

“IT WAS THE BRUISE OF THE WAR”: THE EFFECTS OF INJURY AND
TRAUMA ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF
MASCULINITY IN HEMINGWAY AND LAWRENCE

By

THOMAS BEVILACQUA

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of English

May 2010

Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Approved By:

Barry Maine, Ph.D., Advisor

Examining Committee:

James Hans, Ph.D.

Scott Klein, Ph.D.

“Son of man, you cannot say, or guess, for you know only a heap of broken images, where the sun beats, and the dead tree gives no shelter, the cricket no relief, and the dry stone no sound of water.”- T.S. Eliot

“The world breaks everyone and afterward many are strong at the broken places. But those that will not break it kills. It kills the very good and the very gentle and the very brave impartially. If you are none of these you can be sure it will kill you too but there will be no special hurry.”- Ernest Hemingway

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	4
Abstract	6
Introduction	7
Chapter 1-- "That spunky wild bit of a man in him"	20
Chapter 2-- "He felt he had left everything behind, the need for thinking [...] it was all back of him"	48
Chapter 3-- "Be a man, my son"	82
Conclusion	103
Bibliography	107
Scholastic Vita	111

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank Dr. Barry Maine for being my thesis advisor. I am forever grateful for his advice and unending patience over the course of this project, as well as for leading me back to the works of Ernest Hemingway. The opportunity to work with him has been a special one, and I have enjoyed it immensely. In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Scott Klein and Dr. James Hans for their guidance as my readers and for always being willing to discuss my work while lending their thoughts and suggestions. It was truly a pleasure working with both of these men. Having the opportunity to get to know and work with scholars such as Drs. Maine, Klein and Hans made my time at Wake Forest extremely special, and I will take the things they have taught me with me wherever I go in life. I would also like to acknowledge Drs. Samuel Baker and Martin Kevorkian at the University of Texas at Austin for their help and for pushing me to reach this point in my academic career, as well as Dr. Charles Rossman for fostering within me a passion for the works of D.H. Lawrence.

I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge my fellow English graduate students, as it is certainly because of them that I was able to complete this thesis. Though they probably grew sick of hearing me talk about Hemingway and Lawrence, they were always there to offer the words of guidance and encouragement that helped me make it through this process. I would particularly like to thank Anna Willis for many spirited discussions on Hemingway and the issues of gender, Rachel Ernst for her delicious baked goods that fueled countless stretches of writing, and Emma, Jen, Suen, Wesley, Emily, Michael,

Ashley, Elizabeth and Angela for their support and friendship throughout my time at Wake Forest. I would also like to thank my friends in California, Texas, Massachusetts, Washington D.C. and beyond, who were always willing to listen and help in whatever way they could. I am lucky for friends such as these, and it was because of them I was able to remain sane as I wrote this thesis.

I would also like to acknowledge and thank my family for their support, especially thank my step-mother and my father. In addition, I want to thank as David Marchant for encouraging my work on Hemingway and for always being willing to talk about "Big, Two-Hearted River." Finally, I would like to thank my mother, who always listened to my thoughts and complaints, while helping me through the stumbling blocks I often encountered and providing me with the support and reassurance I needed to complete this thesis.

Abstract

Thesis written under the direction of Barry Maine, Ph.D., Professor of English

Ernest Hemingway and D.H. Lawrence were two authors best known, perhaps even infamous, for their portrayals of gender and particularly masculinity, which has led to the levying of criticisms and challenges by countless feminist critics. But rather than each author writing and reflecting a universal construction of masculinity, what emerges by considering the seminal post-World War I texts of these two authors is that they both possessed unique and nuanced constructions of masculinity that would often emerge in the wake of a physical injury or a psychological trauma. For Lawrence, masculinity was attained when a man embraced his impulse or inner essence, what scholar Peter Balbert outlines as the “phallic imagination,” while turning away from the control and mastery of the will. This choice that Lawrence’s men would make was often prompted by a physical or psychological wounding. By contrast, a physical injury or psychological trauma initiated Hemingway’s men and forced them to learn the importance of maintaining control and mastery, as living up to this “code” of self-control was the only way the Hemingway male could overcome their injury and survive. Lawrence’s construction of masculinity stressed impulse and emotion and the rejection of the will’s control, while for Hemingway masculinity was exerted when the man exhibited control over his impulses. By understanding the unique nature of each author’s construction of masculinity, we can in turn better understand their views and characterization of World War I, as well as realizing the nuanced nature of masculinity and how its further consideration could enrich future readings of the works of these two authors.

Introduction-- The Construction of Masculinity in the Modernist Era

Questions about masculinity have been amongst the most asked throughout history. Generations upon generations have considered what exactly it means to be “a man,” and many people have tried to confront those questions. Historians, sociologists, journalists and authors have all crafted their own interpretations and conceptions of masculinity. The literature of the early twentieth century was particularly affected by ideas about masculinity, and many of that period’s most prominent authors placed these ideas at the heart of their fictions. Thomas Strychacz describes the Modernist era of literature as one beset with “anxieties” related to a “turn-of-the-century crisis of masculinity,” with many “male writers [...] embroiled in a ‘battle of the sexes.’”¹ Masculinity became something that was not merely debated or discussed, but also a concept that had to be outlined and proved in the face of shifting notions of gender roles and normative behaviors. The coming of the modern era brought with it concerns and questions about a man’s role and what it meant to be a man, and particularly because of World War I.

Though masculinity was an issue on many minds at the beginning of the twentieth century, World War I exacerbated these concerns, with war being perhaps one of the arenas most associated with masculinity. As Michael Roper describes it, World War I “loom[s] large in the historiography of twentieth-century masculinity” and ideas of “manliness” were placed “under scrutiny among

¹ Thomas Strychacz, *Dangerous Masculinities: Conrad, Hemingway, and Lawrence* (Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press, 2008), 1.

veterans in the midcentury.”² In addition to the effects of the war on the geopolitical realm and its central place in the narrative of twentieth century history, World War I also had lasting effects upon the conception of masculinity in western culture. The very nature of war, fought in a place where women do not participate except in supporting roles, necessarily raised awareness about what exactly constituted masculinity. War is a unique context for considering gender, because it is a place or state where the action (namely, the fighting) is performed solely by men. War is a man’s world, and thus its effects will be felt primarily by men. Roper notes how for a “majority” of young British men, the war was “a test of character” where they “were typically just as anxious about acquitting themselves properly-- and avoiding shame-- as about the possibility of death and injury.”³ Many of these soldiers were not just fighting for their country, but to prove their own masculine worth in an arena that consisted only of other men which made it, in the words of Margaret Higonnet, “a man’s affair.”⁴ Though many of the expectations that led these young men to approach the war in such a manner were brought into question in its aftermath, masculinity stands as something central to those involved with the war, and that centrality pushed its questions out into the world of literature. Masculinity was an extremely prominent issue of the time, and the authors Ernest Hemingway and D.H. Lawrence each

² Michael Roper, “Between Manliness and Masculinity: The ‘War Generation’ and the Psychology of Fear in Britain, 1914-1950,” *Journal of British Studies* 44 (April 2005): 343, 346.

³ Roper, “Between Manliness and Masculinity,” 348.

⁴ Margaret Higonnet, “Authenticity and Art in Trauma Narratives of World War I,” *Modernism/Modernity* 9 (January 2002): 93.

portrayed and investigated ideas of masculinity, specifically in this post-World War I context.

In the Modernist era, Ernest Hemingway put forth one of the most defined and readily discernible conceptions of masculinity. Phillip Young, one of the preeminent and most influential Hemingway scholars, perhaps best articulated Hemingway's conception of masculinity in his seminal *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration*, as being "the controls [...] which in a life of tension and pain make a man a man and distinguish him from the people who follow random impulses, let down their hair, and are generally messy, perhaps cowardly, and without inviolable rules for how to live holding tight."⁵ The ideal for the male, in Hemingway's articulation of masculinity, is to overpower or master the instinctual and impulsive, and this keeps one from losing control of one's actions in trying situations. A true man must exhibit a form of mastery and control over himself and the situation he faces. Greg Forter articulates how masculinity is proven in Hemingway's texts by "courageously asserting itself in the face of unmaning and life-threatening dangers,"⁶ or by exhibiting the definition of courage that has come to define Hemingway and his views of masculine behavior: "grace under pressure." Hemingway's masculinity must constantly be asserted, tried, tested and proven, specifically through the actions that a man performs. Hemingway's masculinity is proven through performing a given action well, regardless of the action itself. For the Hemingway male, masculinity is not established solely

⁵ Phillip Young, *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1966), 63.

⁶ Greg Forter "Melancholy Modernism: Gender and the Politics of Mourning in *The Sun Also Rises*," *Hemingway Review* 21 (Fall 2001): 22.

because he fishes or drinks or hunts, but it is because he performs the action well and maintains control, no matter what the action is. From this approach, where a man strives for self discipline in order to perform any action well, a kind of stoicism emerged, such that a character such as *The Sun Also Rises*' Jake Barnes would "try and play it along" and refraining from "think[ing] about" that which troubled him and attempted to "try and take it,"⁷ whatever that difficult "it" might be. This ideal was one where emotion was to be restrained as the male maintained control in the face of a challenge. Mastery and control is valued above all, and the true man exhibits that masculinity by remaining in control both physically and emotionally.

Hemingway's construction of masculinity mirrors in certain respects the masculine ideal embraced by many of the young men who fought in World War I. "Manliness," for many of these young men, "was judged largely in terms of external qualities" such as "a man's comportment" and "his physical appearance and performance."⁸ Masculinity was also understood through outward actions and how one physically performed, something at the heart of the Hemingway model of masculinity. However, Hemingway's construction of masculinity is derived in part from a dismissal or rejection of social measures in favor of a "personal code." Hemingway's emphasis on outward actions and the performative aspects of masculinity reflect his belief in a world that has been unmoored from traditional conventions and beliefs as a result of the war, where

⁷ Ernest Hemingway, *The Sun Also Rises* (New York: Scribners, 1926), 39.

⁸ Roper, "Between Manliness and Masculinity," 347.

the only “real” thing left are these actions. There is nothing left in the political or social arena that can provide control or order, but a man must control his own specific and particular world through actions performed well and the exhibition of self-control and mastery.

D.H. Lawrence’s conception of masculinity greatly differs from that of Hemingway. Instead of masculine behavior based upon the well-performed action, Lawrence presented an ideal of masculinity that was rooted in impulse and instinct triumphing over social constraints and political repressions of behavior. According to Lawrence, the masculine essence is often restrained or repressed by society, and only by exercising and displaying that instinctual male essence can masculinity be re-established and enacted. One of Lawrence’s characters, Gudrun Brangwen in *Women in Love*, describes the masculine ideal as rooted in “freedom [...] liberty [...] mobility”: if “you [a man] want to do a thing, you do it. You haven’t the *thousand* obstacles a woman has in front of her.”⁹ From this female character’s description, we can begin to understand Lawrence’s vision of masculinity, specifically the one articulated first in *Women in Love*. Gudrun, through her expression of discontent with her own state as a woman, also articulates what it means to be a man, something innate and essential. Eugene Goodheart describes how Lawrence does not endorse “the idea that the sexual impulse is the deepest impulse in man” but instead focuses on “the unconscious” as the impetus “from which all genuine civilization draws its

⁹ D.H. Lawrence, *Women in Love* (New York: Penguin Books, [1920] 2007), 47-48.

energy.”¹⁰ Goodheart identifies in Lawrence the impetus for masculine behavior as being rooted in the unconscious, an impulse of which man is not truly aware. This impulse is not solely a sexual one and cannot be satisfied by merely repeating and performing the sexual act, something that will be addressed later. Instead, it is the pure and authentic expression of an inner and natural or primitive impulse, one not constrained by the will and power of other actors, that defines masculinity for Lawrence. By exhibiting that impulse, the Lawrencian male asserts his masculinity in the manner that Lawrence envisioned.

The Lawrencian masculine impulse, which Peter Balbert designates as the “phallic imagination”,¹¹ is often repressed by many factors and often times that repression is enacted through female characters. For example, *Women in Love*’s Hermione Roddice “want[s] a life of pure sensation and ‘passion’” but that emerges through her “bullying will” and her desire “to clutch things and have them in [her] power.”¹² Hermione’s will is one that wants to direct and control the essential masculine spirit that Lawrence values in his male characters. In the words of Mark Spilka, “Hermione depends too heavily upon one or two elements of being” that “are fused [...] into a single passion for final abstract knowledge” that leads to the “power to hold all life within the scope of her intellect.”¹³

Hermione wishes to use and incorporate sensation and passion into her own

¹⁰ Eugene Goodheart, *D.H. Lawrence: The Utopian Vision* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, [1963] 2006), 110.

¹¹ Peter Balbert, *D.H. Lawrence and the Phallic Imagination* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1989), 20.

¹² Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 42.

¹³ Mark Spilka, *The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence* (Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 1955), 122.

behavior, thus exerting control over it through her incorporative act. The desire for control is at the heart of a character such as Hermione, and that control moves outward into the world and functions as the restraints within the world that prevent or hinder the expression of masculine energies and impulses. Lawrence uses the feminine, in settings such as these, to reflect a broader idea of policing that exists in the world and that specifically sublimates the male essence, or what might be understood as the “phallic imagination.”

Lawrence’s conception of masculinity is much more elusive and difficult to define when contrasted with the more easily delineated Hemingway model. Lawrence rejected the sexual morality of the time, yet did not formulate a completely limitless endorsement of sexuality and “sensation” above all. There is an ineffable quality to Lawrence’s masculinity, with the impulse going beyond the mere sexual, though it often manifests itself in sexual settings. Oliver Mellors, in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, articulates this when he says he values “being warm-hearted in love” and “fucking with a warm heart,” which he contrasts with “cold-hearted fucking.”¹⁴ The “warm hearted” approach of which Mellors speaks of reflects an ideal for men, for if “men could fuck with warm hearts and women could take it warm-heartedly, everything would come all right.”¹⁵ The sense of the “warm hearted” that Mellors hopes to see integrated into the sexual act stems from “that fundamental source of energy” Balbert ties to his notion of the “phallic imagination,”¹⁶ and imbues sex with an element of vitality and energy that had

¹⁴ D.H. Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* (New York: Penguin Books, [1928] 2006), 206.

¹⁵ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 206.

¹⁶ Balbert, *Lawrence and the Phallic Imagination*, 20.

been lacking. Men must exhibit this impulse that has been repressed and women must be able to receive it and allow it to be exhibited. Action, specifically the sexual act, is not what defines or creates the correct masculine behavior in Lawrence as “cold-hearted fucking” is part of the problem. The action remains the same, but it is an impulse (specifically the “warm hearted” one) that must return for things to “come all right.” Peter Balbert helps to further articulate this distinction, by saying that “sex for Lawrence must strive for deeper levels of meaning, stimulation and singling out”¹⁷ while avoiding the reduction of sex to just the act itself with no feeling or substance behind it. Whereas the “cold hearted” approach reduces the sexual act to a repeated and almost mechanized act, the incorporation of one’s “warm heart” stems from a masculine essence or impulse and keeps sex from reflecting a mechanized and overly regimented model for human relations.

