.” This rigid Puritanism about sexuality dominated the United States in the first years of the twentieth century, which, at the same time, witnessed sexual liberation from Victorian society. Venereal disease exposed the male centered double standard about sexuality taken for granted in the nineteenth century, while women no longer stayed in that restricted state. Men were thus regarded as abnormal because of their traditional privilege of promiscuous intercourse, yet women were also regarded as abnormal because of their liberated sexual adventures. Taking into account the fact that Hemingway was born in the age of this general confusion of sexual matters, examining this disease in the context of Hemingway’s attitudes toward the social norm of sexuality sheds some light upon the previously unrecognized complexities of his life and works. We shall investigate how syphilis functions in his texts and how it contributes to the making of his public image. Analyzing his representation of syphilis will make it clear that his works are marked by an equivocalness oscillating between a repugnance for the Victorian moral standard, on the one hand, and an unintentional compliance with it, on the other.

Hemingway, throughout his career, resisted any form of normalization about sexual matters. He repeatedly professed to be a libertine, and created the public image of a person more sexually experienced than he really was. According to Scott Donaldson, Hemingway insisted that “he learned practically everything there was to know about sex while still a teen-ager,” and that “he’d ‘had the clap’ twice before his older friend Bill Smith ever got laid” (175). Whether this is true or not, this attitude toward venereal disease as a credit upon himself is typical of a revolt against Victorian morality. No matter how much his biographical evidence indicates the opposite,² he wore the mask of the debauchee.

His preference for a libertine attitude toward sexual matters is well expressed in his early short story, “Mr. and Mrs. Elliot.” Nancy Comley and Robert Scholes point out that this story “is based on a binary opposition, deeply embedded in American culture, between puritan and libertine” (83), and that the narrator despises Hubert Elliot’s puritan sex. Hubert, the main character of the story, had never experienced intercourse with other girls before he marries Cornelia. Now after their marriage, they set out on a trip to Europe, and the story describes them when they “tried very hard to have a baby” (CSS 123) only to fail. The story itself is a vicious mockery of the couple who regard sex only as a procreative process.³ According to Comley and Scholes, “The explicitly puritanical character of Hubert’s values is emphasized by the words *pure* and *purity*” (83, emphasis is Comley and Scholes’s). The passage in question is thus:

He was twenty-five years old and had never gone to bed with a woman until he married Mrs. Elliot. He wanted to keep himself *pure* so that he could bring to his wife the same *purity* of mind and body that he expected of her. He called it to himself living straight. He had been in love with various girls before he kissed Mrs. Elliot and always told them sooner or later that he had led a *clean* life. Nearly all the girls lost interest in him. He was shocked and really horrified at the way girls would become engaged to and marry men whom they must know had dragged themselves through the gutter. He once tried to warn a girl he knew against a man of whom he had almost proof that he had been a rotter at college and a very unpleasant incident had resulted. (CSS 123, emphasis is mine)

Hubert’s insistence on his “clean life,” which is a typical Victorian euphemism, signifies his not having had any relationships with prostitutes or extramarital sexual intercourse. Comley and Scholes are right about their insistence that the couple represents a puritanical evaluation, but they are not insistent enough; for the words, “pure,” “purity,” and “clean” are charged not only with a puritanical evaluation but also with the typical insistence upon the social hygiene movement at the time of the publication of this story. Compare the passage above with a lecture delivered to American soldiers in World War I: “It is not true that the absence of previous sexual

experience is any handicap to a man in entering the married state [. . .]. On the contrary, the man who comes to his bride as *clean* and as *pure* as he expects that she will come to him will find the most perfect joy in the married state” (qtd. in Brandt 64, emphases are mine). It is clear that this attitude toward male sexuality is extremely similar to Hubert’s desire that he wants to “bring to his wife the same purity of mind and body that he expected of her.” We should hence conclude that Hubert’s sexual value is typical of that of social hygienists.

Hemingway also had been brought up in this rigid puritanical tradition as seen in his autobiographical story, “Fathers and Sons.” “His [Nick’s] father had summed up the whole matter by stating that masturbation produced blindness, insanity, and death, while a man who went with prostitutes would contract hideous venereal diseases and that the thing to do was to keep your hands off of people” (CSS 371). This kind of statement epitomizes Victorian morality and also appears as the foremost principle of the antisyphilitic movement. As Brandt states, “Continence [. . .] became the hallmark of all sexual prescription” (26). The fear of venereal disease was used to prevent boys from promiscuous intercourse and to support the puritanical evaluation of the nineteenth century. The evidence is found in Hemingway’s *Death in the Afternoon*: “Three things keep boys from promiscuous intercourse, religious belief, timidity, and fear of venereal diseases. The last is most commonly the basis of appeal made by the Y.M.C.A. and other institutions for clean living” (103).

In the light of this context, it should be said that Hubert advocates then the dominant ideology of the antisyphilitic movement and conforms to the overarching system of evaluation constituted in the fight against the disease, or against the social vice engendering it — namely prostitutes. In other words, leading a “clean life” was primarily the moral standard at that time, and the narrator’s mocking tone against Hubert implies that the narrator — or Hemingway, it might be said — resisted this normalization. The story insists that the value assumed by Hubert — and by social hygienists as well — does not necessarily produce a satisfactory result. In fact, the couple’s sex aiming only at procreativity remains futile; and, what is more, the wife engages in a kind of lesbianism with her friend, while the husband is infatuated with alcohol. “Mr. and Mrs. Elliot” is thus a protest against the antisyphilitic movement, or Victorian morality.

In his private life, however, Hemingway had led a rather puritanical sexual life, and on that point, he is allied to Hubert. As Michael Reynolds notes: “In the pre-war era that formed his values, sexual congress with a proper woman betokened matrimony,” and “In Oak Park a man married the woman he lay with. In his fiction he might escape that unwritten rule, but in his own life Hemingway was a native son. He was capable of one night stands and casual beddings, but he could not sustain an affair without marrying the woman or at least asking” (*Young* 147). Hadley, Hemingway’s first wife, also, referring to their divorce afterwards, says: “If Ernest had not been brought up in that damned stuffy Oak Park environment [. . .] he would not have thought that when you fall in love extramaritally you have to get a divorce and

marry the girl” (qtd. in Kert 226). As Comley and Scholes argue, Hubert is Hemingway’s self inverted image — Hubert is, on almost all points, a complete reversal of his creator — yet Hemingway positioned him to be “an opposite into whom he [Hemingway] could project himself imaginatively” (85). Hemingway wished to be a libertine, but he could never escape from the puritanical mindset into which his individuality was forged. By attacking the values represented by the social hygiene campaign, he wanted to be seen as being outside of the cultural environment which nurtured him when young.

This influence of the puritanical education in his home town can be seen in many of his stories, such as “A Very Short Story.” Most critics agree that this story was written based on Hemingway’s own experience in World War I. Young Hemingway, after his wounding in the Austrian front, fell in love with Agnes von Kurowsky, a nurse taking care of him in the Milan hospital. They promised to be married after his getting a job in the United States. He went back to his country, and she continued to attend as a nurse. She finally changed her mind to marry an Italian officer, and sent a letter to Hemingway, telling him that “I know that I am still very fond of you, but, it is more as a mother than as a sweetheart” (Villard and Nagel 163). “A Very Short Story” records this incident, mostly according to this biographical experience except for the vicious ending of the story, in which Luz (her name was at first Ag, short for Agnes, in the previously published version ⁴) and the protagonist falls into a somewhat tragic conclusion:

The major [Luz’s expected fiancé] did not marry her in the spring, or any other time. Luz never got an answer to the letter to Chicago about it. A short time after he contracted gonorrhoea from a sales girl in a loop department store while riding in a taxicab through Lincoln Park. (CSS 108)

Of great importance here is the narrator’s malicious addition indicating Luz’s broken marriage — “or any other time.” Robert Scholes, in one of the most influential studies of this story, states that: “Something punitive is going on here as the discourse seems to be revenging itself upon the character [of Luz]” (37). The point to observe is the nature of the “punitive”; that is, how and why she is punished by the author.

Joseph DeFalco, one of the earliest Hemingway critics, mentions that “the original failure of the love-partnership is reflected as both a physical and psychological disease” (163). The physical one is gonorrhoea, the psychological her jilting. The double infliction on the protagonist’s body and mind coincides with what venereal patients would generally undergo, as Brandt states: “individuals often have suffered a double jeopardy: the physiological consequences of the disease itself, as well as the deep psychological stigma” (5). The protagonist of the story is inflicted with this “double jeopardy,” though the causal relation is inverted in the case of this story: the cause is, for the ordinary venereal patients, the biological disease and its effect is psychological stigma; whereas, in the story, the cause is Luz’s jilting of him (psy-

chological) and its effect is the biological disease. This reversed scheme is the most radical example of Showalter's "men's version," which we have seen at the beginning of this chapter: for the disease, which should originally have been a *cause* for the mental affliction, is here transformed into an *effect* whose cause is attributed to a woman's evildoing. Luz is thus an enemy, that is, if not one of the "femmes fatales who lure men into sexual temptation only to destroy them," yet an exemplar of "the frigid wives who drive them to the brothels [...]." It is Luz who tempts him to promiscuity with a poisonous woman only to blight him. Venereal disease afflicting the protagonist in this story is, for the author, a useful method to blame Luz rather than the protagonist; thus, consequently and unintentionally, supporting the view that venereal disease is the result of a moral violation into which men were enticed by such women of sexual prudery, the view which leads to a conclusion that venereal patients are indeed moral violators, that is, "abnormal." However hard he attempted to deprive of, in Sontag's term, metaphor from the biological disease, not only was he entrapped by the much charged views of the disease, but also he himself was complicit with the social normalization aiming at punishing the abnormal — in other words, metaphorized view of the disease.

Notes

¹ Kern settles this situation as follows: "Syphilis was a disease ideally suited to bear out the admonitions of zealous Christians who insisted that it was the divinely conceived wages of sin. It was an ideal Protestant disease, as well as an ironically Victorian disease" (*Anatomy* 42).

² Almost all the biographies of Hemingway mention that he could never escape from the stern Victorian influence about sexual matters. See, for a laconic summary, Donaldson, *By Force* 179-81.

³ As many biographers maintain, the story was originally based on an actual couple. For instance, Carlos Baker states that the story is "a malicious gossip-story [...] making fun of the alleged sexual ineptitudes of Mr. and Mrs. Chard Powers Smith" (133).

⁴ "Chapter 10" in *in our time*.

Chapter 7

The Wrath of God

The anti-syphilitic movement after the war returned to the state of the previous century — society's conformity to the genteel indifference to sexual matters. Although the actual number of venereal patients was steadily increasing after the war, direct mention of the names of venereal diseases was no longer permitted in public. The general release of "Fit to Fight," the anti-venereal propaganda film during the war, was vehemently protested by censorship throughout the United States, and "By 1922 the Public Health Service had withdrawn all its anti-venereal films" (Brandt 124). This tendency for eradicating "obscene" words culminated in 1934, at which time Thomas Parran, Jr., New York State Health Commissioner was to hold a lecture concerning venereal diseases. "But the talk was never delivered. Moments before air-time, CBS informed him that he could not mention syphilis and gonorrhea by name; in response to this decision, Parran refused to go on" (Brandt 122).

The time was, in short, a period of confusion in which two attitudes toward sexuality were, contradicting as they were, intertwined and thus coexistent with each other. And it was in this atmosphere that Clarence, Hemingway's father and a physician by profession, was incensed by his son's first major collection of short stories, despite his once advanced attitude which led him to provide school children with sex education during the war (Reynolds, *Young* 119). According to Hemingway's sister, "[Father] told him that no gentleman spoke of venereal disease outside a doctor's office" (Sanford 219). And it was also in this situation that June issue of *Scribner's Magazine*, which serialized Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms*, was suppressed by the censor in 1929.

"Up in Michigan" with which we shall begin this chapter and which was composed as early as 1921, had been rejected by his publishers until 1938 because of its sexual explicitness.¹ Liz Coates, a waitress in D. J. Smith's, secretly has affection for Jim Gilmore, a blacksmith in Horton's Bay. Jim never paid much attention to Liz, but, after returning from a deer hunting trip, drunk with whiskey, he is sexually aroused by Liz, who is alone in the kitchen. Taking her out to the dock, he violently has intercourse with Liz without listening to her cry: "You mustn't, Jim. You mustn't" (CSS 62). After finishing the act, Jim goes to sleep; while Liz, after trying to wake him in vain, covers him with her coat and goes home.

The cause of rejection in publishing this story can be inferred from the famous argument about the story between the author and his mentor in the Paris years, Gertrude Stein. His recollection of the incident is recorded in *A Movable Feast*:

“It’s [‘Up in Michigan’ is] good,” she said. “That’s not the question at all. But it is *inaccrochable*. That means it is like a picture that a painter paints and then he cannot hang it when he has a show and nobody will buy it because they cannot hang it either.”

“But what if it is not dirty but it is only that you are trying to use words that people would actually use? That are the only words that can make the story come true and that you must use them? You have to use them.”

“But you don’t get the point at all,” she said. “You mustn’t write anything that is *inaccrochable*. There is no point in it. It’s wrong and it’s silly.” (15, emphases are original)

Stein here speaks for the cultural acceptability of sexual expression: even if the work itself is “good,” one “mustn’t write anything” that includes explicit words and to do so is “wrong” and “silly.” On the contrary, Hemingway, a few pages before the quotation above, describes his own foremost principle being that “All you have to do is write one true sentence” (12). Hemingway was well aware of having gone too far in the realm of restricted expression,² but he had necessarily to reject society’s code of acceptability to recreate the “truth” of the generation. The time was one of so-called sexual liberation, the discovery of the unconscious, and the fear of syphilis. If one can easily discover sexual preoccupations at the root of the generation, it is fairly reasonable to suggest that he could not avoid depicting the sexual in his attempt to write “the truth.” He had, in other words, to revolt against the normalizing repression of sexuality to survive as a writer writing the “truth,” even if the “truth” was forbidden by society.

The violation of the social code of sexual morality, with which the story was charged by two publishers, should be attributed not only to the surface level of expression Stein took up as a problem but also to the subject matter. As Alice Hall Petry argues, “The emphasis on Liz’s cleanliness and neatness [. . .] conveys the purity, the noncarnal nature of her impulses toward Jim” (355). This noncarnality is the most important norm in Victorian society that social hygienists attempted to establish.³ And if the story describes Liz (an advocator of cleanliness, purity, and noncarnality) being polluted by a brutal blacksmith (the representative of carnality), it might be inferred that not only “obscene words” but also the subject matter of the story serves as a revolt against at once censorship, which represents the society’s genteel appearance, and the professed credo of the social hygienists, which determined the course of social acceptability.

