Spring 5-4-2021

Reinvestigating Masculinity in the Works of Ernest Hemingway

Neidy D. McHugh
University of Texas at Tyler

REINVESTIGATING MASCULINITY IN THE WORKS OF ERNEST HEMINGWAY

by

Neidy Danielle McHugh

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
Department of English

Ann Beebe, Ph.D., Committee Chair

College of Arts and Sciences

The University of Texas at Tyler
May 2021

The University of Texas at Tyler
Tyler, Texas

This is to certify that the Master's Thesis of

NEIDY MCHUGH

has been approved for the thesis requirement on
April 5, 2021
for the English Master of Arts degree

Approvals:

Thesis Chair: Ann Beebe, Ph.D.

Member: Anett Jessop, Ph.D.

Member: Hui Wu, Ph.D.

Chair, Department of Literature and Languages

Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Table of Contents

Abstract

REINVESTIGATING MASCULINITY IN THE WORKS OF ERNEST HEMINGWAY

Neidy McHugh

Thesis Chair: Ann Beebe, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Tyler

Tyler, Texas
April 2021

This thesis examines the conception and destruction of masculine identities in Ernest Hemingway's fictive works as resultant of a male dependence on societal acceptance. Utilizing both protagonists that fully align with a machismo persona and protagonists that seem disparate from Hemingway's oeuvre of hyper masculinity, this thesis examines the uniform concerns of Hemingway's men—their perception in society, threats to their masculinity, and their code of ethics. Through a three-pronged approach, this thesis looks at the male place in society, concerns about masculine identities, and responses to threats against masculinity. First, the recurrent figures of the father, the hunter, the son, the provider, and the husband are explicated for their consistent engagement with a larger community of men, the existence of repeating ethical codes amongst these characters, and their fate as it relates to their male ethics. Next, the harm often caused to Hemingway's protagonists by female characters is explained to be acts that destroy male societal position and male authority. Finally, this paper examines the importance of a male

social identity to Hemingway's protagonists by showing they are willing to face death or philosophical crisis to reestablish their masculine identities.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Ernest Hemingway's reputation as a man's man has long permeated studies of the author. Including dozens of biographies and almost a century of scholarship, these examinations center machismo, in the form of fighting, hunting, and womanizing, as a unifying force in his life and writing. Indeed, Hemingway's machismo is as prevalent a topic among the critical literary scholarship where one would expect it, for example amongst the works of queer theory scholar Valerie Rohy, cultural scholar J. Gerald Kennedy, and feminist scholar Jamie Barlow, as it is among scholars seemingly unconcerned with gender, for example Alex Vernon, a scholar of war literature or ecocritics as theoretically distinct as Glen Love, Ryan Hediger, and Susan Beegel. An academic would be strained to identify a school of literary criticism whose attention to Hemingway is not intricately intertwined with a conception of the author and his works as masculinist. Yet, despite this apparent preoccupation with Hemingway's men, these scholarships all seem to take that named masculinity for granted. The distinctly male acts of savagery and the chauvinistic male authority that allows the subjugation of women are treated as footnotes to the action itself. As Josep Armengol has stated, "the specific question of masculinity remains largely overlooked [in Hemingway Scholarship]," and while "much has been written about the role played by machismo in Hemingway's life and works. . . it is usually in relation to [his protagonists'] (patriarchal) relationships with the female characters, rather than men's gender issues in and of themselves" ("Gendering Men" 82). The gap created by the lack of scholarship into Hemingway's conception of masculinity is ironic considering that machismo is one of the most often noted and criticized features of the author's works. Once observed, this lack in critical

inquiry articulates a need for closer analysis of the complexities that are pervasive elements of masculinity in Hemingway's works.

Armengol is not alone in his quest to expand and define Hemingway's manhood. Teodóra Dömötör has examined the relationship between Hemingway's protagonists' masculine activities and emotional unrest through a concept she calls *anxious masculinity*. She believes that these protagonists perform stereotypical and exaggerated performances of machismo because they desire to maintain a nineteenth-century conception of manhood. Dömötör's *anxious masculinity* could be applied more broadly to Hemingway's protagonists if it is understood as a crisis response to challenged masculinity. Deemphasizing her concern with time—in fact, many of Hemingway's protagonists exist outside of locations where they would experience the changing times, for example, soldiers at war, Americans traveling abroad, or members of secluded communities—Dömötör's attention to male emotions and internal struggles highlights what has been missing in Hemingway scholarship, the trust that Hemingway's male characters are complex. To acknowledge a psychological depth to Hemingway's men, whether it be in the form of anxiety or crisis response, is to reconsider machismo as an action as opposed to an innate characteristic, thus complicating the often-archetypical understanding of Hemingway's men. Taking Armengol and Dömötör's work together, a reconsideration of masculine characters that ignores preconceived notions of machismo gives scholars the opportunity to consider men's issues as a valid avenue of Hemingway scholarship while acknowledging his protagonists as complex characters.

As Armengol and Dömötör's work suggests, Hemingway's writing is as concerned with the emotional and psychological development of his characters as it is with the physical plot of the story. Yet rather than center Hemingway's extraordinary characterization, scholars have

focused extensively on other means of interpretation, subsequently losing an entire location for critical analysis. In his preface to the post-humous publication of Ernest Hemingway's *The Garden of Eden*, Charles Scribner Jr. said, "[T]he conception of Hemingway as a writer primarily absorbed with external action fails to take into account his profound interest in character. . . he was always concerned with the effect [physical] events had in the minds of the individuals concerned" (viii). Scribner's criticism points to the trend in Hemingway Scholarship of focusing on tangible action or metaphorical interpretation as the locations for meaning generation. There is no doubt that such scholarship is useful. Ryan Hediger's literal approach to "Big Two-Hearted River" made clear the breadth and depth of Hemingway's scientific knowledge while metaphorical approaches to *The Old Man and the Sea* have yielded endless discussions about man's relationship with nature, yet similar approaches have resulted in interpretations of Santiago of *OMS* as simple and as *The Garden of Eden* as an outlier text in Hemingway's oeuvre. Recentering Hemingway's characterization, and particularly the role of masculinity in characterization, offers avenues for interpretation generative of new meaning. Indeed, Santiago and David Bourne are both complicated characters whose actions are indicative of a deeper struggle with their masculine identities that can be found throughout Hemingway's published writing. Focusing on the events of Hemingway's texts, whether literally or figuratively, has unfortunately led scholars to overlook the rich conversation about manhood that comes to life in the internal conflicts, emotions, and thoughts of Hemingway's protagonists. As Scribner suggested and Dömötör illustrated, the exciting events in Hemingway's literature, often performances of male bravado, do not act simply for the sake of the physical plot, but also as catalysts to emotional and psychological development.

Focusing on the emotions and thoughts of Hemingway's protagonists, this thesis seeks to explicate Hemingway's notion of masculinity in three ways. First, by identifying specific roles that Hemingway's men fill and the motivations that they share, this thesis challenges the simplistic view of machismo attributed to Hemingway's men. Rather than taking the recurrence of violent, aggressive, and authoritative male action at face value, recurrent male character types, namely the father and the hunter, will be explicated for their motivations and their treatment across stories. The examination of individual roles will then turn to the son, the husband, and the provider to reveal the interdependence between a male sense of self, masculinity, and society. This reconsideration of Hemingway's machismo will ground it as a location for scholarship. Second, this work will turn to the female characters that frequently threaten the protagonists. Examining the manner in which these women effect their male counterparts and the consequences of their actions on the men, this chapter will show that Hemingway's manipulative women are threats because their subversive authority emasculates the men around them. Specifically, this chapter postulates that these female characters use gaslighting techniques to undermine their male counterpart's presence and role in society. Such an approach to Hemingway's women differs from current scholarship in that it centers the protagonist's masculinity as the main point of consideration and avoids either centering female complexity as the goal of his villainous depiction or chastising the author for such characterization. Finally, turning to the emasculated Hemingway man, this text examines what a Hemingway protagonist is willing to endure in order to regain his masculine standing. By outlining the fact that these characters seek affirmation as a revolt against isolation, this chapter once again highlights the connection between masculinity and society. Then, by listing characters who would risk death, forfeit their achievements, or reconsider their philosophical stance on the world in order to regain

their sense of manhood, this thesis concludes that masculinity, long acknowledged as a given in Hemingway's works, is in fact a topic in need of dedicated scholarship. While this thesis will look across Hemingway's works for examples, special attention will be paid to Santiago of *OMS* and David Bourne of *GOE*, because Santiago's age and David's gender play often result in these two characters being perceived as outliers among Hemingway's manly men.

Chapter 2

Models of Masculinity: The Father and the Hunter

Ernest Hemingway is often described as a misogynist for both his personal life and the masculine pride that often guides his protagonists. As Hemingway's grandson, John Hemingway, has surmised, "when people think of Ernest Hemingway what comes to mind for most is the idea that he was a 'man's man,' a true macho who loved in equal parts drinking, hunting, war, and womanizing" (424). Indeed, this common perception of the author is as prevalent in biographical works as it is among explications of his characters. This conflation is in part due to his protagonist's participation in the same activities that Hemingway was known for in his personal life. The Hemingway protagonist indeed drinks, fights, hunts, and womanizes in the same locations that Ernest Hemingway himself traveled leading critics and scholars alike to the conclusion that Hemingway and the characters he wrote can be simplified to a singular masculinist trope. There is some truth to the assessment. The keen and animalistic hunter, the self-righteous foreigner, and the authoritative father are Hemingway archetypes recurrent and steeped in toxic masculinity. The prevalence of characters who seem to fit a model of machismo make it easy for critics to condense Hemingway's protagonists down to their stolid attitudes, their aggressive pride, and their ferocity. However, such an absolute consideration overlooks the intricacies written into each of these models of masculinity. When examined across the author's body of work, these archetypical protagonists, while engaging in activities of male prowess and restraining from feminine emotionality, follow patterns that reveal a more complex understanding and expression of masculinity. Two examples of Hemingway's models of masculinity are the father and the hunter characters.

In Hemingway's works, fathers come to represent an image of manhood for their sons. Considering their fathers as prototypes for adult life, Hemingway's boys look to them to understand the rules by which they will function as men in society. As Cary Wolfe explains in her explication of *The Garden of Eden*, "the question that the novel unfolds before [David] is whether his identity and creative power reside in his identification with his father and the code he represents or, conversely, with an act of rebellion against it" (234). Extending beyond David and *GOE*, the question of whether sons will identify with and participate in the world their fathers inhabit is found in almost every story that features these characters. While fathers frequently fail at indoctrinating their sons, their motivations and concerns reveal these characters to be more intellectually and emotionally engaged than their violent and arrogant flaws would suggest. In short, the pattern of concern and attentiveness amongst Hemingway's fathers contradicts their image as centrally concerned with masculine activities. Similarly, Hemingway's hunters cannot be reduced to savage actors of violence against nature.

Ecocritical reception of Hemingway's hunting and fishing characters has always been dichotomous. In a search for a unified understanding of these protagonists, scholars have made contradictory claims about their standing as naturalists and as gamesmen. Almost without exception, ecocritics have chosen one or the other stance and noted texts which do not align with their position as outliers. For example, Jon Roberts Adams claimed that Santiago of *The Old Man and the Sea* was an "anachronistic model of masculinity" because he does not exhibit the same masculine strength and virility often found in the full works of Hemingway's and other game sports writers' of the period (27). Far from anachronistic, Santiago, like Nick Adams, reflects an ethics of gamesmanship that Hemingway utilized to define the masculine role of hunter. An approach to these hunter characters that recognizes an intrinsic ethics of

gamesmanship as a prerequisite for success or failure unifies the image of these male characters rather than relegating either group to an anachronistic or outlier standing. Further, understanding the fate of Hemingway's hunters as retributive of their actions reveals these men to be more than the machismo image of the aggressive, violent killer. Like his father characters who often fail at their goal of instructing their sons, many of his hunter characters fail at the ethics of gamesmanship to disastrous consequences and in both of these examples, Hemingway's considerations of character motivation reveal a more complex conception of masculinity.

In Hemingway's short stories, fathers often fall short of their son's expectations yet manage to maintain their adoration. Read in conjunction, these works reveal a pattern of the Hemingway father. The father character engages in a familial camouflage, where the man keeps his personal concerns separate from his familial life; he is attentive to the needs of his son; and he is engaged in a wider community of men. Using these three elements, Hemingway crafts fathers whose main concern becomes indoctrinating their sons into the world of men while protecting them from knowledge of the father's shortcomings. By distinguishing their parental self from their private self, it becomes apparent that the Hemingway father is aware of his misdeeds and attempts to stop his son from repeating them. Often, this becomes most apparent after the façade fails. As David Bourne thinks in *GOE*, "All your father found he found for you too . . . the good, the wonderful, the bad, the very bad, the really very bad, the truly bad and then the much worse" (129). It would have been as apt for David to say, 'the purposeful, the unavoidable, and the hidden' because indeed, the father in Hemingway fiction reveals the truly bad when he least means to. The distinction between the father's two lives is exacerbated by the contrast between his personal life, marked with violence, thievery, and hubris, and his familial life, defined mainly by his affection for his son. The moment when the veil between these two

lives disappears is usually a result of the father's failed efforts to indoctrinate his son into the company of men. Whether it is amongst horse jockeys, hunters, or medics, the son becomes fully aware of his father's defaults when he can view him in the context of a wider manhood, thus positioning the father as an imperfect example of masculinity.

In "My Old Man" a son reflects on the time he spent with his father before his death. Though the son's life is marked by its instability, he looks back on his time with his father with adoration. He's particularly fond of the instances in which his father indoctrinated him into the world of horse jockeys. Amongst his fondest memories are running with his father to maintain the low weight required of jockeys and betting on the horses at the track. The father in this story is motivated to engage his son in the world of men. For that reason, his son joins him at the stables rather than participating in the normal activities of a child. Other fathers participate in the same process of indoctrinating their sons. In *GOE* the reader learns that David's father allowed him to come on safari to hunt an elephant. Much like Joe's father, David's father wants his son to enjoy his manly occupation without understanding the unseemly implications of his business. Throughout "My Old Man," the father teaches his son about horses, racing, and jockeying, but excludes him from conversations and knowledge that would reveal him to be a cheater. Though Joe thinks he must have known "it was funny all the time," his father had actively attempted to compartmentalize his illegal practices in the racing community from the activities he brought Joe into (200). For example, while on a train, Joe's father is confronted about cheating, but he sends Joe away to ensure the boy doesn't hear the conversation. Through these actions, it becomes clear that the father is aware of his shortcomings as a man and does not want his son to replicate them. The attentiveness with which these fathers approach their sons is not limited to the camouflage of their misdeeds.

David's father is careful to ensure that his son has sufficient food, water, and rest even when it is at the detriment of himself and the other hunter, Juma. Both the father and Juma take turns checking that David is alright and, though David considers himself a burden on their hunting expedition, his father is careful to reassure him that he is not burdensome and in fact was incredibly helpful in tracking the elephant. Similarly, Joe's father makes sure his son is happy, instilling in him a sense of pride in their horse and providing him new binoculars to properly see the races. While engaging their sons in their professions, the fathers make sure their son's feel nurtured. Dr. Adams engages in the same behavior in "Indian Camp." Bringing Nick along for a cesarian section, he makes certain to refer to his son as his "interne" and thoroughly explains each medical procedure. In these three stories, as in many Hemingway works that feature a father, the wellbeing of the son is a chief concern but the fathers fall short of maintaining their sons' innocence. At one point, when a horse does not win as he was expecting, Joe's father says, "It sure took a great jockey to keep [him] from winning" (200). In this moment of anger, Joe's father does not shield the truth, that the races are rigged. In a parallel scene, a young David confronts his father after realizing the brutal and unnecessary nature of hunting and his father responds, "Be careful you don't fuck up," a sharp difference from the care with which he had allowed David to join them on the safari (182). In "Indian Camp" as well, Dr. Adams reveals his callousness when he tells Nick that the woman's pain does not matter. These small lapses are indicative of the fathers' more serious failures which become apparent by the conclusion of each work.