Just as these two authors possessed their own unique conception of masculinity, each author and their masculine ideals were affected by the onset of World War I, and those effects could be seen in their works from that time. The war’s effects upon Hemingway are readily apparent and easily understood. Serving as a Red Cross ambulance driver on the Italian front, Hemingway witnessed the horrific effects of combat and also was himself injured and spent time recuperating in an Italian hospital. Hemingway’s experiences in the wartime theatre, as recounted by Michael Stewart, left him “badly wounded [...] inside as well as outside” and provided him with “not only the obvious subject matter” for

¹⁷ Balbert, *Lawrence and the Phallic Imagination*, 171.

his writing but “also undergirded the entire *oeuvre*, and lurked below the surface of certain important stories that never mentioned the war.”¹⁸ In addition to the many stories that focus on the war and its combatants, many of the situations in Hemingway’s texts include a man who has had a profound and intense experience during the war. In his well-known scholarly treatment of the fictions of Hemingway, Phillip Young sets the war apart as the impetus for his “wound theory” for Hemingway’s fiction, as the war functioned in Hemingway’s life as a physical and psychological wound whose effects were continuously felt throughout his life. Though the centrality of the war and its effects on Hemingway have recently been challenged by psychoanalytical biographers such as Kenneth Lynn, the prevailing approach to the works of Ernest Hemingway is one that understands the war’s centrality to his writing, and one that understands as well that he is a writer best understood in the context of it.

Lawrence, however, is not an author whose ties to the First World War are easily understood. Unlike Hemingway, Lawrence “refused to take any part in the war effort [...] denounc[ing] the war as unmitigated evil”¹⁹ and was removed from the fighting on the front lines. However, this does not mean that he was not affected by the war’s horrors. Jae-Kyung Koh describes Lawrence as believing the war was the result of “the repression, concealment and perversion of natural instinctive power and impulses”,²⁰ particularly through the Judeo-Christian values

¹⁸ Matthew Stewart, "Ernest Hemingway and World War I: Combatting Recent Psychobiographical Reassessments, Restoring the War," *Papers on Language and Literature: A Journal for Scholars and Critics of Language and Literature* 36 (Spring 2000):199.

¹⁹ Jae-Kyung Koh, "D.H. Lawrence and the Great War," *Neophilologus* 87 (January 2003): 161.

²⁰ Koh, "D.H. Lawrence and the Great War," 157.

that dominated Europe at the time. Lawrence did not view the war as the result of political entanglements and military aggression, but instead as the reaction of a culture that had repressed its impulses and instincts, which were the things that Lawrence viewed as being vital (especially to men).

But Lawrence had two approaches to the war; he viewed it with a strong disdain and horror, yet also with the knowledge that “through this cataclysm would come a transition to a new world,”²¹ as the Judeo-Christian system of morality would be destroyed through the violence and horrors of the war. From the ashes of that destruction would emerge a new existence where impulse and instinct would be exercised and understood. But Lawrence’s consideration of the war and its effects were not limited to these theoretical considerations and much of the literature that Lawrence wrote during and after the war was influenced by the catastrophic destruction occurring throughout Europe at the time, even when the subject matter itself did not center upon the war. Lawrence describes, in an appendix to *Women in Love*, how the novel “took its final shape” during the war “though it does not concern the war itself,” as well as expressing his desire to have “the time [...] remain unfixed, so that the bitterness of the war may be taken for granted in the characters.”²² Though some of Lawrence’s texts addressed the war and its aftermath, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* in particular, he also explains that a text whose subject matter is not the war can be informed by a world at war and comment upon the ideas behind that war. Though not all of his texts from the

²¹ Koh, “D.H. Lawrence and the Great War,” 167.

²² Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 485.

time of World War I feature narratives about those directly involved in the war, both Lawrence himself and subsequent scholars have identified the war's theoretical or conceptual influence. This allows Lawrence's texts to be read as reflecting the World War I world, and its influence can be seen in narratives that are not stories "about" the war itself.

What emerges then is a connection on two fronts for these two writers, though they emerged from different continents, backgrounds and beliefs. Each author was, to some degree, affected by World War I in such a way that the war manifested itself in their fictions from that time. But beyond this shared context, each author has approached and addressed ideas of masculinity and posited their own ideas or conceptions of what it means to "be a man" in their world. Though these constructions of masculinity were radically different, both Lawrence and Hemingway had models or ideas that they presented as models for masculinity, which remains relevant to the current discourse on the subject. In addition, these specific models of masculine behavior held by each author were each affected by similar problems related to war, particular to Western culture in the wake of World War I: violence, physical injury and psychological trauma. These three topics emerge in the works of each author most directly affected by and tied to World War I-- Lawrence's *Women in Love* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* and Hemingway's *In Our Time* and *The Sun Also Rises*.²³ In each of these

²³ For this project, I have elected to not investigate *A Farewell to Arms*, another of Hemingway's works that draws upon his experience in World War I. I made this choice as a result of the text's subject matter, namely that it centers upon the actual fighting of the war itself. In this project, I seek to investigate the greater after-effects and traumas resulting from the war. Since large portions of *A Farewell to Arms* center upon the experiences of the main character, Frederic Henry, at the front, I felt as though that might hinder my ability to look at the war's *effects* and prove too constrictive by limiting the scope of what I could investigate.

texts, the author constructs male characters in order to convey his views of masculinity, and those characters' abilities to act as men are affected by ideas about violence, injury and trauma. The post-war era, with the emergence of Freudian psychoanalytic approaches, was a time when many of those who returned from the war wished "to tap the psychic aftermath of war"²⁴ and investigate those traumatic effects of the war that were not tied to any bodily wounding, as well as its more readily apparent effects through physical injury and the violence of the war itself. Hemingway's and Lawrence's male characters, and their ability to act as men, were challenged by the psychological effects of trauma as well as the physical challenges of an injury or violence and reflect a growing awareness at the time of the wounds that can occur within the psyche that do not manifest themselves on the physical body.

The Modernist literary period was one beset by anxieties about masculinity, causing many authors from that movement to address the issue in their writing. These anxieties appeared to emanate from a shifting and changing society, as well as the presence of a cataclysmic armed conflict in World War I, which led to the deaths of millions of young men in battle and forced the survivors to consider what it meant to act as a man under such conditions. The literature of that time reflected this crisis, and two authors who confronted these issues in their own ways were Ernest Hemingway and D.H. Lawrence. Lawrence presented a vision of masculinity that valued "his own positivity of *being*, of

²⁴ Roper, "Between Manliness and Masculinity," 352.

action”²⁵ that had been sublimated by the war and the culture that created it, and thus those “repressed energies of the psyche” were “corrupt[ed].”²⁶ Hemingway offered a view of masculinity rooted in action, but not the instinctual or impulsive action of Lawrence. Instead, Hemingway emphasized action in a more performative sense and his men were ones who lived up to the “Hemingway ‘code,’” articulated by scholars like Phillip Young, and who refrained from “acting upon the desires of ‘random impulses,’” favoring instead “stoic masculinity valuing control.”²⁷ Though they had different ideas of masculinity, their male characters were subject to violence, trauma and injury strongly associated with the horrors of the war. The aforementioned texts by each of these authors, Lawrence’s *Women in Love* and *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* and Hemingway’s *In Our Time* and *The Sun Also Rises*, feature male characters affected by war, violence, trauma and injury that in turn affects their ability to act as men according to each author’s construction of masculinity. By considering each author in the context of having constructions of masculine tested and affected by the war and its consequences, we can then trace how these shared ideas of war, violence, trauma and injury affected their own masculine constructs.

²⁵ D.H. Lawrence, *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 129.

²⁶ Koh, “D.H. Lawrence and the Great War,” 167.

²⁷ Stephen Clifford, “Hemingway’s Fragmentary Novel: Readers Writing the Hero in *In Our Time*,” *Hemingway Review* 13 (Spring 1994): 14.

Chapter 1-- “That spunky wild bit of a man in him”: D.H. Lawrence’s Essential Masculine Nature

Throughout his literary career, D.H. Lawrence often focused upon gender and the roles of men and women in his fiction. These concerns became particularly pronounced in his works created in the wake of World War I, namely the novels *Women in Love* and *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*. In addition to concerns over the role and definition of gender and masculinity, Lawrence also considered how experiences endemic to a war-time environment, such as violence, trauma and injury, affected these male characters and their ability to exhibit their masculine traits. Lawrence’s male characters, such as Rupert Birkin and Gerald Crich in *Women in Love* and Clifford Chatterley and Oliver Mellors in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, are all affected by these experiences. What emerges for these male characters is that these experiences can be overcome if the male character reverts to a pre-modern or primitive mindset, but they prove to be destructive and a hinderance if the man cannot move past efforts at order and control, concepts traditionally associated with masculine behavior yet not in Lawrence’s construction of masculinity, to embrace the impulsive and instinctive.

Women in Love

The primary male characters in *Women in Love*, Rupert Birkin and Gerald Crich, reflect Lawrence’s construction of masculinity. In the case of Birkin, he induces an act of violence against himself, and overcomes that action and subsequent injury and trauma by turning to a more primitive state, one that reflects Lawrence’s masculine ideals. While at a party with Gerald Crich as well

as the two Brangwen sisters, Gudrun and Ursula, Hermione Roddice professes her belief that “in the *spirit* we are all one, all equal in spirit” to which Birkin “turned round in bitter declamation” and professes his belief that “it is just the opposite [...] we are all different and unequal in spirit.”¹ The challenge that Birkin mounts is one that Stephen Miko describes as Hermione’s “insistence upon rationalization” and “abstraction [...] an inseparable element in the reduction of vitality to mechanism.”² In this, we see the demarcation between the masculine and the feminine or what perhaps can be better understood as the “non-masculine.” The “non-masculine” will of Hermione seeks to reduce gender differences so that they can be understood by her, while Birkin’s masculine essence allows for things to be different and for inequalities to exist.

Following his admonishment of Hermione’s reductive understanding of the world in which Birkin “had hurt her” and “been vindictive” with objections that caused “terrible shocks” to pass “over her [Hermione], like shocks of electricity,” “a terrible voluptuous thrill [...] down her arms,” after which she “brought down the ball” of lapis lazuli “with all her force” to “crash on his [Birkin’s] head.”³ Both psychological and physical violence are in play in this encounter, and the physical violence is directed back upon Birkin by Hermione. Birkin devalued Hermione’s desire to categorize and reduce things into a most basic and controlled idea that she can herself comprehend and acquire as a piece of

¹ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 103.

² Stephen Miko, *Toward Women in Love: The Emergence of a Lawrentian Aesthetic* (New Haven, Ct: Yale University Press, 1971), 225.

³ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 105.

knowledge. This challenge by Birkin elicits violence, in the “violent waves of hatred and loathing” that came from him as he responded to Hermione, but also in the actions of Hermione directed back at Birkin. Hermione took those “waves” of energy and redirected them in an action that is blunt and easily understood-- violence.

After escaping from the violence of Hermione, Birkin “lie[s] down and roll [s] in the sticky, cool young hyacinths” and feels the satisfaction of “this coolness and subtlety of vegetation traveling into one’s blood.”⁴ Birkin survives this act of violence committed by Hermione and the physical injury he has endured by turning towards the primitive and natural, which reinforces the masculine and are not constrained by a regulating humanity. Birkin considers the weak value of a regulating and highly organized society and wonders “what did people matter altogether” as he enjoyed “this perfect cool loneliness, so lovely and fresh and unexplored.”⁵ Birkin heals himself after this violent act by putting himself in contact with an entity, in the natural world, that is more instinctual and not constrained by human society. Hermione’s violent act is one that is based in a desire to control or constrain Birkin, more broadly reflecting how within Lawrence’s works, the inherently male impulse is forcibly controlled by the female. Anne Wright describes Hermione as functioning as a representative of “the willed knowledge which this social order represents” and enacting “a kind of

⁴ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 107.

⁵ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 107.

violence against the natural and the instinctual.”⁶ The natural and the instinctual are bound together, and thus as the properly Lawrencian man, Birkin turns towards nature as a means by which he can regenerate and heal.

Hermione represents this modern sense of social order, and thus stands as a constraint on Birkin’s masculine instinct. Hermione values her will and the control she can exert through her will above all, believing that “by learning to use [her] will” she “*made* herself right.”⁷ Stephen Miko’s depiction of Hermione, as possessing “a self-conscious and determined insistence on the importance of the will” and “thoroughly involved in abstraction,”⁸ allows us to understand her actions as specifically being contrary to Lawrence’s masculine ideal. Thus the only way Birkin can triumph is through reverting towards the more purely masculine in a realm not controlled by Hermione’s social order, namely the natural. Laying amongst the vegetation after Hermione’s attack, Birkin “did not want a woman-- not in the least” as “the leaves and the primroses and the trees [...] were really lovely and cool and desirable,”⁹ superior to any human contact. Birkin has entered a place where Hermione’s abstractions and the will to control do not exist, and, as Peter Balbert described, it is there that Birkin can be “revived by his naked communion with the forces of nature.”¹⁰

⁶ Anne Wright, *Literature of Crisis, 1910-22: Howards End, Heartbreak House, Women in Love and The Waste Land* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1984), 124.

⁷ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 140.

⁸ Miko, *Towards Women in Love*, 225.

⁹ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 107.

¹⁰ Balbert, *Lawrence and the Phallic Imagination*, 95.

In addition to his response to the violence acts of Hermione, Birkin's relationship with Ursula and his approach to relationships reflect his embracement. Birkin desires to reach a point where a man and a woman are "clear and whole as angels [with] the admixture of sex in the highest sense surpassed" and thus "leaving two single beings, constellated together like two stars."¹¹ This conception of Birkin's, one that many scholars have referred to as the "star equilibrium," reflects an important aspect of Lawrence's construction of masculinity. For the man and the woman, though together in some sexual/emotional relationship, also remained "singl[ed] away into purity and clear being."¹² While the non-masculine would attempt to overpower and incorporate, as will be later examined in the case of Gerald, the truly Lawrencian male accepts the separate-ness of man and woman and does not try to reconcile the two into one.

Thus Peter Balbert's notion of "naked communion" between Birkin and nature becomes more relevant and important, as they must be two *separate* entities and the communion emerges between the two while they remain separate. Birkin mingles and communes with the natural, but he never overtakes it or integrates it fully into himself. Ursula herself identifies how Birkin does not "want a slave" or a woman "prostrat[ing] herself before a man" but one who could "*take* something from him,"¹³ thus maintaining a form of separation as the two drew from each other. Mark Spilka describes this further, how in Lawrence's

¹¹ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 201.

¹² Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 201.

¹³ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 295.

conception “the individual can only be fulfilled through contact and communion with his fellow men and woman [...] so long as it preserves the intrinsic “otherness” of each participant.”¹⁴ The authentic expression of the masculine is one that comes into contact with the other, which often time comes in the form of sex, but maintains something separate or detached from that. Thus the masculine essence is not one that seeks to control or envelop the female, but instead to create a communion between the two separate entities, and this is the approach taken by Birkin that solidifies him as an example of the Lawrencian construction of masculinity.

While Birkin is affected by an act of violence leading him to enter into a communion with the natural in order to repair himself and his masculine essence, Gerald Crich stands as a male character affected by psychological trauma and the effects of violence, leading him to turn away from the masculine impulse and towards machinery and the industrial world. Birkin primarily functions as a mouthpiece in the novel for Lawrence as a representative of the ideas that he wished to espouse. Gerald, however, is able to function as a symbol and the representation of how masculinity has been affected by a world that does not value all that is associated with it. By considering Gerald after first understanding Birkin as an articulation of the Lawrencian masculine ideal, we can understand what exactly Lawrence’s idea of masculinity does and does not entail and how it can be affected by physical and psychological violence in Gerald’s divergence from the ideas espoused by Lawrence.

¹⁴ Spilka, *The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence*, 127.

Gerald Crich's first psychological trauma occurred when he was a child. When Gerald was "a boy" he "accidentally killed his brother" while they "were playing together with a gun," as Gerald did not know "it was loaded" and the gun accidentally fired "and blew the top of his head off."¹⁵ Gerald experienced a psychological trauma after witnessing the death of his brother as such a young age, and specifically a trauma that he was responsible for to some degree. Gerald was the one who, literally, fired the gun that killed his brother, yet he was merely "playing" and did not intend to shoot him. The action was somehow independent of him, yet the act was a result of him. As Gudrun and Ursula think about the accident, Ursula wonders whether or not "there was an unconscious will" or "some primitive desire for killing"¹⁶ behind the accident, an inclination for destruction within Gerald that was unconsciously expressed through this action.