However, even if the author actually intended such resistance, it collapses at the last instance because of the very structure of the text itself. If Jim, as an adversary of social hygienists, represents the value of libertinism, his system of values is far from supported by the text: the story is, peculiar for Hemingway in this period, for the most part told from Liz’s point of view⁴ — that is, the view of a person who highly esteems the value of cleanliness. The narrator mainly sympathizes with not

Jim but Liz, who resists his seduction. If Hemingway wanted to rehabilitate libertine values by writing this story, his intention is wholly betrayed by the very style of his writing, by his writing from the female point of view, and this style is one of the most remarkable features of the story when compared with his other masculinist stories written around the period.

The story may seem at a glance to revolt against the social norm because of vulgar words chosen for the text, yet such a reading misses the point. The surface of the text, or the outward expression, indeed celebrates the libertine evaluation and denounces the puritanical; while, on the contrary, the core indicates the opposite, to maintain society's normative value. Taking into account this coexistence of opposite values, what seemed like his resistance against social norms in other occasions comes to be seen as dubious. *The Sun Also Rises*, for instance, was severely criticized for its vulgarity in expression: in his mother's opinion, it was "one of the filthiest books of the year" (Lynn 357). Replying to this sentiment, the son writes thus:

[. . .] I am in no way ashamed of the book, except in as I may have failed in accurately portraying the people I wrote of, or in making them really come alive to the reader. [. . .] Besides you, as an artist, know that a writer should not be forced to defend his choice of a subject but should be criticized on how he has treated that subject. The people I wrote of were certainly burned out, hollow and smashed — and that is the way I have attempted to show them. (SL 243)

Here, his mother embodies Victorian morality, while Hemingway also maintains this very morality by insisting that immorality should be attributed not to the author but to the characters — in other words, in the line of his argument, the author who describes them as immoral ("burned out, hollow and smashed") should not be accused of immorality; rather he *is* the advocator of morality because he wrote about immorality, accused it, and condemned it. Here he assumes, if not deliberately, the mask of a moral lecturer, a mask not unlike that which Parran wore when he was, as it were, censored in delivering the radio lecture.

The suppression of *A Farewell to Arms* by Boston police can also be seen from a different angle. Answering the charge, Charles Scribner's Sons issued a statement as follows: "The ban on the sale of the magazine in Boston is an evidence of the improper use of censorship which bases its objections upon certain passages without taking into account the effect and purpose of the story as a whole. 'A Farewell to Arms' is *in its effect distinctly moral*. It is the story of a fine and faithful love, born, it is true, out of physical desire."⁵ What the publisher claims for Hemingway is that the author of *A Farewell to Arms* retains morality under the surface of coarse language. Here again Hemingway's work is laden with a moral tone.

Some of Hemingway's stories were indeed censored, yet they were censored not for violation of the moral code but for mere excess in faithfulness to the actuality

— by the use of forbidden words as in the case of Parran’s broadcasting. Thus, the revolt against censorship, or the deliberate use of vulgar language, on the part of Hemingway, by no way leads to the disruption, but rather the support, of society’s normative values. No matter how hard Hemingway wanted to sympathize with those who live a libertine life, his cultural morality had a grasp on him throughout his lifetime; thus, he allied himself with the harsh preacher preaching continence. We shall hereafter clarify that Hemingway used coarse language as a means of alleviating the familial disaster caused by syphilitic infection.

It is aptly illuminating for this purpose to compare Hemingway’s “One Reader Writes” and Eugene Brioux’s *Damaged Goods: A Play in Three Acts*. The play was written for the purpose of warning people against committing acts that cause venereal infection, and theoretically based on *Syphilis and Marriage* — a treatise by Alfred Fournier, the most famous of syphilologists in France at the time. The English translation of the original play was widely performed in the United States in the years prior to and during the war.⁶ “The object of this play,” exclaims the theater manager at the beginning of the play, “is a study of the disease of syphilis and its bearing on marriage” (180). In the play, the hero-doctor diagnoses George Dupont as syphilitic, and tries to dissuade him from marriage. The doctor then attempts to extenuate the guilt-laden implication which syphilis conveys to Dupont: “Come now, I repeat, there is nothing in all this beyond the ordinary. It is simply an accident that might happen to anybody. [. . .] There is, in fact, none that is more universal” (182). What he attempts to do here is to expose the mystery with which society invests a mere medical disease (“there is nothing in all this beyond the ordinary”); in effect, emancipating venereal patients from a sense of dishonor from contracting this much charged affliction (because “It is simply an accident”). The doctor maintains that his infection was not caused by a sinful act but by mere bad luck.

Dupont, after all, proceeds with the marriage with his fiancé without listening to the doctor’s advice, urged by the necessity of obtaining his bride-to-be’s dowry for buying a notary’s practice. As a result, a year later, a terrible fact comes to light, the fact that a wet nurse has contracted syphilis from Dupont’s baby who shows symptoms of congenital syphilis. Knowing that his son-in-law is the infector, his wife’s father, M. Loches, comes to the doctor’s office to obtain a certificate testifying that his son-in-law had been infected before their marriage, intending to demand a divorce of him on behalf of his daughter. After a series of futile attempts at dissuading him from the idea of divorce, the doctor asks him if he can truly declare that he has never engaged in the same act as that of his son-in-law’s, the act which causes the present disaster.

Come, come: let us have a little plain speaking! I should like to know how many of these rigid moralists, who are so choked with their middle-class prudery that they dare not mention the name syphilis, or when they bring themselves to speak of it do so with expressions of every sort of disgust,

and treat its victims as criminals, have never run the risk of contracting it themselves. It is those alone who have the right to talk. How many do you think there are? Four out of a thousand? (232)

Here we should notice that what is under attack in the above quotation is not only the hypocritical double standard of M. Loches, who blames others for the act that he himself is not free of, but also the “prudery” of refraining from articulating the word syphilis in public.

The original text carries a brief letter to Fournier as a preface to the play, excluded in the English translation: “I believe, with you, that syphilis will lose much of its gravity when one dares to speak openly of a sickness [mal] that is not a shame nor a punishment [...]”(qtd. in Leavy 161).⁷ In Brioux’s conception, the absence of the word “syphilis,” or the lack of appropriate sex education gives rise to the diseased state of society and, thus, the best way of preventing the disease is openly to articulate the word. As George Dupont admits, the newspaper owned by his father has never “printed that word” (198), lest it should lose its readers. This reluctance to speak of the disease, according to the doctor in the play, produces the rueful condition of society. There is a subtle yet well recognizable landslide under way about the cause of the present disaster: that is, the current familial misery is caused not by sexual intercourse that brought on infection (because few are free of the vice) but by the act of imparting the sense of shame to the biological disease — by unanimous silence of society. To look at the disease itself (to achieve, in Sontag’s words, “the healthiest way of being ill”), according to Brioux, one has to deprive syphilis of the mysterious silence haunting the mere physical state. In short, the arch-villain is the act of silence.

According to Leavy, taking the place of the medical profession in his play, “The writer becomes healer, and — conversely — the doctor as literary character becomes one who uses *words* rather than dispenses medicines to heal private and public disease” (161, emphasis is original). This treatment of the writer-healer dispensing the effective remedy of *words* to the public reminds us of Hemingway’s incessant employment of prurient words. It is possible that, by using vulgar language, he not only conveys the actuality of the sexually liberated age but also attempts to cure the social disease by articulating the forbidden words. The similarity between this play and “One Reader Writes,” which shall be detailed below, seems well to support this possibility.

The story is one of the most neglected ones written by Hemingway,⁸ and the reason for this disregard might be explained in the offhand easiness of its composition. The story was composed from a letter originally sent to Logan Clendening, a Kansas City doctor and a friend of Hemingway’s. According to Carlos Baker, “Ernest edited the letter slightly, changing the date and the place-name, and adding a short introduction and conclusion. The result was ‘One Reader Writes’ — probably the easiest short story he had ever devised” (227). In my view, however, this story needs more attention all the more for this peculiar composition history, since how

Hemingway dealt with the letter reveals his attitude toward the general perception of syphilis. Some scholars have criticized Clendening for giving those six letters to Hemingway as well as the writer for making use of an innocent woman's plight to write a story. Paul Smith, however, objects to these sentiments and maintains that, given the doctor's concern for human suffering and his anger at those religious beliefs that approve the existence of such sufferings, "Hemingway shared that concern and anger; and one simple and effective way to express what he and the doctor felt was to reprint the woman's letter and end it with an appeal, not to the ministers of her day but to 'My Christ'" ("The Doctor" 38). What we should see in the text is not the author's offhandedness in composing the story nor the small quantity of his own writing, but what he wanted to present by using the letter almost as it is.

The story begins with a short introduction composed by Hemingway, which describes a woman who decides to seek advice from a medical column in a newspaper and who writes the letter consisting of the major part of the story. And the short conclusion attached to the letter describes the wife's pitiful prayer to Christ: "It's such a long time though. It's a long time. And it's been a long time. My Christ, it's been a long time" (CSS 321). Afraid of the dreadful disease, she wishes desperately that she and her husband can reunite after the treatment. She has been waiting for her husband for a long time, yet it is very likely, from his infection with syphilis, that he gratified his lust by having intercourse with prostitutes during military service in Shanghai. This scheme is typically seen in the nineteenth-century syphilitic literature, in which syphilis is a punishment for lust, "the most unforgivable of the sins of the fathers" and as "a punishment unjustly shared by innocent women and children" (Showalter, "Syphilis" 88). Here, we can recognize that Hemingway retains the clearly established norm about sexuality: to present a female writing *as it is* without the intrusion of a male voice cannot help functioning as a censure of the Victorian double standard.

Yet, of greater importance is the very composition of the letter. Though the content of the letter might be too lengthy to be fully cited, it nevertheless needs our full attention.

May I write you for some very important advice — I have a decision to make and don't know just whom to trust most I dare not ask my parents — and so I come to you — and only because I need not see you, can I confide in you even. Now here is the situation — I married a man in U. S. service in 1929 and that same year he was sent to China, Shanghai — he staid three years — and came home — he was discharged from the service some few months ago — and went to his mother's home in Helena, Arkansas. He wrote for me to come home — I went, and found he is taking a course of injections and I naturally ask, and found he is being treated for I don't know how to spell the word but it sound like this "sifilus" — Do you know what I mean — now tell me will it ever be safe for me to live with him again —

I did not come in close contact with him at any time since his return from China. He assures me he will be O K after this doctor finishes with him — Do you think it right — I often heard my Father say one could well wish themselves dead if once they became a victim of that malady — I believe my Father but want to believe my Husband most — Please, please tell me what to do — I have a daughter born while her Father was in China — (CSS 320)

Her misspelling of the word “syphilis” suggests that she might hardly have heard the name of the disease spoken around her, or at least never seen it in the printed form. Yet she knows the problematical aspects of the disease partly because of her father’s instruction: “one could well wish themselves dead if once they became a victim of that malady.” This guilt-laden perception of the disease, like that of M. Loches in *Damaged Goods*, is transmitted to the daughter, who also imbues the disease with the sense of shame. She is, as it were, an exemplar of commonplace prudery about sexual matters in that she seems rather reluctant to broach the subject of the disease and continues lengthy explanations up until the middle of the letter; that she attempts to hide her husband’s disease from everyone around her — even from the local doctor; that she cannot articulate straightforward expressions about sexual matters and thereby employs euphemisms such as “live with him,” and “come in close contact with him” to mean “have sexual intercourse with her husband.” One of the most remarkable aspects of the letter is that, even to a person without any relationship to her real life, she thus falters in articulating the problem. The wife’s misspelling of “sifilus” for “syphilis” symbolizes the society’s complicity of silence⁹ about the venereal problem, the complicity which is severely attacked in *Damaged Goods*. The incorrect transcription of the word not only indicates the public ignorance about the problem but also embodies the silence surrounding the disease and its patients, the silence leading to tacit consent to avert their eyes from the disease itself.

Yet the conclusion attached to the end of the story informs us that she vaguely knows the cause of the disease — that the disease is sexually transmitted: “I don’t care what he did to get it” (CSS 321). Partial knowledge as acquired by the wife in this story, however, necessarily entails much worse psychological effects on a patient’s family. In spite of her husband’s insistence that “he will be O K after this doctor finishes with him,” she cannot fully believe in his healthy state, assumedly because of the hideous imagery implanted by her father. This is caused not by proper medical knowledge but by the groundless public belief about the disease, the belief which inflamed M. Loches in *Damaged Goods*. All these details of the story, with a tint of irony and pathos, accentuate the scheme, as seen in Brioux’s play, the scheme that prudery about sexual matters and the lack of education lead to the useless condemnation against venereal patients and bring about the needless familial disaster much worsened by the sense of shame on the part of each member of the family.¹⁰

Taking into account the above mentioned, we should consider that the relation-

ship between Hemingway, the author of this story, and Logan Clendening, the original recipient of the letter, is very much similar to that between the playwright Brioux and the famous syphilologist Fournier. As Brioux theoretically based his play upon Fournier's medical opinion, Hemingway was more or less affected by Clendening's best-selling books (Smith, *Reader's Guide* 298-99). Usurping the authority of the doctor as Brioux did in his play, Hemingway attempts to give an appropriate solution to the letter on behalf of the original recipient; by showing the woman's plight, he dispenses words to cure the public ignorance producing worse effects on people's minds than the disease itself does. Though by no means presenting any effectual solution to her, he shows that the root cause of the tragedy of the disease is her very attitude of prudery, silence, and ignorance. In one sense, by publishing this story, he dispenses a cure to society as a whole rather than to the wife as a person.

Hemingway's repeated attempts to resist social restrictions against vulgar language — especially concerning sexual matters — seem at a glance defiant of public morality; yet, though he himself might have believed so, under the surface of expression he sustained such morality as we have seen above. His alliance with physicians — unwittingly with Parran and openly with Clendening — provides us with a new perspective on his works: Hemingway attempted to strip off the shameful investment — or metaphor in Sontag's word — from venereal patients; in that sense, they were both predecessors of Sontag, who tried to eliminate the psychological stigma from, in her case, cancer. There being no evidence of their contracting venereal disease unlike the case of Sontag, they somehow needed to do this de-metaphorization. Playing the role of a doctor, and attempting to extenuate the immorality of the husband who committed the sin of promiscuity, Hemingway in this story tried to convert religious immorality into a simple mistake in its secular sense.

Notes

¹ First published in 1923 by Three Mountains Press in *Three Stories and Ten Poems* in limited edition.

² Hemingway wrote a letter to Horace Liveright about "Up in Michigan": "As for obscenities you and Mr. Smith [his editor] being on the spot know what is and what is not unpublishably obscene much better than I do" (*SL* 155).

³ Brandt records a lecture delivered to American soldiers in World War I: "the man who comes to his bride as *clean* and as *pure* as he expects that she will come to him will find the most perfect joy in the married state" (64, emphases are mine).

⁴ See Petry 353. "Unusually for Hemingway, the story is told essentially from Liz's point of view rather than from that of the main male character, Jim Gilmore."