When it is revealed that Joe's father is a "crook" Joe doesn't know if his father was truly a "swell guy" (205). Suddenly, all the things that the protagonist's father has done to prepare him for the world—their relocations, his informal education, the purchase of their horse—are in

question. The horse is dead, the travel is for naught, and the lessons have been unsubstantiated by the fraudulence with which his father conducted business. Similarly, when David realizes that hunting for sport makes his father a cruel and violent man, he vows to never tell another person a secret. When the failures of the fathers are revealed to the sons the devastation is multiplied because the son is also forced to contend with his retrospective feelings about his father. Joe blames the men who chastised his father, but the shift in his tone makes it clear that his perceptions of the man are permanently altered. Similarly, David claims throughout *GOE* that he loved his father, but he also views him as a cautionary tale. These failures bridge the emotional concern with which the fathers interact with their sons and the common perception of Hemingway's aggressive and self-concerned men. In the case of fathers, Hemingway's often cited machismo is in fact the site of their failure while their unmanly emotional concern for their sons is their true motivation.

Margaret Bauer points to the same lifting of the veil and transformation of the son's opinion in "Indian Camp" by saying that Dr. Adams "showed Nick more than he intended" when they found that the pregnant woman's husband had committed suicide (128). Up until that point, Nick's father had spent the day trying to gently persuade his son's interest towards medicine. Nick's father asserts his confidence as a doctor, explaining to Nick what is happening with the woman in labor. It is clear that Dr. Adams believes Nick is impressed with his medical abilities, allowing his own arrogance to blind him from his son's discomfort. After the cesarian and before he is to begin stitching, he tells Nick, "You can watch this or not," indicating that the important part of the medical lesson is complete, yet Nick has not been watching for some time (93). Indeed, Dr. Adams is so enthralled with the prospect of introducing Nick to medicine, he does not notice that Nick has barely been responding to him. In fact, Nick is not fully engaged in the

experience until he accidentally sees the dead husband. Suddenly, Nick is the one bursting with things to say and his father is providing curt responses. As Bauer suggests, the revelation of the death is twofold. Not only has Nick been exposed to the ugliest side of medicine, death, but his father's arrogance and subsequently his masculine failure becomes apparent. The suicide is revealed after Dr. Adams admits that these scenarios are sometimes hardest on the husbands, yet his knowledge of that fact did not preclude his negligence. As it is apparent at the conclusion of the story, if Dr. Adams had acted on his knowledge, Nick might have never seen the suicide. Each of these three stories is presented from the perspective of the son, revealing how their disillusionment changes their perspective of their father, but a fuller picture of the father is accessible when his response to the lifting of the veil is examined.

A story that purportedly focuses on the love a father has for his son, "A Day's Wait" depicts the failings Hemingway fathers are so desperate to avoid and the father's reaction. Though concerned about and attentive to his son, the father in the story cannot capture his son's attention. He tries to pull his son into the masculine literary world of pirates, but the boy just, "lay still in the bed and seemed very detached from what was going on" (437). The father fails to connect with his son, but he continues to nurture him, attempting to heal him however possible. The father takes notes of what medicines the boy needs and when, he hunts to feed the boy, he reads to him, and he keeps watch of his temperature, yet he does not know the inner turmoil the boy is experiencing. Though he knows the boy is looking around strangely, the father does not realize that the son believes he is dying. In a single line near the end of the story, the father becomes aware: "He had been waiting to die all day, ever since nine o'clock in the morning" (439). This story, distinct from the other stories of fathers in that the narrator was the father himself and not the son, is also distinct in that the lifting of the veil was a realization to the father

more so than it was to the son. The realization for the father is not simply that he did not understand his son's suffering, but that his ignorance has caused his son a whole day of mental anguish, "since nine o'clock in the morning." Rather than the son reframing the father in the context of the larger society of men and subsequently creating distance between them, this story shows the father's realization that he has already been turned away from his son's world. While this story takes a different angle, it reveals the same sad truth of the Hemingway father—he may strive for closeness with his son, but always ultimately reveals the masculine faults he had hoped to mask. Similar to the Hemingway father whose actions hinge on inherent failures, the Hemingway hunter succeeds or fails depending on how closely he follows an intertextual code of ethics.

Ernest Hemingway's "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber" ends with the title character dead while "Big Two-Hearted River" concludes with Nick Adams returning to his camp having successfully captured and eviscerated two trout. Both stories narrate the escapades of a gamesman, yet the protagonists' statuses at the conclusion of each story are shockingly disparate. While Hemingway's works often receive negative criticism for their violent depiction of blood sports, the conclusion of these short works, representative of Hemingway's larger array of stories on gamesmanship, reveal a pattern of poetic justice in his treatment of protagonists who engage in predacious pursuits. In a recent paper examining the narratological animal ethics in Hemingway's Green Hills of Africa, Daniel Newman said, "[w]hile ethical criticism must consider how Hemingway's animals are treated in the narrative, it must also assess how this treatment itself is treated by the narrative," effectively complicating the popular notion that Hemingway's literary depiction of animal-hunting is irreconcilable with a moral treatment of human-animal relationships (514). A closer look at Hemingway's treatment of protagonists

reveal that his hunters and fishers' fate is intrinsically tied to their adherence to or rebellion against an intertextual code of ethics. Two key tenets of Hemingway's ethical gamesmanship are approaching the sport with confidence, knowledge, and expertise and compassionately regarding prey. Alternately characterizing gamesman as cowardly and righteous, the unifying pattern in Hemingway's gamesmanship stories is vindication to those motivated within his notion of ethical gamesmanship and retribution to those outside of his code of ethics. The use of poetic justice to punish or reward gamesmen can be seen across Hemingway's fiction to varying degrees, but Francis Macomber and Nick Adams serve as antithetical examples of Hemingway's unethical and ethical gamesman.

Daniel Newman makes a case for the responsibility of style, specifically modernist minimalism and the use of the mot juste (the exact right phrase), in developing an ecological ethics within Hemingway's Green Hills of Africa. Newman's assertion is that Hemingway's careful consideration of animals "naturalistically and without comment" provides the animals with an existence independent and distinct from humans and thus imbues them with an independent non-human value (515). In exemplifying this concept, Newman points to the narrative description of grasshoppers in "Big Two-Hearted River" in contrast with Nick Adams's use of the insects. Though Newman's overall goal is to complicate perceptions of Hemingway' ethical concerns in his non-fiction, he extends his idea of different tonal or narratorial voices working towards the same narrative goal to apply to Hemingway's short fiction. However, works of fiction do not always ascribe to singular narratorial concerns and narrative theorists have long been concerned with the blending and shifting voices in Hemingway's fiction. In discussing the "voice" of Margot Macomber in "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber" George Cheatham has said, "the narrator weaves [...] complicated blends of narratorial report and

focalized narration interspersed with bits of free indirect discourse and interior monologue" (747). Cheathanm's argument is that voices, specifically Margot Macomber's, can be found in the narratorial shifts and silences within the text. Both scholars are pointing to the same phenomenon in Hemingway's work, but to different ends. Newman identifies Hemingway's shifts to "corporeal, rhythmically-stilted and biologically-acute" writing as evidence of his animal ethics while Cheatham deals with the same "focalized narration" as evidence of shifting and multitudinous voices within a fictive text (521). By applying Newman's conception of a singular narratorial concern, specifically animal-ethics, to Cheatham's assertion of multiple concurrent voices or narratives, the close biological and technical passages in the fictive works of Hemingway can be reframed. In both stories mentioned here, and the wider collection of Hemingway's gamesmen stories, the shifts in narrative tone to detailed naturalist depictions reveal the level of confidence, knowledge, and expertise of the gamesmen characters in order to validate the poetic justice they will ultimately receive.

Passages of naturalistic and technical precision often appear in Hemingway's gamesman stories to highlight a character's preparation or lack thereof. For example, in "The Capital of the World" the character Paco is certain that he could be an expert bullfighter despite never having competed or trained. In the moments before his death, as he is enacting a pseudo-bullfight with a coworker, the text transforms into the close reading of an actual bullfight to highlight Paco's naivete:

> Running with head down Enrique came toward him and Paco swung the apron just ahead of the knife blade as it passed close in front of his belly and as it went by it was, to him, the real horn, white-tipped, black, smooth, and as Enrique passed him and turned to rush again it was the hot, blood-flanked mass of the bull that thudded by, then turned like a cat

> and came again as he swung the cape slowly. Then the bull turned and came again and, as he watched the onrushing point, he stepped his left foot two inches too far forward and the knife did not pass, but had slipped in as easily as into a wineskin. (49)

By presenting this detailed and sharp description of an actual bullfight, the narrator diverges from the straight-forward narration precisely to articulate Paco's point of divergence from actual bullfighters: their level of experience. Knowledge, confidence, and expertise are the first tenet of Hemingway's ethical gamesman, and while Paco's fate exemplifies what happens to a character falsely depicting these qualities, many other stories illustrate the glory attained by characters who embody these characteristics. Santiago of The Old Man and the Sea regains the town's approval after catching a large marlin and the father in "A Day's Wait" successfully hunts two quail for his sick son. Both these protagonists enter their sport with ease because they are confident and knowledgeable about the process and the result is a successful hunt, if perhaps not a successful life.

In "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber," expert-level understanding is used to illustrate the title character's ignorance as opposed to highlighting his knowledge. Francis is terrified by the sounds of the lion roaring and surmises him to be dangerous and close to camp, yet the experienced Robert Wilson has more acute conclusions at hearing the lion's roar. "Sounds like an old-timer," says Wilson who is better prepared and more experienced in hunting the animal (12). The reader has already been informed of Francis's cowardice and disgrace, but through this passage they are made aware of the circumstances leading to that characterization. Francis's inability to quantify the danger lurking outside his camp is emblematic of his lack of hunting experience. This gap in knowledge plays out further when the party hunts the lion. Francis in unsuccessful at killing the lion and upon their pursuit of the injured animal is

unsuccessful at witnessing his death. These failures spring from Francis's fear and apprehension and act as clear indicators of his lack of knowledge, confidence, and expertise. The punishment for Francis's transgression against the tenet of knowledge of an ethical gamesman is becoming a cuckold. His wife, repulsed by Francis's cowardice, sleeps with the established hunter, Wilson. Thus, the first instance of poetic justice in this story takes the form of the impotent hunter becoming the impotent husband.

However, Francis does not continue to be an unsuccessful hunter through the end of the story. In his pursuit of the buffalo, Francis is successful. It is his growth of courage and confidence which allow him to ultimately act as a successful hunter and as he crosses that threshold, the text also reveals his new technical understanding and animal awareness. The text reads, "[H]e had no fear, […] he was shooting at the bull as he moved away […] remembering to get his shots forward into the shoulder" (28). This successful transition into the role of hunter is marked by joy and exuberance, emotions markedly different than the earlier characterization of Macomber as a coward. The transformation is also linguistically and descriptively marked by the technical description of the aim of the gun as knowledge which Macomber is privy to. As Newman's appeal to a singular narrative objective argued, a specific type of writing, technical and nuanced, reveals an ethical treatment, yet Cheatham's argument is also true. There appears to be inconsistence in narrative messaging. Sometimes the technical tone reveals knowledge and sometimes it reveals ignorance. The dissonance, however, is resolved when we understand the narrative goal to be greater than a singular view of Francis Macomber, and rather a repeated characterization dependent on his adherence to Hemingway's ethics of gamesmanship.

Nick Adams in "Big Two-Hearted River" is more consistently adherent to the first tenet of Hemingway's ethical hunter. The refrain "he knew" or "Nick knew" appears consistently

throughout the story. The technical depictions, such as the capturing and hooking of the grasshoppers, the preparation of the campground, or the preparation of the fishing pole, are explicitly Nick's actions and perceptions. There is no doubt that Nick Adams is characterized as a proper gamesman. Ultimately, Nick is rewarded for his successful gamesmanship in the form of two large trout, yet there are moments in the story where Nick works against his knowledge and expertise. After catching his first trout, Nick contemplates where he should fish next. Coming upon a deep pass in the stream below a beech tree, Nick "was sure he would get hooked in the branches" if he were to cast his fly there (229). Tempted by the depth of the water, he acts against his better judgment and attempts to cast his line amongst the branches and roots. While Nick does snag a fish, inevitably and as he himself predicted, the line gets caught. Two things are represented in the intercourse between Nick and his judgment. First, it is revealed that gamesmen are not without temptation. While Nick had the knowledge of what he should do, in that moment, he did not have the restraint to make the knowledge actionable. Second, Nick, like other gamesmen in Hemingway's oeuvre, is punished for working against his better judgment. Another example of gamesman working against their better judgment is Harry in "The Snows of Kilimanjaro." First, Harry forgets to put iodine on his scratch, then he chooses to ignore the injury, and finally he accepts a weak antiseptic. Like Harry who ignores or rejects his knowledge of the proper course of action when out hunting, Nick circumvents his better senses to his own detriment. The differing fates of the characters who work against or without knowledge—Harry, Francis Macomber, and Paco all dying while Nick simply loses a fish—points to an amalgamated effect of violating tenets of Hemingway's ethics of gamesmanship. While the latter worked against his better judgment, the former all perpetrated additional violations against Hemingway's intertextual code.

Ryan Hediger, a literary scholar who frequently explores the treatment of animals in literature, reframed views of Hemingway's literary persona as belonging to two systems of ethics (42). The first is an anthropocentric view which regards hunting ethics as dependent on an ethics of competition whereas the second centers the agent, in this case the protagonist, as a philosopher who must determine the correct course of action based on his relationship to other creatures (42). Like Newman's ethical reading which merits an understanding of animals as intrinsically valuable outside of human use or need, Hediger's second system of ethics, the one which he defends in his paper as being Hemingway's narrative position, prescribes that the protagonist recognize a situational relationship with animals that acknowledges their agency. The idea of animals as independently valuable combined with the notion of an inherent human responsibility to respect them, leads to the second tenet of Hemingway's ethics of gamesmanship: A gamesman much approach the hunt with compassion for their prey.

Approaching prey with compassion does not translate to hesitancy in attack nor remorse for a kill. Hemingway does not venerate Francis Macomber when he hesitates from exiting the vehicle to shoot the lion nor does he forgive David in "An African Story" when he regrets his betrayal of the elephant and renounces elephant hunting. The consideration for compassion as it applies to the ethics of a gamesman is in the decision of how an animal is handled. Hemingway punishes characters who are unduly cruel to animals while venerating those who avoid cruelty. In "Big Two-Hearted River" Nick Adams personifies Hemingway's empathetic fisherman. The first example of Nick's compassion is in his collection of grasshoppers. "Nick picked them up, taking only the medium-sized brown ones," the narrator says (221). At this point, Nick's characterization as a knowledgeable gamesman has been established so that the "only" in the quotation takes on extra meaning. There are many grasshoppers under the log, but Nick takes the

time to pick out only the ones that meet his specifications. Certainly, with the knowledge that the drying dew will soon allow the grasshoppers to escape, it would be faster for Nick to scoop all, or more than he needs quickly and indiscriminately into his bottle. The fact that he doesn't signifies something important about Nick's ethics. The reader understands that Nick is selecting the type of grasshoppers that will best serve as bait but the fact that he excludes any other grasshoppers shows that he is cognizant not to waste their lives even if doing so is an inconvenience for him.

The second incident in which Nick exemplifies his sympathetic leaning towards animals is in his treatment of the first fish he catches. Acknowledging that the trout was too small to keep, Nick returns him to the stream and when the fish does not immediately swim away, he touches him to urge him on. Several things become apparent in the passage. Nick cares for the well-being of a fish even though the fish's survival in no way benefits him personally. This is exemplified when the narrator provides us Nick's interior monologue: "He's alright, Nick thought. He was only tired" (225). Nick's concern for the fish, having no possible ulterior motive, exemplifies Hediger's notion of an ethically aware protagonist and helps to justify Nick's ultimate happy ending. Nick's sympathy is further illustrated in the narrator's careful attention to Nick wetting his hands before touching the trout and the exposition on what happens to trout when they are touched by dry hands. "[A] white fungus attacked the unprotected spot" the narrator explains, and then dipping once more into Nick's motivations, "Nick had again and again come on dead fish, furry with white fungus […] Nick did not like to fish with other men on the river. Unless they were of your party, they spoiled it" (225). Nick's sympathy towards fish extends so far that he not only models his behavior to minimize unnecessary cruelty, but also chooses to separate himself from any gamesman who would engage in a cruel activity. The word

“spoil” here indicates that the benefits of fishing, both the corporeal fulfillment of hunger and Nick’s joy, can be undone if the proper ethics of gamesmanship are not upheld.