This accident clearly had a traumatic effect upon him and is something that Gerald will "carry the responsibility of [...] all through [his] life."¹⁷ This psychological "wound" is one that will be felt without being manifested on the actual, corporal body. Gerald will possess a psychological "brand and curse"¹⁸ as a result of this accident that, as described by Michael Squires, "contributes to his growing psychic split, typical of Modernism, between vitality and nullity"¹⁹ or between the organic and more truly masculine on one side and the mechanized

¹⁵ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 26, 49.

¹⁶ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 49.

¹⁷ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 49.

¹⁸ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 26.

¹⁹ Michael Squires, "Modernism and the Contours of Violence in D.H. Lawrence's Fiction," *Studies in the Novel* 39 (Spring 2007): 90.

and the non-masculine on the other. Unlike Birkin, who reacts to his physical injury by turning to something more primal and thus more masculine, Gerald shuns his masculine nature in favor of a greater control that contradicts Lawrence's concept of essential male nature and strives, above all, to constrict and overpower and exert this power through the control of his mechanized world of his family's coal mines.

Rather than turning back towards his inner masculine impulse as Birkin does through his "naked communion" with the natural world, Gerald immerses himself in his father's coal mining enterprise. Gerald subsequently becomes much more regimented and reflects a desire for control and mastery over the world and everything in it. As Gerald grew older and became entrenched in his father's coal mining, he becomes entranced with "this inhuman principle in the mechanism" as he wished to act as "a perfect, changeless, godlike medium between himself and the Matter he had to subjugate," and believing that "this productive repetition ad infinitum" made him "the God of the Machine."²⁰ Gerald turns to the work and the coal mines, embracing the mechanized action and repetition of that life as he moves forward and away from the trauma of the accident. Gerald embraces the ability, in the words of Peter Scheckner, of "mechanical efficiency and the perverse will of a few men [to] triumph over nature and over the majority of men."²¹ By aligning himself with his family's coal-mining enterprise and the mechanized society that coal serves, Gerald is able to

²⁰ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 228.

²¹ Peter Scheckner, *Class, Politics and the Individual: A Study of the Major Works of D.H. Lawrence* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1985) 66.

experience control both over the Earth in the mining of the coal and over the miners working to serve his interests.

Rather than embracing the natural and the instinctual, as Birkin does, Gerald instead turns to the desire for order and control, also seen in the domineering will of Hermione, and thus redirects or sublimates his inherent masculine impulse. Stephen Clifford describes Gerald as wishing to be “the singularly dominant force in his own life and in the lives of those around him.”²² Gerald wants to have control over his own life and the world around him that the more instinctual life of the Lawrencian male will not permit, but which embracing the beliefs of someone like Hermione will allow for. Clifford himself notes this, when stating that Hermione and Gerald both make “persistent attempts to uphold the social ideals of masculine and feminine propriety.”²³ But beyond the agendas they put forth, they each share a desire to attain control over all that surrounds them, either for the purpose of knowledge (in Hermione) or sheer domination (in the case of Gerald).

Gerald’s turn away from the instinctual Lawrencian construct of masculinity towards the “non-masculine” desire for control and mastery through the will manifests itself when Gudrun and Ursula see Gerald riding his horse. Gerald quite clearly and forcibly controls the horse, as he “held on her unrelaxed, with an almost mechanical relentlessness, keen as a sword pressing in her” with

²² Stephen Clifford, *Beyond the Heroic “I”: Reading Lawrence, Hemingway and “Masculinity”* (Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1998) 114.

²³ Clifford, *Beyond the Heroic “I,”* 129

“both man and horse [...] sweating with violence.”²⁴ Gerald asserts his physical dominance over his horse, willing the horse to do his bidding. Lawrence use of italics when he describes how Gerald “*forced* [the horse] round”²⁵ emphasizes the power of Gerald’s will and the degree to which it is being exerted in this scene. Gerald uses this will, something that counters Lawrence’s authentic masculinity, to force his horse to perform and behave as he would like. Gerald is depicted as being like a weapon, “keen as a sword” and creating “trickles of blood” upon his horse.²⁶ The means by which Gerald controls this horse emphasize both violence and the will, decidedly non-masculine concepts in Lawrence’s construction, as well as a mechanized sense of control that also denies Gerald’s own masculine essence. Gerald runs against that masculine essence, as we see in him a trend towards the destructive and domineering rather than the natural and invigorating aspects of what Peter Balbert describes as the “phallic imagination,” setting the tone for Gerald’s later sexual experiences with Gudrun, as Cornelia Nixon identifies “the actual horse as female standing in for Gudrun, secretly relishing [...] her subjection to the overweening Gerald.”²⁷ In this scene, we see Gerald literally commanding and willing the natural being of the horse, but the incident takes on symbolic significance as well, as it reflects how Gerald will bring his desire to control to his sexual encounters with Gudrun.

²⁴ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 111.

²⁵ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 111.

²⁶ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 112.

²⁷ Cornelia Nixon, *Lawrence’s Leadership Politics and the Turn Against Women* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1986), 112.

Later in the novel, Gerald experiences another psychological trauma that elicits a response that shows him once again sublimating his own true masculine essence. Gerald experiences two different psychological traumas, in the drowning death of his sister at the party hosted by his parents, and in the protracted illness and death of his father, Thomas Crich. In the wake of these attacks to his psyche, Gerald's "instinct led him to Gudrun [...] he only wanted the relation established with her."²⁸ But though we do see Gerald's "instinct" emerge, what occurs after does not truly reflect the masculine regenerative essence, or the "phallic imagination." Rather the sexual act again reflects Gerald's mechanistic state and the sublimation of his "true" masculine essence in favor of his will. Gerald overpowers and controls Gudrun, remaining "the firm-mouthed master" for whom Gudrun "relaxed, and seemed to melt, to flow into him [...] as if he were soft iron becoming surcharged with her electric life," which left Gudrun feeling as though "her soul was destroyed with the exquisite shock of his invisible fluid lightning [...] and this knowledge was a death from which she must recover."²⁹ Rather than the regenerative properties of the phallus and the masculine ideal Lawrence envisioned, Gerald's turn to sexuality is depicted in mechanical and destructive terms as he is metal that is animated by the electricity of Gudrun, and the act and its climax is described in terms of destruction rather than regeneration.

²⁸ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 322.

²⁹ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 331-332.

The depiction of Gudrun's melting and flowing into Gerald goes against the Lawrencian masculine ideal that Birkin comes to represent, the aforementioned "star equilibrium" that Mark Spilka describes in which the male and female "must polarize rather than merge in love."³⁰ Gerald's sexual encounter, specifically this one in the wake of these traumatic actions, rejects the ideas of the "star equilibrium" and leaves him standing in contrast to Birkin. Gerald does not allow for polarization, as he must overtake Gudrun and consume her, allowing him to maintain control. They cannot exist in polarized states, maintaining an individual or separate selves in "equilibrium" with another. This also contrasts with the communion that Birkin seeks after being subjected to the violent actions of Hermione. Rather than trying to commune, bringing about unity between two separate things, Gerald overtakes and envelopes Gudrun rather than establishing a communion between the two of them. Mark Spilka describes how this sexual act in which Gerald "take[s] her as a child takes life-giving warmth and milk from its mother" is one where "Gerald's failure to find organic purpose in the man's world" makes him "a child in love."³¹ Gerald does not commune with Gudrun through their love making, but instead takes from her what he needs and thus prevents the sexual act from being a "creative" one, which reflects his rejection of Lawrencian masculine ideals by embracing control and force that culminates in Gerald's demise.

³⁰ Spilka, *The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence*, 126.

³¹ Spilka, *The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence*, 138.

Gerald's actions at the end of the novel not only further reflect his sublimation of the masculine essence, but a corruption of that very essence that leads to his final violent acts and ultimate death. Jae-Kyung Koh, considering Lawrence's reactions to World War I, describes how "the Christian ideal" that was largely responsible for the war had "undermined the roots of passion" and that "the repression of basic instincts" had led to "the distorted expression of those long-repressed impulses."³² Such impulses were repressed by the culture that promulgated the war, and as a result became distorted and corrupted, leading to their expression in ways that are not true to the essence of masculinity. Gerald's rejection of the masculine essence transforms him into what Mark Spilka describes as "the perfect instrument of industrial power" through his "use of will, spirit, and intellect to bring about [...] a complete breakdown in organic life."³³ This embracing of the industrial and mechanized, reinforced by his family, which Spilka describes as "death-driven,"³⁴ leads Gerald's final action to be harmful for both Gudrun and himself. Gerald's energies and impulses have been channeled through means that run against what Lawrence portrays as the truly masculine, and as was the case with European society during World War I, the suppression has corrupted or distorted those natural impulses and thus they are enacted in destructive ways.

Gerald's final actions at the end of the novel reflect the degree to which his masculine essence has been suppressed and corrupted, and how it exerts

³² Koh, "Lawrence and the Great War," 167

³³ Spilka, *The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence*, 134, 140.

³⁴ Spilka, *The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence*, 135.

itself in ultimately harmful ways. While in the snowy Alps, after Gudrun has told him that she plans on leaving him, Gerald “took the throat of Gudrun between his hands, that were hard and indomitably powerful” and choked her, “watching her eyes roll back” and thinking “what a fulfillment, what a satisfaction” and “how good this was.”³⁵ This is the culmination of Gerald’s repression and alteration of his masculine impulse, manifesting itself in this violent and destructive action so “at last he could finish his desire”³⁶ that could be traced back to his unconscious will to kill his brother through those accidental means. Whether because of his “death driven” family or his position within the industrial world, Gerald’s impulse and desire has been corrupted such that this violent action is the fulfillment of it. Gerald has used up the last of his masculine essence and is left with “a weakness [that] ran over his body” and “a decay of strength” but he “did not want to rest, he wanted to go on and on, to the end.”³⁷ As Michael Squires describes, “the unconscious force of violence has spent itself”³⁸ in Gerald, and thus there is nothing left to fuel him. Gerald has rejected the regenerative aspect of the masculine and the phallic, and thus Gerald does not “want to rest” and allow his energies to regenerate; by turning away from his natural masculine identity in favor of the automated and mechanized, Gerald has lost the regenerative and restorative aspects of the masculine ideal and through his denial of that aspect of Lawrence’s construction of masculinity, Gerald cannot refuel his desire and, like a

³⁵ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 471.

³⁶ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 471.

³⁷ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 472.

³⁸ Squires, “Modernism and the Contours of Violence in D.H. Lawrence’s Fiction,” 91

machine that has expended all of its fuel, reaches a final stop, which for Gerald is death as “he wandered on unconsciously” through the snow “till he slipped and fell down, and as he fell something broke in his soul and immediately he went to sleep.”³⁹

The two primary male characters of *Women in Love*, Rupert Birkin and Gerald Crich, are subject to the assaults of physical violence and psychological trauma. Birkin experiences a physical assault at the hands of Hermione Roddice, one that represents a domineering approach that is contrary to Lawrence’s masculine ideal. It is through a communion with the natural world that Birkin is able to heal himself and survive, to stand as a model of the Lawrencian construction of masculinity. Gerald, by contrast, has been subjected to countless psychological traumas throughout his life from his accidental killing of his brother to the drowning death of his sister Diana and finally the death of his father and coal-mining enterprise patriarch Thomas. But rather than turning to a communion with regenerative natural (and, as Lawrence portrays it, masculine) elements, Gerald turns towards the willed power of the industrial world, and something that is closer to the ideals of Hermione rather than Birkin. This approach represses and corrupts the masculine essence, leading it to be expressed in a very un-masculine fashion and proving unsustainable and unable to be regenerated. What we see in *Women in Love* is the two actions that a man can take in the face of a trauma or injury: he can turn to the essential nature of man as a means of regeneration and healing, as in the case of Birkin, or he can act as Gerald and

³⁹ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 474.

turn away from the masculine in favor of the will, as coupled with the industrial world of his family's coal mines. This choice, to either embrace the masculine essence or turn away from it in the wake of an injury or trauma, occurs again in Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

Lady Chatterley's Lover

Lawrence's controversial novel *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, which centers upon an affair between upper-class Constance Chatterley and her paralyzed husband's gamekeeper Oliver Mellors, also reflects Lawrence's consideration of how trauma and injury can affect masculinity. Perhaps the most well-known and prominent example of an injured male character in Lawrence's writing is Constance's husband, Clifford Chatterley. Clifford served as "a smart lieutenant" during the First World War and, while "in Flanders" he was severely injured and was "shipped over to England [...] more or less in bits."⁴⁰ Clifford's military service leads directly to physical injury, "with the lower half of his body, from the hips down, paralysed for ever" so that "he could never have any children."⁴¹ This injury rendered Clifford unable to perform the act that he was asked to perform, namely "to marry and produce an heir" for Wragby and at the behest of his father whom he viewed as "a hopeless anachronism."⁴² Thus, when Clifford "was shipped home smashed, and there was [to be] no child," Clifford's father "died of chagrin."⁴³ Clifford's role had been to, above all, procreate and provide a child to

⁴⁰ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 5, 10.

⁴¹ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 5.

⁴² Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 12.

⁴³ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 12.

whom the physical place of Wragby as well as its title could be passed. Clifford's initial reaction to this is one of skepticism, that being "responsible for Wragby, old Wragby" and was "terrible" but "also splendid [...]" and at the same time, perhaps, purely absurd."⁴⁴ Before his injury, Clifford rejects the ideology that emphasizes lineage and the importance of passing on tradition and control, specifically through genetic material. But in the wake of his wound, Clifford appears to turn back toward the world of "Old Wragby" and realizing its importance, primarily as a means by which he can maintain some sense of potency through a control that reflects a prior social order.

The war and the wound it left led Clifford to reject that which was left of his masculine essence in order to maintain control and his own sense of power. Clifford's physical injury and impotence also contained a psychic "bruise of fear and horror" that was "coming up and spreading in him," and "the paralysis, the bruise of the too-great shock" of his injury "was gradually spreading in his affective self."⁴⁵ Clifford's wound transcends its merely physical state and seeps through into Clifford's psyche and drains him of his affect, which can also be read as the impulse at the heart of Lawrencian masculinity. Clifford has been physically wounded through the stifling of his literal potency (by paralyzing him from the waist down) and the psychological trauma neutralized his masculine essence as he renders himself as one who is not masculine by lack of affect, what Peter Balbert describes as "a failure of the phallic imagination as well as the

⁴⁴ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 11.

⁴⁵ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 49.

phallus.”⁴⁶ It is from the “affective self,” or Balbert’s “phallic imagination” that encompasses “the passionate potential of man,”⁴⁷ that the masculine energy emerges and that affective self has been neutralized as a result of Clifford’s wound and experiences in the war. Clifford can only “talk brilliantly” but “all the brilliant words seemed like dead leaves, crumpling up and turning to power, meaning really nothing, blown away on any gust of life [...] not the leafy words of an effective life” but rather “the hosts of fallen leaves of a life that is ineffectual.”⁴⁸ Clifford can create through beautiful and occasionally powerful words, but those things have no sustaining power or vitality and eventually disintegrate into nothing. The “affect” or the generative impulse is closely tied to Lawrence’s construction of the masculine, and that is something that has been diminished in Clifford as well as something he has willingly turned away from.