⁵ "Boston Police Bar Scribner's Magazine," *New York Times*, 21 June 1929. Emphasis is mine.

⁶ For the circumstances around the play before the war, see Brandt 47. Quétel also states that "in 1913 it [*Damaged Goods*] was staged on Broadway after a 'Sociological Fund' created for the

purpose had collected the necessary monies to put on this militant play. There was even a special performance in Washington before President Wilson and the members of Congress — a political act intended to make an official break with the conspiracy of silence deplored by the American medical profession” (158). As to the period during the war, the note to the fourth edition of *Three Plays by Brieux* published in 1917, which contains this play, records that “the ban of the Censor has been removed from two of [the plays included in the volume].” And this is “because the war [...] has given the most urgent importance to Brieux’s subject-matter in the case of *Damaged Goods* [sic], which has been performed nightly for many months in London, and is still running at the St. Martin’s Theatre as I write” (viiiia).

⁷ Translation and the bracketed annotation is Leavy’s.

⁸ According to Paul Smith, “The only extended analysis of the story is Mark Edelson’s” (*Reader’s Guide* 299).

⁹ Edelson maintains that “The story’s theme is communication — and more especially *non*-communication — between people” (Edelson 330). This non-communication, recurrent motif in Hemingway’s works, can be enlarged from the personal problem as viewed by Edelson to that of the society as a whole, since the prudery and ignorance of the wife were typical of the ordinary people in those days.

¹⁰ In spite of the claim both by the doctor who treats the husband in “One Reader Writes” and by the doctor in *Damaged Goods*, syphilis had been incurable until penicillin was put to use in 1942. However, Brieux and Hemingway believed the contrary — that the disease was much more slight than it really was, following the theory of, respectively, Fournier and Clendening.

Chapter 8

That Awful Lust

We have seen in the previous two chapters that, while assuming the appearance of a libertine, Hemingway actually retained a deep-seated puritanical morality concerning sexuality. His challenge against the social code for acceptability of vulgar language, indeed provocative for some people, was in fact invalidated by his underlying morality implanted in his childhood. Though he is extremely infamous for his braggadocio about his own sexual experiences, most of which were actually disproved by material evidence, critics have reached a consensus about his attitude toward women and sexuality that he mostly led a life of puritanical rigidity. But if in his actual life Hemingway did lead a life according to such morality, we shall come upon two questions: the first is why he had to wear the mask of a libertine; and the second is why he was so much obsessed by the topic of venereal disease, especially in the form of a challenge against censorship. We shall, at the beginning of this chapter, posit a possible answer to both of these questions: he had to mitigate a guilt for his hidden sexual desire regarded by the social norm as “abnormal.”

As the posthumous publication of *The Garden of Eden* reveals, Hemingway had peculiar desires which people with puritanical rigidity would have thought of as abnormal. According to Carl P. Eby’s meticulous study of Hemingway’s sexual preference, the writer had various types of fetishism which had to be hidden from the public in order to protect his own personality showing off his manliness. Given his erotic disposition — as associated with “gender instability, narcissism, erotic attachment to hair, latent homosexuality, castration anxiety, and Oedipus complex” (2) — hidden under the surface of feigned masculinity; given these sexual drives, he had to reduce his consciousness of guilt and somehow to justify his sexual urge which could have otherwise much more agonized his personality nurtured in the puritanical morality. He, thus, desired to abandon the puritanical trait inherited from his parents, and to acquire a new personality which could tolerate such sexual preferences. In short, he did want to see himself as a libertine; he did have a wish to view his own desire from not the puritanical but the libertine viewpoint. As we have seen in the previous two chapters, however, he could never escape from the cultural environment in which he was raised. In this chapter, we shall begin by examining Rinaldi’s behavior after he noticed contracting syphilis in *A Farewell to Arms*. He is described as a typically libertine character in the novel, yet even he has to feel the sense of guilt knowing his infection.

The quotation below is the scene in which Rinaldi first exposes his anxiety about

infection:

“To hell with you,” Rinaldi said. “They try to get rid of me. Every night they try to get rid of me. I fight them off. What if I have it. Everybody has it. The whole world’s got it. First,” he went on, assuming the manner of a lecturer, “it’s a little pimple. Then we notice a rash between the shoulders. Then we notice nothing at all. We put our faith in mercury.”

“Or salvarsan,” the major interrupted quietly.

“A mercurial product,” Rinaldi said. He acted very elated now. “I know something worth two of that. Good old priest,” he said. “You’ll never get it. Baby will get it. It’s an industrial accident. It’s a simple industrial accident.” (175)

His detailed explanation of the condition reveals that he is in an incubation period between the secondary and tertiary stage.¹ Diseases having incubation periods, such as syphilis, cause their patients extreme anxiety because they have to endure the possible coming of the next stage not knowing whether they are cured of it or not. Rinaldi here is under the pressure of such anxiety. In addition, the treatment referred to in this passage, which was common before the discovery of penicillin, caused venereal patients inordinate agony: “Massive doses of mercury and iodides of potassium [sic] often led to serious complications: loss of teeth, tongue fissures, and hemorrhaging of the bowel. [...] These therapies [...] also entailed considerable pain, demonstrating the punitive position of the profession regarding diseases communicated in ‘immoral congress’” (Brandt 12). Rinaldi’s depressed and irritated attitudes might be the result of these agonized sufferings, and, what is more, he himself is at once a doctor and a patient so that he has to take “the punitive position” over himself. It is he who is most poignantly aware of the immorality of contracting the disease.

In this passage, moreover, we should notice Rinaldi’s strategy, whereby he attempts to reduce the stigmatic nature of the disease, immoral implication against himself, or “metaphor” in short. Syphilis has been attached to the notion of moral violation, the notion of degradation into the realm of depravity. Thus he tries to consider that “Everybody has it. The whole world’s got it.” For him, syphilis must be “an industrial accident.” The conception of syphilis as a punishment for moral violation and thus as the wrath of God is primarily a religious feeling. Rinaldi’s sudden vicious attacking of the priest at the mess can be explained by this association. The very existence of the priest is, for him, an accusation against his felt sense of depravity. Before contracting syphilis, he had no antipathy toward the priest; as he once says, “I like him” (65). However, after the infection, he associates syphilis with religious conception; he suddenly begins to bully the priest, because he has to defend himself from the alleged accusation of religious beliefs as represented by the priest.

Hereafter, we shall investigate how this attempt of Rinaldi’s is shaped throughout the course of the novel. From before he notices his infection to the time of the

quotation above, we should retrace the steps Rinaldi takes in his changing attitude toward sexual matters. His preference in women is clearly shown in the following quotation.

“Tell me [Frederic] about Gorizia. How are the girls?”

“There are no girls. For two weeks now they haven’t changed them. I [Rinaldi] don’t go there any more. It is disgraceful. They aren’t girls; they are old war comrades.”

“You don’t go at all?”

“I just go to see if there is anything new. I stop by. They all ask for you. It is a disgrace that they should stay so long that they become friends.”
(64-65)

Rinaldi’s desire to have new girls indicates that he requires of prostitutes, as most soldiers might do, not psychological communication but mere physical satisfaction; thus, if they stay in one place long enough to be regarded not as “girls” but as “old war comrades,” they no longer serve his initial purpose. This view, as we have already seen, contradicts the morality which social hygienists had advocated, for this way of making contact with women was considered as the most dangerous. In spite of this tendency toward women and sexuality, Rinaldi sustains the very evaluation of social hygienists as well: “I tell you something about your good women. Your goddesses. 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. [...] And you never know if the girl will really like it” (66). Here he divides women into two categories: one is “girls” who have no sexual desire, and the other is “women” who have one. This is the notion most typical of the Victorian genteel tradition which had been strongly supported by social hygienists.

These reports of the high rates of infection among prostitutes confirmed for many the notion of two types of women — good and bad, pure and impure, innocent and sensual. Venereal epidemiology was socially constructed upon this bifurcation. Accordingly, an ‘innocent’ woman could only get venereal disease from a ‘sinful’ man. But the man could only get venereal disease from a ‘fallen woman.’ This uni-directional mode of transmission reflected prevailing attitudes rather than any bacteriologic reality. (Brandt 31-32)

This stereotypical notion of womanhood not only exposes the Victorian double standard but, at the same time, supports the very male-centered ideology; for “These views make clear the way in which disease functioned metaphorically to define gender roles.” And the women’s role is, for those social hygienists, primarily “motherhood” (Brandt 16). In Rinaldi’s term, “girls” are for childbearing, and “women” for sexual pleasure. On account of these assumptions, Rinaldi’s advice foreshadows,

ominously, his contracting syphilis and, again ominously, Catherine's pregnancy.

Next, We shall turn to the scene after which Rinaldi has learned of his contracting syphilis. The quotation below depicts Frederic's returning to the unit after his recuperation from being wounded.

"Look, baby, this is your [Frederic's] old tooth-brushing glass. I [Rinaldi] kept it all the time to remind me of you."

"To remind you to brush your teeth."

"No. I have my own too. I kept this to remind me of you trying to brush away the Villa Rossa [a brothel] from your teeth in the morning, swearing and eating aspirin and cursing harlots. Every time I see that glass I think of you trying to clean your conscience with a toothbrush." He came over to the bed. "Kiss me once and tell me you're not serious."

"I never kiss you. You're an ape."

"I know, you are the fine good Anglo-Saxon boy. I know. You are the remorse boy, I know. I will wait till I see the Anglo-Saxon brushing away harlotry with a toothbrush." (168)

We should notice primarily that Rinaldi reveals his conception of going to brothels as a moral violation by way of bantering with Frederic's sense of guilt. Rinaldi, on the face of it, mocks Frederic's "remorse" which is primarily a religious feeling and attributed by Rinaldi to Frederic's being "the Anglo-Saxon" (which is repeated twice in the quotation) or, in this context, to his being a puritan; yet he unwittingly betrays that he is trapped by this religious conception of the disease. Frederic's remorse, which Rinaldi mocks here, is the same emotion as that which Rinaldi felt when he noticed his infection. Frederic once felt remorse after having intercourse with prostitutes, while Rinaldi is now feeling the same emotion because of the very same act yet with a more dreadful result. Rinaldi is a person who, as a doctor, should regard the disease purely as a biological phenomenon and who, as a patient of the disease, wants to regard it as deprived of the shameful investment. However, he not only betrays his entrapment into the value-laden conception of the disease but thereby emphasizes the fact that he and Frederic were doing the same act — and that it is unfair that Rinaldi alone had contracted the disease.

Fallen into this agonizing situation, he tries to overestimate the value of debauchery on which he is consequently to stake his own life. "Even with remorse you [Frederic] will have a better time." In spite of this desperate attempt to mitigate the painful remorse, he is forced to express a keen regret for his own act. "I am pure [...]. I am like you, baby. I will get an English girl too. As a matter of fact I knew your girl first but she was a little tall for me" (170-71). It is indeed he who approached Catherine first, but he gave her up for Frederic. And this decision consequently leads to Rinaldi's syphilis and to Frederic's bereavement. As Rinaldi remarks ("I am like you"), they are essentially the same kind of people. Frederic had also incessantly

been to the brothel, as shown in the quotation, and, what is more, he had even contracted gonorrhea (299) which was regarded as much less dangerous in the age. It is Catherine who divides them into different fates. The men who have intercourse with “women” contract syphilis, and are punished, or pay for their own moral violation; while the men who have intercourse with “girls” stay out of such peril. Thus, the social normalization of sexuality functions throughout this novel, for the normative sexual attitudes are strictly established by way of showing both Frederic’s and Rinaldi’s different fates.

Frederic’s fate with Catherine, however, is also painful; for the story ends in Catherine’s death. Meditating on her impending death, Frederic, in the famous passage, remarks thus:

Now Catherine would die. That was what you did. You died. You did not know what it was about. You never had time to learn. They threw you in and told you the rules and the first time they caught you off base they killed you. Or they killed you gratuitously like Aymo. Or gave you the syphilis like Rinaldi. But they killed you in the end. You could count on that. Stay around and they would kill you. (327)

Frederic’s anger against the gratuitousness of one’s destiny seems to equate his own position with Rinaldi’s contracting syphilis. One may conclude that Frederic also regards Rinaldi’s infection as gratuitous, or as, what Rinaldi calls, “an industrial accident,” which, by definition, means an unexpected result beyond human prevention. However, Catherine’s death is caused by her pregnancy, and the responsibility for the pregnancy, at least half of it, rests with Frederic.² Then, Frederic’s juxtaposition of her death with Rinaldi’s syphilis seems to assume a different tone. As Rinaldi justifies himself by way of regarding syphilis as “an industrial accident,” Frederic also justifies himself by this juxtaposition: Catherine’s death is also “an industrial accident.” Frederic must feel responsible for her pregnancy; thus, it is necessary for him to mitigate his sense of guilt, to think that her death is caused by something other than himself, namely, by a “gratuitous” reason.

The concept of “an industrial accident” appears again in another one of Hemingway’s works. In *Death in the Afternoon*, an essay written three years after *A Farewell to Arms*, Hemingway writes thus:

Syphilis was the disease of the crusaders in the middle ages. It was supposed to be brought to Europe by them, and it is a disease of all people who lead lives in which a disregard of consequences dominates. It is *an industrial accident*, to be expected by all those who lead irregular sexual lives and from their habits of mind would rather take chances than use prophylactics, and it is a to-be-expected end, or rather phase, of the life of all fornicators who continue their careers far enough. (101, emphasis is mine)

Here Hemingway tries to mitigate the sense of guilt for committing promiscuous intercourse with almost the same strategy as Rinaldi in *A Farewell to Arms* — syphilis is an *accident*. Yet he also maintains that the cause of infection is “irregular sexual lives.” If such a life causes one to contract syphilis, if one’s own behavior triggers infection, syphilis cannot be considered merely as an accident. Brought up in the stern Victorian tradition, Hemingway could not conceive of libertine lives as morally acceptable, whereas he also had a strong desire to be a libertine; thus denouncing the patients, while, at the same time, mitigating the sense of guilt of leading such lives. Resisting normative values, Hemingway, like Rinaldi in the story, wanted to regard such moral violators as “the normal.” The environment in which he had been brought up and the environment in which he reformed his evaluation in the period of sexual liberation always conflict with each other in his discourse, and the very conflict generates an ambivalent attitude toward sexual matters. And this split conception of syphilis indicates that he could never obtain the mitigation he desperately longed for as Rinaldi did — that he could never have relieved his sense of guilt about his hidden sexual desire.