Antithetical to Nick Adams’s concern for animals is Francis Macomber’s disregard for their suffering. Motivated by his own cowardice, Francis repeatedly prioritizes his safety over an ethical approach to hunting. When the wounded lion escapes, Francis offers solutions that both go against the advice of the expert, Wilson, and which would result in more suffering for the lion. Francis's first suggestion for killing the lion is to set the grass on fire. His second and third suggestion are to send in others to kill the lion. Francis’s final suggestion is to leave the lion in the brush to bleed to death. Even when Wilson confronts Francis about his final suggestion saying, “What do you mean?” Macomber simply repeats himself either unwilling or unable to consider the cruelty of allowing an animal to die a slow, painful death (17). Just as Francis Macomber was characterized by his lack of experience and cowardice, he is now characterized by his cruelty. Stepping into Wilson’s thoughts, the narrator explains, “[Wilson] suddenly felt as though he had opened the wrong door in a hotel and seen something shameful” (17). The expert gamesman of the story, Wilson, defines Francis’s thoughts as shameful, indicating their misalignment with proper hunting etiquette. Wilson’s feeling as though he has opened the wrong door echoes the sentiments of Nick Adams. Francis’s unethical gamesmanship makes the gamesman who must accompany him feel out of place.

After the wounded lion escapes, Macomber asks a series of questions that start with “What do we do?" And concludes with a series of requests that would allow him to avoid continuing the hunt (17). In the span of two pages, Francis Macomber violates every principle of Hemingway’s ethical gamesman. He is unknowledgeable about how to proceed, terrified rather than confident, and he is cruel. Despite his later transcendence into the role of hunter, his early

violations result in retribution through his death. While the circumstance of his death, accidental or intentional, has been hotly contested for decades, the reason for his death is clear. Regardless if one follows the traditional reading that Margaret aimed the rifle at Francis or the revisionist reading that she aimed at the buffalo, her reason for aiming the gun remains Francis's actions as a gamesman. George Cheatham, in his attempt to identify Margaret's unique narrative voice, touches on the inevitability of Francis's death. In comparing the two schools of thought, he says, "[Margaret's] choices are clear responses to Francis's behavior" (757). By acknowledging that Margaret's choice to shoot the gun is responsive to "Francis's behavior," the protagonist himself becomes responsible for his death. If Margaret shot at the buffalo to protect her husband, it is because his earlier cowardice indicated his inability to act as a proper hunter. If Margaret shot at her husband, it is because of his revealed cruelty, "chasing those big helpless things in a motor car" (30). The poetic justice which concludes this story is this: Francis Macomber, the unethical gamesman is unethically hunted.

The poetic justice which Nick Adams's receives at the conclusion of "Big Two-Hearted River" is more nuanced than Francis Macomber's. When Nick fished the tree covered stretch of the stream, he revealed the unpleasant results of working against ethical gamesmanship, yet the same temptation is present at the conclusion of the story. Nick knows that fishing in the swamp would be "to hook big trout in places impossible to land them" (231). If he purposely caught a fish he could not keep, he would be violating the tenet of compassion for prey. To go against his better judgment of avoiding the swamp would be violating the tenet of knowledge. By not fishing the swamp, he turns away from this unethical sport and is rewarded with the two trout which he keeps and will presumably eat at camp, yet the final sentence of the story reads, "There were plenty of days coming when he could fish the swamp" (232). Once again, the narration

positions knowledge as actionable. To be ethical, one must continually make ethical choices, and for Nick Adams to continue to be an ethical gamesman, he must choose to utilize his knowledge, confidence, and expertise in an ethical and sympathetic manner.

Gamesmanship, particularly in the form of hunting and fishing, is a major recurring theme in the works of Ernest Hemingway, yet hunters and fishermen in Hemingway's short stories do not share a unified motivation for their pursuits, a common outcome, nor a singular representation of the masculine role of hunter. In "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber," a local gossip columnist describes Francis Macomber's purpose as "adding more than a spice of adventure to [his] […] Romance" (22). Alternately, Nick Adams in "Big Two-Hearted River" happily, "felt he had left everything behind, the need for thinking, the need to write, other needs. It was all back of him" (210). These two memorable protagonists enter their stories of gamesmanship for different reasons. What's more, their understanding of hunting and fishing as well as their treatment of animals is as disparate as the fate which Hemingway articulates for them. Francis's characterization as cruel, cowardly, and incompetent juxtaposed with Nick's characterization as knowledgeable, confident, and compassionate reveal a pattern of poetic justice dependent entirely on a gamesman's compliance with a code of ethics and subsequently his reluctance to the popular notion of masculine bravado. The two tenets of Hemingway's ethical gamesman have hitherto been described as competence and compassion, but certainly the code could be expanded to include patience, restraint, and independence, qualities that Hemingway's triumphant gamesman share. Ryan Hediger said of an animal ethics, "we must work to recognize who and what we are if we are to make ethical choices" (41). This idea, applied to Hemingway's gamesman describes the questions which guide their fate: Who are the

gamesmen? What characteristics define them as gamesmen? How does that constructed character reveal their ethics?

Hemingway's fathers and hunters are two examples of how the simplistic view of Hemingway's men as machismo stereotypes undermines the intricacies that the author has woven into his models of masculinity. Far from savage and aggressive enactors of their will, Hemingway's men operate within their masculine roles because of complex emotional and ethical motivations. This is not to say that the descriptors that are most frequently associated with Hemingway's protagonists, hubristic, assertive, and domineering men, are inaccurate, but rather that Hemingway has embedded dialogue about the nature, cause, and realities of these masculine traits. In the next chapter, this thesis focuses on the relationship between Hemingway's masculinities and society to examine the source of his characters machismo identities. Just as this chapter revealed a complex set of motivations that propel Hemingway's men into action, the next chapter will examine why these characters engage in specific roles and how those roles validate their identity.

Chapter 3

Masculinity and Society: *The Garden of Eden* and *The Old Man and the Sea*

A discussion on Ernest Hemingway and masculinity might start with an often-quoted passage from a letter he wrote to F. Scott Fitzgerald in 1926. “[N]ot referring to guts but to something else. Grace under pressure” (717). The quotation and specifically the phrase “grace under pressure” is most often and most famously described as a qualifier for courage. Because Hemingway’s letter explicitly dissociates "grace under pressure” from “guts,” attributing the quotation to courage relies on the subtle distinction between the colloquialism “guts” and the concept of courage, a distinction that is connotative at most. A more succinct connection can be established by asking who, in Hemingway’s works, is under pressure and what is that pressure? Respectively, the answers to the preceding questions are male protagonists and the societal pressure to perform as a man. Rereading Hemingway’s quotation with these connections in mind, “grace under pressure” becomes a successful performance of masculinity.

The notion of performative gender was established in the 1990s by American philosopher Judith Butler. In short, Butler argues that behaviors categorized as masculine or feminine are dictated by societal expectations rather than evolving from innate sex characteristics. In her book *Gender Trouble* she says gender expression is “constructed within the terms of discourse and power, where power is partially understood in terms of heterosexual and phallic cultural conventions” (41). This argument, taken out of the context of Butler’s engagement with body politics and used as a literary framework, explains why authors of different locales or time periods might describe an ideal man in different terms—the authors were conditioned to view manliness through different lenses. This reconceptualization of manhood as determined by society offers two points of discussion to the question of Hemingway and masculinity. First,

Hemingway's notion of masculinity or "grace under pressure" requires his protagonists to perform in societally prescribed male archetypes. His characters are motivated by a desire to be perceived as men. Second, Hemingway's protagonists' masculinity is threatened when their social relationships are called into question. This results in what Teodóra Dömötör has called *anxious masculinity* (Anxious Masculinity, 122).

In her discussion of Hemingway's short story "Mr. And Mrs. Elliott," Dömötör asserts that the comical reading the story is often ascribed underestimates the seriousness of Mr. Elliott's depression and overlooks its cause, the societal expectations of a husband. She explains, "Hemingway's American hero needs the support of women in understanding his manhood. Their presence assures his identity" (131). Indeed, there is a trend in Hemingway's writing where male protagonists define their masculinity based on their relationships to women. David Bourne in *The Garden of Eden*, Jake Barnes in *The Sun Also Rises*, and Francis Macomber in "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber" are just some of the men who define their happiness and success through the satisfaction of their lovers. Yet other works highlight male-male or man-society relationships as the measure of both the protagonist's self-worth and his masculinity. In Hemingway's hunting stories, the protagonists are often concerned with their relationship to fellow gamesmen and in his bullfighting stories, they are concerned with their public persona. Still, in other works the protagonists' main concerns and measures of manliness are split between both their relationship with women and their relationship with other men. In *A Farewell to Arms* for example, Frederic's preoccupations are both his relationship to Catherine and his reputation as an invalid, a deserter, and finally a criminal. Rather than the "support of women" being the determining factor in the masculinity of Hemingway's heroes, it is their ability to fit the

masculine roles society has assigned them whether that be husband, hunter, soldier, or something else.

Josep Armengol studied how the hunter role functions as performative masculinity in the later works of Ernest Hemingway. Though his analysis centers on Hemingway's works of non-fiction and examines biographical factors, Armengol's analysis incorporates Butler's notion of gender as performative. Armengol's explication of *GHOA* and *UK* support the notion that Hemingway's protagonists, whether they be fictive or real-world persona, are motivated by their masculine roles and societal connections. Armengol writes, "In [*Green Hills of Africa*], trophy-hunting functions not only as an individual test of manhood but also, and above all, as 'a performance' of phallic power before and against other . . . hunters" (837). Armengol asserts that the Hemingway who narrates these later non-fiction works uses hunting as a stage to assert his manliness or "phallic power." Like Dömötör, Armengol acknowledges the necessity of human relationships in defining masculinity, but contrary to Dömötör's assertion about the role of female characters, Armengol centers male comradery as the location where masculine identity is formed and exhibited. Armengol was not the first critic to illuminate the social roles that define masculinity in Hemingway's works. Jacob Michael Leland explicated *SAR* as a story of Jake Barnes's reclamation of masculinity through the role of consumer. A central argument in Leland's article is that the reestablishment of Jake's manhood is necessitated because of his status as a foreigner (39). By establishing Jake's foreignness as the source of a diminished masculinity, the perceptions of a protagonist's society—the human and social relationships he can establish or maintain—become the main motivation of Hemingway's hero.

Hemingway's masculinity is defined through relationships. Whether through brotherhood, competition, sex, or power, Hemingway's protagonists develop and express their

masculinity through its effect on others. In this way, Hemingway's masculinity is not as limited as some have defined it. While it is often depicted through a man's physical prowess or libido, it is also defined by the gentleness with which a husband enters marriage, a writer's authorial command of his audience, or the gregariousness of a gentleman in society. Indeed, more central to the male Hemingway protagonist than aggression or authority is their acceptance by society. As Cary Wolfe says in her ecofeminist reading of *GOE*, "we are beginning to understand that Hemingway . . . was, all along, intensely interested in the transgressive possibilities of gender performativity" (Wolfe 223). In *GOE,* David Bourne fulfills many masculine roles that allow him entrance into society. As one of the central concerns in *GOE* is the limits to which gender can be pushed within a marriage, it serves as a perfect location to examine how Hemingway's male protagonist performs gender within and outside of society.

The roles with which David Bourne identifies in *GOE*—son, husband, and earner—are related in that they are male positions in family and society. It follows that David's understanding of self is undeniably entangled with his conceptualization of masculinity. Each instance of presenting himself as a distinct member of society is defined by his gendered relationship to others. David's self-examinations include his comparisons to his father, his role as a husband, and his status as a writer. David's reflections within his autobiographical compositions reveal the story of his self-development in relation to male influences. In the embedded narrative of David's youth, his father and Juma alternately serve as male role models and adversaries, providing David the space to define who he is as a man. David's present-day identity as a man in a foreign country is defined by his role as husband. Local proprietors and old acquaintances alike make considerations about his character based on his marriage. In turn, David's actions are often a result of his desire to be a good husband. As David and Catherine

continue to explore various destinations, he maintains his relationship to the larger world through his writing. The news clippings he periodically reads, which contain reviews of his writing, define his contribution to society. A point of pride, his writing allows him to understand himself as both an expert and an earner, traditionally male roles in the 1920s—when the story takes place.

Several of David's works are mentioned throughout GOE—his first novel about East Africa, his second novel on aviation, the chronicles of his ongoing honeymoon, and the short stories which detail his childhood experiences. Of these pieces of writing, the reader is only given full spectatorship to David's childhood narrative. This embedded narrative tells David's coming of age in a harsh terrain where his only companions are his father, a man named Juma, and his dog. In this story, masculine relationships influence David's development of self and morality and ultimately shape his definition of manhood. Just before David begins composing the story of his childhood safari, he completes a short piece about one of his father's experiences. David thinks, "All your father found, he found for you too" (129). This quotation sets the stage for the role of David's father in the subsequent work. While the reader might be inclined to consider David's father a harsh or violent man, this precursor is a reminder that he is also a source of David's knowledge and truth. Though David will not agree with the choices his father makes, those choices, just like his own, provide context for the man he chooses to become. The quote also holds lived experiences and secondhand knowledge to be equivalent, thus illustrating the capacity of David's male relationships to act as determinants in his self-development.

At the outset of the embedded story, David and his dog are tracking an elephant through the jungle and the reader is made to believe that his motivation is awe for the creature. David points out the elephant "smelled strong but old" and had a right tusk "as thick as his own thigh"

(159-60). The young David is careful not to alert the elephant of his presence, forcing his dog to stay back and moving silently so that he seems not only awed, but frightened. This deepening sense of David's fear and wonder lasts only until the writer's next return to the story when the reader learns that David's stealth and curiosity arose from a desire to impress his father and Juma. This stark shift in perspective reveals the nature of David's childish ambitions. It is not wonder which prompted David to risk his wellbeing, but the promise of a bond with other men. It appears that David is rewarded for his report. He is invited to join Juma and his father on their hunt for the elephant and he is cared for—has his feet checked; is offered extra food, water, and warmth; and is carefully observed as they trek through the jungle—yet David seems to reject these offerings. "I'm not hungry," he says when offered more meat (165). "I don't need your coat," he tells his father who wants him to stay warm at night (166). The shift in tone which revealed the motivation behind David's elephant tracking, also reveals that his desires are not being met. He wanted to impress his father and Juma not so that they would spoil him or offer him preferential treatment, but so that he could enter their company as an equal. This story of David's coming of age is marked with his active desire to be a man amongst men. David the writer is aware of the ironies of his entrance into manhood. He depicts his boyhood self as an outsider might perceive him, full of wonder, fear, and exhaustion, while the boy himself believes that he is acting with the confidence of a masculine hunter. When he must then perform in the same male role that his father and Juma occupy, he is discouraged to learn he is neither able nor perceived able to function as a true hunter.

The distinction between David and the men, while contrary to David's initial objective of joining them in manhood, still allows him to mature. Indeed, the recognition that he is not one of the men allows him to contemplate them from a detached point of view and develop his own

intellectual opinions on their, and subsequently his own, vision of masculinity. As David writes about his continued journey with Juma and his father he says, "[I] knew that it was not just the need for sleep that made the difference between a boy and men . . . [I] knew too that it was not just that they were men. They were professional hunters" (171). In this second tonal shift, David recognizes his otherness from the men while also becoming aware of the complexity of that distinction. Through the repetition of "not just" David notes that the type of men he is among, professional hunters, are an iteration of manhood that is further removed from his current state. This is illustrated again when David acts as a hunter and kills two spur fowl for dinner. Though he receives the comradery he had initially sought, David is now uninterested, giving no reaction at all to Juma's smile or his father's discussion of their improved rations. Where David had once lamented being treated being treated like a child by the men, he is now apathetic to enter their company.

David's new understanding of his relationship with men, knowing he does not need to seek their approval, allows him to truly enter the role of their equal and permits him to appraise their actions. What David finds, is that he does not want to be a man like Juma or his father. The realization that the men he is with hunt for sport rather than necessity allows David, for the first time, to consider that some men will be undeserving of his company. "I'll never tell them anything again," David thinks, illustrating his departure from their vision of masculinity (181). Rejecting the companionship of these men David asks himself, "Why didn't you help the elephant when you could?" and tells his father, "Fuck elephant hunting" (181). He is content that his father will not trust him in the capacity of a hunter again. The embedded narrative illustrates to the reader David's first introduction to manhood. Through this story we learn that David has always identified masculinity through relationships. As a child he hoped to be a man by being

among men, but ultimately defined himself as a man through the types of relationships he would not tolerate.