Clifford cannot create potency from within, and thus he must artificially create it through things outside of him. One such instrument is his motorized wheel-chair, into which Peter Balbert describes Clifford as having “sunk the roots of his moral being.”⁴⁹ Clifford turns to this piece of machinery of movement as, again quoting Balbert, “the only means of feeling erect and potent.”⁵⁰ Mechanization and machinery provide Clifford with the ability to feel potent and, more importantly, maintain control over that which is around him. This turn to the

⁴⁶ Balbert, *Lawrence and the Phallic Imagination*, 159.

⁴⁷ Balbert, *Lawrence and the Phallic Imagination*, 46.

⁴⁸ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 50.

⁴⁹ Balbert, *Lawrence and the Phallic Imagination*, 164.

⁵⁰ Balbert, *Lawrence and the Phallic Imagination*, 164.

mechanical also reflects a turn towards the will, or the desire to forcibly control, that surfaces in Clifford in light of his injury. Clifford exhorts that that “neither [his] mind nor [his] will is crippled” and that he does not “rule with [his] legs.”⁵¹ Clifford embraces the mechanical and industrial as a substitute for his “legs,” while valuing his will and ability to control and maintain mastery above all. What is embodied in Clifford is an aspect of Lawrencian thought, describes by Scott Sanders, as having “traced the origins of human destructiveness to the *desire for mastery*-- over nature, over the body, over one’s mate, over servant classes and rival nations and whatever appears to resist the personal or collective will.”⁵² Clifford’s embracing of the mechanized, “hurl[ing] himself into a mechanized war against nature”⁵³ as described by Sanders, leads to his rejection the regenerative or empowering masculine essence in favor of this decidedly non-masculine destructive mode. Clifford’s insistence upon his will and the desire to control makes him into “a monster” as described by Daniel Schneider, and his monstrosity “is created as we witness the ugliness of his fixed will.”⁵⁴ Clifford’s will and the value he places in it turns him into a “monster” or something not even human, and with the interjection of Mrs. Bolton into Clifford’s life, whatever sense of potency that exists within him is lost and directed towards avenues decidedly non-masculine.

⁵¹ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 83.

⁵² Scott R. Sanders, “Lady Chatterley’s Loving and the Annihilation Impulse,” in *D.H. Lawrence’s Lady: A New Look at Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, ed. Michael Squires and Dennis Jackson (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1985), 3.

⁵³ Sanders, “Lady Chatterley’s Loving,” 6.

⁵⁴ Daniel Schneider, *D.H. Lawrence: The Artist as Psychologist* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 1984), 242.

The presence of Mrs. Bolton, who came to Wragby to help care for Clifford, stands as another non-masculine means by which Clifford experiences a sense of potency. Specifically, it is through Mrs. Bolton encouragement that “Clifford was tempted to enter this other fight, to capture the bitch-goddess” of success “by brute means of industrial production” and that “somehow, he got his pecker up,” as Mrs. Bolton “roused [Clifford] to go to the mines once more.”⁵⁵ Clifford’s full emersion into the life of the Tevershall mines that he owns does not come from within, but rather from outside of him and specifically from this woman who is “in charge” of him. Clifford’s impotence is not limited to the most literal and directly sexual context, but it describes with his “affective self” and his ability to alter and create in the world around him. Clifford, neither literally or figuratively, can get “his pecker up” and that stimulation must be supplied either from industry and the coal mines or through the influence of this woman and thus someone outside the masculine ideal. Through Mrs. Bolton’s influence, Clifford shapes and controls the Tevershall community, making them “live the life of [his] coal-mine” and “their lives [...] industrialised and hopeless”⁵⁶ in the words of Connie Chatterley. Spilka depicts how Clifford has “confuse[d] inorganic power (and its mastery) with moral strength,”⁵⁷ which shows the reason why Clifford turned towards the world of the mines-- to gain some kind of power and authority, even though it is in a non-masculine form. Clifford, through Mrs. Bolton’s insistence

⁵⁵ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 107.

⁵⁶ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 182.

⁵⁷ Spilka, *The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence*, 183.

and through industrial and mechanized means, is able to replicate the “affect” that exists in most men, but only in an “injured” form.

One specific instance where Clifford’s dependence upon outside and, specifically, mechanized power becomes apparent is when Clifford and Connie are out touring the grounds of Wragby and his electric wheelchair ceases to function. Clifford’s chair cannot power itself and can only perform “about half the work” of movement and another person must push to do “the rest.”⁵⁸ Without the mechanical impulse, Clifford is left without power, “seated [like] a prisoner” and “at everyone’s mercy.”⁵⁹ The failure of Clifford’s chair to function without the pushing of another man mirrors his dependence upon others and machinery for the maintenance of his masculine essence, as he has tied his ability to exhibit any kind of masculinity to the mechanized realm, which ultimately proves unsustainable. Clifford can “only break the thing down altogether,” unable to provide true and sustainable power but only the “nervous energy,”⁶⁰ an energy that is decidedly non-masculine in Lawrencian terms. Just as the motorized wheelchair ultimately expends all of its power and cannot power itself, Clifford’s masculine essence ultimately proves unsustainable, as it is not in accordance with Lawrence’s masculine construction, as he turns towards the mechanized world of control and will. As Mark Spilka depicts the scene, Clifford has taken whatever strength he has left and “place[d] it on the machine, and when that fails

⁵⁸ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 189.

⁵⁹ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 189-190.

⁶⁰ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 187.

him, his moral (not his physical) dependency is revealed.”⁶¹ In this same scene, we encounter a man who turned away from that mechanized world of Clifford after experiencing his own injuries and traumas, and thus is able to regenerate and continue to express his true masculine identity-- Oliver Mellors.

Mellors, the Chatterleys’ gamekeeper, stands in contrast to Clifford in many ways. But beyond his existent physical sexual ability as opposed to Clifford’s paralysis and impotence, Mellors approaches his injuries and traumas in a markedly differently fashion than Clifford, and Mellors’ approach is one that reflects Lawrence’s construction of masculinity. These two men do have the common status of being injured in some form, and for Mellors these injuries are both physical, created through a pneumonia he experienced, and a psychological trauma he felt based upon his experiences with other women, and specifically his ex-wife Bertha Coutts. During Mellors’ “life abroad, as a soldier” he’ dealt with “the death of [his] colonel from pneumonia” as well as “his own narrow escape from death” that left him with “damaged health.”⁶² Mellors experiences physical and psychological injuries during his time in the military, with the death of his colonel, someone who helped him progress as a military officer, as well as his physical well-being. Like his colonel, Mellors contracts pneumonia and though it does not kill him it leaves him weakened, for after he pushes Clifford’s motorized wheelchair he sat “with his hands trembling on his thighs” and says to Connie that “the pneumonia took a lot out of [him].”⁶³ Mellors has been physically

⁶¹ Spilka, *The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence*, 182.

⁶² Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 141.

⁶³ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 191.

affected and injured in the war, through the pneumonia he contracted, but Mellors also experiences psychological wounds that were inflicted by the women with whom he had previously had relationships.

In addition to his ailments related to his career as a soldier, Mellors also suffered psychological trauma from of the women of his past, the past before he met Connie Chatterley. From one woman who “had a passion for [him]” but who “just didn’t want it [sex]” to another who ,“if you forced her into the sex itself, she just ground her teeth and sent out hate” and “could simply numb [Mellors] with hate,”⁶⁴ Mellors could never find a woman with whom he could be in sexual equilibrium. These encounters led him to marry Bertha Coutts, a woman with “a sort of sensual bloom” and who “wanted [him], and made no bones about it,” yet eventually “treat[ing] him with insolence [...] never hav[ing him] when [he] wanted her” to the point where when they did have sex, it felt “as if it was a beak tearing at [him].”⁶⁵ Mellors’ prior sexual relationships, culminating in his marriage to Bertha, were one that stifled and hindered his ability to express his masculine essence through the sexual act and left him with what Balbert depicts as “a wound” that “manifests itself [...] as an adamant fear about the consequences and performance of his long dormant sex life.”⁶⁶ These experiences inflicted psychological trauma upon Mellors that made his “mind mistrust” and left him as

⁶⁴ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 200-201.

⁶⁵ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 201-202.

⁶⁶ Peter Balbert, “From *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* to *The Deer Park*: Lawrence, Mailer and the Dialectic of Erotic Risk,” *Studies in the Novel* 22 (Spring 1990): 77.

a “battered warrior.”⁶⁷ Mellors cannot fully express his “phallic imagination” because of the psychological battering to which he has been subjected at the hands of his former lovers. The women in Mellors’ life, up until that point, have only wanted “good, sharp, cold-hearted fucking” and having to constantly perform that act of “death and idiocy”⁶⁸ had a psychological effect on Mellors. These previous women value the act of sex above all, rather than any feeling or “heart” that exists behind the act, and the value placed on sex that is “good, sharp [and] cold-hearted” reflects a turn in world in general, and specifically in women, towards the power of that which is modern, mechanized and industrial.

Mellors turns to solitude in an act of rejection against two things that can be understood as tied together. Mellors rejects both the “female will” and the “modern, female insistency”⁶⁹ as well as “those evil electric lights and diabolical rattlings of engines”⁷⁰ of the mechanized world. Each of these enterprises, the modern woman and the mechanized world, have taken control of man and forced him to suppress his natural masculine essence. Mellors turns away from these things, instead preferring a life devoid of “any further close human contact,” leaving him “to his own privacy” in “the darkness and seclusion of the wood.”⁷¹ Mellors turns away from that which would try to control and affect his “phallic imagination” in the wake of these traumas, using “his separateness of self [and]

⁶⁷ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 205.

⁶⁸ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 206-207

⁶⁹ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 89.

⁷⁰ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 119.

⁷¹ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 89, 119.

his otherness” as “weapons against”⁷² those factors. Much like Birkin, who believed he “could love the vegetation and be quite happy and unquestioned, by himself,”⁷³ Mellors turns to a natural solitude in order to heal and regenerate his injured and traumatized masculine self. However, in Connie, Mellors finds someone who can accept his masculine impulse or “phallic imagination” and not strive to control it with her feminine will.

It is through Connie that Mellors can express his masculine essence, thus allowing for its regenerative properties to be fully exhibited. Connie refers to Mellors’ phallus, the bodily representation of his “phallic imagination,” as “proud” and “lordly” while saying “he’s lovely, *really*” and eventually it is “knighted [...] John Thomas is Sir John, to [Connie’s] Lady Jane,”⁷⁴ or her vagina. Rather than turning away from the masculine essence, Connie accepts and submits to it and thus is able to “take it warm-heartedly,”⁷⁵ something that women such as Bertha Coutts could not do. Connie understands and accepts the regenerative nature of the phallus and Mellors’ masculine essence, while also maintaining her own self and not trying to control or force his masculine impulse according to her will. Balbert describes “the existential education in ‘loving’ which Connie gets from Mellors,”⁷⁶ an education that Connie seeks out and is ready to accept, and that an understanding that comes from Mellors’ masculine essence. Connie can

⁷² Spilka, *The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence*, 183.

⁷³ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 108.

⁷⁴ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 227.

⁷⁵ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 206.

⁷⁶ Balbert, *Lawrence and the Phallic Imagination*, 140.

accept the “phallic imagination” of Mellors in the sexual act, while never losing her own self in the process and thus they reach the “star equilibrium” that Birkin strove for in his relations with Ursula. Stephen Clifford describes Lawrence’s portrayal of Connie’s and Mellors’ relationship as “a balanced, celebratory union between man and woman”⁷⁷ as neither attempts to will or control the other and acting as a pair in communion.

It is this lack of a will to control the masculine impulse, represented by the phallus, that distinguished Connie Chatterley from the women of Mellors’ past who injured him, thus allowing his sexual experiences with her to be regenerative rather than destructive. After their first sexual encounter, Mellors notes how Connie “wasn’t all tough rubber-goods-and-platinum, like the modern girl” with “some of the vulnerability of modern hyacinths” and that “somewhere she was tender [...] something that had gone out of the celluloid women of today.”⁷⁸ Again Mellors appears to echo Birkin; just as Birkin performed an act of communion with the vegetation to rehabilitate himself after suffering injury at the hands of Hermione, Mellors is able to complete his rehabilitation by turning to Connie, someone who maintains a connection to the natural and rejects the industrial. Peter Balbert identifies “Mellors’s courage” in his relationship with Connie, especially he had to “reengage the painful memories and scars of his previous relationships”⁷⁹ through his encounters with Connie, but her natural tenderness separates her from those other woman and allows Mellors to “begin to heal in the

⁷⁷ Clifford, *Beyond the Heroic “I,”* 315.

⁷⁸ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 119.

⁷⁹ Balbert, “*From Lady Chatterley’s Lover to The Deer Park,*” 77.

very process of his sexual re-engagement.”⁸⁰ Mellors’ move away from industrial society and the woman who embrace mechanical and “cold-hearted” sex, and towards a woman who represents none of the hardened or willed aspect of the modern female, allows him to repair and regenerate himself in the wake of his injuries, something that Clifford could not do through his turning to the mechanized and industrial.

What emerges in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* and *Women in Love*, is a choice for the man who suffers physical or psychological injury. Clifford addresses his injury in a similar fashion to Gerald, turning towards the industrial and the will to control. This desire to control and achieve mastery sublimates whatever masculine essence still existed in Clifford after his paralyzing injury, and prevents the regenerative properties of the masculine impulse to be exhibited and leaves him at times, quite literally, out of gas and power. Clifford cannot use his sexual organ as a result of his wounding, but it is by turning to the mechanized world and exhibiting a desire for control that Clifford loses his potency and masculine essence. By contrast, Mellors attempts to heal himself in the wake of his psychological traumas and physical injuries through methods similar to that of Birkin. Mellors turns to solitude in the forest, eschewing human contact in a world dominated by machinery and the industrial. While this solitude represents part of Mellors’ recuperation, his sexual encounters with Constance Chatterley form the second component and mirrors Birkin’s embrace of the vegetation that surrounded him as a means of recuperation as well as his relationship with

⁸⁰ Balbert, *Lawrence and the Phallic Imagination*, 144.

Ursula. These two men who experience injury and trauma are faced with the same choice as Birkin and Gerald in *Women in Love*: fully embrace the natural masculine impulse and the “phallic imagination,” or turn to the ultimately unsustainable mechanization along with the will that entails a sublimation of the masculine essence in order to maintain control despite one’s injuries. Lawrence’s men could either turn back and accept the more primitive and essential vision of masculinity and the world, or continue to embrace a mechanized and industrial world that corrupted the masculine essence and would eventually lead to death and destruction.

Chapter 2-- “He felt he had left everything behind, the need for thinking [...]

It was all back of him”: Hemingway’s Action-Driven Masculinity

Ernest Hemingway addresses ideas of masculinity in his fictions with narratives that often focus upon male characters who exhibit the Hemingway “code” of “grace under pressure.” There is an readily discernible and consistent masculine ethos running throughout Hemingway’s work, beginning with novels like *The Sun Also Rises* and *A Farewell to Arms*, and extending to later works such as *For Whom the Bell Tolls* and *The Old Man and the Sea*. But Hemingway’s constructions of masculinity are perhaps most pronounced in his earliest works, namely the short story collection *In Our Time* as well as *The Sun Also Rises*, and it comes as no surprise that those texts were perhaps those most informed and affected by World War I, texts in which Hemingway’s own experiences from the war most greatly manifested themselves. For Hemingway, as it was for the many other men who served, the war functioned as a test of one’s masculinity and therefore the war factors into the narrative of these texts as a test of masculinity for his characters. In particular, Hemingway addressed how the ability of the characters to act “as men” was affected by physical and psychological wounds, often wounds acquired through a character’s action in the war. The characters of Nick Adams and Krebs, who appear in the most-discussed short stories of *In Our Time*, each suffer physical wounds and psychological trauma from the war, and from other sources in the case of Nick Adams. *The Sun Also Rises* features numerous characters who have been physically and mentally damaged by the war, like Count Mippipopolous and Jake

Barnes in addition to the physically wounded bullfighter Pedro Romero, all of whom can be placed in opposition to those who have not been wounded, namely Robert Cohn. In each of these texts, the injury or trauma functions as an initiation, allowing the male to have a better or more authentic understanding while also providing him with the opportunity to exhibit his masculinity according to the Hemingway “code.”