As we have seen above, Hemingway could never escape from his innermost fear of syphilis, from his desire leading to moral violation, and from the received morality concerning sexual matters. He himself notices his own predicament, since in the deleted part of “Big Two-Hearted River,” posthumously published under the title, “On Writing,” he states thus: “It was the Madame planted all that asceticism. The Ghee [a friend of Nick’s] went with girls in houses in Cleveland but he had it, too. Nick had had it, too. It was all such a fake. You had this fake ideal planted in you and then you lived your life to it” (*NAS* 235). While going to a brothel to satisfy sexual desire, Nick and his friends nevertheless sustain the “asceticism,” which has been “planted” in them since their boyhood. While disparaging it as “a fake,” they can never escape from the fake.

Besides “One Reader Writes,” Hemingway wrote another story based on a letter sent to Clendening — “God Rest You Merry, Gentlemen.” The story provides us with Hemingway’s attempt to reconcile his deepest desire with the puritanical morality of the day. A boy comes to the hospital to be castrated because he cannot accept his burgeoning sexual desire to which he refers as “that awful lust” and “a sin against purity” (*CSS* 299-300). After he asks doctors to perform castration only to be rejected, he cuts off his own penis with a razor and is dying from excessive bleeding on Christmas Day. Considering Clendening’s constant charge against the inhuman and absurd (for the eyes of the scientific age) doctrines of religious institutions, and considering Hemingway’s sympathy with him as well, this story seems a condemnation of anachronistic beliefs in religion in favor of scientific medicine. The boy, in this line of analysis, is a trapped victim of erroneous piety that goes hand in hand with a lack of sex education, caused by society’s conspiratorial silence about sexual matters or the prudery typical of the puritanical society. Distressed by his uncontrollable desire, he decides to go to the hospital, not to a confessional.

Yet it is a curious fact that the role assigned to the doctors in the story does not properly function to support the superiority of medicine over religion. Doctor Wilcox, one of the two doctors, obviously lacks ability as a doctor, since he cannot get along without “*The Young Doctor’s Friend and Guide*, which, being consulted on any given subject, told symptoms and treatment” (CSS 298). His blind reliance on the guidebook without judging the case by himself reminds us not only of his inability but of the Pharisaic rigidity in obeying the written rules. The boy confesses his sin not to the priest with the Bible but to the doctor with a guidebook.³ Doc Fischer, the other doctor, also is powerless in the attempt to persuade the boy of his naturalness. The boy being about to die, the two doctors endlessly and aimlessly continue to quarrel as if to blame the boy’s impending death on each other; Doc Fischer insinuates Doctor Wilcox’s inability in the form of vulgar irony (“he was unable to find this emergency [the boy’s self-mutilation] listed in his book”), and Doctor Wilcox teases Doc Fischer about his pretending to be a Christian in spite of the fact that he is actually a Jew, a fact which Doc Fischer refers to as “my achilles tendon” (CSS 300-301). The boy, as it were, came to a confessional under a religious opposition between a Pharisee and a Christ-killer disguised as a Christian.⁴

There exists another character in the scene, when the boy visits the hospital — Horace, a journalist. He is the first person narrator of the tale and complicit with the silence around sexual matters. When Doc Fischer asks the boy what the problem is, the boy’s answer is summarized by the narrator thus: “The boy told him” (CSS 299). The boy’s consultation is, even though self-evident for the reader, left to the reader’s imagination. Similarly, the doctor attempts to give sex education to the boy to dissuade him from the foolish attempt of castration, and the narrator describes the scene thus: “[. . .] and he told the boy certain things” (CSS 300). The content of the “certain things” is not specified. The problem of sexuality is actually spoken and discussed, yet the narrator leaves it unmentioned in a way which reminds us of Victorian prudery. Essentially it is the same sort of silence on the part of the society that results in the tragic misunderstanding of the boy, the misunderstanding which is caused by the lack of appropriate sex education.

We should consider that this religio-medical image of the doctors and the prudery in sexual matters reflect Hemingway’s father, who was a doctor. In “Fathers and Sons,” his semi-autobiographical story, the protagonist, reading in the paper a singer’s arrest on charges of mashing, asks his father what “mashing” means.

“It is one of the most heinous of crimes,” his father answered. Nick’s imagination pictured 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. He resolved, with considerable horror, that when he was old enough he would try mashing at least once. (CSS 371)

This comical passage well captures the painful situation in which silence about sexual matters produces a crooked imagination investing the matter with much charged implications. Though this conversation might be fictional, the author's father is ostensibly the model for this typical Victorian character.⁵ If the boy in "God Rest You Merry, Gentlemen" is a victim of prudish morality, the problem that afflicts the boy also afflicted the author since his boyhood. In light of Hemingway's fear of violating the morality of the day, it is very likely that the boy, who desperately wants to deprive himself of "that awful lust" and who confesses his alleged sin to the priest-doctor, reflects the author's hidden sense of guilt for having "that awful lust." The boy's cut-off penis is a symbol of the author's forbidden sexual desire, and thus the boy's possible death is a vicarious expiation for his lust. Not successful in escaping both from the rigid puritanical morality and from his desire (unlike the boy in the story who succeeded at the cost of his own life), Hemingway sublimates his substitute into a victim, a martyr, or a Christ figure.

Though Hemingway declares in the posthumously published "fictional memoir," *True at First Light*, that "I was as afraid as the next man in my time and maybe more so. But with the years, fear had come to be regarded as a form of stupidity to be classed with overdrafts, acquiring a venereal disease or eating candies" (283), it is doubtful whether he really overcame the fear of syphilis; since the fear is tightly linked to the fear of his immoral sexual desire, which he could never abandon until death.⁶ The description of his medical treatment of venereal patients in an African village, the description which lasts as many as four pages long, rather betrays the considerable fear he once had in the pre-penicillin age. We should surmise that the sudden relief from the fear by the discovery of the antibiotic⁷ found an outlet for the suppressed anxiety in the form of the overabundant recording of his treatment and of the overemphasis of the tractability of the disease. In other words, though the fear of syphilis was removed by the antibiotic, the more fundamental fear that he was violating a deep-seated morality inscribed in his body must have remained to prick his sense of guilt. His desire itself was, as it were, like a crown of thorns on his head, tormenting his inner psyche throughout his life.

Hemingway, all through his lifetime, attempted to be seen as a manly man living the life of a libertine. Hemingway scholars have hitherto focused either on his licentious aspect that attempted to revolt against the genteel tradition of his hometown or on his hidden self that was recently discovered to be much more feminine than the outward disguise; however, as we have seen, his attitude toward sexuality cannot simplistically be determined as by previous critics. Rather he wavered all through his lifetime between his own desire prohibited in the puritanical society on the one hand and his inmost fear of the wrath of God as embodied in venereal diseases. Though many of his stories have heretofore been regarded as notoriously male-centered, these masculine faces seen in each story are rather his desire and, under the surface structure, they demonstrate that he had always been feeling the sense of guilt in pretending such faces.

Notes

- ¹ Normally syphilis is divided into three stages. For the details about each stage, see Quétel 80.
- ² In the course of Catherine's pregnancy, Frederic pays little attention to her condition. In particular, when she confides to Frederic that she is expecting a baby, he reveals his negative reaction to her pregnancy (137-38). See Part IV for the discussion of Catherine's pregnancy.
- ³ We should remember that, at the height of the anti-syphilitic movement at the beginning of the twentieth century, there was a consensus among doctors that "it is necessary to 'act as a confessor to the patient' in order to reduce [...] 'the moral pains of syphilis'" (Quétel 196). As to the religious discourse in "God Rest You Merry, Gentlemen," see Monteiro.
- ⁴ Regarding Hemingway and anti-Semitism, see Wilentz.
- ⁵ About the prudery of Hemingway's father, see Spilka.
- ⁶ See Eby for abundant biographical evidence.
- ⁷ The industrial production of penicillin began in 1941 in the United States. See Quétel 249.

Part IV

**Transgressing the Gender
Boundary:
Representations of Hair**

Chapter 9

Pregnancy and Sterilization

The prescription that women's hair should be long has been strongly observed in Christian countries since St. Paul's precept to the Corinthians.

Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?

But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering.

But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God. (1 Cor. 11.14-16)

"Although there have been many attempts to break away from this dictum of St Paul's," Desmond Morris says in *Body Watching*, "its influence is still with us to this day. Despite occasional hirsute rebellions by Cavaliers and Hippies, the shaggy, long-haired male has remained a rarity, and despite similar rebellions by bobbed and snipped modern females, the short-haired female has also proved to be a rare species [...]." Given that the length of hair functions as a sign indicating the difference between both sexes because of the strongly observed prescription about hairstyle, an abundant display of female hair is naturally vested with erotic meanings; thus, "too provocative for sexually inhibited societies" (32) such as Victorian America. We can find a typical example in *The Scarlet Letter*.

[...] she took off the formal cap that confined her hair; and down it fell upon her shoulders, dark and rich, with at once a shadow and a light in its abundance, and imparting the charm of softness to her features. [...] Her sex, her youth, and the whole richness of her beauty, came back from what men call the irrevocable past, and clustered themselves, with her maiden hope, and a happiness before unknown, within the magic circle of this hour. (Hawthorne 202)

This famous scene, in which Hester Prynne seduces Arthur Dimmesdale by the exposure of her abundant hair, teaches us how enormous an erotic power women's hair has: just to display rich flows of female hair functions as an act of sexual temptation. It is almost as if Morris commented on Hawthorne's romance when he says: "Puritans hated its sensuality, but were unable to demand its cropping because this would have made it unfeminine and contrary to the law of God as laid down by St. Paul" (32). Women cannot cut their hair because the image culturally assigned to

women strictly prohibits the act, while women must keep hiding their hair because their ample tresses function as a powerful sexual symbol. In other words, we can understand through representations of women's hair in the nineteenth century literature that femininity itself was at once preserved and feared in the Victorian era.

In the 1920s, however, Western societies witnessed women's revolution against the traditional prescription: they cut their hair short as well as exposed it in public. This widely prevalent popularity of women's short hair is partly explained as a result of the radical surge in the women's liberation movement. Grant McCracken, in his study of hairstyles, follows this line:

The 1920s were the time of the great bob rebellion. Women threw off the elaborate hairstyles of the last two centuries. The suffragette movement that swept North America, transforming voting privileges and clothing styles, also created pressure for a new look, for something that cut away that great symbol of women's oppression, her "crowning glory." Women across the country went to men's barbershops and demanded to have their hair cut short. (162)

Whatever caused this reactionary craze, women's bobbed hair would have immensely affected people's gender conception in those days, who had taken for granted that long hair was natural for women. Being accustomed to seeing short-haired women today, we might be prevented from understanding fully the impact which people in those days felt when they first saw this innovative hair style. To begin with, it is necessary to see the record of this impact. Scott Fitzgerald's "Bernice Bobs Her Hair," written in 1920, is a perfect example. As the title suggests, the story's central theme is Bernice's act of cutting her hair short. When the story begins, Bernice is all but ignored by boys around her and because of her failure to behave socially in public she is regarded as a nuisance even by her niece, Marjorie. To find a way out of this miserable situation, Bernice asks her niece to tell her how to become popular among boys. The most effective way Marjorie teaches her is to tell them she will bob her hair. Having never seen a short-haired woman before, boys are fascinated by such an "unmoral" (37) idea; successful at her attempt, Bernice soon becomes the center of their attention. But there emerges a pang of jealousy on the part of Marjorie, so she tricks Bernice into really cutting her hair.

"I want you to bob my hair."

The first barber's mouth slid somewhat open. His cigarette dropped to the floor.

"Huh?"

"My hair — bob it!"

Refusing further preliminaries, Bernice took her seat on high. A man in the chair next to her turned on his side and gave her a glance, half lather,

half amazement. One barber started and spoiled little Willy Schuneman's monthly haircut. [...]

Outside a passer-by stopped and stared; a couple joined him; half a dozen small boys' noses sprang into life, flattened against the glass; and snatches of conversation borne on the summer breeze drifted in through the screen-door. (43)

Seeing people's reactions to Bernice's act described here, we can clearly understand how strongly women in those days were prescribed by the traditional assumption to wear long hair. After the passage quoted above, Bernice takes revenge by cutting Marjorie's hair while she is asleep. In this story, women's short hair is almost inconceivable, and it is not too much to say that her act is a hideous crime to shock people around her. Though attracting attention because of its immorality, the actual cropping of her hair causes Bernice a great pain; thus, the very same act of cutting Marjorie's hair is a means to her revenge.

On the other hand, Hemingway's response to women's short hair is completely different from Fitzgerald's. He never showed any repugnance for bobbed hair, but depicted it as a fascinating practice, which can be seen in the description of Brett Ashley's hair in *The Sun Also Rises*. It is fairly reasonable to surmise that Hemingway was less bounded by the traditional conception of women's hair than his contemporaries. He even praises in *The Sun Also Rises* the iconoclastic novelty of Brett's short hair, saying "She started all that" (30). Yet his positive response to women's short hair was not rendered from the viewpoint of the women's liberation movement. As many critics note,¹ Brett Ashley is not so independent a character as assumed at first sight. She is engaging with Mike Campbell at the beginning of the novel, and, at the closing scene, she is completely helpless without Jake's help after she leaves her lover, Pedro Romero. She always needs men to be with her, almost unable to live without her men. In addition, we are told that she feels a strong repugnance for her own sexual desire. In Hemingway's fictional world, there appear quite a few women cutting their hair short, yet cropped hair is never charged with the notion of "women's liberation," except for in one of his last novels, the unfinished *The Garden of Eden*. It is very likely that he perceived the newly spread hairstyle of women in a different way from his contemporaries.

"Cat in the Rain," one of the most famous short stories of Hemingway's early career, is indispensable in assessing his conception of women's hair. The story depicts a newlywed American couple staying in an Italian hotel. The wife is introduced when she is looking out of a window of their room to see the rainy garden of the hotel, while her husband is reading a book paying no attention to his wife. Finding a cat crouching under a table in the garden for shelter from the rain, she suddenly realizes that she wants the cat and goes out to obtain it. But when she comes out to the garden, the cat has already disappeared. She comes back to the room fairly distressed, but her husband shows only an outward concern with her unfulfilled wish. After a

brief quarrel between the couple, possibly caused by the husband's indifference to his wife, the story ends with the episode in which the hotelkeeper has a maid bring "a big tortoise-shell cat" for the wife.

There is a persistent dispute among Hemingway scholars over the question of whether the symbolical act of her wanting the cat signifies that she *wants to have a baby* or that she *has already been pregnant*. A fuller discussion about this problem lies outside the scope of our discussion, but, for the convenience of proceeding the argument, we shall briefly examine Hemingway's letter addressed to Fitzgerald:

Cat in the Rain wasnt [sic] about Hadley. I know that you and Zelda always thought it was. When I wrote that we were at Rapallo but Hadley was 4 months pregnant with Bumby. The Inn Keeper was the one at Cortina D'Ampezzo and the man and the girl were a harvard kid and his wife that I'd met at Genoa. Hadley never made a speech in her life about wanting a baby because she had been told various things by her doctor and I'd — no use going into all that. (Ernest Hemingway to F. Scott Fitzgerald, December 24, 1925. *SL* 180)

In this letter, Hemingway attempts to make his friend believe that the model of the couple in the story is not the author and his wife. Because of not a few inconsistent statements which conflict with biographical fact, opinions are divided among critics as to the validity of his insistence. Yet, the important point for us is what he offers as a ground for his insistence that his wife is not the model for the American girl in the story: the fact that his wife has "never made a speech [...] about wanting a baby." Then it seems reasonable to suppose that the American girl, in fact, wants to have a baby though not making a speech. And the most intriguing point is, as we will see below, the subtle relationship between the length of her hair and her desire to have a baby.