In the main timeline of the novel, we see the type of male roles David has chosen to occupy. While in Spain David recognizes a patron at a bar as his old Colonel and he feels "suddenly happy" (60). As in other moments of human connection, David is encouraged by his ability to substantiate his maleness in the presence of others. In the context of the colonel, David knows the definition of his masculinity as that of a soldier. Yet the security of knowing his male place is quickly challenged. In the background of a foreign bar, he is not at war and the Colonel is not his commander. After learning that David has gotten married, the Colonel is quick to assess the value of the male connections David has gained. The Colonel, who knows of Catherine's family, says her father's death "is no loss to [David]" and continues to say that she also has a "silly uncle" who is "really worthless" (61). David retorts that he married Catherine, not her family, establishing his role of husband as more valuable than any male society to which he may belong. In fact, throughout David's time in France and Spain his marriage to Catherine is the main role he plays in society.

In each lodging throughout their honeymoon, anytime David shows up without his wife the proprietor asks when she will be there. One of the first instances when they interact with the general public together, a waiter asks if the letters they are viewing have pictures of their wedding and if he may see them. When he learns that they are looking at reviews of David's book, he asks Catherine, "Is Madame also a writer?" again centering the relationship between the two rather than David's status alone (24). In each of the foreign locales they travel to, the only constant they have is each other and thus their status as a unit becomes the focus of both David and the locals. One night, Catherine claims "we're us against all the others" (37). Though she

often travels off on her own, she too centers their relationship as their defining feature in the French Riviera. David's devotion to the role of husband is central to the novel. When Catherine wants to dress or act in ways that are improper or seemingly "crazy," David forgives her and reassures her of his love.

David's conviction to his role as husband is so intense that he often acts as an enabler for Catherine's erratic behavior even to the detriment of the other facets of his masculine expression. After having her hair cut very short, notably shorter than women tend to cut their hair, Catherine explains that she wants to roleplay during sex as a man and have David act as a woman. David's reaction is to grab her breasts and say, "Where I'm holding you you are a girl" (17). He is trying to subtly tell Catherine that he does not want to engage in the sexual act. However, this initial reluctance does not last long and as Catherine persists in her desire to reverse roles, David laid "back in the dark and did not think at all" as Catherine presumably engaged in penetrative sex (17). This first instance of David giving in to Catherine's sexual fantasies sets the tone for each recurrence. In subsequent encounters, David is more vocal about his desire to not participate in this role reversal, yet each time he ultimately gives in. While these activities seem to undermine David's status as a man, they highlight his conviction to the masculine role he plays on his honeymoon—the husband.

David's willingness to appease his wife spreads beyond their sexual encounters to other facets of their life. Though he doesn't want to, David allows Catherine to dictate how he will get his hair styled. David allows Catherine to transform an extramarital affair into a polyamorous partner in their marriage. David forgives Catherine for destroying the only copy of his compositions. In each of these instances Catherine seemingly attacks a key expression of his masculinity, yet he allows or forgives these acts because he understands a successful husband to

have a fulfilled wife. It becomes clear that Catherine's erratic behavior extends beyond innocent sexual and gender experimentation to aggressive and sporadic outbursts, but David prioritizes Catherine's desires over her health. When she revolts against the idea of seeing a doctor, David says, "We don't have to [go]" and again folds to Catherine's will (157). When Catherine finally leaves their honeymoon, which seems to the reader to be little short of a nightmare for David, it is of her own volition. Even though her absence allows David to reengage in another important expression of his masculinity, his role as a writer, the letter she wrote for him leaves him feeling moved rather than relieved.

The Colonel, who appraised David for his male relationships and his marriage, also inquired about his role as an author and subsequently a provider. "I liked the book. Has it done well?" he asks David (61). The Colonel's emphasis on the financial security the book offers rather than its artistic value highlights the part of David's authorship which relates to his masculine role in society. In fact, as David and Catherine travel through France and Spain David's writing keeps him connected to the society that he has left. Though few of the locals know of his book, he is mailed news clippings of reviews of his book which allow him to fill the masculine role of an authority. The first batch of news clippings also came with news of a second printing. David's immediate reaction is to grab a pencil and calculate his earnings. David reveres the role of earner and is excited to occupy that space. The importance David places on the monetary value of his writing is illustrated in one of his early arguments with Catherine. When she reminds him that they have plenty of money from her bank account he says, "The hell with it" (27). While David had earlier admitted to enjoying the easy life that accompanied Catherine's dowry, he is not happy to admit that their wealth stems from her. He goes on to say that he wants

to write, which, in the context of the argument, reveals his deep desire to function as the provider in their family.

As a boy trying to become a man, as a husband, and as a writer, David's character is defined by the masculine roles he chooses to occupy or reject. Those roles are in turn defined by their dependence on human relationships. Hemingway's use of tonal shifts in the embedded narrative, David's exaggerated willingness to accommodate his wife, and David's persistence in his writing help to define a masculinity that is ubiquitous in Hemingway's works. David learns from his father that the company of men is not the defining factor of manhood, he fulfills the role of the giving husband to a fault, and he writes to create a place as an expert in society and a provider at home. Through these facets of the protagonist, *GOE* is an example of the interrelationship between masculinity and human connection found across Hemingway's works. This same theme can be seen in his shorter works including his short stories and his novella, *The Old Man and the Sea.*

As a novella that mostly follows an old, solitary character on the vast sea, *OMS* may seem a strange choice to study the connection between masculinity and society, yet this work, and especially Santiago's recollections and circumstances, offer insights into the ways humanity constructs male expectations. Ostracized by his community for forces outside of his control, Santiago is perceived as frail and needy, the antithesis of Cuba's male machismo. Yet, as his expedition proves, he maintains the virility and strength which define successful male heroes. While his community dissociates with him for his perceived lack of masculine prowess, it is their abandonment of him which strips him of his sense of manliness and self-worth. Though Santiago engages in an epic and brutal journey, he is more concerned with the relationships that he has lost than the purported manliness of his adventure. The Old Man's relationship to Manolin and

his late wife showcase the role that human connections play in motivation. In his moments when he feels most disconnected from society, he turns his mind to public displays of masculinity—including arm-wrestling, hunting, and baseball—to reconnect. It is through the juxtaposition of Santiago's desire for connection and his dauntless pursuit of a fish that Hemingway portrays the true source of masculine power—the validation of society.

Ernest Hemingway addresses the source of Santiago's ostracization in the very first page of the novella. "[A]fter [the first] 40 days without a fish . . . the old man was now definitely and finally *salao*, which is the worst form of unlucky" (9). The words, described as coming from Santiago's former apprentice's parents, reveal a great deal about Santiago's predicament and the locals' opinions of him. As a fisherman, Santiago's inability to catch a fish would signify that he is short on both monetary funds and food. Already described as an old man, Santiago quickly takes on the image of a frail dependent of his society. Manolin's parents, aware of the boy's affection for Santiago, blame his misfortune on uncontrollable luck, yet it becomes clear that the locals believe the true cause of Santiago's ineffectuality is his corporeal state. "[M]any of the fisherman made fun of the old man . . . Others, of the older fisherman, looked at him and were sad" (11). The sympathy of the older fisherman signifies their acknowledgment of their own impending fate. Santiago, they believe, is useless because of his age and decrepit state. Rather than take pity on Santiago, his society shuns him. The young fishermen laugh; Manolin's parents send their son away, removing both Santiago's professional attendant and his personal confidant; and only Manolin seeks to provide for Santiago's basic needs. Though Santiago's pursuit of the marlin later in the story indicates it was never a failing of his virility that stopped him from catching a fish, society's rejection of him impacts his perception of himself as a man.

Santiago does not cope with his isolation. At his hut, he and Manolin pretend that Santiago has fishing supplies that he previously had to sell and that he has food that he cannot afford. These inventions of mind point to the type of self-sufficient masculinity that Santiago wishes he had. He is neither successful in his profession nor is he able to provide for himself. Other male roles that Santiago has been stripped of are simply ignored. "Once there had been a tinted photograph of his wife on the wall but he had taken it down because it made him too lonely" (16). Santiago's avoidance illustrates his inability to cope with his disconnect from humanity. Both the male role of provider that he pretends to inhabit and the lost role of husband that he ignores are examples of Santiago's yearning for a society-centered masculinity. It is not being perceived as a man that he desires, but the connections that such perceptions afford.

On the boat, Santiago proves that he was always capable of catching fish. Despite his age, injuries, and a cramping hand, Santiago leverages his expertise to ultimately catch a fish bigger than the town had ever seen, but because they had already rejected him, he had to pursue the marlin alone. While there is much to say about Santiago's physical pursuit of the fish, it is his mental journey which illustrates his motivations and desires. Before and during his fishing expedition, Santiago idolizes the baseball player Joe DiMaggio. DiMaggio is a significant figure for Santiago to latch on to. Santiago asks himself, "Do you believe the great DiMaggio would stay with a fish as long as I will stay with this one?" (68). Santiago is sure that he would. As a professional athlete, Joe DiMaggio would have exerted stereotypical masculine energy. To play professional baseball, he would need endurance, strength, and speed, but integral to understanding why Santiago latched on to DiMaggio is understanding that he wasn't simply a professional athlete, he was an American hero. During the composition of *OMS* DiMaggio was one of the most famous baseball players and subsequently, one of the most beloved. Santiago

would idolize DiMaggio not just because he was an example of male physical excellence, the son of a fisherman, and nicknamed after a boat, but because he collected a level of societal appreciation that Santiago could only ever dream of.

Santiago also reminisces about a time when he won an arm-wrestling match. The thought, "gives himself more confidence" (68-9). Again, Santiago focuses on an instance of societal importance. In this memory, he and his opponent are held at a tie for twenty-four hours before Santiago wins, but significant to the old man's reveries is that men were betting for either side and that when he won just before a draw was called. Santiago recalls this memory fondly, though he was locked in competition for an entire day and was bleeding from his fingernails before it was through, because he played an important and masculine role in society. Hemingway describes the competitor as "a fine man and a great athlete" which sweetens Santiago's victory (70). Like Santiago's idolization of DiMaggio, his jubilation in this triumph is doubled by both the athlete status and the adoration of onlookers. Santiago also recognizes in his memory, the same fate which his town seems to have inflicted on him. The following spring, he had a return match against the same man, but "won it quite easily since he had broken the confidence . . . in the first match" (70). While there are many physical odds against Santiago capturing the marlin, the biggest mental obstacle is overcoming the broken confidence instilled by the town's insistence of his salao.

In *GOE* David goes to extreme lengths to maintain his status as Catherine's husband. In *OMS* Santiago goes to extreme lengths to regain his status as a fisherman. While these characters engage with masculinity in disparate ways, David clinging to the male role he has carved out for himself while Santiago desperately attempts to regain the position that was once his, both are motivated by a desire to maintain human connections. Like most of Hemingway's protagonists,

these men strive to function in masculinized roles of society. Beyond their inherent connection to society, the roles explored in this chapter, son, husband, provider, and fisherman, and the roles presented in the previous chapter, father and hunter, are also unified in their frequent oversimplification by critics and scholars. More than simple tropes, the roles that recur in Hemingway's works place characters in patterns of ambitions and goals that are unanimous across the author's body of works. These characters, however, face threats to their masculinity from more than just their own shortcomings and one of the most frequent threats is the woman. Recentering masculinity as the heart of Hemingway scholarship, it would make sense that the antithesis of man would be his demise. Hemingway's women enter the text as objects of desire, but frequently become objects of despair. Their sense of authority and their reconstruction of the man's purpose result in a loss of masculinity, which is the ultimate threat for characters who thrive in social environments.

Chapter 4

Female Manipulation as Threat to Masculinity: *The Garden of Eden*

In recent years, the women of Hemingway's fiction have taken center stage in feminist literary scholarship. Once purported to be flat or unengaging characters, Hemingway's women have come to evoke questions of motivation, psychological characterization, and emotional complexity. Yet even as these characters have taken center stage, scholars have been careful to note their relegation to a subordinate position in Hemingway's stories. As Margaret Bauer said in 2003, "Hemingway is often criticized for his one-dimensional characterization of the women in his fiction. . . [but t]he problem they have with Hemingway's women is not that they are one-dimensional (the numerous studies of them suggest otherwise), but that they are usually not central characters" (126). Indeed, Hemingway rarely creates female protagonists, and the identity of his female characters is almost always defined by their relationship to men. Bauer goes on to argue that these characters are not evidence of a masculinist Hemingway aesthetic as they are not more flawed than the protagonists, but Bauer's argument falls short of defining their significance to Hemingway's overall literary purposes. The flaws which Hemingway's women exert, like their identities, are definitively tied to their male counterparts, causing harm to their masculine identities. Their detrimental relationship to Hemingway's men in combination with their relegation to a secondary character status, reveals that Hemingway's women often fill the role of villain. Further, by examining the characteristics of Hemingway's villainous women, women like Catherine Bourne, Lady Brett Ashley, and Margaret Macomber, it becomes clear that the threat that Hemingway's women pose is an authoritative challenge to their counterpart's masculinity.

Long before the recent uptick in feminist scholarship, there has existed a woman question in Hemingway scholarship. Alan Holder has said, "It seems to be the general consensus of

Hemingway criticism that his women fall into one of two categories, either that of the bitch who threatens to rob the Hemingway male of his strength and integrity, or that of the dream girl, a mindless creature who makes no demands upon her man and who exists only to satisfy his (sexual) needs" (153). Scholars, as Holder mentioned, regularly categorize the women in Hemingway's works as characters intended to be obstacles or prizes for their male counterparts. As the quotation suggests, the most important feature of these women's characterization is their relationship to the wellbeing of their male counterparts. Holder, for his part, attempted to redefine the division in Hemingway's women, claiming there was an "other Hemingway" within his body of work and essentially recategorizing the writing of the author as works that employed sympathetic views of women and works that did not (153). Holder's assertion of inscribed literary sympathy is essentially a renaming of what was already recognized in Hemingway scholarship: some of his women cause harm to the protagonists.

This trend of creating new dichotomies to diversify the understanding of Hemingway's female characters persisted in the field. In 1980, Linda Wagner published an article examining the characteristics of Hemingway's early female characters versus those in his later published works. She declared, "One of the most striking characteristics of Hemingway's women in his early fiction is their resemblance to the later, mature Hemingway hero" (239). In a way, Wagner's assessment is similar to Holder's. The characteristics which she aligns with the early women and the late heroes are indeed the characteristics that position them in a sympathetic light. Yet Wagner's work is distinct from Holder's in that she centers the female characters as having their own inherent sovereignty that does not necessitate additional sympathy from the male protagonist. For Wagner, the value in the female characters, that is the early female characters in Hemingway, is found through explication of the female character on her own

whereas Holder defines their value through the fictitious male gaze. Wagner's approach recognizes Hemingway's female characters as having and expressing unique motivations.

By examining female characters through the male gaze Holder both worked for and against his cause. Indeed, understanding the effect of female characters on the central figure of apiece, in this case Hemingway's male protagonists, is a requisite to understand their implications on the work as a whole. Yet, by focusing only on the author's or the characters' sympathies Holder underestimates the effect that female characters have on the plot. As Wagner asserted, Hemingway's women have power. Rather than focus on how the male characters feel about their women, a focus on the effect of female actions provides a fuller picture of what Hemingway accomplished. Wagner's approach, however, did not have the same goal as Holder's. While Wagner details the complexities of Hemingway's early women, she does not examine how these "interesting women" functioned beyond a point of intrigue (243). Taking these two approaches together, a fuller picture of the intricacies Hemingway wrote into women can becomes clear. Hemingway's female characters exert their authority over male characters to the detriment of their manhood.

Contrary to Holder's pursuit of a sympathetic woman, answering the question of female authority leads back to "the bitch who threatens to rob the Hemingway male of his strength and integrity" (Holder, 153). She, more so than Holder's sympathetic woman or Wagner's reconceptualized female hero, has complex motives which may prove she was never a bitch at all. Charles Nolan aimed to understand the motivations of Hemingway's female characters by re-evaluating the actions of Catherine in *Farewell to Arms*, Lady Brett Ashley in *The Sun Also Rises*, and Maria in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Reconceptualizing the actions of each of these women as symptomatic of psychiatric disorders he says, "Catherine's depression, Brett's

borderline [personality disorder], and Maria's trauma make us sympathetic to their plights and respectful of the challenges each of them must overcome to have any chance at happiness" (118). By ascribing the actions of these women to mental conditions, Nolan contends with the traditional notion of Hemingway's 'flat' women in a way that is unique from Holder and Wagner. While he also argues that they are sympathetic characters and he acknowledges that they have power and authority, in discussing their actions and the implications on the protagonist he acknowledges their autonomy—albeit limited by mental illness—as a frequent source of anguish for the Hemingway hero.