In Our Time

Hemingway’s first short story collection, *In Our Time*, is tied together not by narrative but by an idea and a state indicative of a man who had experienced first hand the brutality of World War I. In particular, it is in the male characters of Nick Adams, who appears in multiple short stories as well as one short “vignette,” and Harold Krebs of the short story “Soldier’s Home,” that these ideas are best articulated. The characters are related, something D.H. Lawrence himself noted, writing in a review of *In Our Time* that “it is a series of successive sketches from a man’s life [that] makes a fragmentary novel” and though “it does not pretend to be about one man [...] it,” in fact, “is.”¹ Though these characters are separate in name, they each reflect the Hemingway “code” of behavior by which masculinity is defined. Each of these characters has been affected by experiences in war and otherwise (in the case of Nick Adams), both through physical injury and psychologically trauma. But the effect of these emotional and corporeal wounds

¹ D.H. Lawrence, “*In Our Time: A Review*,” in *Hemingway: Seven Decades of Criticism*, ed. Linda Wagner-Martin (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1998), 19. This review was originally published in *Calendar of Modern Letters*, April 1927.

is not necessarily a negative one, for it allows these men to act as men, according to the Hemingway model.

Harold Krebs, the main character of the short story "Soldier's Home" is someone who has been traumatized by the war and because of that trauma, he is able to exhibit the mastery of self and the control indicative of the Hemingway male. Upon Krebs' return home, he found in "his home town in Oklahoma [that] the greeting of heroes was over," that he "did not want to talk about the war at all" but "to be listened to at all he had to lie."² Krebs has been affected and placed out of balance by his experiences in the war, at times not wanting to address or communicate his experiences about the war and when he does no one wishes to hear about his experiences. But what emerges above all in Krebs after the war is a desire to "live alone without consequences."³ Throughout the story, Krebs' actions reflect a desire to disconnect, seemingly a result of his experiences in the war. Krebs has been affected by his time serving in the war and those experiences have forced him to withdraw and turn away from that which would draw him in and create "consequences" and entanglements that would prevent him from acting according to his new-found code.

Krebs' approach towards the girls in his town reflects how things have changed for him since his return to the United States. For Krebs, it is "all this talking" that separates the girls at home from those in France and Germany since "you couldn't talk much and you did not need to talk" with the girls in Europe;

² Ernest Hemingway, *In Our Time* (New York: Scribners, [1925] 2003), 69.

³ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 71.

Krebs “liked the look of” these girls he sees in Oklahoma “much better than the French girls or the German girls [but] the world they were in was not the world he was in” and though “he would like to have one of them [...] it was not worth it.”⁴ The “talking,” or the connection, required is what separates the American girls from Krebs’ world. Krebs does not want the exposure required to speak with these American women, instead preferring the disconnected and action-based experiences with the Europeans, that might entail casual sex without the entanglements of relationships. Harold Kaplan describes Krebs as “com[ing] back from his war shock and is sickened by involvements,”⁵ like those that would be required to gain an American girl. Krebs’ experiences in the war have led him to turn away from emotional connection with others, forced into what Thomas Strychacz describes as a state of “near-paralysis.”⁶ It is not merely that Krebs chooses to turn away from American girls because it would involve some form of connection, but that Krebs’ prior experiences have made him unable or pushed him towards remaining unattached and unconnected.

What Krebs turns to, in the wake of this detachment, is his ability to act and perform correctly by exhibiting control and mastery over his situation. Through this, Krebs is able to overcome his psychological trauma and reflect Hemingway’s construction of masculinity. The wound, in this case a psychological one, serves as an obstacle, but one that allows for Krebs to exhibit

⁴ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 72.

⁵ Harold J. Kaplan, *The Passive Voice: An Approach to Modern Fiction* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1966), 97.

⁶ Thomas Strychacz, *Hemingway’s Theatres of Masculinity* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2003), 69.

those masculine traits. One such masculine trait is the focus upon the self and self-mastery. Krebs does not wish to penetrate the “complicated world of already defined alliances and shifting feuds”⁷ of the girls in his hometown, remaining detached as a means of maintaining mastery over himself. Krebs turns away from the “complicated world” of these American girls, as those complications would keep him from being in control, and thus would inhibit his ability to be a true man according to the new codes forged in the war. Krebs is a representation of what Alex Vernon sees as “another veteran seeking escape from social allegiance” by “escap[ing] social ties,”⁸ and the other things that would inhibit his ability to be in control of himself. Krebs must maintain control and act accordingly; however, the world to which he returns after the war does not allow him to act purely and honestly, which would be befitting of the Hemingway male.

Krebs finds himself forced or inclined to tell “lies” that “were quite unimportant and consisted in attributing to himself things other men had seen, done or heard” and “not sensation” or any gross embellishment, yet Krebs “acquired the nausea in regard to experience that is the result of untruth.”⁹ Krebs returns to a place in his hometown of Oklahoma that still represents the values of the past and has not made the progress required after the war. Krebs “did not want to tell any more lies”¹⁰ in regard to his experience of the war, yet the society

⁷ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 71, 74-75.

⁸ Alex Vernon, “War, Gender and Ernest Hemingway,” *Hemingway Review* 22 (Fall 2002): 51.

⁹ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 69-70.

¹⁰ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 71.

he returns to reflects a pre-war mentality through “the intrigue and the politics,”¹¹ and thus Krebs is forced into lying. J.F. Kolber writes that he “can find no critical reading of the story that questions Krebs’s having been a good, fighting Marine,”¹² reflecting that Krebs did not *want* to lie, but he has returned to a world that has not been initiated into the kind of understanding that Krebs gained through his war-time experience. Krebs “had been a good soldier,”¹³ but the society to which he returns requires something more from him, and thus he is ensnared and forced to betray himself by lying.

The “nausea” that Krebs feels as he tells this lies, and how when he “fell into the easy pose of the old soldier among other soldiers” made him feel as though “he lost everything”¹⁴ reflects the unnatural aspect of this act and how he is forced into it because the world to which he has returned does not understand what he does. Krebs must betray his new understanding of masculinity that emphasizes remaining free and disconnected and thus enabling him to act without external influence as he has returned to a place untouched by the war, and thus his body reacts negatively, as shown through his nausea, as he goes against the correct or pure action by lying through his stories of the war.

The final scene of “Soldier’s Home” reflects the disconnect Krebs experiences as a result of the trauma of the war, and his emphasis of control

¹¹ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 71.

¹² J.F. Kolber, “‘Soldier’s Home’ Revisited: A Hemingway *Mea Culpa*,” *Studies in Short Fiction* 30 (Summer 1993): 379.

¹³ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 72.

¹⁴ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 70.

over the self rather than being controlled by other ideals. When he is with his mother at the breakfast table, Krebs feels either “embarrassed and resentful” or “sick and vaguely nauseated” when his mother invokes “His [God’s] Kingdom” or reminds him of how she “held [him] next to [her] heart when [he was] a tiny baby.”¹⁵ These emotional connections of love and religion elicit a negative response from Krebs, as they are the things he wished to avoid upon his return from the war. Krebs’ mother is what Carlos Baker describes as “a sentimental woman who shows an indisposition to face reality and is unable to understand what has happened to her boy in the war,”¹⁶ namely Krebs’ desire “to keep his life from being complicated” and “to go smoothly,”¹⁷ allowing him to maintain his self-control. Complications impede control of the self; emotional and moral connections prevent Krebs’ life from “go[ing] smoothly,” and thus they must be overcome. Krebs “couldn’t make [his mother] see” what he meant when he said he “do[es]n’t love anybody,” instead “only hurt[ing] her” and leaving her “crying with her head in her hands.”¹⁸ Krebs’ mother obviously did not experience the war herself, and thus the approach that Krebs must take to overcome his trauma through the expression of masculinity remains foreign to her. Krebs’ “mother fails to see that her son has come of age [...] no longer a boy to be scolded,”¹⁹

¹⁵ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 76.

¹⁶ Carlos Baker, *Hemingway: The Writer as Artist* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972), 130.

¹⁷ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 76-77.

¹⁸ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 76.

¹⁹ Kenneth Johnston, *The Tip of the Iceberg: Hemingway and the Short Story* (Greenwood, FL: Penkevill, 1987), 78.

according to Kenneth Johnston, and thus cannot understand the self-control and detachment needed by her son, newly initiated into the world of men.

Though Krebs “felt sorry for his mother” as “she had made him lie,”²⁰ it is necessary that Krebs maintain control over himself, correcting things after they started “going that way” toward complication and doing what he wants to do, like “go[ing] over to the schoolyard and watch[ing] Helen play indoor baseball.”²¹

What Krebs exhibits is how a man must maintain a firm grip over himself in the wake of a trauma, which he does by avoiding connection or complication, to achieve what he wants. Joseph DeFalco describes Krebs as having “gone through a maturation process” where “the necessity to sever once and for all the restrictive bonds that stifle the moral impulse adds a new dimension,”²² which he is able to enact through acting masterfully. Again quoting DeFalco, “the return is a test for [Krebs]”²³ and he passes that test by reflecting Hemingway’s construction of masculinity: that the man must be completely in control of the self and mastery of the self is of the utmost importance.

Though Krebs provides a brief window into the wounded male in Hemingway and how one confronts his injuries, Hemingway expands upon this through the recurring character of Nick Adams, seen in many stories in the *In Our Time* collection as well as later collections. The short story “Indian Camp,”

²⁰ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 77.

²¹ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 77.

²² Joseph DeFalco, *The Hero in Hemingway’s Short Stories* (Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1963), 143.

²³ DeFalco, *The Hero in Hemingway’s Short Stories*, 143.

portrays Nick Adams' experience of psychological trauma at a very young age. In the story, Nick travels with his father and uncle to an Indian camp to help a pregnant Indian woman through a particularly difficult birth. The mother cannot "stop screaming" because of the pain but eventually Nick's father completes the delivery, even "doing [the] Caesarian [section] with a jack-knife and sewing it up with nine-foot, tapered gut leaders."²⁴ But though the baby is born, the Indian father was overcome and was found with "his throat [...] cut from ear to ear" with "the open razor lay[ing], edge up, in the blankets."²⁵ Nick's father explains that the Indian just "couldn't stand things."²⁶ The Indian father, witnessing such a difficult and painful operation, cannot control himself and commits suicide; Phillip Young notes how "the husband, who has been through two days of screaming [...] found the operation on his wife more than he could take"²⁷ and succumbs to suicide to cease his experience of suffering as well as that of his wife. The Indian father cannot maintain control of himself in the face of such suffering, and instead takes his own life in order to disengage from that suffering.

Nick's father acknowledges the strenuousness of the situation, telling Nick he's "terribly sorry [he] brought [Nick] along" and that "it was an awful mess to put [him] through" and "very, very exceptional."²⁸ This scene has a distinct psychological effect upon Nick as well, reflected in the story's final line that

²⁴ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 16, 18.

²⁵ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 18.

²⁶ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 18-19.

²⁷ Young, *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration*, 32.

²⁸ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 18-19.

describes how Nick, rowing back with his father from the Indians' camp, "felt quite sure that he would never die."²⁹ Though Nick witnessed the "awful mess" that drove a man to commit suicide, this psychological wounding initiates Nick into a world of trauma and pain in which he can survive by acting according to the ideals emphasized by Hemingway, specifically by valuing above all self-control. This feeling of Nick's, that he "would never die," perhaps can be best understood when considering a question he asked his father after they discovered the Indian father's suicide. Nick's father replies to Nick's question, "is dying hard?" by saying that he "think[s] it's pretty easy,"³⁰ thus setting the tone for Nick's revelation in the story's last line. Nick has been made to experience the real world as well as understanding what it means to truly "be a man," thus declining the "easy way"; Nick "will never die" because death would be "pretty easy." Death represents a loss of control as the Indian father turned to death because he could not control himself after witnessing a particularly horrendous childbirth. This narrative is one that Phillip Young describes as "a typical Nick Adams story" that centers upon "an initiation [...] the telling of an event which is violent or evil, or both, [...] which brings the boy into contact with something that is perplexing and unpleasant."³¹ But through this this exposure, Nick Adams discovers how to exhibit his masculinity, namely by maintaining control and fighting against that which is "pretty easy."

²⁹ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 19.

³⁰ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 19.

³¹ Young, *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration*, 31.

The other short story in this collection that illustrates both Nick Adams' wounding, and how he is able to overcome it by embracing Hemingway's constructions of masculinity, is "Big, Two-Hearted River." In this story, we see Nick as a young man, much older than the child in "Indian Camp." Earlier in the book, we see Nick in the Chapter VI vignette, which expands upon the idea of the wounded Nick as well as placing death as a relinquishing of control in opposition to the masculine ideal. In this vignette, Nick is "[sitting] against the wall of the church where they had dragged him" as "he had been hit in the spine" during a battle.³² During this battle, Nick is physically wounded, which can be coupled with the psychological wound he experienced during his childhood. In addition to acquiring a physical injury to go along with his previously acquired psychological trauma, we see Nick speaking to his fellow soldier Rinaldi, telling him "[they]'ve made a separate peace" and that they are "not patriots" as "Rinaldi lay still in the sun breathing with difficulty."³³ Nick speaks and acts in such a way that reflects Hemingway's construction of masculinity, emphasizing control over the self in Nick's decree that they have "made a separate peace"; in other words, Nick is not fighting for ideals or patriotism, which would restrict his ability to maintain self control.

In addition, we see both of these men fighting against death, particularly Rinaldi who cannot help but breathe "with difficulty." Though he has fought in a battle and is physically suffering because of his injuries, Nick does not accept

³² Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 63.

³³ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 63.

death as that which would be “easy” and instead clings to life. Nick also learns that an individualism and a self-reliance will be essential in this “separate peace” he has made, as he notes how “Rinaldi was a disappointing audience.”³⁴ Rinaldi does not actively endorse or acknowledge that he is part of that “separate peace” that Nick claims has been made. Rinaldi’s lack of affirmation seems to show that this “separate peace” will be something that Nick will have to realize on his own, and particularly through his fishing trip. Nick’s experiences during the war reinforce the trauma he experienced during “Indian Camp,” and we see him in “Big, Two-Hearted River” using his attempts to overcome those wounds as an opportunity to truly act as a man.

“Big, Two-Hearted River” occurs after these events, yet Nick is clearly affected by them. Though Nick has left the actual battlefield, the circumstances of the war continue to follow him and permeate the story’s northern Michigan setting. Nick walks through “the burned-over stretch of hillside where he had expected to find the scattered house of the town” but only “the river was there.”³⁵ Hemingway’s description of the setting “suggest[s]” what William Adair describes as “images he [Nick] has seen during the war” and that “the landscape of this fishing story suggests specific places in Nick’s time at the war.”³⁶ The conflict and its wounding has extended beyond Nick into the surrounding area; Nick is completely engulfed by World War I, and his physical and psychological wounds

³⁴ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 63.

³⁵ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 133.

³⁶ William Adair, “‘Big Two-Hearted River’: Why the Swamp is Tragic,” *Journal of Modern Literature* 17 (Spring 1991), 584, 587.

have enveloped him. But though this landscape too has been devastated, Nick returns to this place from his past in the hopes of escaping the war, and as we see to exhibit the traits that define the male in the Hemingway construction. As Alex Vernon describes him, Nick Adams is “a recently returned veteran of the Great War, [who] attempts to forget the war [and] recover his prewar adolescent self by engaging in his favorite prewar adolescent activity, fishing.”³⁷ Nick has returned to the river in hope of healing as his “heart tightened” and that “he felt all the old feeling”³⁸ as he watched the trout swim by. For Nick, the act of fishing is rehabilitative, an action he can perform that will heal and correct him especially as he is able to exhibit the inherently masculine trait of control and mastery.