Let us look at the text in detail. Throughout the story, we are told that the husband is indifferent to his wife. At the opening lines of the story, the husband all but ignores his wife: even when she declares that she will bring the cat in from the rainy garden, he continues to read his book without so much as looking toward her. It seems that she has been dissatisfied with such attitudes of her husband. After she returns to the room unsuccessful in her attempt, he still pays no attention to her in spite of her profound disappointment. Though he briefly looks away from the book, it is not to look at his wife but merely to rest his eyes, tired from reading for many hours. Without listening to his wife's sudden burst of various complaints about her present life, he continues to read the book. His indifference to his wife is well displayed in the description of his gaze, for he never sees her until the closing scene of the story; however, after the wife suggests that she will cut her hair, the husband suddenly pays intense attention to the wife. This sudden change in his attitude toward her strikes us with the impression that he is in fact obsessed by her hairstyle.

“Don’t you think it would be a good idea if I let my hair grow out?” she asked, looking at her profile again.

George *looked up and saw* the back of her neck, clipped close like a boy’s.

“I like it the way it is.”

“I get so tired of it,” she said. “I get so tired of looking like a boy.”

George shifted his position in the bed. He *hadn’t looked away* from her since she started to speak. (CSS 131, emphases are mine)

The husband has theretofore ignored his wife, but as soon as she says that she wants to grow her hair he suddenly “looked up and saw” her and “hadn’t looked away” from her. This abrupt attention on the part of the husband deserves much consideration. We can surmise from the quotation above that it is the wife’s suggestion of changing her hairstyle, now “clipped close like a boy’s,” that aroused his persistent attention. Hemingway scholars since Spilka’s influential study have regarded representations of changing hairstyles, recurrent in all his works, as manifestations of an androgynous desire he was alleged to have had — the hidden desire to fuse with female partners by way of cutting their hair exactly alike. But unlike the description of tonsorial experiments in *The Garden of Eden* or *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, this wife’s desire to grow her hair in “Cat in the Rain” seems unrelated to such androgynous desire. The representation of hair, at least in this story, must be rendered with another intent.

If the story depicts the wife’s desire to have a baby, as we have seen above, it is very likely that her wanting to grow her hair long is a manifestation of her hidden desire to become pregnant. It is fairly reasonable to surmise that the length of hair in this story indicates the ability of reproduction: her insistence that she wants to “let [her] hair grow out” and wear a more womanly hairstyle than her present style “clipped close like a boy’s” can be interpreted as her desire to become more feminized, to reaffirm her identity as a woman, and to recover the ability to be pregnant.

As many anthropologists have investigated, it is almost universally believed, at least in primitive communities, that hair has mystic powers. A Westerner would be well acquainted with the famous episode of Samson and Delilah, in which Samson’s hair is represented as the source of his essential life force. Moreover, James G. Frazer in *The Golden Bough*, of which Hemingway had three copies in his library, devotes fourteen pages to elaborate accounts of symbolic meanings of hair found in various primitive tribes.² In addition, an aficionado of bullfighting would never fail to think of “coleta” or a matador’s pigtail, about which Hemingway explains in “An Explanatory Glossary of Certain Words, Terms, and Phrases Used in bullfighting,” attached to *Death in the Afternoon* (396). It is natural that Hemingway, who was well informed with anthropological knowledge and Frazer’s monumental work,³ assigned to the length of women’s hair the symbolical function of procreativity.

The schema that the length of female hair indicates the fertility of its wearer resonates throughout Hemingway’s work. For example, Catherine Barkley in *A*

Farewell to Arms is the only person in his whole body of works who is dissuaded by the protagonist from cutting her hair; and, as is well known, she becomes pregnant and dies when she delivers her baby at the end of the novel. Marie Morgan in *To Have and Have Not* once wore long hair when she gave birth to two daughters; while, in the story, she cuts her hair short and loses the ability to bear children. Helen Gordon in the same novel, who is a long-haired woman, needs to take contraceptive pills and undergo abortions over and over because her husband does not want babies: "Love is ergoapiol pills to make me come around because you were afraid to have a baby. Love is quinine and quinine and quinine until I'm deaf with it. [...] It's half catheters and half whirling douches" (185-86). Maria in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* has her hair cut by the Falangists when raped, and the possibility is suggested that she has lost the ability to become pregnant: "It is possible that I can never bear thee either a son or a daughter for the Pilar says that if I could it would have happened to me with the things which were done" (354). Catherine in *The Garden of Eden* also cuts her hair according to her desire to transgress the gender boundary and believes that she is sterile: "I thought if I'd be a girl and stay a girl I'd have a baby at least. Not even that" (71).

Then, in "Cat in the Rain," the husband's curious tenacity to oppose the wife's suggestion to change her hairstyle offers us an important topic for further investigation: his stubborn adherence to his wife's short hair, taking into account its symbolic meaning, should be regarded as his reluctance in accepting his wife's pregnancy. To put it more explicitly, by forcing her to cut her hair short, he symbolically attempts to "sterilize" her. In many cultures, cutting one's hair has been regarded as an important ritual, as Desmond Morris states: "psychoanalysts have interpreted the cropping of male hair as displaced castration" (29). It is very likely that Hemingway appropriated this schema to his own end: to cut women's hair is to sterilize female reproductive ability.

Notes

¹ See, for example, Martin.

² Frazer 193-207.

³ Jeffrey Meyers looked over Brasch and Sigman's *Hemingway's Library: A Composite Record*, and located not only *The Golden Bough* but "fifty-seven books on Indians," and "Sigmund Freud's *Basic Writings*, which included *Totem and Taboo* (1913)" to conclude that Hemingway "was well read in anthropology" (304).

Chapter 10

In Pursuit of Femininity

If Hemingway considered women's hair as a symbol of female procreative ability as we have seen in the previous chapter, men's hair also must be laden with a certain significance. He frequently depicted scenes in which a man and a woman attempt to identify with each other by arranging their hairstyle exactly the same. Considering that he wrote not only about women's but also about men's tonsorial experiments, we should investigate more in detail the cultural background of haircutting to fully understand his deep-seated conception of hair. According to McCracken, in Western societies only women can be admitted to the realm of expressive power of hairstyle (37). Men wearing long hair or dyeing their hair are not a rare species today, yet those men who are particular about their hairstyle had been despised as unmanly until half a century ago. Men had to cut their hair uniformly short, showing off that they held no particular interest in their own hairstyle. In short, the primary purpose of cutting their hair short was to deny the rich expressiveness human hair essentially has; and, in so doing, they tried to imply that they did not have any intention of decorating their hair as women do. Hemingway also considered those males who are conscious of their hair as being outside of the male normative value. Homosexuals appearing in the early part of *The Sun Also Rises*, for example, are marked by the whiteness of their skin and their elaborately arranged hair: "I could see their hands and *newly washed, wavy hair* in the light from the door. [. . .] As they went in, under the light I saw white hands, *wavy hair*, white faces, grimacing, gesturing, talking" (28, emphases are mine). *Death in the Afternoon* also records an episode, in which a man dyes his hair immediately after being converted to a homosexual.

In Hemingway's stories, a man who is conscious of his hair is always charged with (for him) a negative value of being a homosexual. Then when we read the following scene in *A Farewell to Arms*, we must bear in mind that in Hemingway's mind men with long hair primarily deviated from the normative value:

"[. . .] Darling, why don't you let your hair grow?"

"How grow?"

"Just grow a little longer."

"It's long enough now."

"No, let it grow a little longer and I could cut mine and we'd be just alike only one of us blonde and one of us dark."

"I wouldn't let you cut yours." (299)

The tonsorial experiment of cutting a woman's hair and growing a man's hair to be "just alike" is proposed by a female character, and Frederic refuses to do it.¹ To protect the masculine image of himself, it is fairly reasonable to suppose that Hemingway could not encourage his protagonist to deviate from the male normative hairstyle. Nevertheless, he betrays his fascination with the rich expressiveness of hair by depicting at least the suggestion of a man's wearing the hairstyle suitable to the opposite sex.

Hemingway's attitude toward an attempt to transgress the boundary into femininity gradually began to change at the end of the 1930s, and at the same time the hostile representations of female hair, rendered, in our argument, for the purpose of sterilizing female procreative ability, also disappeared in this period. Those who are killed such as Catherine Barkley or those who are forced to abort their children such as Helen Gordon are no longer found in Hemingway's works. The turn of the decade was for Hemingway a period of transition in which he came to terms with femininity and female procreative ability. *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, written in this period, includes a motif of tonsorial experiment similar to that of *A Farewell to Arms*, and to compare both scenes clarifies the change that occurred in Hemingway's conception of femininity and masculinity in this period:

"But in Madrid I [Robert Jordan] thought we could go together to the coiffeur's and they could cut it 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."

"I would look like thee," she said and held him close to her. "And then I never would want to change it." (345)

The scene quoted above is similar to that of *A Farewell to Arms*, in that a couple attempt to identify with each other through arranging their hair to look alike. However, the significance the scene conveys to the reader is completely different. In *A Farewell to Arms*, the tonsorial experiment is proposed by a female character and refused by a male character; while, on the contrary, in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, it is Jordan who suggests to Maria that she cut her hair as his own. On the simplest level, he tells her to arrange her hair neatly that was cropped by the Falangists, yet, as we can see from his expression ("as they cut mine") and Maria's response ("I would look like thee"), he is well aware of their appearance becoming similar to each other after the haircutting.

What is more, we should notice that Jordan has long hair: at the beginning of the story, his superior, General Golz advises him to cut his hair ("you need a haircut" [8]); and, in the middle of the story, Maria suggests cutting his hair ("I will borrow the scissors of Pilar and cut thy hair" [172]). On both occasions, he refuses to cut his hair. Then a fairly intriguing point to notice is Jordan's suggestion to cut their hair alike; for it implies that he has his hair cut short, considering the length of Maria's hair. In Jordan's conception, this attempt to cut his hair is not to deny the expressiveness

of hair, for he is aware of the effect the haircutting would create. Hemingway had theretofore negatively responded to such attempts until *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, and this is the first time he depicted a male character who transgresses against the male normative value about hairstyles.

Indeed, in *A Farewell to Arms*, Catherine expresses repeatedly the desire to identify with Frederic (“There isn’t any me any more” [106]. “There isn’t any me. I’m you. Don’t make up a separate me” [115]. “We really are the same one” [139]), but he avoids all these appeals. On the other hand, the desire to become united is shared by both Jordan and Maria. The following quotation starts with Maria’s comment:

“Afterwards we will be as one animal of the forest and be so close that neither one can tell that one of us is one and not the other. Can you not feel my heart be your heart?”

“Yes. There is no difference.”

“Now, feel. I am thee and thou art me and all of one is the other. And I love thee, oh, I love thee so. Are we not truly one? Canst thou not feel it?”

“Yes,” he said. “It is true.”

“And feel now. Thou hast no heart but mine.”

“Nor any other legs, nor feet, nor of the body.” (262)

Unlike in the case of *A Farewell to Arms*, Jordan responds with ardor to Maria’s desire to become one and the same person. Though still it is a female character who initiates the topic, Jordan’s response grows gradually more and more eager and ecstatic as he replies to Maria’s suggestion. According to Pilar, from the beginning they look very similar to each other (“You could be brother and sister by the look” [67]); by cutting their hair exactly alike, they want to encourage further the androgynous fantasy that they are really the same person, the fantasy to become united by transgressing the gender boundary.

In this context, Gerry Brenner’s analysis of Jordan’s narrative should be fairly important for us. Brenner argues that a characteristic of his narrative as quoted below is charged with a feminine quality:

They were having now and before and always and now and now and now. Oh, now, now, now, the only now, and above all now, and there is no other now but thou now and now is thy prophet. Now and forever now. Come now, now, for there is no now but now. Yes, now. Now, please now, only now, not anything else only this now, and where are you and where am I and where is the other one, and not why, not ever why, only this now; and on and always please then always now, always now, for now always one now [...]. (379)

Brenner argues that “the whole passage reads like the semiotic style that Julia Kristeva associates with women — repetitive, spasmodic, rhythmic, nonstructured”

(137). He also cites the theories of Irigaray and Cixous to insist on a feminine quality in this passage. In this point, Jordan's narrative sets up a clear distinction from what is generally thought of as characteristics of the Hemingway style — a series of terse, short, declarative sentences without unnecessary flourishes of adjectives and adverbs.

As we can see from the fact that Jordan obtains feminine narrative characteristics, to possess femininity, for Hemingway, means to possess female productive ability. In his mind, the female biological ability of reproduction is symbolically identified with the creativity of artistic works.² Since artistic professions are traditionally assigned to women in Western cultures, Hemingway naturally could not help being aware of the feminine aspect of his profession.³ It seems natural that "hair," "procreative ability," and "creative activities," all of which are culturally or biologically prescribed as women's attributes, come to be interconnected with one another in Hemingway's mind.

It is, then, worth noting that the role of the best story teller in the novel is assigned to a female character, Pilar. Fascinated by her tale of the first day of the Spanish Civil War, Jordan meditates on her skills of vivid representations of actual events:

If that woman could only write. He would try to write it and if he had luck and could remember it perhaps he could get it down as she told it. God, how she could tell a story. She's better than Quevedo, he thought. He never wrote the death of any Don Faustino as well as she told it. I wish I could write well enough to write that story, he thought. (134)

As we can see from his ardent adoration of her talent, Pilar is presented in this novel as an exemplary model for Jordan who is a would-be writer. After listening to Pilar's tale, he seeks to acquire creativity peculiar to the female. With "her thick curly black hair [. . .] twisted into a knot on her neck," Pilar has this feminine productivity embodied by her rich hair.⁴

Jordan's quest for femininity and his attempt to transgress the gender boundary, however, are suddenly suspended when he realizes his own maleness near the end of the story. On the night before the destruction of the bridge, he and Maria cannot have sexual intercourse, for Maria cannot accept him because of "a great soreness and much pain" (341). After that Maria tells him the painful memory of her being raped by the Falangists. Causing Maria the pain during the unfulfilled sexual intercourse, and being told about the rape she suffered, he cannot help being aware of the inevitable violent nature of his sex: however highly he appraises femininity and harbors feminine qualities in his inner psyche; however desperately he wants to transgress the gender boundary, he is faced with the gruesome fact that he and the rapists could inflict pain on women through the very same act of sexual intercourse. In short, Jordan here is forced to identify himself with a rapist.