In the works of Hemingway, females often threaten the well-being of male protagonists. Dolores Barracano Schmidt classifies these female characters as "The Great American Bitch" an archetype that began appearing regularly in literature at the turn of the 20th century and has persisted in pop culture (900). She goes on to describe this character, "She is well-educated, well-married, attractive, intelligent, desirable, admired by her husband, envied by others, the woman who appears to have everything and is totally dissatisfied with it. . . Her constant demands and ever-increasing dissatisfaction are unsolved mysteries to her me" (900). This description does seem to match many of Hemingway's women. Schmidt notes Margot of "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber," Brett of *SAR*, and the wife in "Cat in the Rain" as examples, but the description would also apply to Catherine of *GOE* and Cornelia of "Mr. and Mrs. Elliot." These women express desires that their husbands cannot or will not fulfill while seemingly getting everything they request. Schmidt's summation of the "American Bitch" is in line with the early critical reception of Hemingway's female characters that were classified as obstacles to the male heroes. Nolan might argue that the complicated desires of these characters are evidentiary of a complex psyche that Hemingway imbues his women. Indeed, it seems the

actions of these women as well as the reactions of their men can be attributed to psychological and sociological theory.

Kate Abramson has defined the term "gaslighting" as "a form of emotional manipulation in which the gaslighter tries (consciously or not) to induce in someone the sense that [his or] her reactions, perceptions, memories and/or beliefs are not just mistaken, but utterly without grounds" (2). This is precisely the type of manipulation Hemingway's women engage in. Catherine Bourne in *GOE* makes sure to repeatedly tell her husband that he is enjoying her sexual and gender expression experimentation. Margot in "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber" tells Francis the cause of her infidelity is his cowardice. To a lesser extent, Lady Brett Ashley in *SAR* also engages in this practice, making almost all the male characters believe she is attracted to them only to reveal that she had no interest and later acting as though she never led them on. The men in these stories, when they become aware of the manipulative nature of their women, rename them in a practice that Nadine Devost claims "pinpoint[s] a woman's place in a relationship" (46). In *SAR*, for example, Brett is referred to as "Circe . . . she turns men into swine" (148). The reference is a blatant pronouncement of her status as a seductress and manipulator. In "Short Happy Life," Francis calls Margot "bitch" for her infidelity and in *GOE* David refers to Catherine as "devil" for the sexual acts she engages him in. As Devost makes clear in her work, Hemingway was purposeful in the terms he used to refer to his female characters and they were always revelatory of the protagonist's perceptions. This renaming illustrates a commonality in the actions of these female characters. To answer an earlier posed question, these female characters exert their authority over men through mental manipulation.

Another aspect of gaslighting that Abramson outlines is the frequency with which it is enacted as a tool of sexism. One of six manners that Abramson outlines in which gaslighting

frequently becomes a sexist act reads "some of the forms of emotional manipulation that are employed . . . rely on the target's internalization of sexist norms" (3). While Abramson is framing these acts as they are perpetrated by men in authority against women, the mental manipulation that Hemingway's female characters engage in also depends on an exploitation of "the target's internalization of sexist norms" and more specifically, the protagonist's sense of his masculinity. For example, in "Mr. And Mrs. Elliot" Cornelia allows her husband to believe she wants to have a child with him, fueling his desires to fill the role of father, yet she is intimate with him infrequently and eventually has him send for a woman who is presumably her lesbian lover. Often the transgressions against Hemingway's protagonists' masculinity take the form of denying, transgressing, or redistributing sexual favors. In addition to Cornelia's refusal, Catherine Bourne's sexual subversion, Margot Macomber's infidelity, and Lady Brett Ashley's false coquettishness all threaten the masculine roles in which Hemingway's protagonists perform. Catherine Bourne is a particularly adept example of the toll female sexual authority has on the protagonist's masculinity.

Catherine Bourne's erratic and unexpected behavior throughout *GOE* illustrate her sense of authority over her husband. By exercising unilateral decision making and attempting to convince David that he is a beneficiary of her choices, Catherine engages in a practice of gaslighting. Her actions threaten and strain David's social and mental wellbeing by alienating him and undermining his sense of purpose. The changes in intimacy, appearance, and authorial power which Catherine catalyzes reposition David as a subject to Catherine's will as opposed to an autonomous actor. Catherine's belief that she is an expert on her own and her husband's desires transform their sexual relationship despite David's reluctance and protestation. Concurrently, Catherine's persistent desire to change her appearance against social expectations

positions David as a pariah in spaces where his foreignness already created a degree of separation. Her sense of authority over David's writing undermines his confidence. Catherine exploits each area of their relationship—the sexual, the social, and the professional—by urging transformation in a direction of her choosing while convincing David that it was his idea all along.

The bible story of the garden of Eden is often read as a story of temptation, but until the devil arrives, Eve is not tempted. The argument stands that the story is less about Eve's temptation in consuming the symbolic fruit, however enticing it might have been, than Eve's inability to withstand the devil's manipulation. It is apt, then, that Hemingway nicknames Catherine Bourne devil in *GOE.* When Devost claimed the Hemingway's naming conventions "pinpoint a woman's place in a relationship," she also noted "these references. . . chang[e] depending upon how a given relationship unfolds" and "become mirrors of the conflicts in which the women find themselves" (1). Almost every time David refers to Catherine as "devil" it is in reference to one of the activities in which she asserts her authority over David: their sex life, their appearance, or David's writing. Just as the devil in the form of a serpent convinced Eve that she would not die if she ate from the tree, Catherine convinces David to fold to her will, and only in those moments does Catherine transgress to becoming "devil."

One of the first facets of the Bourne's relationship where we see Catherine enacting authority over David's agency is their intimacy. The first time Catherine engages David in gender reversing role-play, he is hesitant but willing. Though he urges her to maintain her female identity, grasping her breasts and telling her she is a girl, he ultimately facilitates the act when he "helps with his hands" (17). David is a participant in this first transformation of their sexual partnership. It is not fair at this point in the story to say he has given in to Catherine's will, but

her communication with David immediately following the act is reflective of the manipulation she will enact throughout the novel. Though they both feel "dead and empty," Catherine attempts to pull David more fully into her fantasy by telling him who he is when they reverse roles (17). Catherine tells David, "You are changing. . . Oh you are. You are. Yes you are and you're my girl Catherine. Will you change and be my girl and let me take you?" (17). More fervently than David resisted Catherine's role reversal on her part, he does not accept this new identity for himself. He allows Catherine to enact her fantasy of becoming Peter, but he will not become her Catherine. Catherine's repetitive, gentle affirmations and proposing the identity as a question are attempts to convince David the experience was a positive one. In essence, Catherine is aware that David feels dead and empty, but she "reconceptualized the experience so that it was not so uncomfortable (for them) to live with" (Abramson 5-6).

The next time Catherine tries to engage David in role-reversing intimacy, he is more forcefully reluctant. He tells her specifically she cannot kiss him if she is acting as a boy and goes on to say he feels like his chest "is locked in iron" (67). In response to David's heightened resistance, Catherine meets him with a new tactic. This time, Catherine deploys her manipulation before the sexual act to convince David. She says, "I'm always Catherine when you need her," but immediately propositions her husband again (67). Complicating the concept of the bitch versus the dream girl, sex acts with Catherine become obstacles to David's masculinity as opposed to rewards. These acts of intimacy always leave David feeling remorse or defeated resignation and yet Catherine's chorus of reassurance pushes David to continue bending to her will. It becomes obvious that his understanding of a husband's position requires a fulfilled wife so, though Catherine's requests become more authoritative and demanding, David continues to yield to her will. When Catherine then seems to become less interested in sex with David and

stops propositioning him, it follows that David's ego, husband status, and sense of masculinity all take a blow.

The reversal of sexual positions becomes an assertion of Catherine's sexual power which ultimately extends beyond the couple's personal intimacy. Catherine's invitation for Marita to become both an emotional and sexual partner to herself and her husband is an extension of the sexual authority which Catherine asserts over David. When Catherine first suggests Marita stay at the Aurol, David immediately shoots down the idea, but when Catherine looks away dejectedly, he changes his sentiment. Catherine has gained so much control over David that she can bend his will with simple gestures. At this point, Catherine is no longer just getting what she wants, she is finding public ways to toy with David's emotions. Though she is aware of David's discomfort with the "devil things" they do, she still says in public that they could have fun with Marita the way they had fun that morning, referring to their gender-reversing sexual activities. The situation is intentional. Though David thinks, "[t]he hell with her . . . Fuck her" he cannot voice those feelings without revealing the sexual acts which leave him ashamed (97). By referring to their sexual activities publicly but cryptically she is removing David's ability to protest. She is, to again quote Abramson on gaslighting, "destroy[ing] even the possibility of disagreement" (10).

Catherine's assertion of sexual authority continues through the affairs she organizes for both herself and her husband. As Catherine begins her sexual exploration with Marita, David tries to discourage her. After Catherine speaks about kissing Marita, David says, "So now you've done it . . . and you're through with it" (113). But Catherine wants to fully consummate her relationship with Marita. Though David continues to protest, and Catherine is adamant she needs to sleep with Marita. She tells David he will get over it, she does not love Marita, and that David

can sleep with Marita after to absolve her of any wrongdoing. Catherine's arguments hinge on her belief that David will always bend to her will. She claims he will get over it because he has always understood her gender-bending activities before, putting the onus of the responsibility on David's forgiveness rather than her actions. Her declaration that she does not love Marita seems false when taken in with the fact that she and Marita have come to inhabit the public spaces that Catherine once shared with David. Finally, Marita's third assertion, that David could essentially even out their relationship by also sleeping with Marita, undermines his status as husband. Though he has continued to bend to Catherine's will, it has always been to appease or keep his wife happy. By asking him to commit a transgression against their marriage, and indeed framing it as an equalizing transgression, Catherine is asking David to act outside of the role of husband which has thus far been his motivation for obeying Catherine.

Catherine also undermines David's position as a husband in the social sector of their relationship. There is no point in the novel where Catherine conforms to the social expectations on her as a woman and at the first location of their honeymoon, Aigues Mortes, "[m]ost people thought they were brother and sister until they said they were married. Some did not believe that they were married and that pleased [Catherine] very much" (6). In this quotation it is revealed that Catherine's initial joy is not derived from being perceived as a boy, as she will later try to appear, but from a dissociation of her and David's marriage. Just as Catherine will continue to manipulate their sexual relationship until David no longer acts as their husband in private, Catherine functions in public spaces to the same end. The reason Catherine is not thought to be David's wife is her appearance. Specifically, in Aigues Mortes, Catherine's outfits make her appear unlike the other women. David has never seen any other woman wear a fisherman shirt like Catherine does. Additionally, "No one wore shorts either around the village" (6). Catherine's

choice of attire sets them up as social pariahs in this foreign environment, with the only reason they are not completely shunned being that Catherine places a large sum in the church collection each Sunday. The emasculating effect of Chatherine's actions are twofold—first in the public separation it creates between David and his role as husband and second in the separation it creates between David and his role as provider since Catherine's dowry is their main source of income.

As the novel progresses, Catherine participates in a physical transformation that makes her appear more masculine while continuing to deteriorate David's public persona. As she repeatedly cuts her hair shorter and gets tanner, she begins entering society without David, a stark contrast from their early honeymoon when they were always together. For a time, David tells himself he is content with Catherine's constant transformations. "[A]ll you truly know is that you feel good," he tells himself as he questions whether her transformations are acceptable (31). David's contentment with her transformations ceases when it directly affects his public life outside of their honeymoon and when she demands he too changes his appearance. Upon meeting David's old military Colonel, Catherine reveals that she is sometimes a boy. "I wish you hadn't told the Colonel," David later says (67). Catherine claims the Colonel already knew and understood and promises she will not create a scandal. David is not assuaged by her promises. As has become the pattern, David allows Catherine to have the external power while he internally anguishes. As he lays beside his wife he thinks, "now she would show the dark things in the light and there would, it seemed to him, be no end to the change" (67). Catherine's reveal to the Colonel affects David's public life in two ways. Again, she has undermined the marital relationship by removing herself from the role of wife, but also, by revealing herself to inhabit a masculine space in their marriage, has threatened David's masculinity in the presence of a

military associate and subsequently, undermined his understanding of his masculine societal position as a veteran.

Catherine manipulation of David through appearance becomes literal when she convinces him to cut and dye his hair the same as hers. He asks for a shorter cut, but Catherine insists their hair be cut just the same. He does not want to lighten his hair at all, but after some brief pleading from Catherine, he again gives in to her will. As Dolores Barracano Schmidt describes the trope of "The Great American Bitch," Catherine has, "[b]y refusing to be soft and passive, . . . made it impossible for her mate to be tough and aggressive. Casting off her femininity, she destroys his masculinity" (904). Catherine's authority in their relationship displaces David from the masculine roles he believed define him. Removed from the position of a husband and a socialite, David is left to cling to his understanding of self as a writer—the only masculine role that Catherine has yet to corrupt. Yet, as Schmidt claims "in the restricted sphere of home and social life, [the great American Bitch] appears to dominate" (904). A writer, whose professional role is to create content that engages the general public, is inherently a social position. As an example of Schmidt's archetypical figure, Catherine also threatens David position as a writer.

Catherine begins her assault on David's writer-hood by attempting to disconnect him from the rest of the writerly world. It is first revealed that David is a writer when he receives newspaper reviews of his latest book that have been sent to him by his publisher. Rather than express interest in the contents of the reviews, Catherine claims that having them on their honeymoon is "like bringing along somebody's ashes in a jar" (24). As David indicates the reviews are positive, it is clear she is threatened by David's standing as an authority amongst writers. It is not that they contain anything implicitly negative that causes Catherine unhappiness, but the fact that he is reviewed at all. Later she refers to the clippings in a direct assault against

his manhood and status as a husband. First, when David says his drink puts "heart in a man" she responds, "So make your own, you clipping reader" (39). Then she asks, "Do you think I married you because you're a writer? You and your clippings?" (39). These responses reveal that she understands David's relationship between writing and masculinity. She mocks him essentially claiming that if he is confident in his status as a writer, he does not need her as a wife. She goes further to claim that his writer status, as a location of his masculinity, did not make him any more appealing as a romantic partner.

Catherine takes it even further by claiming authority over David's writing. By burning his clippings, burning his manuscript, and acting as an independent agent in the development of his account of their honeymoon, she attempts to claim his authorial power as her own. In a direct attack against his writing, Catherine says, "He can't write like a gentleman nor speak like one in any language. Especially not his own" (216). This marks a change in her attitude towards his work. Up until that point, Catherine had urged David to work on the narrative of their honeymoon instead of his stories, but from this point until the end of the novel she claims absolute authority over David's artistic direction. In defense of having burned his short stories, Catherine tells him "They were worthless" and "I paid the money to do them" (219-20). The twofold approach to David's writing involves devaluing and claiming ownership. While Catherine had previously revealed a sense of shared ownership over the narrative of their honeymoon—deciding that it would need editing and illustration and working to acquire those services without David's input—she finally transgresses into a full sense of ownership. In her final letter to David, she writes, "I'll wire and write and do all the things for my book" (237). In her final interaction with David, she not only claims ownership of the book, but perpetuates her

own masculine authority over David. She will write to him and provide to him financially, once more positioning herself as the provider and authority in their marriage.

When David realized that Catherine had burned his manuscripts, he initially feels disbelief. He thinks, "She couldn't really have destroyed them. No one could do that to a fellow human being" (219). David's devastation is in line with Abramson's description of the final stage of gaslighting. "A gaslighted [person] has lost, albeit partially and temporarily, [themself]. And in various ways, her [or his] depressive responses *are* fitting" (23). David's distress is short lived. He does not dwell on his suffering and instead approaches Catherine calmly so as not to upset her. This change of demeanor as well as his feeling of being "moved" by Catherine seems to indicate that her strong hold on him was not broken even by her final transgressive action.