An example of this effort for control occurs as Nick walks toward his potential campsite; though “he was tired and very hot” and “knew he could strike the river by turning off to his left,” Nick “kept on toward the north to hit the river as far upstream as he could go in one day’s walking.”³⁹ Nick exerts control over himself to do what is necessary to attain the best fishing conditions, completing the action that he set out to perform even though there were easier choices available; though “there were plenty of good places to camp on the river,” Nick recognizes his specific one individually and that “this was good.”⁴⁰ These actions and the diligence exhibited by Nick reflect a man “holding tight to the details of the landscape and the rules that govern such simple activities as making a camp

³⁷ Vernon, “War, Gender and Ernest Hemingway,” 36.

³⁸ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 134

³⁹ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 136

⁴⁰ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 140.

[...] in order to cope with the darkness welling up within as well as around him,”⁴¹ as David Minter analyses the scene. Nick was able to control himself and stick to his path, though there might be easier choices, in order to yield the best results. Joseph Flora describes Nick as having “to check his enthusiasms” and that “he has to remind himself to be practical,”⁴² which emerges in his willingness to eschew the easy and quick path. Even Nick’s dinner, at which he says to himself that he has “a right to eat this kind of stuff, if [he’s] willing to carry it”⁴³ shows how Nick “has made camp and can feel that he has earned the right to supper,”⁴⁴ as Carlos Baker describes it. Nick has acted “as a man” by taking the more difficult path and thus can be afforded some reward for his actions.

In addition, Nick’s actual fishing reflects his ability to maintain control, and by performing an action well his masculinity is asserted. Nick does not approach this fishing trip concerned with volume, as he “did not care about getting many trout”⁴⁵ and instead centers upon performing the act of fishing correctly. For the Hemingway male, the amount is less important than the performance of the act itself. This can be understood by once again considering Nick’s choice of a camping site. Nick could have veered from the path he chose, getting to the river quicker in search of a greater number of fish. Instead, Nick keeps himself on the

⁴¹ David Minter, *A Cultural History of the American Novel: Henry James to William Faulkner* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 143.

⁴² Joseph Flora, *Hemingway’s Nick Adams* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), 165.

⁴³ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 139.

⁴⁴ Baker, *Hemingway: The Writer as Artist*, 126.

⁴⁵ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 152.

more strenuous path that delays his gratification but ultimately will yield “better fishing.” While many might assume that catching the most fish would be indicative of the superior man, for the Hemingway male performing the act well and maintaining control is the most masculine thing one can do. This emphasis on control is made apparent when Nick hooks, yet eventually loses, a trout like which “he had never seen” with “a heaviness, a power not to be held” and after the trout gets away Nick “felt, vaguely, a little sick” as “the thrill had been too much.”⁴⁶ Nick was unable to control himself and his emotions as he tried to catch the much larger trout, and perhaps it is because those emotions overcame him that he lost it. Nick must remain steady and in control, not “rush[ing] his sensations”⁴⁷ and maintaining what Joseph Flora describes as “a delicate balance between heart and head knowledge”⁴⁸ will allow him to display his mastery of the act of fishing. Though the “heart” will come into play, the “head” that represents masculine control must win out if Nick is to function as an example of Hemingway’s construction of masculinity.

Nick must maintain an objectivity and a control over himself so he can act and perform well, allowing him to overcome the physical injuries and psychological traumas from his past that still haunt him. Phillip Young’s recounting of this fishing trip states that “Nick obviously knows what is the matter and what he must do about” healing himself through this fishing trip, a healing of the wounding he experienced as a result of his World War I service as displayed

⁴⁶ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 150.

⁴⁷ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 151.

⁴⁸ Flora, *Hemingway’s Nick Adams*, 170.

in the Chapter VI vignette, and this healing will occur so long as Nick “keep[s] physically occupied” and by “keep[ing] his hands busy.”⁴⁹ Performance is the most important factor if this fishing trip is to be a regenerative one for Nick, and sentiment and feeling must not overcome him like it did with the large trout if Nick wishes to act like a true Hemingway male. Later, Nick does exhibit greater control as he hooks another and “worked the trout [...] out of the danger of the weeds into the open river” and “brought the trout in” by “eas[ing] downstream with the rushes” of the trout, while catching another trout by “[fighting] him against the current [...] work[ing] the trout upstream, holding his weight”⁵⁰ and eventually pulling him out of the water. Nick makes his catch by “working” the fish in the water, controlling of the situation and avoiding potential pratfalls. With these fish, Nick performs in accordance with Hemingway’s construction of masculinity through his ability to control the situation and dictate the outcome; Nick is not overwhelmed by the rush of emotion, but instead masters the fish, “working,” “easing” and “holding” it until he is able to get it out of the water.

Nick’s actions at the end of his fishing trip reflect how the action of fishing and not the amount of fish caught reflect the constructions of masculinity for Hemingway; Nick regains the masculinity that was wounded through his injury in the war by fishing well, and thus does not need to continue in search of more trout. In the story’s final pages, Nick sees that “the river narrowed and went into a swamp” but he decides not to continue fishing there, as “he did not want to go

⁴⁹ Young, *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration*, 47.

⁵⁰ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 152, 154.

down the stream any further,” satisfied with the “fine trout” he caught earlier and goes “back to camp” as “there were plenty of days coming when he could fish in the swamp.”⁵¹ Nick does not have to continue fishing, though part of the river remains unexplored by him. This again reflects the emphasis on action and how masculinity can be proven through action rather than the results. Nick achieved what he set out to achieve, asserting his masculinity in the face of his traumas and injuries by fishing “well” and maintaining control. Nick does not need to continue, as he has completed the goal and acted as a man through the acts of fishing he has performed, and can “return[...] to his camp encouraged but thinking that he has gone as far with himself as is best for one day,”⁵² as described by Phillip Young. Control is exhibited as Nick knows that now is a prudent point to stop fishing and there will be “plenty of days” to continue to fish, thus he does not have to rush any more fishing into this day.

Nick’s choice to avoid the swamp also reflects an idea first invoked by Krebs, namely to avoid complications and entanglements. But while those entanglements come in the form of American girls and relationships for Krebs, for Nick Adams it comes in the form of the swamp at the end of his fishing. Nick knows that “it would not be possible to walk through a swamp like that” because “the branches grew so low” and fishing there would entail “deep wading with the water deepening up under his armpits, to hook big trout in places impossible to land them.”⁵³ The physical confines of the swamp would make it difficult for Nick

⁵¹ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 154-56

⁵² Young, *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration*, 47.

⁵³ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 155.

to perform the acts of fishing, as he is likely to become entangled in one of the low-hanging branches as cast his fishing line. The environment into which Nick would enter in that swamp would inhibit his ability to fish well, and thus he chooses to avoid it and wait for a time when he would be better prepared to fish there. Maintaining control and exerting that control by performing an action well under duress are indicative of Hemingway's conception of masculinity, and Nick's choice to wait to fish in the swamp reflects this as he does not need to catch more fish to somehow justify his trip in addition to how the location of the swamp would impact his ability to perform the act of fishing itself.

Hemingway's masculine ethos is displayed in his short story collection *In Our Time* through the characters of Harold Krebs and Nick Adams. Each of these characters is wounded, either psychologically, physically or through a combination of the two. In "Soldier's Home," Krebs returns from World War I and finds himself striving to avoid connection and that which would impede him, even to the point of lying. Nick Adams experiences both psychological trauma after witnessing an Indian's suicide during "Indian Camp" as well as physically wounding during a battle in the Chapter VI vignette, and he eventually sets out to fish in "Big Two-Hearted River" as a means by which he can heal himself. Nick embarks on this fishing trip to ostensibly heal himself of the wounds he suffered and is given opportunities to exhibit his masculinity by maintaining control and not succumbing to the easier choices that are available. Each of these characters are affected by a physical or psychological wound yet that very act of wounding allows them to act as men, according to Hemingway's construction of masculinity.

In each of these cases, the wound functions as an obstacle but one that enables the male character to act as a man. We see this trend continue in Hemingway's subsequent major work of fiction, *The Sun Also Rises*, as characters like Count Mippipopolous and especially Jake Barnes use masculine behavior to overcome injuries of one form or another, while an "uninjured" man such as Robert Cohn cannot truly act as a man as Hemingway conceived of it.

The Sun Also Rises

Though *In Our Time* introduced Hemingway to the literary public and provided the first example of the themes and ideas that would recur throughout his career, his 1926 novel *The Sun Also Rises* made him known worldwide for his portrayal of ex-patriates living in post-World War I Paris who made up what Gertrude Stein labelled the "lost generation." But in addition to portraying a certain group of people, Hemingway also furthered his continued his construction of masculinity and how it can be affected by wounding, either physical or psychological. In particular, characters such as the Count, Pedro Romero and particularly Jake Barnes have all been wounded both physically as well as through psychological traumas, and through these injuries each male character is able to assert their masculinity to counteract the effects of their wounding.

Though only a minor character appearing in a small portion of the book, Count Mippipopolous plays an important role as a man who has been literally wounded and affected by war, and those injuries directly relate to and affect his masculine identity. The count is presented as both physically wounded, as well as carrying some form of psychological damage, placing him in the company of

the other expatriates in Paris at the time. Brett Ashley frequently describes the count as being “quite one of us,” as “one can always tell” according to Brett Ashley.⁵⁴ The count belongs to this “lost generation” of men and women haunted by the war, either through corporeal wounds from the battlefield or psychological scars from the war itself. Later, while in Jake’s apartment drinking champagne with him and Brett, the count asks if she has “ever seen [his] arrow wounds” and proceeds to take off his shirt to show “below the line where his ribs stopped [...] two raised right welts” while “above the small of the back were the same two scars, raised as thick as a finger.”⁵⁵ The count carries these bodily injuries, gained over the course of “seven wars and four revolutions” and specifically when he was “in Abyssinia [...] on a business trip.”⁵⁶ The wounds stand as the proof that the count “[has] seen a lot” and “lived very much”⁵⁷ and solidify the count’s position amongst the other wounded members of Jake and Brett’s coterie.

The count’s wounds are representative of his life experience and the outward representation of his belonging amongst those in Paris at the time, causing Brett and Jake to be, according to William Adair, “moved by his arrow wounds and [to] read into them a history of suffering and courage”⁵⁸; it is because the count “[has] lived very much that” he “can enjoy everything so well,”

⁵⁴ Ernest Hemingway, *The Sun Also Rises* (New York: Scribners, 1926), 40.

⁵⁵ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 67.

⁵⁶ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 66-67.

⁵⁷ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 66-67.

⁵⁸ William Adair, “Hemingway’s *The Sun Also Rises*,” *Explicator* 60, no. 2 (Winter 2002): 91.

which Jake can “absolutely” understand.⁵⁹ The count’s wounds, indicative of his experience, enable him to enjoy life in a way that is decidedly masculine, according to Hemingway’s construction of masculinity, and the count serves Jake “as a ‘role’ model [...] because he has suffered severe injury and survived,”⁶⁰ to quote Dana Fore. Though Fore places this within the context of Jake’s relationship with Brett and her displaying someone to Jake who can live with his wounds, he also functions as a model of Hemingway’s construction of masculinity. The count exhibits control over himself and the situations in which he is placed, to maximize his pleasure; if performing a given action well is integral to the Hemingway male, then the count exhibits such qualities as he “lives” very well.

The count, as a result of his injuries both on his psyche and body, “enjoy [s] everything” and that approach reflects, in a certain respect, the constructions of masculinity articulated by Hemingway. The count has come “to know the values” as a result of the life he lived, and his knowledge of those values enables him to act like a man; Count Mippipopolous has the freedom and control over himself to “always [be] in love,” which “has got a place in [his] values.”⁶¹ This action reflects a desire that echoes Krebs’ turn away from connection, as Delbert Wylder notes how “love does not complicate [the count’s] life because he is

⁵⁹ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 67.

⁶⁰ Dana Fore, “Life Unworthy of Life?: Masculinity, Disability and Guilt in *The Sun Also Rises*,” *Hemingway Review* 26, no. 2 (Spring 2007): 78.

⁶¹ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 67.

always in love without being emotionally involved.”⁶² The count does not privilege or romanticize love and accepts it as part of the everyday, removing from romance the complications of emotional attachment. The point that perhaps reflects the count’s use of masculinity to counteract his wound comes with the wine he drinks with Jake and Brett. When Brett says that they “ought to toast to something,” the count replies that “this wine is too good for toast-drinking [...] you don’t want to mix emotions up with a wine like that. You lose the taste.”⁶³ The count wishes to enjoy the wine to its maximum potential and the emotions or sentiment of Brett can only hinder or prevent the most pleasurable outcome from occurring. Emotions, like the connections or difficulties of Krebs, get in the way of the desired outcome. The count only wants to freely drink and enjoy this wine, and Brett’s emotions in the form of the toast, would seriously inhibit the count’s ability to perform the one action he wishes to perform.

Hemingway’s character of Count Mippipopolous provides a short example of the wounded male and how asserting his masculinity allows him to move beyond his injuries in both mind and body. Hemingway expands upon this model perhaps to a fuller degree than in any of his texts, with the character of Jake Barnes, who suffers an injury that seemingly destroys his masculinity, yet is able to overcome it by performing the actions characteristic of the Hemingway male. Jake was “wounded” while “flying on a joke front like the Italian” and thus sent to a hospital where the Italians would say to him that “you, a foreigner, an

⁶² Delbert E. Wylder, *Hemingway’s Heroes* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1969), 40.

⁶³ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 66.

Englishman [...] have given more than your life.”⁶⁴ Jake’s wound is a great one, and specifically eliminating his ability to perform sexually. However, David Blackmore notes how Jake “is not impotent, but simply incapable of performing the act of intercourse,” and “the wellspring of life as well as the sexual desire”⁶⁵ still exists for Jake yet his ability to perform the action associated with that desire, sexual intercourse, has been taken away. Jake still desires Brett and loves her, feelings that are mutual as Brett “simply turn[s] all to jelly when [Jake] touches [her],” yet “there’s not a damn thing [they] could do”⁶⁶ about consummating those feelings. Jake has been “unmanned” as his ability to act on his amorous feelings has been taken away. Though his injury has stripped him of one specific way by which he can assert his masculinity (the sexual act), Jake is able to overcome the wound that (rather literally) unmanned him by exhibiting the control and self mastery paramount to Hemingway’s own construction of masculinity. By contrast, a character such as Robert Cohn can be a man (by consummating a relationship with Brett Ashley) while not being a “Hemingway male” through his lack of self control and mastery.

Throughout the book, Jake Barnes exhibits mastery and self control in his actions, and that degree of mastery allows him to assert his masculinity and overcome his physical wound. Jake “was pretty well through with the subject” of his wound, having “considered it from most of its various angles” as he “tr[ie]d

⁶⁴ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 38-39.

⁶⁵ David Blackmore, “‘In New York It’d Mean I Was A...’: Masculinity Anxiety and Period Discourses of Sexuality in *The Sun Also Rises*,” *Hemingway Review* 18 (Fall 1998): 54.