As she regains her femininity with her hair growing near the end of the story,

the fantasy of their identification with each other beyond the gender boundary can no longer be sustained; and through the course of this disruption of their fantasy, Jordan grows more and more aware of his masculinity. Hereafter we will see how his orientation toward femininity is redirected to masculinity.

As Spilka points out (246-47), the relationship between Pablo, the leader of the guerrilla band, and his wife Pilar reflects Hemingway's father and mother: in both families, the husband is a coward (or so at least in Hemingway's eyes) and cannot confront his wife's domineering presence in the home; and the wife takes control of other members in place of her husband. And the contrast between the masculine duty represented by the father and the feminine creativity represented by the mother in Hemingway's family is also transplanted into the quasi-family structure of the guerrilla band in the novel.

Once you accept the idea of demolition as a problem it is only a problem. But there was plenty that was not so good that went with it although God knows you took it easily enough. There was the constant attempt to approximate the conditions of successful assassination that accompanied the demolition. Did big words make it more defensible? Did they make killing any more palatable? [...] But my guess is you will get rid of all that by writing about it, he said. Once you write it down it is all gone. (165)

While women have the ability to produce, what Jordan, as a man, has to do is a destructive and violent action of blowing up the bridge. This quotation keenly conveys his doubt about the destruction and slaughter he is going to carry out. And the doubt can be removed only by the creative activity of "writing about it."

Jordan's father, like the author's, has committed suicide, and Jordan regards him as a coward. Given that he rejects his father and that he refuses to accept Pablo, who is also a father figure as discussed above, as an obstacle to perform his duty to blow up the bridge, the first half of the story lays stress more on the feminine values of creativity than on the masculine destructive force. At the end of the novel before the attack, however, as is well known, Jordan is reconciled with Pablo, and possibly with his own father vicariously through this surrogate father figure.

He [Jordan] put his hand out and said, "*Suerte, Pablo,*" and their two hands gripped in the dark.

Robert Jordan, when he put his hand out, expected that it would be like grasping something reptilian or touching a leper. He did not know what Pablo's hand would feel like. But in the dark Pablo's hand gripped his hard and pressed it frankly and he returned the grip. Pablo had a good hand in the dark and feeling it gave Robert Jordan the strangest feeling he had felt that morning. (404, emphasis is original)

After this reconciliation, Pilar yields her control of the guerrilla band to her husband,

and the patriarchal power relationship in the quasi-familial band is restored.

After all, Jordan cannot transgress the boundary splitting femininity from masculinity. At the closing paragraph of the novel, he is waiting to meet the approaching enemies, staying in the realm of masculine duty and values at the cost of his own life. Of course he cannot fulfill the promise of tonsorial experiment with Maria. This ending of the novel tells us that Hemingway, at this stage of his life, could not complete his attempt to come to terms with femininity to the extent to which he could approach it in *The Garden of Eden*, which he started to write about six years later. Hemingway, allegedly a masculine writer, chose at the last instance to remain in the realm of masculinity. However, *For Whom the Bell Tolls* takes an important position shifting from the period of misogyny to that of the desire to transgress the gender boundary: in the 1920s and the first two thirds of the 30s, he attempted to sterilize feminine reproductive ability; yet, in the 40s, he strongly desired to acquire the feminine creative force. This novel should be marked by his first step into feminine territory.

In *The Garden of Eden*, the relationship is clearer than in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* between tonsorial experiment and artistic creativity. With a man's hesitant but steady approaching to femininity and a woman's desire to obtain masculine prerogative being intermingled with each other, the story goes around the axis of practices of cutting hair. In the first half of the story, a newly-wed writer and his wife peacefully enjoy their honeymoon trip. At first, the wife is fairly content with her husband's writing about their married life. However, in the middle of the story, David, the writer, stops writing about them to begin writing "An African Story," the story of his youth, in which he is directly opposed to his father about killing an elephant. As he gradually becomes absorbed in the story, losing interest in Catherine, his wife, she tries by whatever means necessary to attract his attention to her, only in vain. This breach in their conjugal relationship finally drives her into insanity at the end of the story.

When the story begins, David believes that he is so far getting along with his wife, and never imagines that his wife in fact secretly harbors discontent for their married life. But one day, when Catherine suddenly wants to bring a change into their life, David, for the first time has a doubt about her satisfaction: "Now when they had made love they would eat and drink and make love again. It was a very simple world and he had never been truly happy in any other. He thought that it must be the same with her and certainly she acted in that way but today there had been this thing about the change and the surprise" (14). The "change" and the "surprise" mean the sexual role reversal, in which Catherine has her hair cropped short like a boy and plays the part of a man in their sexual intercourse. It is clear that she is dissatisfied by her assigned role of a woman.

Catherine's dissatisfaction is made clearer in the quarrel with David about book reviews on his novel. She hates to see that David is deeply immersed in reading the reviews without even noticing that he has drunk the vermouth, and this brings about

the first quarrel in their married life. We can find in Catherine's complaint her essential dissatisfaction about her role: while David produces works as a writer, she is only a housewife without ever producing anything meaningful. The following conversation is exchanged between Catherine and a waiter, who is told that the reviews David is reading are about his novel:

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

"No," the girl [Catherine] said not looking up from the clippings. "Madame is a *housewife*." (24, emphasis is mine)

The term, "housewife" has a negative implication of confining a woman within a household.⁵ By calling herself a "housewife," she attempts to emphasize the contrast between David, who has a career as a writer, and herself, who is just a housewife.

There are numerous signs that indicate Catherine's discontent about her role as a woman. When David says that he likes her "as a girl," Catherine tells him that to be a girl is "a god damned bore."

"[...] Do you want me to wrench myself around and tear myself in two because you can't make up your mind? Because you won't stay with anything?"

"Would you hold it down?"

"Why should I hold it down? You want a girl don't you? Don't you want everything that goes with it? Scenes, hysteria, false accusations, temperament isn't that it?" (70)

The list of feminine qualities she enumerates is a typical example of the negative evaluation the male has attributed to femininity. Ernest Hemingway, allegedly a misogynist writer, seems rather sympathetic to women's gender role in that he consciously has Catherine denounce the from-the-male-viewpoint negative characterization of various feminine aspects. Her statement before she leaves David, "because I'm married to you [that] doesn't make me your slave or your chattel" (225), sounds like a familiar feminist criticism blaming the male dominance over female role in the household, though it is uttered by a half-crazed woman with little reasonable sense of what she is doing.

Moreover, Catherine also feels dissatisfied by her role as a woman in sexual intercourse. As the story develops, we come to see her being in a painful torment when she has to play the part of a woman though she actually feels herself as a man:

"You aren't really a woman at all," Marita said.

"I know it," Catherine said. "I've tried to explain it to David often enough. Isn't that true, David?"

David looked at her and said nothing.

“Didn’t I?”

“Yes,” he said.

“I did try and I broke myself in pieces in Madrid to be a girl and all it did was break me in pieces,” Catherine said. “Now all I am is through. You’re a girl and a boy both and you really are. You don’t have to change and it doesn’t kill you and I’m not. And now I’m nothing.” (192)

Marita, who has a homosexual relationship with Catherine, considers that she is not “really a woman.” And blaming David, Catherine states that it is because she had to try “to be a girl” that she broke herself in pieces. In her opinion, because David can be “a girl and a boy both,” he does not “have to change” into either sex, and to play the other sex “doesn’t kill” his mental stability unlike in the case of Catherine. Desiring the social status that is limited to men, and wanting to do sexual acts as a man, yet being biologically nothing but a woman, Catherine gradually harbors an envious feeling for David. He has both feminine and masculine privileges — artistic creativity to produce a work and the social status to publish it, while Catherine has lost the former and originally lacks the latter.

While David is working on the work of their married life, Catherine does not show this discontent. Yet, finding that her husband begins to be absorbed in writing about his younger years in “An African Story,” Catherine suddenly exposes her envy for his creative ability. In order to attract his attention from the work to her, she attempts to bring a change into their sexual intercourse, cropping her own hair as well as requesting her husband’s hairstyle be arranged like her own, and changing their sexual roles in their intercourse. This relationship is a reversal of what is described in “Cat in the Rain,” in which the husband tries to deprive his wife of her reproductive ability. In this novel, it is Catherine who attempts to deprive her partner of his creativity by means of cutting his hair. In short, she tries to “sterilize” his creative energy.

Catherine’s attempt, however, never actually succeeds. To cut her own hair and to imitate the role of a man in order to procure male social status and to usurp her husband’s ability as a writer goes nowhere, resulting, on the contrary, in losing her own ability to create a work.

“[...] The whole way here I saw wonderful things to paint and I can’t paint at all and never could. But I know wonderful things to write and I can’t even write a letter that isn’t stupid. I never wanted to be a painter nor a writer until I came to this country. Now it’s just like being hungry all the time and there’s nothing you can ever do about it.” (53)

Her desire to write grows greater and greater, yet she does not have any means to fulfill the desire. Her hunger forever torments her, and is only vicariously quenched by seeing her husband write about her in his novel.⁶ Considering that she cannot have a baby, Catherine’s short hair symbolizes that she has lost her womb both in a

literal sense and as a metaphor indicating the rich fount of creative energy.⁷

After arranging his hair like his wife, David, in spite of Catherine's intention, seems more and more to acquire creative energy: it is only after doing the tonsorial experiment that he begins writing "An African Story" with great speed (93). David's hairstyle is indeed short yet not to deny the rich expressiveness of hair as every man did at the time in which the novel was published; for, to match his hairstyle with his wife's naturally earns the expressive force implying that he is "a girl and a boy both." By means of cutting his hair, by means of transgressing the gender boundary, David acquires the feminine quality and the creativity peculiar to the female. It is evidenced by the fact that, near the final stage of the novel, he, who is at a standstill in writing "An African Story," regains creative energy to complete the work by means of the second tonsorial experiment with Catherine.

At the end of the novel, Catherine leaves David and David is united with a more womanly character, Marita. This ending seems another example of anticlimax like in the case of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, yet it was chosen by an editor, Tom Jenks, among the possible endings numerous left behind in Hemingway's unfinished manuscripts. We can never know how Hemingway was actually going to end the novel.

Notes

¹ Actually what Frederic grows in the novel is not hair but a beard, a typical symbol of masculinity.

² Biographical evidence confirms this hypothesis. In his family, creative activities were always associated with femininity: Hemingway's mother, Grace was an opera singer, and instructed her children in music and literature. She represented artistic activities in Hemingway's household. On the other hand, his father, Clarence, teaching his sons how they should behave in hunting and fishing, represented masculine responsibility and values. The chapter entitled "Arts and Sciences" in Carlos Baker's biography describes the newly built house of the Hemingways in 1907 as reflecting the opposite aspects of the mother's artistic talent and the father's scientific personality as a doctor. The role assignment of his father's labor and his mother's artistic activity would have infiltrated young Hemingway's mind. And the contrast between the Oak Park home, which was dominated by the mother's influence, and the Michigan cottage, in which Hemingway learned the skill of fishing and hunting from the father also implanted the notion that artistic activities were attributed to women's role. See C. Baker 8-17.

³ For example, Marilyn Elkins states thus: "Certainly, America's greatest public writer has always had to be male, a man's man who was easily recognizable as a fearless sportsman and bon vivant, for Americans have a well-established idea that culture is not useful and that artists and writers are ineffectual. Therefore, Americans view culture as feminine and the men who deal in it as effeminate and unimportant to the 'real world.' From Walt Whitman to Norman Mailer, American crossover writers — those who have appealed to consumers of both low and high culture — have displayed the guises of masculinity, regardless of their private practices" (94-95).

⁴ Considering that she is a bisexual, she has both feminine creativity to produce artistic works on the one hand and the masculine social status to open her works to the public on the other. Catherine Borne, as we will see below, does not have this latter condition to publish her work.

⁵ According to the *Random House Unabridged Dictionary* “HOUSEWIFE is offensive to some, perhaps because of an implied contrast with *career woman* (*just a housewife*) and perhaps because it defines an occupation in terms of a woman’s relation to a man.”

⁶ Catherine repeatedly insists in the novel that she cannot write a work: “I can’t write things, David. You know that” (222), “But I can’t write things, David” (223), to cite only two. About Catherine’s wish to produce artistic works, various critics have argued. See, for example, Burwell 112-18.

⁷ See Showalter, “Feminist” 250-51.

Conclusion

The general views of the body have greatly changed since the First World War. Advanced technology made it possible completely to shatter the bodies of soldiers by means of weapons of mass murder; while, at the same time, it offered medical science the vast possibility to “fix” those bodies and to retrieve the original shape at least to a certain degree. Watching scenes of butchery and reconstruction of the bodies on an unprecedentedly vast scale gave rise to a new mode of understanding the human body, a new conception of the body in which each bodily part could be divided, fixed, and reunited to the whole.

As we have seen above, Ernest Hemingway was greatly influenced by this social upheaval as to the view of the body, and his works eloquently reflect this confusion. This is partly because, as anyone at the time was, he was tormented by the conflict between the new set of values and the old traditional view of the body in which he was raised in his childhood. As Allen argues in his famous study of 1920s American culture, everyone felt uneasiness about this rapidly changing morality.

A time of revolution, however, is an uneasy time to live in. It is easier to tear down a code than to put a new one in its place, and meanwhile there is bound to be more or less wear and tear and general unpleasantness. People who have been brought up to think that it is sinful for women to smoke or drink, and scandalous for sex to be discussed across the luncheon table, and unthinkable for a young girl to countenance strictly dishonorable attentions from a man, cannot all at once forget the admonitions of their childhood. It takes longer to hard-boil a man or a woman than an egg. Some of the apostles of the new freedom appeared to imagine that habits of thought could be changed overnight [. . .]. But it couldn't be done. (102)

Like “the apostles of the new freedom” described above, Hemingway, on the surface, celebrated iconoclastic values after the war, yet he also could not “all at once forget the admonitions of [his] childhood.” He himself probably believed that he was in pursuit of these newly established ideas about the body — that were, basically, carnal rather than spiritual; libertine rather than puritan; hyperaesthetic rather than anaesthetic; ambiguous about the gender boundary rather than fixed. Yet, at the same time, his inner self that was forged in the stern Victorian tradition by his parents always resisted this desire.

This thesis is intended to show four different aspects of Hemingway's view of the body. In part I, we have seen his representations of wounded soldiers that reflect the social confusion after the war and that, at the same time, betray his ambivalent atti-

tude toward the technological view of the body. His ambivalence toward technology has been further discussed in the second part, in which we have taken up the motif of anaesthesia in his stories. The third and fourth parts have argued that the post-war cultural mode totally differed from the pre-war traditional morality. We have seen that Hemingway sublimated this confusion and his inner conflict caused by it into works of fiction and attempted to overcome his own difficulties when facing this chaotic disorder of morality.