The actions of and changes that Catherine Bourne undergoes during *GOE*, demasculinize and subsequently isolate David Bourne, threatening the foundation of his understanding of self. David is devoted to two roles in *GOE*—being a husband and being a writer. Each of these roles allow him to engage with wider society with confidence and authority. Catherine's actions throughout the book threaten David's masculinity by challenging those roles. The changes in their intimacy and appearance subvert David's husband status while Catherine's sense of authority over David's artistic endeavors threaten his status as a writer. The ability of female characters to destabilize masculinity and subvert societally prescribed gender roles reveals the fragility of Hemingway's men, a fragility that is inconsistent with current scholarly analyses. Yet, this fragility and destabilization is not only a frequent element in Hemingway's literature, but also the catalyzing factor in much of its action. Catherine's persistent redefinitions of her role and identity cause David to seek new roles in the world. The next chapter explores how

Hemingway's protagonists redefine themselves once their masculine societal roles have been destabilized.

Chapter 5

Reinvention After Emasculation: *The Old Man and the Sea, The Garden of Eden,* "The Capital of the World," and "The Undefeated"

Juxtaposing *The Garden of Eden* and *A Movable Feast*, J. Gerald Kennedy asks if both stories can be described as "a young writer's fall from innocence into the complications of sexual ambiguity" (188). Indeed, both Hem and David Bourne have a complicated relationship with non-heteronormative sexuality. Like many of Hemingway's protagonists, throughout the course of their respective narratives, their masculinity comes into question vis-a-vis the masculine roles they fill in their relationships and society. Kennedy asserts, "David Bourne confronts a . . . need to redraw the boundaries of sex, gender, and desire—to resituate himself (as it were) within the bourne of heterosexual propriety" (202). When recentering masculinity as the central concern of Hemingway's protagonists, what Kennedy calls "the complication of sexual ambiguity" can be viewed as the destabilization of David's masculinity and "redraw[ing] the boundaries" becomes reinvention in the face of emasculation. David Bourne is not alone in his need to reestablish his masculinity. Hemingway protagonists ranging from Francis Macomber to Jake Barnes find themselves in positions of emasculation that leave them feeling disconnected from society and requiring reinvention in some context. In *The Old Man and the Sea,* Santiago also deals with his lost masculinity, a direct result of his advanced age, through a reinvention of his boundaries, but in his case, it is the bounds of his teleological place as opposed to David's sexual redefinition. As Jon Adams surmises, "Santiago counterbalances the physical effects of age, which threaten to steal away his livelihood, with mental comforts in recollections of his past and faith in his 'many tricks' and 'resolution'" (26). The recollections, tricks, and resolution which provide Santiago solace are reminders of his masculinity. His recollections include his time as a fisherman off of

the cost of Africa and a competition of physical endurance he competed in years ago, while the tricks and resolution are the masculine skills of the fishing trade that he has mastered and retained. While each of these reminiscences offers him confidence in his battle with the marlin, it is ultimately his mental reapplication of his masculinity, his strength and wit, to a new teleological understanding, his role in a natural order, which offers him escape from the anguish of his societal rejection.

David Bourne and Santiago serve as examples of the philosophical reconsiderations Hemingway's protagonists are willing to undertake once their masculinity has been threatened. David Bourne creates a faux marriage to alleviate the emasculation he has experienced in his true marriage to Catherine. He sacrifices his status as Catherine's husband, a role he has done anything to maintain, as well as much of his recent professional work in order to reestablish his masculinity through his relationship with Marita. Similarly, in *The Old Man and the Sea*, Santiago forfeits his understanding of the world in an effort to regain a teleological purpose after his masculinity has been stripped indefinitely. A philosophical stance is not the only thing Hemingway's protagonists wager in the face of emasculation. Santiago's journey represents both an intellectual and a physical sacrifice as he takes on ever increasing damage to his body to regain a sense of purpose. Hemingway's bullfighting stories further evidence the Hemingway protagonist's willingness to trade physical safety for the reclamation of masculinity.

In two short stories, "The Capital of the World" and "The Undefeated," characters engage with the act of bullfighting to establish their masculinity despite the threat it poses to their physical health and safety. In the first story, the young man Paco has become engaged in the adult world for the first time. He romanticizes the qualities and actions that make him feel manly, employment, rebellion, and above all else, bullfighting. Unable and unwilling to

recognize his immaturity, Paco engages in a faux bullfight that costs him his life. In the second story, Manuel has been emasculated by his fall from popularity as a bullfighter. Convinced that he must regain his social status through a return to the sport, he reenters the ring despite his recent injury, his understanding of its danger, and his fear. These stories exemplify the physical toll Hemingway's protagonists are willing to endure to establish or reestablish their masculine identities. Together, these four stories, *GOE, OMS,* "The Capital of the Worlds," and "The Undefeated," illustrate the devastating and isolating effect emasculation has on Hemingway's protagonists' sense of self as well as the lengths which these men will go to reestablish their masculine position in the world.

David Bourne's dilemma in *GOE* is complicated to say the least. Richard Fantina describes David Bourne, and in fact several key Hemingway protagonists, as engaging in "heterosexual masochism," denoting their sexuality to allow for a discussion of what he considers Hemingway's homophobic undertones (84). Applying masochism to the actions of David Bourne is an interesting consideration. Masochism assumes that the recipient is receiving pleasure from experiencing pain. This summation, however, simplifies what David experiences with his wife Catherine. In and of itself, the sexual subversion that they partake in does not cause David physical pain. Neither can you consider the reaction to their sexual acts to be pleasurable for David. In the antithesis of masochism, it seems that David Bourne experiences emotional pain as a result of the physical pleasure he and his wife engage in. The pain, or more aptly, the anguish that David experiences after each sexual subversion stems from his insecurity in his masculine role. Far from the provider and husband roles that he anticipated filling for Catherine, he takes on the role of her "girl" all while she is reminding him that she is the main financer of their current vacation (17). With his manly occupations stripped from their marriage, David is

left unmoored in his relationship to Catherine. David's insecurity and rejection of Catharine's lesbian affair, which Fantina considers to be a representation of internalized homophobia, act as the turning points in which David chooses to reinvent his masculinity as opposed to continuing his current relationship with Catherine.

The reinvention of marriage that David undertakes with Marita is expressed in explicit moments of reasserting the masculine roles that were undermined in his relationship with Catherine. One of the most obvious examples of David's lost and reclaimed masculinity is the differing sex acts he participates in with his women. After the first instance in which David allows Catherine to sodomize him, he thinks "goodbye Catherine goodbye my lovely girl goodbye and good luck and goodbye" (18). Foreshadowing what will follow, David's relationship with his wife and subsequently his identity as her husband begin to unravel after she dominates him sexually. The redistribution of David's sexual desire to Marita is not exclusive to sexual acts, but also to smaller instances of intimacy. David and Catherine used to swim naked together, but this intimacy ends shortly after Marita arrives. Marita becomes the object of these intimate moments, first swimming with both David and Catherine and finally with David alone. After they go swimming alone, Marita tells David, "I want more things like that. . . Things that only we have" (141). After this conversation, David renames Marita as Haya, which in Arabic means bashful. The disparity in the intimacy between David and Catherine and David and Marita not only reveals David's reassignment of his intimate partner, but the preference he feels for his new reality where Marita stands in as wife.

Another area of David's personal reinvention is in relation to his writing. While Catherine intended to claim authority over David's literary career, thus relinquishing him of the masculine role he filled in the professional world, Marita reasserts David's confidence in his writing. "I

loved the book," Marita says of David's first novel, to which Catherine replies, "Don't overreach" (111). Indeed, Catherine has proven that she has little respect for David's authorial jurisdiction, maintaining that she, rather than David himself, knows which of his writing is valuable and how it should be marketed. In dissolving this authority that Catherine maintains over his writing, David allows Marita to read his work in progress. This act of reinvention is not met kindly by Catherine, who chooses to burn both the clippings that assured David of his standing as a literary figure and the work which he and Marita believe to be valuable. Symbolic of David's reestablished sense of authority over his writing, after Catherine has been physically replaced by Marita, the novel ends "He wrote on a while longer and there was no sign that any of it would ever cease returning to him intact" (247). Writing was the only concern that rivaled David's preoccupation with performing as a successful husband to Catherine in the novel, and his reclamation of this masculine identity in Catherine's absence signifies the conclusion of his reinvention through his redefined marriage.

The dissonance that David feels in his relationship with Catherine suggests an alternate meaning to the title of *GOE.* In the metaphorical garden of Eden, perhaps she is not Eve tempting her husband with a fruit of knowledge as scholars have surmised. Perhaps Catherine's desire for authority and her subsequent emasculation of David make her Lilith, whose inability to submit to Adam result in a status as the failed wife. David's relationship with Marita, then, may be doomed from the start, but even if they are casted from their Eden, they will at least maintain their marital relationship in a way that he and Catherine could not. In *GOE* David's relationship with Catherine results in his authority as a husband and a writer being stripped, so that both functions must be reestablished through his relationship with Marita. This same reassessment of

relational position takes place in Hemingway's works that feature more physically masculine characters.

In "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber," the title character experiences a series of emasculating events which lead to his ultimate transformation of self. After Francis fails to kill a lion on his hunting expedition, Robert Wilson completes the hunt and later sleeps with Francis's wife, Margot. In the story, Macomber "was thirty-five years old, kept himself very fit, was good at court games, [and] had a number of big game fishing records" (4). In combination with the fact that he is wealthy and has a beautiful wife, Macomber is the quintessential Hemingway man—young, virile, and independent—until he is proven to be a coward. Francis's failure as a hunter and his wife's transgression strip him of the masculine identities of husband and gamesman and leave him unmoored from the rest of his company. Following this incident, Francis reinvents himself by redistributing his efforts and attention to the goal of hunting the buffalo. Francis's new sense of purpose allows him to regain authority as a gamesman and a husband and he "becomes a fully self-controlled and self-determined man" (Strychacz, "Unraveling the Masculine Ethos" 16). This pattern of losing and reinventing masculinities is a pattern in all of Hemingway's major fictive works and many short stories. In *For Whom the Bell Tolls* Jordan must find a way to blow up the bridge and maintain his status as soldier even after Pablo has stolen the dynamite. In "The Undefeated," Manuel must reestablish his function as a bullfighter to regain his integrity. In *OMS*, Santiago is alienated by his community for his inability to catch a fish and must reestablish his manhood by defining the role of man in the natural world.

Critical analyses of Ernest Hemingway's *OMS* are replete with binaries—predators stalking prey, man interacting with nature, and love and hate—yet, these binaries fail to address

the complexity of the knowledge building practice which plays out in the interwoven third-person and stream-of-consciousness narrative. Hemingway's novella, while exhibiting the author's signature brusque style, engages in a sophisticated intellectual conversation about man's place in the natural world through Santiago's observations and contemplations. Gregory Stephens and Janice Cool have said, "Hemingway seems to have found in Santiago a simpler man through whom he could philosophize about man and nature without the posturing of a matador, or the bragging of men with guns" (81). There is no doubt that Santiago philosophizes about man and nature, and it may seem that as a character in isolation he has no use for posturing or bragging, but indeed his process of knowledge building necessitates inquiry as well as boasting and posturing. The interactions that Santiago has with the sea and its creatures are not free from masculine performance, and in fact engage in the characteristics of masculinity most familiar to Santiago, competition and violence. Further, both Santiago's teleological engagement and his isolation are a direct result of his internal relationship to Hemingway's machismo image, or as Stephens and Cool call it, "men with guns." It is the emasculation he feels as a result of the villagers' alienation that propels him to continue on his perilous journey. Santiago's quest, far from a straight-forward sea narrative, is the philosophical pursuit for a teleologic position in the natural world of a man who has lost his masculine position in society.

Richard Hovey takes a teleological approach to *OMS*, asking what can be learned when we read the story's naturalism in conjunction with Santiago's emotions. He claims the text is Hemingway's most philosophical story.

> A tale of adventure, *The Old Man and the Sea* is also one of those fictions where the thought and the action are one. . . His subject is man in nature and the nature of man. For all his affectionate description of nature's beauties, Hemingway never lets us forget the

> Darwinian [referring to the teachings of evolution by Charles Darwin] struggle going on beneath and above the Gulf waters. Against such naturalism, we are made continually aware of Santiago's fellow feelings for nature's creatures. (49)

As Hovey indicates and goes on to explicate, Santiago is both a philosophizing and sympathizing character. Indeed, in Hovey's estimation, Santiago's duplexity brings him peace within a chaotic world. His notion of dualities merging, as when he claims, "the thought and the action are one," can be extended to the form of the story to further our understanding of Santiago's teleological concerns. In *OMS*, Hemingway entwines narrator and protagonist voices making indistinct the division between Santiago's thoughts and the narrator's observations. This occurs frequently when the narration becomes a litany of the things "he [Santiago] thought." The effect is a story that is told in third person but often transforms into a stream of consciousness. Evaluating Santiago's actions from this perspective, it is not Hemingway who "never lets us forget the Darwinian," but Santiago. Further, while Hovey claims that "Santiago is at peace with the world," the polarity of his emotional responses to nature in conjunction with his Darwinian—or perhaps more aptly, Darwinesque—understanding of the natural world appears to constantly put him at odds with himself (49). This is because Santiago is not merely contemplating the framework of a natural ecology. Having been removed from society, he is coming to terms with a masculine role independent from the location where masculine identities are developed, society.

OMS is not the only Hemingway work which positions man in nature to redefine his masculine role. In an article about "Big Two-Hearted River," Michael Roos points to a moment when Nick Adams engages in evolutionary thinking. He asserts that a black grasshopper "represents, in a Darwinian reading, . . . nature's built-in ability to adapt and regenerate itself in

response to catastrophic environmental changes" and that "Nick's mood noticeably lightens as he seems to acknowledge his kinship with the grasshopper . . . " (Darwinian Reading 62). Removing the emblematic from this quotation, the grasshopper, which Nick notes as having generationally "turned black" after living in a burned-out and subsequently blackened environment for a year, reveals that Nick himself is aware of nature's "ability to adapt" (Big Two-Hearted River 212). Roos's observation of kinship, then, is inextricably linked to Nick's knowledge of himself as an animal susceptible to and benefitting from the same natural entities and catastrophes as the grasshopper. When "Nick's mood noticeably lightens" the story has created a teleologic moment where Nick reconstructs his function in the world. Observing the adaptability of the grasshopper reminds Nick of his own adaptability in a changing world and he is satisfied by the universality of his existence outside of society.

Hovey takes a similar approach to Santiago in *OMS*. He claims Santiago "feels himself [as] a part of nature" and despite the simplicity one might attribute to such a view of self, "he by no means lives . . . the unexamined life. He asks the eternal questions" (50). For Hovey, the "eternal questions" are man's place and purpose in the world, answered retrospectively by Santiago's status as a "part of nature." This exemplifies yet another merging of dualities. The contemplation of "eternal questions" is a distinctly human trait. Hovey makes this distinction clear by reaching across time to juxtapose Santiago's internal monologue with the Socratic concept of "the unexamined life." Simultaneously, he asserts that Santiago exists as an entity of nature, a concept that denotes, "The phenomena of the physical world collectively; [especially] plants, animals, and other features and products of the earth itself, as opposed to humans and human creations" ("Nature, n11"). In merging these two concerns, the human and the natural, Hovey might appeal to a variant definition of the word nature, "the whole natural world,

including human beings; the cosmos." In fact, this second definition more fully accounts for the intellectual work which Santiago engages in. His comparative assessment of his place in the world accounts for animals such as dolphins, the marlin, and sharks, and humans, as well as celestial entities. In the course of his expedition, Santiago contemplates man's relationship to the stars, the moon, and the sun, considering their ordered position in a hierarchy of the wider universe and posing rhetorical questions of how man should deal with them if they are a more authoritative entity. In short, Santiago applies the notions of masculine authority to the natural world to regain a sense of belonging.