⁶⁶ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 34.

and play it along and just not make trouble for people” and tried “not to think about it” and just “try and take it,”⁶⁷ as was the case in Krebs who wanted things to “go smoothly.” The wound and the problems that emerge from it are things that Jake, as the Hemingway male, must confront on his own. For Jake, Greg Forter argues “the wound thus carries the contradictory burden [...] the loss of male power and potency on one hand, and the apparently more beneficent rupture with sentimental manhood on the other.”⁶⁸ That rupture also forces Jake to embrace fully the Hemingway construction of masculinity by being masterful in his actions. Throughout the novel, Jake acts in such a manner that allows him to maintain that control and thus somehow reclaim his masculinity that had been damaged because of the specific nature of his injury.

Jake’s fishing trip with Bill Gorton reflects this turn towards mastery, as his ability to fish well and maintain control allows him to overcome his injury and assert his masculinity. The scene by the river is one of extreme action, with “one trout sho[o]t[ing] up out of the white water” while Jake “baited up” and “several trout [...] jump[ing] at the falls.”⁶⁹ There is almost a loss of control inherent to the scene into which Jake enters, with constant movement and action that potentially could overcome and disrupt his control. There is a fluidity to this scene that challenges one’s ability to maintain control and exhibit mastery, yet Jake is able to and thus asserts his masculinity. In spite of the whirlwind of action occurring around him, Jake first catch was “a good trout” and then after that he “hooked

⁶⁷ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 35, 39.

⁶⁸ Forter, “Melancholy Modernism,” 27.

⁶⁹ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 124.

another and brought him in” and after “a little while [he] had six [...] all about the same size.”⁷⁰ Jake performs the act of fishing well, catching multiple fish without any issue; he is in control of himself and the situation, and thus can perform the same action over and over. This fishing scene reflects how, according to Harold Kaplan, “sport revises heroism in the only sphere where heroism is possible, and where action is not doomed to failure or disgrace [...] the action is a gesture, a performance, a willing creature of art,”⁷¹ and the true man is the one who can best perform and make those gestures, as is seen in Jake Barnes. Jake’s ability to fully participate in the sport of fishing alongside an uninjured man like Bill Gorton hints at how those who have been injured can, by fully embracing Hemingway’s construction of masculinity, can quell their fears about being reintegrated into a world that might not seem willing to accept them

Jake’s attention to detail and control is exhibited as he prepares and packs the fish, “la[y]ing] them out, side by side [with] all their heads pointing the same way” and then “pick[ing] some ferns and pack[ing] them all in the bag [with] three trout on a layer of ferns.”⁷² The action itself, and the control that Jake maintains by performing and arranging the fish in this manner, is the justification for the action. In particular, Jake’s acknowledgment of the aesthetics, as he “looked at” how “beautifully colored” the fish were and that “they looked nice in the ferns,”⁷³ reflects how important the *act* is to the Hemingway male. Jake does

⁷⁰ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 124.

⁷¹ Kaplan, *The Passive Voice*, 101.

⁷² Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 124.

⁷³ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 124.

not perform this action out of any utilitarian need, but because it is aesthetically pleasing, thus emphasizing the action above all. Though there is nothing inherently masculine about the way one packs a fish, the way he approaches this act reflects the way he approaches others as well, namely with a kind of ritualistic approach in which the true value of an action is how well it is performed, often established by a good feeling that might emerge in the performer. In that sense, Jake's fish packing stands as an exhibition of masculinity, as he performs the act of packing well as the fish "looked nice" and create a positive feeling within him. The performance of this action, with its pleasurable outcome, is all that Jake seeks, and it is through performing these actions well and exhibiting mastery by arranging the fish to his liking that Jake is able to exhibit masculinity.

Another way in which Jake is able to re-establish his masculinity and overcome his injury while amongst those who are uninjured by having a certain command and understanding of money. Jake believes that "enjoying living" was related to "learning to get your money's worth" and "the world was a good play to buy in."⁷⁴ Jake sees money as essential to acting in this world because it allows for direct action to occur. Jake does not like it when "one makes things complicated by becoming your friend for any obscure reason," while describing how "if you want people to like you you have only to spend a little money" as he did when he "overtipped" the waiter in San Sebastian who "appreciated [Jake's] valuable qualities."⁷⁵ For Jake, money is something with a firmly established

⁷⁴ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 152.

⁷⁵ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 237.

value, and that definition allows him to use it as an instrument of control to affect the world around him through his transactions with that money. This notion of gender being tied to monetary transactions emerges when Jacob Michael Leland writes of how it is through “mak[ing] money and [...] circulat[ing] it” that Jake is “allow[ed ...] to imagine himself as a fully realized male.”⁷⁶ But Leland’s analysis focuses on establishing how Jake “depends upon earning and spending practices to establish an American, male, expatriate identity in Paris,”⁷⁷ linking Jake’s interest in money to cultural identity while not fully examining the implications of Jake’s monetary habits in regard to gender. Money is something with a defined value, thus allowing for easy action to occur; Jake knows the value of his money and thus, by “get[ting]” his “money’s worth” he asserts his ability to act well and act as a man.

A subsequent episode in the novel, when Jake is swimming in the ocean near San Sebastian after he left Brett Ashley, Robert Cohn and his other expatriates at the conclusion of the fiesta, reflects his turn to action and how performing an action repeatedly allows him to maintain control over a world that sorely lacks it, and functioning as an assertion of masculinity as well. While Jake is in San Sebastian, he swims twice in the ocean and the first trip is remarkably similar to the second, and during his first excursion Jake “went into a bathing-cabin, undressed, put on [his] suit” and then “dove [and] swam out under water [...] to the raft, pulled [him]self up, and lay on the hot planks” before swimming

⁷⁶ Jacob Michael Leland, “Yes, That Is a Roll of Bills in My Pocket: The Economy of Masculinity *The Sun Also Rises*,” *Hemingway Review* 23 (Spring 2004): 38.

⁷⁷ Leland, “The Economy of Masculinity in *The Sun Also Rises*,” 37

back to the shore as he “dove [...] holding it for length.”⁷⁸ Jake’s second swim is remarkably similar to the first, as he again “undressed in one of the bath-cabins” and “swam out, trying to swim through the rollers, but having to dive sometimes” before “pull[ing] up on the raft” to sit once again.⁷⁹ Each of Jake’s swims are remarkably similar and based in a desire to perform the action well, rather than going or seeing something different. Jake does not swim past the raft to go somewhere different, but instead performs the same action each time, and thus exerting control over himself and what he does. Jake holds his dive “for length,” stressing the form of his dives over the outcome, which would be where he ended after his diving.

Jake also displays his mastery over nature, such as when “a roller came” and Jake “dove, swam out under water and came to the surface with all the chill gone” or when he “swam back to the surf and coasted in, face down, on a big roller, then turned and swam.”⁸⁰ In each of these instances, the natural is somehow affecting Jake’s ability to act, yet through his dives he is able to exhibit a mastery over the natural. Jake either overcomes the natural, in the first example, and performs the actions he wants to perform despite the rollers, or he controls and uses the natural to make his swimming easier in the second example. In each of these instances, Jake exhibits his mastery over the natural by either performing the actions he wants in spite of its challenges or by using the natural in order to perform his actions better. But, in either case, the actions

⁷⁸ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 239.

⁷⁹ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 241.

⁸⁰ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 238, 241.

of swimming and diving are given a certain value and power that gives them a ritualistic significance and thus reflecting things greater than mere swimming. Donald Daiker describes “Jake’s swimming” as “relat[ing] to Romero’s bullfighting,” which will be addressed later, “in that each is a ritual act that functions in part to cleanse and purify.”⁸¹ Daiker’s description of Jake’s actions as “ritual” emphasizes the importance of the action of swimming and diving, and that their importance is not in what is seen or where he swims to, but that Jake swam and dove well and through this he maintains his masculinity.

In addition to Jake Barnes, the young bullfighter Pedro Romero also suffers physical wounds, specifically from a fight with Robert Cohn, but he overcomes these physical injuries and asserts his masculinity through the actions of bullfighting. Romero’s “hurt face” is “very noticeable” to those watching his bullfight, yet “the fight with Cohn had not touched his spirit” as only “his face had been smashed and his body hurt” but “he was wiping all that out now” through his actions in the ring as he exhibited “a course in bull-fighting” with “all the passed he linked up, all completed, all slow, tempted and smooth.”⁸² Romero never lacks control in the ring, despite his afflicted body, as “he preserves his integrity despite the physical punishment he receives from Cohn,” as described by Delbert Wylder.⁸³ Romero controls the actions in the ring, as “he killed [the bull] not as he

⁸¹ Donald Daiker, “The Affirmative Conclusion of *The Sun Also Rises*,” in *Modern American Fiction: Form and Function*, ed. Thomas Daniel Young (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1989), 44.

⁸² Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 223.

⁸³ Wylder, *Hemingway’s Heroes*, 56.

had been forced to [...] but as he wanted to.”⁸⁴ Romero does not kill the bull because of an outside factor, performing the bullfighting actions he wants with a degree of mastery that reflects an assertion of masculinity. But while Romero’s actions and the control he exhibits in the face of physical injury reflect Hemingway’s constructions of masculinity, the character of Robert Cohn is not “initiated” through physical or psychological wounding and does not act according to Hemingway’s masculine code though he is capable of performing actions that are often seen as masculine outside of Hemingway’s context.

Robert Cohn provides an effective counterpoint for male characters such as Jake Barnes, Count Mippipopolous and Pedro Romero, as he does not exhibit the control and mastery inherent to the true Hemingway male, though outwardly he would appear to be what many would consider to be “a man.” Cohn’s introduction in the first pages of the novel establishes him as someone who does not value performing actions well in the same fashion as Jake. Though “once [a] middleweight boxing champion of Princeton,” Cohn “cared nothing for boxing” yet “learned it painfully and thoroughly to counteract the feeling of inferiority and shyness” to gain the “inner comfort in knowing he could knock down anybody who was snooty to him.”⁸⁵ Cohn does not derive any pleasure from the act of boxing, but rather the empowerment and prestige that comes from being a boxer. Whereas the act and the pleasure or satisfaction derived from performing an action well are central to Hemingway’s construction of masculinity, Cohn exhibits

⁸⁴ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 224.

⁸⁵ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 11.

a different characteristic by focusing on the title and image that comes with being a boxing champion. Greg Forter articulates that “the problem with Cohn [...] is that he *has not himself been wounded*” and “continues to behave as if a host of values that the wound renders hollow are still in fact live possibilities.”⁸⁶ This is reflected through his embracing of boxing solely for the feelings of power that comes with it, and also in his actions in regard to Brett Ashley.

Cohn stands in opposition to Hemingway’s construction of masculinity, behaving in a manner that contrasts with a character such as Jake Barnes who upholds that code, though Cohn is able to exhibit the most traditional conception of masculinity through his ability to sleep with Brett Ashley. Though Jake has been in love with Brett “off and on for a hell of a long time”,⁸⁷ a love which Brett emotionally reciprocates, Cohn “lived together” with Brett “at San Sebastian.”⁸⁸ By being physically able to perform the sexual act, Cohn might be perceived as being more masculine, particularly relative to the wounded Jake. But it is at this point where Hemingway diverges from more conventional views of masculinity by presenting Jake as the “better man,” even though he has been “unmanned” through his injury. Cohn’s sexual encounter with Brett does not reflect Hemingway’s “code” that stresses control but rather a Romanticized vision that contradicts Hemingway’s constructions. Cohn “do[es]n’t believe [Brett] would marry anybody she didn’t love” and, as Jake tells him about her he asks Jake to “take [...] back” things he perceived as negative, something Jake refers to as

⁸⁶ Forter, “Melancholy Modernism,” 27.

⁸⁷ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 128.

⁸⁸ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 199.

“prep-school stuff.”⁸⁹ Cohn is concerned with Brett’s honor and larger, more idealized conceptions of love, “follow[ing] Brett around like a poor bloody steer”⁹⁰ in an act of reverence. “Brett did sleep with [him],”⁹¹ but only because “she thought it would be good for him”⁹² and not out of any larger feeling or sentiment. Brett is closer to the masculine ideal than Cohn, able to understand the importance of an action for its own sake. For the Hemingway male, the meaning behind the action is less significant than how well the action is performed, and this is something that Cohn cannot understand as he has not been initiated into this world. Phillip Young describes Cohn as “point[ing] up the code most clearly by so lacking it” and by being “‘messy’ in every way.”⁹³ Cohn’s romanticized belief in feeling or sentiment contrasts with Hemingway’s belief in actions that did not require any belief or emotion to justify them.

Thus Cohn, a boxing champion and also sexually potent, is presented as less of “a man” than the wounded and impotent Jake Barnes, who nevertheless maintains control over himself and focuses on performing actions well in keeping with Hemingway’s constructions of masculinity. However, it is when Cohn “found Brett and [Romero]” together and, after a long fight, that Romero “hit him [Cohn] just as hard as he could in the face” that Romero “ruined Cohn” and made it such

⁸⁹ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 46-47.

⁹⁰ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 146.

⁹¹ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 146.

⁹² Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 107.

⁹³ Young, *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration*, 83-84.

that Cohn would never “want to knock people about again.”⁹⁴ In the end, Cohn has been “ruined” and particularly as a result of his romanticized beliefs, as after the struggle with Romero, Cohn insisted on “shak[ing] hands with [Romero]” as well as “with Brett, too.”⁹⁵ Cohn exhibits the romanticized chivalry that has separated him from Jake and Romero through his request to shake hands, and it is as a result of those actions that Romero is able to punch Cohn and ruin him. Cohn has learned, through the wounding he experiences from Romero, the folly of his romanticized constructions, which were rendered obsolete as a result of his fight with Romero, and thus is left wounded like Jake and the rest of the expatriates; after this wounding at the hands of Romero, Cohn can finally begin to learn and understand the Hemingway construction of masculinity.

In both *In Our Time* and *The Sun Also Rises*, the two works written closest to his experiences in World War I, Ernest Hemingway outlines a code of masculine behavior that would persist throughout his literary career, namely one that valued control and mastery in challenging situations. These works feature numerous male characters who have been injured either physically and psychologically, but rather than having those wounds on either their body or psyche diminish the male character’s masculinity, the injuries and traumas allow Hemingway’s men to assert that very masculinity and take the opportunity to act as men. Characters such as Harold Krebs and Nick Adams from *In Our Time* as well as Jake Barnes, Mippipopolous and Pedro Romero from *The Sun Also*

⁹⁴ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 205-206.

⁹⁵ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 205.

Rises, each show how a character's wounds provide them an opportunity to display the mastery indicative of masculine behavior, in addition to showing how performing those actions well can negate the effects of the wound. Hemingway also presents a contrast in Robert Cohn, one who would appear to be an example of masculinity yet does not suffer from wounds like Jake Barnes, thus not understanding the mastery required of the Hemingway male and then serving as the antithesis of Hemingway's code of masculinity. The wounded male in Hemingway is not less of a man than the unwounded, and those wounds afford each male to prove they are truly men by acting according to Hemingway's own "code."

Chapter 3-- "Be a man, my son": Hemingway and Lawrence's Divergent Constructions of Masculinity and Their Relation to World War I

Both Ernest Hemingway and D.H. Lawrence formulated their own constructions of masculinity and most powerfully articulated those constructions in their novels that followed World War I. Lawrence's masculinity stressed the impulse and the realization of that impulse as an essential component, particularly in the wake of a society that sought to sublimate and control that impulse through the mechanization that came along with an industrial-capitalist ideology. Hemingway's idea of masculinity differed greatly from Lawrence's, as he emphasized performance and control in the face of pressures and challenges, with human impulse serving as one of those very challenges. Despite these differences, these two authors each featured male characters who were affected by wounds, both physical and psychological, in such a way that it also affected their respective constructions of masculinity. But though the masculinity of these characters is often affected by some injury or trauma, the effects that are manifested are very different and reflect the broad philosophical differences between the two authors.