On the road to the natural body, he could not get rid of the older values, and the ambivalent feelings toward the body are found at the very core of his literature, functioning as the driving force of his artistic achievement. His struggle with these conflicting values, especially his struggle in his writing of fiction, as it were, created the primary momentum for the genesis of many stories as well as the major force of his literary tension. The literature of Ernest Hemingway mirrors in his artistic mastery vivid reflections of the confusion that everyone must have keenly sensed when the dynamic change in the view of the body took place after the war.

Appendix

A Chronology of Hemingway's Works

This chronology is based on Paul Smith's remarkable study of Hemingway's short stories, *A Reader's Guide to the Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway* and Charles M. Oliver's "Appendix III: Hemingway Chronology and Dateline" included in *Ernest Hemingway A to Z: The Essential Reference to the Life and Work*.

The parenthetical date after titles shows the period in which the story was written. Every title is placed in order of publication, but stories included in a collection are put in the same order as the collection as well as in order of publication.

- 1922** "A Divine Gesture" (Summer 1921) in the *Double Dealer* (May)
- 1923** *Three Stories and Ten Poems* published by Contact Publishing Co., Paris (no date, but later July / early August)
1. "Up in Michigan" (Fall 1921; February 1922)
 2. "My Old Man" (July – September 1922)
 3. "Out of Season" (April 1923)
- 1924** "Indian Camp" (November 1923 – February 1924) in *transatlantic review* (April issue)
- in our time* published by Three Mountains Press in Paris (no date, but probably mid March)
- "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife" (March – April 1924) in *transatlantic review* (November)
- "Cross-Country Snow" (April 1924) in *Der Querschnitt* (December)
- 1925** "Mr. and Mrs. Elliot" (April 1924) in *The Little Review* (Autumn – Winter issue, 1924 – 1925)
- "Big Two-Hearted River" (May – November 1924) in *This Quarter* (May issue)
- "The Undefeated" (September – November 1924) in *Der Querschnitt* in German translation (June); in *This Quarter* (Autumn – Winter issue, 1925 – 1926)
- In Our Time* published by Boni and Liveright in New York (October 5)
1. "Indian Camp"
 2. "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife"
 3. "The End of Something" (March 1924)
 4. "The Three-Day Blow" (March 1924)
 5. "The Battler" (December 1924 – March 1925)
 6. "A Very Short Story" (June – July 1923)
 7. "Soldier's Home" (April 1924)
 8. "The Revolutionist" (June – July 1923)
 9. "Mr. and Mrs. Elliot"
 10. "Cat in the Rain" (February 1923 – March 1924)
 11. "Out of Season"

12. "Cross-Country Snow"
 13. "My Old Man"
 14. "Big Two-Hearted River"
- 1926** *The Torrents of Spring* published by Scribner's (May 28)
 "Banal Story" (January – February 1925) in *The Little Review* (Spring – Summer issue)
Today Is Friday published by The As Stable Publications (Summer)
The Sun Also Rises published by Scribner's (October 22)
- 1927** "The Killers" (September 1925 – May 1926) in *Scribner's Magazine* (March issue)
 "In Another Country" (September – November 1926) in *Scribner's Magazine* (April issue)
 "A Canary for One" (August – September 1926) in *Scribner's Magazine* (April issue)
 "Fifty Grand" (January 1924 – November 1925) in *Atlantic Monthly* (July issue)
 "Hills Like White Elephant" (May 1927) in *transition* (August issue)
Men Without Women published by Scribner's (October 14)
1. "The Undeclared"
 2. "In Another Country"
 3. "Hills Like White Elephant"
 4. "The Killers"
 5. "Che Ti Dice La Patria?" (April – May 1927)
 6. "Fifty Grand"
 7. "A Simple Enquiry" (November 1926 – February 1927)
 8. "Ten Indians" (September 1925 – May 1927)
 9. "A Canary for One"
 10. "An Alpine Idyll" (April 1926)
 11. "A Pursuit Race" (November 1926 – February 1927)
 12. "Today Is Friday" (May 1926)
 13. "Banal Story"
 14. "Now I Lay Me" (November – December 1926)
- 1929** *A Farewell to Arms* serialized in *Scribner's Magazine* (May, June, July, August, September, October issues); published in book form by Scribner's (September 27)
- 1930** *Kiki of Montparnasse* with "Introduction" by EH; published by Black Manikin Press (January 22)
 "Wine of Wyoming" (October 1928 – May 1930) in *Scribner's Magazine* (August issue)
- 1931** "The Sea Change" (January 1930 – June 1931) in *This Quarter* (December issue)
- 1932** "After the Storm" (April 1928 – June 1932) in *Cosmopolitan* (May issue)
Death in the Afternoon published by Scribner's (September 23)
- 1933** "A Clean, Well-Lighted Place" (Fall 1932) in *Scribner's Magazine* (March issue)

- “Homage to Switzerland” (March – June 1932) in *Scribner’s Magazine* (April issue)
- “The Gambler, the Nun, and the Radio” (Summer 1931 – Fall 1932) in *Scribner’s Magazine* (May issue) by the title of “Give Us a Prescription, Doctor”
- “God Rest You Merry, Gentlemen” (February – December 1932) by House of Books (mid April)
- Winner Take Nothing* published by Scribner’s (October 27)
1. “After the Storm”
 2. “A Clean, Well-Lighted Place”
 3. “The Light of the World” (May – July 1932)
 4. “God Rest You Merry, Gentlemen”
 5. “The Sea Change”
 6. “A Way You’ll Never Be” (May – November 1932)
 7. “The Mother of a Queen” (Fall 1931 – August 1932)
 8. “One Reader Writes” (February 1932 – February 1933)
 9. “Homage to Switzerland”
 10. “A Day’s Wait” (March – July 1933)
 11. “A Natural History of the Dead” (January 1929 – August 1931)
 12. “Wine of Wyoming”
 13. “The Gambler, the Nun, and the Radio”
 14. “Fathers and Sons” (November 1932 – August 1933)
- 1934** “One Trip Across” (Later became a part of *To Have and Have Not*) in *Cosmopolitan* (April issue)
- 1935** *Green Hills of Africa* serialized in *Scribner’s Magazine* (May, June, July, August, September, October, November issues); published in book form by Scribner’s (October 25)
- 1936** “The Tradesman’s Return” (Later became a part of *To Have and Have Not*) in *Esquire* (February issue)
- “The Capital of the World” (November 1935 – February 1936) in *Esquire* (June issue) by the title of “The Horns of the Bull”
- “The Snows of Kilimanjaro” (February – April 1936) in *Esquire* (August issue)
- “The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber” (November 1934 – April 1936) in *Cosmopolitan* (September issue)
- 1937** *To Have and Have Not* published by Scribner’s (October 15)
- 1938** “Old Man at the Bridge” (April 1938) in *Ken* (May 19)
- The Spanish Earth* (transcript of EH’s narration of the film of the same title) published by The J. B. Savage Co. in Cleveland (June 15)
- The Fifth Column and the First Forty-nine Stories* published by Scribner’s (October 14)
- “The Denunciation” (May – September 1938) in *Esquire* (November issue)
- “The Butterfly and the Tank” (July – September 1938) in *Esquire* (December issue)
- 1939** “Night Before Battle” (September – October 1938) in *Esquire* (February issue)

- “Nobody Ever Dies (October – November 1938) in *Cosmopolitan* (March issue)
- “Under the Ridge” (February 1939) in *Cosmopolitan* (October issue)
- 1940** *For Whom the Bell Tolls* published by Scribner’s (October 21)
- 1942** *Men at War* edited with “Introduction” by EH; published by Crown Publishers (October 22)
- 1944** *The Viking Portable Library: Hemingway* edited by Malcolm Cowley; published by Viking Press (September 18)
- 1950** *Across the River and Into the Trees* serialized in *Cosmopolitan* (February, March, April, May, June issues); published in book form by Scribner’s (September 7)
- 1951** “The Good Lion” in *Holiday* (March issue)
- “The Faithful Bull” (early 1950) in *Holiday* (March issue)
- 1952** *The Old Man and the Sea* in *Life* (September 1 issue); published in book form by Scribner’s (September 8)
- 1957** “A Man of the World” (May – June 1957) in *Atlantic* (November issue)
- “Get a Seeing-Eyed Dog” (March 1954 – July 1956) in *Atlantic* (November issue)
- 1960** *The Dangerous Summer* serialized in *Life* (September 5 and September 19 issues)
- 1961** *The Snows of Kilimanjaro and Othe Stories* published by Scribner’s (January)
- 1962** *The Wild Years*, an anthology of newspaper articles for *The Toronto Star*, edited by Gene A. Hanrahan; published by Dell Publishing Co. (December)
- 1964** *A Moveable Feast* published by Scribner’s (May 5)
- 1967** *By-Line: Ernest Hemingway*, an anthology of newspaper articles, edited by William White; published by Scribner’s (May 8)
- 1969** *The Fifth Column and Four Stories of the Spanish Civil War* published by Scribner’s (August 13)
- 1970** *Ernest Hemingway: Cub Reporter*, an anthology of newspaper articles for *The Kansas City Star*, edited by Matthew J. Bruccoli; published by University of Pittsburgh Press (May 4)
- Island in the Stream* published by Scribner’s (October 6)
- 1971** *Ernest Hemingway’s Apprenticeship*, an anthology of writings in EH’s high school days, edited by Matthew J. Bruccoli; published by Microcard Editions (July 2)
- 1972** *The Nick Adams Stories* edited by Philip Young; published by Scribner’s (April 17)
- 1974** *The Enduring Hemingway*, an anthology, edited by Charles Scribner, Jr.; published by Scribner’s
- 1979** *Ernest Hemingway: Complete Poems* edited by Nicholas Gerogiannis; published by University of Nebraska Press

-
- 1981** *Ernest Hemingway: Selected Letters, 1917 – 1961* selected and edited by Carlos Baker; published by Scribner's
- 1984** *Ernest Hemingway on Writing* selected and edited by Larry W. Phillips; published by Scribner's
- 1985** *The Dangerous Summer* published in book form by Scribner's (June 24)
Ernest Hemingway: Dateline Toronto, an anthology of newspaper articles for *Toronto Star* edited by William White; published by Scribner's (November 18)
- 1986** *The Garden of Eden* published by Scribner's (May 28)
- 1987** *The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway: The Finca Vigía Edition* published by Scribner's (December 2)
- 1993** *Hemingway at Oak Park High: The High School Writings of Ernest Hemingway, 1916 – 1917* edited by Cynthia Maziarka and Donald Vogel, Jr.; published by Oak Park and River Forest High School
- 1999** *True at First Light* edited by Patrick Hemingway; published by Scribners (July 21)

Works Cited

- Adair, William. "A Source for Hemingway's 'Indian Camp.'" *Studies in Short Fiction* 28 (1991): 93–95.
- Allen, Frederick Lewis. *Only Yesterday: An Informal History of the 1920's*. 1931. NY: Perennial, 2000.
- Armstrong, Tim. *Modernism, Technology and the Body: A Cultural Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Azevedo, Carlos. "Oak Park as the Thing Left Out: Surface and Depth in 'Soldier's Home.'" *Ernest Hemingway: The Oak Park Legacy*. Ed. James Nagel. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 1996. 96–107.
- Baker, Carlos. *Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story*. NY: Scribner's, 1969.
- Baker, Sheridan. *Ernest Hemingway*. NY: Holt, 1967.
- Bell, Michael. *Primitivism*. London: Methuen, 1972.
- Bierce, Ambrose. *The Complete Short Stories of Ambrose Bierce*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1984.
- "Boston Police Bar Scribner's Magazine." *New York Times* (Jun. 6 1929): 2.
- Brandt, Allan M. *No Magic Bullet: A Social History of Venereal Disease in the United States Since 1880*. NY: Oxford UP, 1985.
- Brasch, James D. and Joseph Sigman. *Hemingway's Library: A Composite Record*. NY: Garland, 1981.
- Brenner, Gerry. "Once a Rabbit, Always? A Feminist Interview with María." *Blowing the Bridge: Essays on Hemingway and For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Ed. Rena Sanderson. NY: Greenwood, 1992. 131–42.
- Brieux, Eugene. *Three Plays by Brieux*. Trans. Mrs. Bernard Shaw, St. John Hankin and John Pollock. 5th ed. London: Cape, 1921.
- Burwell, Rose Marie. *Hemingway: The Postwar Years and the Posthumous Novels*. NY: Cambridge UP, 1996.
- Comley, Nancy R. and Robert Scholes. *Hemingway's Genders: Rereading the Hemingway Text*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1994.
- Cooperman, Stanley. *World War I and the American Novel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins P, 1967.
- Crane, Stephen. *The Red Badge of Courage*. 1895. NY: Norton, 1994.
- DeFalco, Joseph. *The Hero in Hemingway's Short Stories*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1963.
- Donaldson, Scott. *By Force of Will: The Life and Art of Ernest Hemingway*. NY: Viking, 1977.
- Eby, Carl P. *Hemingway's Fetishism: Psychoanalysis and the Mirror of Manhood*. NY: State U of New York P, 1999.
- Edelson, Mark. "A Note on 'One Reader Writes.'" *Fitzgerald / Hemingway Annual* (1972): 329–31.