A teleologically concerned reading is, like Hovey's and Roos's, centrally concerned with a protagonist's contemplative knowledge generating, but, unlike Roos's, does not rely on an explicit Darwinian theory of evolution. Rather, a teleologic reading must accomplish what Susan Beegel once described as, "a reading of *The Old Man and the Sea* that abandons the anthropocentric critical practice of relegating nature to the role of setting" (Santiago and the Eternal Feminine 131). For Beegel, that entails anthropomorphizing nature, or more specifically the sea, to establish a thematic connection between the sea and a larger undercurrent of feminine mystique in *OMS*. It is true that the sea takes on characteristics of a woman in the novella, but it is important to note that Santiago is the one who anthropomorphizes, not the narrator. "[T]he old man always thought of her as feminine and as something that gave or withheld great favours, and if she did wicked things it was because she could not help them. The moon affects her as it does a woman" (30). In this quotation we see the narration's tendency to slip into stream of consciousness, emphasizing Santiago's teleologic concern as the force that characterizes the sea. As a fisherman, the sea is the source of his livelihood and the location where most of his time is spent. In personifying the sea, Santiago attempts to decipher the mechanics of the source of his

survival and subsequently his role pursuant to that order by defining it with a role he understands in society. Just as women in Hemingway have the ability to manipulate and emasculate their male counterparts, the sea has the ability to destroy a fisherman's sense of self and manhood. As the sea becomes the site for Santiago's heuristic development of self, it too becomes part of a larger hierarchy where the moon prescribes the sea's "great favours" and "wicked things." As Santiago humanizes the natural entities in the story, he also ascribes to himself the characteristics of the animals that he hunts.

Gregory Stephens and Janice Cool have said, Santiago's "love for animals is often inseparable from an imperative to kill them" (82). Indeed, all the animals that Santiago expresses love or kinship towards are creatures that he must kill. This mimics his relationship to society. To survive, he needs to be a successful fisherman even if it is to the detriment of other fishermen. The juxtaposition of society as a location of both kinship and competition is thus shifted to the creatures of the sea. Further, the animals that he does not need to kill, the Portuguese man-o-war or the sea swallows for example, are met with contempt or pity rather than love. This is also in line with the way masculinity is measured amongst men. Paralleling his sea voyage with his life in society, Santiago reminisces about an arm-wrestling match. When engaging in this activity, he first considered his opponent worthy of respect, but once he had beaten him, he acknowledged that the man is no longer worth his attention or further competition. Looking at the subset of killed but unloved animals and the distinction between the pitied and the disdained creatures, the parameters of Santiago's teleologic philosophizing becomes clear. Santiago ranks natural entities on their life-serving and harm-causing qualities, much as men interact through competition or kinship.

Ryan Hediger frames one notion of life-serving as nutrition. He says, "the whole story hinges on the unavoidable reality of animal appetite . . . In other words, this story aims to show . . . the ordinary and universal act of appetite. Death, at the center of this story and crucial to all appetite, can flatten hierarchies" (53). Looking across Santiago's interactions with sea animals, the old man is merciful with those that offer him nutrition, just as one would be kind to a generous friend. One of the first creatures we see Santiago kill is an albacore. After pulling him in, Santiago "hit him on the head for kindness," saving him from the cruelty of a slow death (39). There is little question that the albacore's usefulness is the reason for Santiago's mercy. Unlike the marlin or the porpoises that Santiago feels a kinship to, the albacore is notable for the apathy it evoked in Santiago's depictions. Contrary to the personified ocean, the albacore has "unintelligent" eyes and is dubbed a "tuna, [for] the fishermen called all the fish of that species tuna and only distinguished among them by their proper names when they came to sell them or to trade them for baits . . ." (39, 40). Stripped of even a "proper name," Santiago sees no intrinsic value in the albacore outside of what it can offer him in a corporeal sense. The irony of Santiago's assessment of the albacore is that his current dilemma as an ostracized member of society has also left him without a proper name. Amongst his peers, Santiago becomes simply "the old man." The moment of valuation for the fish comes at its consumption, "Eat it now and it will strengthen the hand," Santiago tells himself (58). Similarly, Santiago believes he will recover his lost value as a man and fisherman if he can bring back a huge catch. Looking at Santiago's treatment of the tuna and his disregard for his wellbeing, death does not "flatten hierarchies" as Hediger claims, instead death exacerbates the divisions of worth by illuminating a hunter and a hunted in a ranking of predation. Given the indivisibility of an animal's nutritional value and its death, Santiago's sympathetic, pitying, or merciful treatment of prey is indicative of

a teleological placement of the animal below the fisherman's rank. Were nutrition and death the only factors in Santiago's philosophical repositioning of the natural world, it would be a system similar to Darwin's evolutionary sub-theory of survival of the fittest, yet, as Beegle suggested when she explained the projection of human qualities onto the sea, *OMS* exhibits a less scientific approach to valuation.

The utility of natural entities, as Santiago understands it, extends beyond their nutritional value to incorporate their status as tools to fulfill his role as a fisherman. The albacore serves Santiago dually as a source of life-serving, first as a form of sustenance when his strength wanes and second as bait to catch other fish. Other animals present themselves as tools to Santiago's success as well. For example, early in the novella Santiago is plagued by his solitude. One of the refrains of the first half of the text is variations of, "I wish I had the boy." Whether one believes, like Foulke, the boy is the archetypical "helper figure of romance," considers his utility directly connected to Santiago's need for companionship, or some combination of each, it is clear the old man seeks a tool to fill the absence of masculine brotherhood (132). As Santiago travels farther into the sea, he contemplates "how alone he was . . ." but immediately, a flight of ducks reminds Santiago, "no man [is] ever alone on the sea" (61). This moment is followed by Santiago's reflections on the connection between loneliness and fear. In Hemingway's greater oeuvre, fear is often the undoing of men's endeavors. For example, in "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber," the title character's fear, "was . . . like a cold slimy hollow in all the emptiness where once his confidence had been" and directly results in his botched hunting expedition (11). Fear poses a similar dilemma in "The Undefeated" when Manuel's worry, the breaking of his characteristic bravado, marks the beginning of his downfall. Fear, then, in Hemmingway's stories serves as an obstacle against the successful fulfillment of one's purpose. When the ducks remind

Santiago that he is not alone, they stop him from experiencing the fear of solitude and thus enable him to continue his life's purpose as a fisherman. Like the albacore, the ducks serve Santiago's corporeal needs, a function which places them below man in Santiago's hierarchical ranking of natural entities.

If we consider Manolin's role in the book as Foulke does, the archetypical "helper figure of romance," then it is the man-o-war bird who performs this role in his absence. "The bird is a great help," Santiago acknowledges as he follows it to discover the location of fish below the surface (38). In the absence of Manolin, Santiago must perform all the tasks of a fisherman on his own. In this single way, the locating of fish in the ocean, the man-o-war birds can fulfill the helper role left empty by Manolin's absence. Yet Santiago's appraisal of this bird is not all positive. The protagonist is careful to illustrate the bird's ineptitude. As Santiago watches the man-o-war circle his prey, he observes that it uses its wings "wildly and ineffectually" (34). This is a second criteria of Santiago's valuation of natural entities, their self-sufficiency. Just as men are judged on their ability to provide for themselves, for example the fishermen's ability to bring in a catch, Santiago sees self-preservation as an organizing force in nature. Santiago's appraisal of the man-o-war bird is one of many examples of his preoccupation with a natural entity's ability to perform within its teleological class. Shortly after this encounter, the narrator reflects on Santiago's love of turtles. "He loved green turtles and hawk-bills with their elegance and speed and their great value . . ." (36). The turtles' elegance and speed in the water enable them to perform as hunters and "their great value," which Santiago loves most of all, is the turtles' consumption of the Portuguese men-of-war, the jellyfish-like creatures that sting their prey. Here, Santiago values the turtles' self-sufficiency and predation much as he himself is praised at the conclusion of the novella when his great catch becomes apparent.

Santiago's emotional response to predation is complicated further by his assessment of whom is the receiver of harm. The turtles' predatory abilities are praised because the turtles are consuming a creature that would cause Santiago harm. Conversely, the Portuguese men-of-war, classified as predators, are degraded by Santiago for their potential to cause him bodily harm. In this way, both disdain and approval become indicators of a second level of Santiago's hierarchy. Hediger believes, "cross-species empathy puts birds, fish, and men on the same playing field," yet Santiago considers both an animal's usefulness and its predatory nature before he valuates it (85). Hediger is correct to a degree. The conclusions at which Santiago arrives necessitate that the natural entities are on the same playing field, that is, participating in the same activities of predation, but as his emotional reactions indicate, that playing field is not even. Further, Santiago's emotional responses to other species is nuanced and complex just as relationships in society contain many complexities. Empathy is consigned only to the animals with which Santiago feels kinship. It is the complexity of Santiago's reactions that illustrate his teleologic conclusions about his place amongst nature.

One predator that makes fleeting appearances in the book is the lion. Portrayed in Santiago's recounted memories and dreams, the lions are the purest of Santiago's teleological considerations, because they exist only in the protagonist's mind. Alexander Hollenberg believes the portrayal of lions as the final line of the novella, "dramatizes the friction between the anthropocentric and biocentric ethics" (39). Hollenberg points out that every other depiction of the lions portrays them in conjunction with a beach and he believes this lack of setting is meant to magnify the struggle between human and non-human concerns. The simplicity of the depiction, "The old man was dreaming about the lions," does point to the larger role of the biocentric, or rather natural teleologic, concerns of the book, but only as it relates to the old man

who is dreaming (127). Rather than separating anthropocentric and biocentric concerns, the lions create a location for Santiago to engage in the human act of contemplation to position himself teleologically in a larger natural existence. One of Hemingway's most well-known fictive depiction of lions occurs in "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber". In that story, the title character's fear of the lion in combination with his disregard for their autonomy result in his unsuccessful status as a hunter and a man. Francis Macomber's indifference to the lions, exemplified in the repeated refrain "Macomber had not thought how the lion felt," is a stark contrast to Santiago's relationship with the lions (15). While Macomber doesn't think of the lion, Santiago thinks and dreams of them incessantly. As Hollenberg hints, Santiago has a philosophical connection to the lions.

There is one more layer to the hierarchical rankings that Santiago ascribes. All the animals, predator and prey, are at the mercy of the forces of nature. This category is comprised of the sea, the wind, and the celestial bodies. Susan Beegel argues there is "a complex persona for the sea that resonates throughout the novella . . ." and the existence of such a persona suggests, "the sea's connection to a spiritual and biological principle of the Eternal Feminine" (Santiago and the Eternal Feminine 132). Beegel's article ascribes to metaphor much of the contemplative work that Santiago engages in within the text. Rather than Beegel's notion of an "Eternal Feminine," the sea belongs to a class of natural entities which Santiago classifies as having the highest power over all other entities. While Beegel's symbolic reading describes "the spiritual element" as the sea's symbolic relationship with mythological and divine female figures, Santiago understands his relationship with the sea through his teleological understanding of forces of nature. Beegel's notion of a "biological principle" is more in line with Santiago's hierarchy as both explain the sea's power to dictate the biological existence of living creatures.

As a fisherman, Santiago's livelihood depends on the sea being calm enough for him to take out his skiff. When the sea is hostile, he does not "say bad things of her" as younger fisherman do, instead he understands her as la mar, "something that gave or withheld great favours . . ." (30). Santiago, while understanding that he is at the mercy of the seas fluctuating graces, never disparages her, a distinction which the narrator attributes to his age and experience. Santiago, in contrast to the terns who experience only the sea's hostility, is also privy to its restorative effects. When the injuries to his hands are too much to bear, Santiago submerges them in the sea, and they are soothed. This connection between the sea's palliative qualities and Santiago's corporeal concerns highlights the seas connection to the hierarchy of nature that involves the animals of the sea while relating it once again to Santiago's tumultuous relationship with society. Just as Santiago is alternately praised and alienated by society, he still seeks to regain his masculine grace in an effort to reenter society. Similarly, while Santiago is fully aware of the alternating benefit and harm the sea will cause him, he reveres her.

There is one key entity who has not been addressed in this analysis so far: the marlin. As Santiago grapples with and redefines his teleological location in the world, the Marlin alludes his classification system, exhibiting characteristics of prey and predator, kin and competition. This animal, Santiago's point of fixation and the cause of the journey, exists as the location of Santiago's most important teleological discovery. In a metatextual sense, Santiago and the marlin are interchangeable. Just as the old man serves as the heroic central figure of the novella, literally below the surface, the fish engages in the same quest, something that Santiago is recurringly aware of. In this way, Santiago's kinship with the marlin reveals not only a changing understanding of the teleological classification of his adversary, but a changing understanding of himself as a man and the rules of masculinity. In this context, separated from society, Santiago

finds that it is not just his fellow fisherman who are his direct competition. Even in the ocean with only non-human creatures as company, his masculine attributes can be tested and undermined.

There has been much disagreement amongst scholars whether *OMS* is a tragedy. Perhaps some of that divergence could be attributed to the unresolved status of Santiago's teleological pursuit. As he sails home, resigned to the fate of his marlin, he transfers the kinship he once shared with other predators to his bed. "Bed is my friend. Just bed, he thought" (120). The reader is left wondering if Santiago's abandonment of his animal kin is indicative of a resignation from the reclamation of his masculinity. Indeed, the old man is bereft of the emotion which characterized his teleological thinking and is separated from the ocean where he was able to redefine his masculine role. Manolin believes that Santiago's hands will heal, and he will fish again. Santiago's fellow fisherman, as they see the skeleton of the marlin, come to understand Santiago as a greater predator than ever before—in the eyes of society he is once again a man. For Santiago's part, the old man dreams of lions. A hopeful reading might look once more to Roos. Perhaps Santiago's return to the lions, like Nick's joy at the black grasshoppers, represents "nature's built-in ability to adapt and regenerate itself in response to catastrophic environmental changes" (62).

Santiago's reestablishment of his masculine identity occurs in the philosophical, but it also evidences the physical toll Hemingway's protagonists are willing to endure to reclaim their status as men. Santiago accepted possibly irreversible injury to his hands and back for a chance at reclaiming his masculine status. Similar to Santiago and Hemingway's other hunters and fishers, his bullfighter characters hold their masculine acceptance into society as a chief concern. In "The Capital of the World" a young man who has just entered adult society seeks to define his

manhood by proving he can perform as a bullfighter. Paco disregards warnings from the men around him as he romanticizes the possibility of social notoriety through the dangerous sport. In "The Undefeated," Manuel is well aware of the dangers of bullfighting as he has just been released from the hospital and had a brother who died in the profession. Still, determined to reestablish his lost pride, masculinity, and social standing, Manuel ignores his instincts and risks his life to re-achieve his masculine standing. In both of these stories, the protagonists consider bullfighting be the epitome of male prowess and are willing to risk even their life to achieve that social standing. While other characters, notably men who are more secure in their masculinity, try to dissuade Paco and Manuel from the dangerous sport, both men ultimately suffer for their mulish resolve.

Unlike many of Hemingway's protagonists, Paco has not experienced a loss of his masculinity. Rather, as he enters into his first adult roles, he has yet to establish his manhood and romanticizes all things that seem to be part of the mature world. Paco came to Madrid from a small village and "loved Madrid, which was still an unbelievable place, and he loved his work which, done under bright lights, with clean linen, the wearing of evening clothes, and abundant food in the kitchen, seemed romantically beautiful" (38). Paco's naivete is apparent in his joy towards his simple role as a server. In actuality, the hotel where he and his sisters work is a cheap place where unskilled and washed-up matadors find accommodations. Paco's underdeveloped masculinity is further illustrated by the reverence he gives to the adult men that surround him despite his lack of understanding about their goals and motivations. For example, "[h]e did not yet understand politics but it always gave him a thrill to hear the tall waiter speak of the necessity for killing the priests and the Guardia Civil" (42). Though Paco has no understanding of the politics that would prompt such a radical form of protest, nor does he

comprehend the violence that the tall waiter and his comrades would like to enact, he romanticizes the notion simply because an older waiter expresses it. The narrator goes on to explain that Paco, "would like to be a good catholic, a revolutionary, and have a steady job like this, while, at the same time, being a bull fighter," contradictory identities that all but Paco can see as impossible to coexist (42-3). Manuel of "The Undefeated," on the other hand, has experience as a man and a matador. He pursues the dangerous sport, not because he wishes to assert a sense of masculine authority, but because he wishes to regain a sense manhood that has been lost.

Manuel's emasculation is one of the most explicit examples in Hemingway's oeuvre. Described as injured, pale, mocked, and underestimated, Manuel is both disgraced by his displacement from his role as a matador and aware enough to be ashamed. Having recently been released from the hospital, everyone that Manuel comes into contact with either attempts to dissuade him from participating in the bullfights or mocks him for his belief that he can return to the profession. Renata, the manager who books matadors, tells Manuel he thought his leg had been amputated while he was in the hospital. The implication is that Manuel's career has been cut off at the knees and that he should not continue to bull fight. Manuel is aware of his perception by the manager and of the fact that the money he is offered is well below a fair price. Still, having internalized his shame, Manuel accepts the small amount of money to perform at the most dangerous time of the bullfights. On several occasions the narrator points out that Manuel's matador's ponytail had been pinned forward on his head, "so that it would not show under the cap" (236). This physical presentation coupled with his acceptance of the small salary and the defeat with which he enters conversation with Zurito illustrate the sense of defeat that his last injury has instilled. For that reason, Manuel's determination to regain his masculine position is

simultaneously diminished by his self-acknowledgement of his emasculation. Later, when waiters notice his pony tail and ask if he is part of the Charlie Chaplain, or the farce matadors who perform comedy before the actual competition, Manuel does not act upset or indignant, simply accepting that he does seem more like a clown than a serious performer. In both "The Undefeated" and "The Capital of the World" it is acknowledged that fear is one of the greatest risks to a bullfighter, yet Manuel enters into competition knowing he has little faith in himself.

Both Manuel and Paco are aware of the dangers of bullfighting, yet the desire to attain the elusive position of the successful and manly matador leads them to act against their best interests. Paco is repeatedly warned by Enrique that bullfighting is more dangerous and terrifying than Paco's romanticized perception. "You think of the bull, but you do not think of the horns. The bull has such force that the horns rip like a knife, they stab like a bayonet, and they kill like a club" Enrique tells him (47). Enrique's efforts do not dissuade Paco. Certain both that fear would be the only obstacle in becoming a successful matador and that he would not feel fear, Paco pushes Enrique to enact their faux bullfight, a suggestion that Enrique believed would shatter Paco's naivete. Even as their performance transforms from dangerous to deadly, Paco thinks only of the glory that comes with being a matador. "There should be a rubber cap," Paco says when he becomes aware of the wound from which he is bleeding out (49). Rather than focus on his immediate circumstance Paco imagines what would happen if it had been a true bullfight. Only when he is finally dying does he experience the fear that might have saved his life. While Paco's naivete exacerbated his willingness to enact a dangerous performance, Manuel was not inexperienced not naïve when he entered the ring.

Manuel is starkly aware of the dangers of bullfighting. In Retana's office, the head of the bull who killed his brother is on display. Manuel knows that this brother was "the promising

one," essentially revealing his understanding that even those better equipped for the sport have come to disastrous ends (236). Manuel is also aware that night performances and fights where the matador is a stand in are more likely to end in injury. Still, he agrees to compete in what Retana has offered him. In the ring, he shows great skill, but time and again, "the aged Manolo rated no applause" (253). It becomes clear to all but Manuel that the society for which he performs has no intention of restating any former glory. When Manuel becomes aware of the crowd's distaste for him, in the form of hurling objects at him, he still focuses on the goal of regaining his masculinity. He is thrown by the bull three times and still reattempts at each instance to kill the bull. Even when he has been carried off to the infirmary, Manuel refuses to allow Zurito to cut off his matador's ponytail. Though he claimed he would not perform as a matador again if he were to have a bad run, Manuel has gone back on his word. Even in the face of possible death, he ranks his masculine identity above his health.

Hemingway's protagonists' preoccupation with their masculinities causes them to restructure their philosophical understanding of the world and forfeit their wellbeing in order to maintain their social and masculine standing. Ranking their social identity above even the possibility of death, these men serve as an example of Hemingway's intricate consideration of specifically male, gendered concerns. The boundaries that these men redraw or cross serve as a rich textual location for further inquiry, where scholars can explore why these characters enter philosophical crisis or act against their own interest. The link that exists between Hemingway's conception of masculinity and social roles provides an explanation for his characters desperate actions, they cannot stand being isolated, alienated, or rejected. Synthesized with the other chapters contained herein, one can conclude that Hemingway men are insecure, threatened, and reactive to changes in their masculine authority. Further, a scholar would find that the common

perception of Hemingway's literary machismo is an oversimplification of the author's rich dialogue into the concerns of men about manhood.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

Hemingway's conception of masculinity has long been overlooked by literary scholars. Far from the simple, violent, and aggressive enactors that they are purported to be, Hemingway's protagonists have motivations, emotional reactions, and concerns that complicate their interactions with society. Isolation and challenges to male authority have a devastating effect on Hemingway's men, and push them to utilize any means necessary to reestablish their manhood. This thesis revisited some of the most common themes of Hemingway criticism, naturalist concerns, female authority, and physical action, through a lens that centered masculinity. While respecting the work that has been accomplished by ecocritical, feminist, pragmatic, and biographical scholars of Hemingway, this text worked to fill a gap in scholarship concerned with Hemingway's male protagonists' sense of masculinity.

In Chapter 2, two roles are examined, that of the father and the hunter. Looking across Hemingway's short fiction, the father is defined as a man who is aware of his shortcomings and attempts to shield his son from his misdeeds while showering him with affection. Rather than exploring the societal connections of the previous chapter, this section concerns itself with the complexities of Hemingway tropes. Complex in his emotions, the faulty father's guise fails as he attempts to indoctrinate his son into the world of men. Moving on to the Hemingway hunter, the chapter seeks to contest the common notion that Hemingway's brutal hunters and sympathetic naturalists are contradictory characters. Instead, this portion focuses on an intrinsic code of ethics that Hemingway's protagonists either abide by to their success or violate to their detriment. In the subsequent chapter, *The Garden of Eden* and *The Old Man and the Sea* are used as case studies in the interdependence of Hemingway's protagonists' gendered sense of self and society.

Focusing on David Bourne's roles as son, husband, and provider the text examines how each of these roles is motivated by or dependent on outside perspective. Examining the role of a son, it is revealed that this character's relationship with his father was motivated by his desire to enter the community of men. David's emotions, as expressed in his autobiographical short story, reveal that he was unhappy to be perceived as less than a man. The role of husband is proved to be one that often works to a man's detriment as he focuses on fulfilling the needs of his wife. It also provides an example of how private gendered roles often permeate into the protagonist's social life. Looking at the role of provider in Hemingway literature, which in the case of *GOE* is simultaneously the role of writer, highlights the need to be in constant connection with larger society. Shifting gears, the chapter's consideration of Santiago in *OMS* considers how he uses his memory to maintain male societal relationships while in isolation. Specifically, it looks at Santiago's preoccupation with baseball, lions, and arm wrestling. Having thoroughly examined the complexities of Hemingway's men, the next chapter shifts its focus to Hemingway's women.

Chapter Four begins with an examination of the perpetual dichotomous state Hemingway's women find themself in. They exist as objects of desire or objects of frustration, angels or devils, sympathetic or unsympathetic, and complex or simple. Scholars' continuous creation of new categorization systems for these women suggests that there are, at least from a reader's point of view, two types of women in Hemingway scholarship. Reframing the question from how these women are defined to how each type affects the overall narrative and the protagonist, this chapter concerns itself with the devil or bitch who seems to ruin her male counterpart's life. In this chapter, Catherine Bourne's manipulation of David is examined as the source of his destabilizing masculinity and alienation. In the penultimate chapter, this thesis asks how men react once their masculinity is threatened. Examining several short stories about

bullfighters, the text determines that Hemingway's protagonists are so desperate to maintain their masculinity, that they would enter deadly situations. The chapter shifts to another character who faces deadly odds rather than exist as an outcast, Santiago. This portion of the chapter explains how Santiago recreates his sense of masculine purpose in the world by transferring his masculine concerns for brotherhood and competition to a broader scope of natural entities. Concluding the explications of this thesis, the examination of Santiago's reorganizing of the world once again highlights the implicit and essential connection between society and masculinity in the works of Ernest Hemingway.

To me, reading the works of Hemingway through a lens of masculinity equated to centering Hemingway's intent. Doing so allowed fresh takes on old themes, for example, the complexity of Hemingway's women and the environmental concerns of Hemingway's hunters. Hemingway's men, whether secure or insecure in their masculinity, are devoted to the masculine roles they fill. As hunters, husbands, and fathers, they fulfill the societal expectations placed on men, but when these characters are displaced or rejected by society, their sense of masculinity falls into question. Masculinity functions as an essential element in the Hemingway hero's sense of self and when it is challenged, these characters are forced to reevaluate their place in society and the world in order to move forward. Including the full range of Hemingway's prose writing, masculinity and society are central concerns that evolve and gain complexities as works are read together. As scholars continue to study Hemingway's conception of men, they will need to read and analyze the interplay of other forces in the protagonists' sense of self. Posthumous publications continue to challenge long-standing notions of the author's intent while new frameworks in feminist and critical theory offer insights that were previously overlooked. Still, many of the traditional associations with Hemingway's works, including the misogynistic lens

readers often attribute to the author, are valuable in parsing out true and projected complexities of the characters. As scholars continue to explore the implicit internal stories of Hemingway's characters, they will undoubtedly uncover new motivations, emotional responses, and psychological characterization that has been ignored due to Hemingway's objective and sparce style.

Works Cited

Abramson, Kate. “Turning Up the Lights on Gaslighting.” *Philosophical Perspectives*, 2014, vol. 28, pp. 1-30.

Adams, Jon Robert. “‘The Great General Was a Has-Been': The World War II Hero in 1950s Conformist Culture.” *Male Armor: The Soldier-Hero in Contemporary American Culture*, 2008, Virginia UP, pp. 25-61.

Armengol, Josep. “Gendering Men: Re-Visions of Violence as a Test of Manhood in American Literature.” *Aedean*, 2007, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 75-92.

---. “Performing Manhood through Animal Killings? Revisions of Hunting as a Performance of Masculinty in Ernest Hemingway’s Late Writings.” *Men and Masculinities*, 2020, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 833-851.

Barracano Schmidt, Dolores. “The Great American Bitch.” *College English*, May 1971, vol.32, no. 8, pp. 900-905.

---. “Santiago and the Eternal Feminine: Gendering La Mar in The Old Man and the Sea.” *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice*, edited by Lawrence R. Broer and Gloria Holland, Alabama UP, 2004, pp. 131-55.

Bauer, Margaret. “Forget the Legend and Read the Work: Teaching Two Stories by Ernest Hemingway.” *College Literature*, Summer 2003, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 124-37.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* Routledge, 2006.

Cheatham, George. “Margot Macomber’s Voice in Hemingway’s ‘The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber.’” *Surroundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 2000, vol. 83, no. 3/4, pp. 739-64.

Devost, Nadine. “Hemingway’s Girls: Unnaming and Renaming Hemingway’s Female Characters.” *The Hemingway Review,* Fall 1994, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 46-59.

Dömötör, Teodóra. “Absent Father, Homosexual Sons, and Melancholic Repression in Three of Hemingway’s Short Stories.” *Intertexts*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 69-89.

---. “Anxious Masculinity and Silencing in Ernest Hemingway’s ‘Mr. And Mrs. Elliott’”. *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies*, Spring 2013, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 121-133.

Fantina, Richard. “Hemingway’s Masochism, Sodomy, and the Dominant Woman.” *The Hemingway Review*, Fall 2003, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 84-105.

Foulke, Robert. “The Sea Quest: Moby Dick and The Old Man and the Sea.” *The Sea Voyage Narrative,* 2002, pp. 112-36.

Hediger, Ryan. “Hunting, Fishing, and the Cramp of Ethics in Ernest Hemingway’s The Old Man and the Sea, Green Hills of Africa, and Under Kilimanjaro.” *The Hemingway Review*, Spring 2008, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 35-59.

Holder, Alan. “The Other Hemingway.” *Twentieth Century Literature*, October 1963, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 153-157.

Kennedy, J. Gerald. “Hemingway’s Gender Trouble.” *American Literature,* June 1991, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 187-207.

Leland, Jacob Michael. “Yes, That is a Roll of Bills in My Pocket: The Economy of Masculinity in *The Sun Also Rises*.” *The Hemingway Review*, 2004, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 37-46.

Hemingway, Ernest. “A Day's Wait” *The Short Stories: The First Forty-Nine Stories with a Brief Preface by the Author*, Macmillan Publishing Company, 1938, pp. 436-9.

---. “Big Two-Hearted River: Part I.” *The Short Stories: The First Forty-Nine Stories with a Brief Preface by the Author*, Macmillan Publishing Company, 1938, pp. 209-18.

---. “Big Two-Hearted River: Part II.” *The Short Stories: The First Forty-Nine Stories with a Brief Preface by the Author*, Macmillan Publishing Company, 1938, pp 221-32.

---. “The Capital of the World” *The Short Stories: The First Forty-Nine Stories with a Brief Preface by the Author*, Macmillan Publishing Company, 1938, pp 38-51.

---. *The Garden of Eden.* Scribner, 1987.

---. *Hemingway: The Sun Also Rises & Other Writings 1918-1926*. Edited by Robert W. Trogdon, Library of America, 2020.

---. “Indian Camp.” *The Short Stories: The First Forty-Nine Stories with a Brief Preface by the Author*, Macmillan Publishing Company, 1938, pp. 91-5.

---. “My Old Man.” *The Short Stories: The First Forty-Nine Stories with a Brief Preface by the Author*, Macmillan Publishing Company, 1938, pp. 191-205.

---. *The Old Man and the Sea*. Scribner, 1952.

---. “The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber.” *The Short Stories: The First Forty-Nine Stories with a Brief Preface by the Author*, Macmillan Publishing Company, 1938, pp. 3-37.

---. *The Sun Also Rises*. Scribner, 1954.

Hemingway, John. “Ernest Hemingway, The False Macho.” Men and Masculinities. 2012, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 424-31.

Hollenberg, Alexander. “The Spacious Foreground: Interpreting Simplicity and Ecocritical Ethics in The Old Man and the Sea.” *The Hemingway Review*, Spring 2012, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 27-45.

Hovey, Richard B. “Santiago is at Peace Because He Understands His Connection to Humanity.” *Social Issues in Literature: Death in Ernest Hemingway’s The Old Man and the Sea, edited by Dedria Bryfonski*, Greenhaven Press, 2014, pp. 48-57.

“Nature, n11.” *OED Online*, Oxford UP, 2003, oed.com/view/Entry/125353. Accessed 19 October 2020.

Newman, Daniel. “Flaubertian Aesthetics, Modernist Ethics and Animal Representation in Hemingway’s Green Hills of Africa.” *Style*, 2013, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 509-24.

Nolan, Charles. “‘A Little Crazy’: Psychiatric Diagnosis of Three Hemingway Women Characters.” *The Hemingway Review*, Spring 2009, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 105-20.

Ott, Mark. “Reading Hemingway’s The Old Man and the Sea: Glossary and Commentary.” *The Hemingway Review*, vol. 39, no. 1, 2019, pp 147-50.

Requena-Pelegrí, Teresa. “The Complete Body of Modernity in the 1920s: Negotiating Hegemonic and Subordinated Masculinities in Ernest Hemingway’s *The Sun Also Rises*.” *Embodying Masculinities: Toward a History of the Male Body in U.S. Culture and Literature*, edited by Joseo Armengol, Lang Publishing, 2013, pp. 13-29.

Roos, Michael K. “A Darwinian Reading of ‘Big Two-Hearted River’: The Re-enchantment of Nick Adams?” *Teaching Hemingway and the Natural World*, edited by Kevin Maier, The Kent State UP, 2018, pp. 57-71.

Strychacz, Thomas. “‘The Sort of Thing You Should Not Admit’ Ernest Hemingway’s Aesthetic of Emotional Restraint.” *Boys Don’t Cry?: Rethinking Narratives of Masculinity and Emotion in the U.S.*, edited by Milette Shamir and Jennifer Travis, Columbia UP, 2002, pp. 141-66.

---. “Unraveling the Masculine Ethos in ‘The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber.’” *Hemingway’s Theaters of Masculinity*, Louisiana State UP, 2003, pp. 14-52.

Stephens, Gregory and Janice Cools. “‘Out Too Far’: Half-Fish, Beaten Men, and the Tenor of Masculine Grace in The Old Man and the Sea.” *The Hemingway Review*, Spring 2013, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 77-94.

Tambling, Jeremy. “Introduction,” *Allegory*. 2010, pp 1-18.

Wagner, Linda W. “‘Proud and Friendly and Gently’: Women in Hemingway’s Early Fiction.” *College Literature*, Fall 1980, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 239-247.

Wolfe, Cary. “Fathers, Lovers, and Friend Killers: Rearticulating Gender and Race via Species in Hemingway.” *Boundary*, Spring 2002, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 223-257.