- Eliot, T. S. "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock." *Collected Poems 1909 – 1962*. NY: Harcourt, 1963. 3–7.
- Elkins, Marilyn. "The Fashion of Machismo." *A Historical Guide to Ernest Hemingway*. Ed. Linda Wagner-Martin. NY: Oxford UP, 2000. 93–115.
- Ellman, Richard, ed. *Selected Letters of James Joyce*. London: Faber, 1992.
- Faulkner, William. *Soldiers' Pay*. 1926. London: Vintage, 2000.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. *The Short Stories of F. Scott Fitzgerald: A New Collection*. Ed. Matthew J. Bruccoli. NY: Scribner's, 1989.
- "The Fourteenth at Gettysburg." *Harper's Weekly* (21 Nov. 1863): 747–48.
- Frazer, James G. *The Golden Bough*. NY: Gramercy, 1981.
- Goodrum, Charles and Helen Dalrymple. *Advertising in America: The First Two Hundred Years*. NY: Abrams, 1990.
- Grebstein, Sheldon Norman. *Hemingway's Craft*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1973.
- Green, Harvey. *The Uncertainty of Everyday Life, 1915 – 1945*. Fayetteville: U of Arkansas P, 2000.
- Haiken, Elizabeth. *Venus Envy: A History of Cosmetic Surgery*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1997.
- Hawthorne, Nathaniel. *The Scarlet Letter*. 1850. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1962.
- Hemingway, Ernest. *The Torrents of Spring*. 1926. NY: Scribner's, 1998.
- . *The Sun Also Rises*. 1926. NY: Scribner's, 1954.
- . *A Farewell to Arms*. 1929. NY: Scribner's, 1995.
- . *Death in the Afternoon*. 1932. NY: Touchstone, 1996.
- . *Green Hills of Africa*. 1935. NY: Touchstone, 1996.
- . *To Have and Have Not*. 1937. NY: Scribner's, 1996.
- . *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. 1940. NY: Scribner's, 1995.
- . *Across the River and Into the Trees*. 1950. NY: Scribner's, 1996.
- . *The Old Man and the Sea*. 1952. NY: Scribner's, 1995.
- . *A Moveable Feast*. 1964. NY: Touchstone, 1996.
- . *The Nick Adams Stories*. Ed. Philip Young. NY: Scribner's, 1972.
- . *Ernest Hemingway: Selected Letters, 1917-1961*. Ed. Carlos Baker. NY: Scribner's, 1981.
- . *The Garden of Eden*. NY: Scribner's, 1986.
- . *The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway: The Finca Vigía Edition*. 1987. NY: Scribner's, 1998.
- . *True at First Light: A Fictional Memoir*. Ed. Patrick Hemingway. NY: Scribner's, 1999.
- Hynes, Samuel. *The Soldiers' Tale: Bearing Witness to Modern War*. NY: Penguin, 1997.
- "In the 'Libey.'" *Harper's Weekly* (20 Feb. 1864): 122–23.
- Joyce, James. *Dubliners*. 1914. NY: Penguin, 1993.
- Kendall, Elizabeth. *Where She Danced: The Birth of American Art-Dance*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1999.

- Kern, Stephen. *Anatomy and Destiny: A Cultural History of the Human Body*. Indianapolis: Bobbs, 1975.
- . *The Culture of Time and Space, 1880 – 1918*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1986.
- . *The Culture of Love: Victorians to Moderns*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1992.
- Kert, Bernice. *The Hemingway Women*. NY: Norton, 1986.
- Lawrence, D. H. *Sons and Lovers*. 1913. London: Penguin, 1994.
- . *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. 1928. London: Penguin, 1994.
- Leavy, Barbara Fass. *To Blight with Plague*. New ed. NY: New York UP, 1993.
- Leiter, Louis H. "Neural Projections in Hemingway's 'On the Quai at Smyrna?'" *Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's In Our Time*. Ed. Michael S. Reynolds. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1983. 138–40.
- Lynn, Kenneth S. *Hemingway*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1995.
- Marchand, Roland. *Advertising the American Dream: Making Way for Modernity, 1920 – 1940*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1985.
- Martin, Wendy. "Brett Ashley as New Woman in *The Sun Also Rises*." *New Essays on The Sun Also Rises*. Ed. Linda Wagner-Martin. NY: Cambridge UP, 1987. 65–82.
- McCracken, Grant. *Big Hair: A Journey into the Transformation of Self*. Woodstock, NY: Overlook, 1996.
- Meyers, Jeffrey. "Hemingway's Primitivism and 'Indian Camp.'" *New Critical Approaches to the Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway*. Ed. Jackson J. Benson. Durham: Duke UP, 1990. 300–308.
- Monteiro, George. "Hemingway's Christmas Carol." *Fitzgerald/Hemingway Annual* (1972): 207–13.
- Morris, David B. *The Culture of Pain*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1991.
- Morris, Desmond. *Bodywatching: A Field Guide to the Human Species*. NY: Random, 1987.
- Morse, Janice M. and Carl Mitcham. "Compathy: The Contagion of Physical Distress." *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 26 (1997): 649–57.
- Oliver, Charles M. *Ernest Hemingway A to Z: The Essential Reference to the Life and Work*. NY: Checkmark, 1999.
- Orwell, George. *Homage to Catalonia*. 1938. London: Secker, 1951.
- Petry, Alice Hall. "Coming of Age in Hortons Bay: Hemingway's 'Up in Michigan.'" *New Critical Approaches to the Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway*. Ed. Jackson J. Benson. Durham: Duke UP, 1990. 353–59.
- Quétel, Claude. *History of Syphilis*. Trans. Judith Braddock and Brian Pike. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1990.
- Quick, Paul S. "Hemingway's 'A Way You'll Never Be' and Nick Adam's Search for Identity." *The Hemingway Review* 22.2 (Spring 2003): 30–44.
- "Rebel Cruelty." *Harper's Weekly* (18 Jun. 1864): 387.
- Reynolds, Michael. *The Young Hemingway*. NY: Norton, 1998.
- . "A Farewell to Arms: Doctors in the House of Love." *The Cambridge Companion to Ernest Hemingway*. Ed. Scott Donaldson. NY: Cambridge UP, 1996. 109–27.

- . *Hemingway: The Paris Years*. NY: Norton, 1999.
- Richards, Thomas. *The Commodity Culture of Victorian England: Advertising and Spectacle 1851 – 1914*. London: Verso, 1990.
- Rothman, Barbara Katz. *In Labor: Women and Power in the Birthplace*. NY: Norton, 1982.
- Rovit, Earl and Gerry Brenner. *Ernest Hemingway*. Rev. ed. Boston: Twayne, 1986.
- Sanford, Marcelline Hemingway. *At the Hemingways: With Fifty Years of Correspondence between Ernest and Marcelline Hemingway*. Centennial ed. Moscow, Idaho: U of Idaho P, 1999.
- Scarry, Elaine. *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*. NY: Oxford UP, 1985.
- Scholes, Robert. "Decoding Papa: 'A Very Short Story' As Work and Text." *New Critical Approaches to the Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway*. Ed. Jackson J. Benson. Durham: Duke UP, 1990. 33–47.
- Showalter, Elaine. "Feminist Criticism in the Wilderness." *The New Feminist Criticism: Essays on Women, Literature and Theory*. Ed. Elaine Showalter. NY: Pantheon, 1985. 243–70.
- . "Syphilis, Sexuality, and the Fiction of the Fin de Siècle." *Sex, Politics, and Science in the Nineteenth-Century Novel*. Ed. Ruth Bernard Yeazell. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1986. 88–115.
- Slade, Joseph W. "American writers and American Inventions: Cybernetic Discontinuity in Pre-World War II Literature." *The Technological Imagination: Theories and Fictions*. Ed. Teresa De Lauretis, Andreas Huyssen and Kathleen Woodward. Madison, Wisconsin: Coda, 1980. 27–47.
- Smith, Paul. "The Doctor and the Doctor's Friend: Logan Clendening and Ernest Hemingway." *The Hemingway Review* 8.1 (Fall 1988): 37–39.
- . *A Reader's Guide to the Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway*. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1989.
- Snedden, Robert Knox. *Eye of the Storm: A Civil War Odyssey*. NY: Simon, 2000.
- Sontag, Susan. *Illness As Metaphor and Aids and Its Metaphors*. NY: Anchor, 1990.
- Spilka, Mark. *Hemingway's Quarrel with Androgyny*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1995.
- Stone, Edward. "Hemingway's Mr. Frazer: From Revolution to Radio." *Journal of Modern Literature* 1 (Mar. 1971): 375–88.
- Tate, Trudi. *Modernism, History and the First World War*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1998.
- Trumbo, Dalton. *Johnny Got His Gun*. 1939. NY: Citadel, 1991.
- Villard, Henry S. and James Nagel. *Hemingway in Love and War: The Lost Diary of Agnes von Kurowsky*. NY: Hyperion, 1989.
- Waldhorn, Arthur. *A Reader's Guide to Ernest Hemingway*. NY: Farrar, 1972.
- Warren, Edward. *Some Account of the Letheon; or Who Was the Discoverer?* 2nd ed. Boston: Dutton, 1847.
- Wertz, Richard W. and Dorothy C. Wertz. *Lying-In: A History of Childbirth in America*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1989.

-
- Wharton, Edith. *Twilight Sleep*. 1927. NY: Scribner's, 1997.
- Whitman, Walt. *Whitman: Poetry and Prose*. NY: Library of America, 1996.
- Wilentz, Gay. "Anti-Semitism in *The Sun Also Rises*." *Readings on Ernest Hemingway*. Ed. Katie De Koster. San Diego: Greenhaven, 1997. 146–52.
- Williams, Wirt. *The Tragic Art of Ernest Hemingway*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1981.

Index

- Adair, William, 40
Allen, Frederick Louis, 105
Armstrong, Tim, 17, 20
Azevedo, Carlos, 57
- Baker, Carlos, 66, 71, 103
Baker, Sheridan, 29
Bell, Michael, 36–37
“Bernice Bobs Her Hair”, 90–91
Bierce, Ambrose, 3–4
Brandt, Allan M., 62, 64, 65, 67, 74, 78, 79
Brasch, James D., 94
Brenner, Gerry, 97–98
Brice, Fanny, 17–18, 19
Brieux, Eugene, 70–74
Burwell, Rose Marie, 104
- “Chickamauga”, 3–4
Clendening, Logan, 71–72, 74, 75, 82
Comley, Nancy, 63, 65
Cooperman, Stanley, xi
Crane, Stephen, 6
- Dalrymple, Helen, 29
Damaged Goods: A Play in Three Acts, 70–74
DeFalco, Joseph, 24, 29, 65
DiMaggio, Joe, 27–28
Donaldson, Scott, xi, 63, 66
Dubliners, 41
- Eby, Carl P., 77, 85
Edelson, Mark, 75
Eliot, T. S., 42
Elkins, Marilyn, 103
Ellman, Richard, 57
“Eveline”, 41
- Faulkner, William, 5, 7, 8, 13, 16
Fitzgerald, F. Scott, 43, 90–91, 92
Fournier, Alfred, 70, 74, 75
“The Fourteenth at Gettysburg”, 6
Frazer, James G., 93, 94
Freud, Sigmund, 94
- The Golden Bough*, 93, 94
Goodrum, Charles, 29
Grebstein, Sheldon Norman, 22–23, 29
Green, Harvey, 21
- Haiken, Elizabeth, 17–18, 29
Hemingway, Clarence Edmonds, 67, 103
Hemingway, Ernest
BOOKS:
Across the River and Into the Trees, 26–27, 28, 29
Death in the Afternoon, ix, 10, 54, 64, 81–82, 93, 95
A Farewell to Arms, x, **9–16**, 19, 36, **37–39**, 40, 44–45, 67, 69, **77–82**, 93–94, 95–97
For Whom the Bell Tolls, 93, 94, **96–100**, 103
The Garden of Eden, 77, 91, 93, 94, **100–103**, 104
Green Hills of Africa, 54
In Our Time, 46, 54
in our time, 66
A Moveable Feast, 20, 67–68
The Old Man and the Sea, **27–28**
The Sun Also Rises, **47–50**, 69, 91, 95
Three Stories and Ten Poems, 74
To Have and Have Not, 29–30, 54, 58, 94
The Torrents of Spring, 8
True at First Light, 84
Winner Take Nothing, 54
- SHORT STORIES:
“Big Two-Hearted River”, 34, 82
“Cat in the Rain”, **91–93**, 94, 102
“The End of Something”, 46
“Fathers and Sons”, 55, 64, 83–84
“The Gambler, the Nun, and the Radio”, **50–54**, 58
“God Rest You Merry, Gentlemen”, **82–84**
“In Another Country”, 13–14, **19–22**, 23
“Indian Camp”, x, 33, **34–37**
“Mr. and Mrs. Elliot”, **63–65**
“A Natural History of the Dead”, 10–11, **43–44**
“Now I Lay Me”, 12–13
“One Reader Writes”, **70–74**, 82
“On the Quai at Smyrna”, 43–44, 55

- "On Writing", 34, 82
 "The Snows of Kilimanjaro", 54–57
 "Soldier's Home", viii, 18, 45–46
 "The Three-Day Blow", 46–47, 48
 "Up in Michigan", 67–69
 "A Very Short Story", 65–66
 "A Way You'll Never Be", 22–26
 Hemingway, Grace Hall, 103
 Hemingway, Hadley, 64
 Hemingway, Marcelline, *see* Sanford, Marcelline Hemingway
 Hemingway, Pauline, 29
 Holmes, Oliver Wendell, 35–36
Homage to Catalonia, 10
 "In the 'Libey'", 4
Johnny Got His Gun, 6–7, 8
 Joyce, James, 41
 Kashkin, Ivan, 58
 Kendall, Elizabeth, xi
 Kern, Stephen, vii–viii, 3, 8, 36, 61–62, 66
 Kert, Bernice, 29, 65
 Kurowsky, Agnes von, 65
Lady Chatterley's Lover, 8, 13, 42, 51, 58
 Lawrence, D. H., 8, 42
 Leavy, Barbara Fass, 71, 75
 Leiter, Louis H., 43
 Liveright, Horace, 74
 Lynn, Kenneth, 40, 69
 Marchand, Roland, 29
 Martin, Wendy, 94
 Marx, Carl, 53
 McCracken, Grant, xi, 90, 95
 Meyers, Jeffrey, 36–37, 94
 Mitcham, Carl, 40
 Monteiro, George, 85
 Morris, David B., 40
 Morris, Desmond, 89, 94
 Morse, Janice M., 40
 Morton, William T. G., 35–36
 Nagel, James, 16, 65
 Orwell, George, 10
 Parran, Thomas, Jr., 67, 69, 70
 Petry, Alice Hall, 68, 74
 Pfeiffer, Pauline, *see* Hemingway, Pauline
 Quétel, Claude, 61, 74–75, 85
 Quick, Paul S., 29
 "Rebel Cruelty", 4
The Red Badge of Courage, 6
 Reynolds, Michael, viii–ix, 16, 58, 64, 67
 Richards, Thomas, 29
 Richardson, Elizabeth Hadley, *see* Hemingway, Hadley
 Rothman, Barbara Katz, 33, 35
 Rovit, Earl, 29, 58
 Sanford, Marcelline Hemingway, 34, 67
The Scarlet Letter, 89
 Scarry, Elaine, 40
 Scholes, Robert, 63, 65
 Showalter, Elaine, 61, 66, 72, 104
 Sigman, Joseph, 94
 "The Sisters", 41
 Slade, Joseph, 21
 Smith, Paul, 22, 72, 74, 75
 Sneden, Robert Knox, 5
Soldiers' Pay, 5, 7, 8, 13, 16
Sons and Lovers, 42
 Sontag, Susan, 62, 74
 Spilka, Mark, 99
 Stein, Gertrude, 67–68
 Stone, Edward, 58
 "The Swimmers", 43
 Tate, Trudi, xi, 5
Totem and Taboo, 94
 Trumbo, Dalton, 6–7, 8
Twilight Sleep, 43
 Villard, Henry S., 65
 Waldhorn, Arthur, 29
 Wertz, Dorothy C., 33
 Wertz, Richard W., 33
 Wharton, Edith, 43
 Whitman, Walt, 4
 Wilentz, Gay, 85
 "The Yellow Wall Paper", 56