For Lawrence, the wound offered each man a choice: to embrace his more primitive masculine essence that could be sustained, or to continue to exhibit the mechanization of industrialized society, which could allow for control but ultimately would be proven unsustainable. For the Hemingway male, the wound initiates him into the world which, in turn, allows the wounded male to exhibit his masculinity through control and mastery in an attempt to overcome his wound.

Lawrence's desire to revert back to the impulse reflects the Freudian influence upon his thought, as Lawrence hoped to see man freed from the repression of a moralistic society to be unencumbered and act according to his own essence and impulses. By contrast, what can be seen in Hemingway is an appropriation of the older conceptions of masculinity, namely those that value performance and stoicism, while rejecting the more antiquated ideals that were often bound to them, what Thomas Strychacz describes as the "yearnings for autonomous manhood" that had existed prior to World War I "while signifying new forms of cultural authority,"¹ namely a personal "code" that sought to maintain personal control within a world that lacked it. Lawrence's wounds afford the man a choice to accept impulse as the means to survive or to embrace a "death driven" desire for control, while Hemingway's wounds bring the man into a world where exhibiting mastery is the only way to survive and stay alive.

One point where this distinction between these two authors is made abundantly clear comes in their representation of the will and their portrayal of control within their characters. For Lawrence, the will is often associated with characters who are female, or with male characters who do not act in such a way that reflects Lawrence's construction of masculinity. Hermione, in *Women in Love*, stands as one of that novel's examples of a character who fully embraces the will and how that will is shown to be destructive, particularly to the authentic Lawrencian man. One instance where Hermione's will was exhibited comes

¹ Thomas Strychacz, "The Sort of Thing You Should Not Admit': Ernest Hemingway's Aesthetic of Emotional Restraint," in *Boys Don't Cry?: Rethinking Narratives of Masculinity and Emotion in the U.S.*, ed. Milette Shamir and Jennifer Travis (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 161.

during his visit to Ursula's classroom as Birkin's inspects it for his job as a school inspector. While in the classroom, Hermione expresses her belief that it would be "better" for humans to "be animals, mere animals with no mind" and "not over-conscious [or] burdened to death with consciousness."² Hermione expresses a desire to revert back to something natural and unconstrained by the modern human consciousness, similar to that which Clifford Chatterley contemptuously describes existing in Connie as "the *nostalgie de la boue*,"³ or a "longing for mud." But this desire to return to the primal, something that rather authentically exists in someone like Connie, is designated as being inauthentic in Hermione, particularly as a result of her desire for control. Birkin rebukes Hermione, saying that "knowledge means everything to [her] and this reversion to the natural would be something she would "want [...] in her head"; Hermione's "passion is a lie," rather the manifestation of her "bullying will," a "conceit of consciousness" and "[her] lust for power."⁴ Hermione, in this scene, invokes Lawrence's condemnation of control and mastery through the words of Birkin, as she "concentrate[s] in herself the willed knowledge which this social order represents, as a kind of violence against the natural and the instinctual," within what Anne Wright notes is "a society in crisis."⁵ The natural world that one like Hermione seeks is not the true one, but rather one that can be dictated by her will and

² Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 41.

³ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 296.

⁴ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 41-42.

⁵ Wright, *Literature of Crisis*, 123-124.

forced to adhere to her willed understanding of the world, a desire that appears to be endemic to society as well.

It is Hermione's consciousness, as well as her will to control and master, that keeps her from fulfilling her role in the Lawrencian world, and instead brands her as a destructive and inorganic force within that world. Birkin diagnoses Hermione as wanting to be "deliberately spontaneous [...] to have everything in [her] own volition, [her] own deliberate voluntary consciousness."⁶ Hermione's will and desire to exert it is so great that it attempts to yoke together two contradictory concepts-- spontaneity and deliberateness. Hermione does not want true spontaneity, nor an actual reversion to the natural, but merely something that feels that way while satisfying her intellect and will. Though Hermione attempts to embody the primitive concepts that would pair her with Birkin, someone who is authentic in the realization of his masculine impulse, she cannot help but be dominated by her desire for control and thus is "the real devil who won't let life exist."⁷ Control is antithetical to creation according to Lawrence, as creation related to the instinctual, and thus the masculine as well. Mark Spilka reflects this when he describes Hermione as seeking the "power to hold all life within the scope of her conscious intellect [...] reduc[ing] them to finite particles of thought, and to reduce even Rupert Birkin to his abstract spiritual essence"⁸; Hermione, through her will and intellect, breaks down and reduces things to

⁶ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 42.

⁷ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 42.

⁸ Spilka, *The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence*, 122.

pieces that can be controlled by her will, rather than creating and building something new through the creation that emerges in the absence of the will..

In the Lawrencian construction, that which is organic and related to the impulse can be regenerative while matters of the intellect and will can only break things down and be a destructive force. Hermione thus stands as a manifestation of Lawrence's disapproval of control, placing her in opposition to the natural and regenerative associated with masculine behavior in the form of Birkin. The Lawrencian male is a man who rejects control and mastery, instead turning towards his impulse and uncontrolled energies for his energies, while the "non-masculine" emphasizes a control that sublimates the spontaneity and power of those impulses, either in the female (as we see in Hermione) or through the male figure who chooses to turn away from masculinity, such as Gerald Crich or Clifford Chatterley. Scott Sanders draws the connection between these two characters, noting how "Clifford insists upon his right to dominate the working class" while Gerald "regards his employees" in his family's coal mines "as tools, extensions of his will."⁹ These two men seek a mastery over themselves as well as seeking to alter and affect the world around them through this control, something that is inherently non-masculine and much like Hermione's own approach to knowledge and "spontaneity." Lawrence constructs a masculinity that clashes with Hemingway's emphasis of the essential role of performance in masculinity through an established and asserted form of mastery is established,

⁹ Sanders, "Lady Chatterley's Loving," 5.

as the authentic Lawrencian male rejects the mastery that comes with embracing the will at the expense of the essential impulse.

For Hemingway, control and will was something for a man to actively seek and the exertion of those things were indicative of the true man. The character of Nick Adams reflects this, as he often seeks to exhibit control and not succumb to impulses or other uncontrolled factors. This can be seen in the short story “The Three Day Blow,” which Phillip Young describes as one that “effectively documents Nick’s introduction to drunkenness, a condition which is to become important for the Hemingway protagonist.”¹⁰ However, Young is only half-correct in this observation, as the story perhaps best stands not as Nick’s initiation into drunkenness, but instead an initiation into how a man must drink and also maintain control whilst they drink in order to not become drunk. As Nick and Bill drink Scotch together, “the liquor [...] all died out of [Nick] and left him alone” and thus he “wasn’t drunk.”¹¹ Though Nick drinks as much as Bill, the liquor never fully overtakes him or inhibits his ability to act as he would like. Nick is not as affected by the drink such that he cannot maintain a sense of mastery. Nick can consume liquor without letting it control him or prevent him from acting as he would like, something that happens to most people when they drink large amounts of liquor. Bill even says how he “just got a good edge on” from drinking, to which Nick replies that “there’s no use getting drunk.”¹² Getting drunk, which entails a loss of control, is something to be avoided and does not yield anything

¹⁰ Young, *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration*, 35.

¹¹ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 47.

¹² Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 49.

positive for the Hemingway male. Joseph Flora notes how Nick takes a certain pride in “holding his liquor” and “being practical,”¹³ which emphasizes the control Nick must maintain so that he does not get somehow lost or carried away. A man can (and should) drink alcohol, but he who best exhibits Hemingway’s construction of masculinity (as Nick Adams often does) will not allow himself to feel the same “edge” as Bill or to be overcome by it. Sensation and pleasure must not get the better of Hemingway’s men, and Nick Adams exhibits this control over himself by not getting drunk while avoiding being completely under the control of the alcohol.

Control, particularly self control as the self is subjected to other factors and forces, is vital for the Hemingway male and a central component of his construction of masculinity. In addition to Nick Adams, Jake Barnes reflects this concept as well, particularly in regard to the un-manning injury he suffered during World War I. Hemingway writes that it is when Jake’s “head started to work” that “the old grievance,”¹⁴ or this emasculating injury, becomes more prominent in his mind and has an affect upon him. There is a connection made between thinking about something and how it impedes a man’s ability to maintain control. Jake strives “not to think about” his injury, aspiring to “try and take it”¹⁵ and telling Bill Gorton that “[he]’d a hell of a lot rather not talk about it.”¹⁶ The wound and the thoughts that it elicits within Jake are things to be ignored and pushed away, not

¹³ Flora, *Hemingway’s Nick Adams*, 64.

¹⁴ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 38.

¹⁵ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 38-39.

¹⁶ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 128.

to be understood or examined as they would diminish his ability to stay in control of himself. Rather, one strives not to think and talk about things, and rather acting to thus putting those troubling or painful things out of one's mind. Phillip Young notes that "Jake complains very little, although he suffers a good deal" and "there are certain things that are 'done' and many that are 'not done,'"¹⁷ namely trying to confront and talk about those wounds that are either physical or in the mind. These thoughts and impulses are not allowed to dominate the mind of the Hemingway male, as they are those things that "are not done," which Jake prevents by using his will to maintain control and not allow them to have the upper hand. Though Stephen Clifford asserts that "Jake is never through with the subject" of his wounding and "the injury becomes his singularly defining quality, at the center of every angle, every perspective he adopts,"¹⁸ Jake is able to overcome it by turning towards what Thomas Strychacz highlights as an "aesthetic of emotional restraint."¹⁹ Strychacz's choice of the word "aesthetic" is particularly relevant, as it invokes action and, most importantly, performance as being necessary in order to maintain control. While the injury does enter into Jake's life, its primary effect is to drive him towards the behavior that emphasizes control and restraint, particularly in regard to emotion, and thus that ability to maintain control becomes the defining characteristic rather than the injury itself.

A conception of masculinity such as Hemingway's, one that placed mastery over one's thoughts and impulses functioning as an essential

¹⁷ Young, *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration*, 83.

¹⁸ Clifford, *Beyond the Heroic "I,"* 199.

¹⁹ Strychacz, "The Sort of Thing You Should Not Admit," 161.

component, stands in stark contrast to Lawrencian masculinity, as Lawrence portrayed acts of control where the man sublimated his essence as being indicative of that which is false and non-masculine. The thoughts and emotions the Hemingway male seeks to master and suppress were the same as those at the heart of the Lawrencian male, driving his actions. Characters such as Birkin and Mellors do not seek to control or master their central impulse as control is the path that leads to death and destruction, yet for Hemingway men like Jake Barnes and Nick Adams, it is the only way to survive.

In addition to differing in regard to control and how it relates to masculinity, both Hemingway and Lawrence address the importance of action in a different way and each ascribe them with different significances. For Hemingway, action is how masculinity is best exhibited, and a man's performance stands as the most accurate validation of his masculine qualifications. In "Soldier's Home," Krebs exhibits the centrality of action to the Hemingway construction of masculinity, as he turns to sport upon his return from the front as a means of pleasure and regeneration. Returning to his hometown in Oklahoma from the European front during World War I, Krebs would pass "the hottest hours of the day in the cool dark of the pool room" as he "loved to play pool,"²⁰ thus spending his time playing that game rather than trying to integrate himself into his parents' world. Krebs takes refuge from the heat of the day in the pool hall, playing a game based upon smooth and repeated actions that mirrors Krebs' desire for life to go "smoothly." A game such as pool provides Krebs with refuge through its "cleanness and

²⁰ Hemingway, *In Our Time*, 70.

order,” quoting Robert W. Lewis Jr., for though “pool is completely irrelevant to his life” and “‘meaningless’ or absurd, it is [a] rite.”²¹ There is no meaning or purpose behind the game of pool for Krebs; the game possesses no significance beyond something that he can perform well through his actions alone. Meaning does not lead to action in pool, as there is no “reason” that one plays pool, except to play the game and the pleasure that one derives from it. Devoid of any broader meaning, Krebs can approach to the game of pool as a ritual and a means of renewal, for it does not require any connection or meaning but merely a well-performed act. Krebs’ active embracing of a game such as pool reflects Harold Kaplan’s observation that the “The Hemingway hero retreats to games” because, “if life is formless and meaningless, sport is not. It ritualizes action, it discriminates, it dramatizes; the significance is clear, victory is possible.”²² Krebs finds solace by performing an established and repeatable action with defined outcomes, and by performing those ritualized actions he asserts his masculinity as well as establishing his place within the world.

The healing, as well as the enabling of the masculine, that Krebs experiences by playing pool is radically different from what would occur according to the Lawrencian construction, in which an emphasis placed on action, specifically their repeated performance, leads to a kind of death and causes the man to lose his masculine essence. Lawrence expresses his distaste for mechanization and a reduction to mere action through Ursula Brangwen,

²¹ Robert W. Lewis Jr., “Hemingway’s Concept of Sport and ‘Soldier’s Home,’” in *The Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway*, ed. Jackson J. Benson (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1975), 173, 177.

²² Kaplan, *The Passive Voice*, 101.

when she says how it is “better [to] die than live mechanically a life that is a repetition of repetitions” and “to live mechanized and cut off within the motion of the will [...] is shameful and ignominious.”²³ For Lawrence, focusing on performance evolves into a descent into action alone that borders on the mechanical, and thus is destructive to the masculine essence. For Lawrence’s men, the performance of a given action is secondary to the impulse that causes it. Making the action into the vital component reduces the man who performs it into nothing more than a machine, continuously repeating a given task without anything essential or human at the heart of the action, thus denying him of his essential nature. Peter Scheckner describes Lawrence, at the time he was writing novels such as *Women in Love* and *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, as “ach[ing] for a scrap with the social forces he detested-- industrial capitalism and the sexual, psychic, and economic injuries it imposed” and “the human blight caused by industrialism”²⁴ that led many men to accept automated lives and mechanized action as the best means by which empowerment can be attained. Industrial capitalism, and all its manifestations, pushed man towards action as opposed to their inner impulses, as it reduced them to machines to fit into their larger systems.

For Lawrence, stressing action eradicates the masculine impulse and pushes the man towards weakness and ultimately death. This conceit emerges in Mellors’ all-important distinction between “cold hearted” and “warm hearted” sex,

²³ Lawrence, *Women in Love*, 192.

²⁴ Scheckner, *Class, Politics and the Individual*, 140,164.

as his description of “cold hearted” sex invokes machinery, “sharp” and “piercing” that invokes metal, while lacking the “tenderness”²⁵ indicative of the human flesh. It is clear that at the heart of Mellors’ distinction between warm and cold heartedness is the role of the action, in this case sex, and what lurks behind it. To be “cold hearted” reflects a turn towards action alone, where the actual performance of sex becomes the most important aspect and the emotions that are usually to be associated with sexual intercourse are not as prominent. By contrast, being warm hearted means exhibiting “that spunky wild bit of a man”²⁶ that exist within, which is the very impulse that is central to Lawrencian masculinity. Mark Spilka notes how “the man,” or what we might define as the true Lawrencian man, “speaks for warmheartedness” and “is able to accept it as part of his masculine strength.”²⁷ Mellors creates his masculinity as well as exerting the power associated with it from being warm hearted, fueled by his innate masculine essence and taking the act beyond and making it something with a greater importance. Emphasizing merely the act and making its performance central, while diminishing and suppressing the influence of impulse and feeling, contradicts the nature of Lawrence’s construction of masculinity. Impulse is vital and should fuel and drive action, while for Hemingway impulse is meant to be controlled and mastered through the exemplary performance of a given action. For Lawrence, actions must have meaning and feeling behind them

²⁵ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 206-207.

²⁶ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 196.

²⁷ Mark Spilka, *Renewing the Normative D.H. Lawrence: A Personal Progress* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1992), 66.

while Hemingway's actions were ones by which feeling is created through their performance

Emphasizing action and performance above impulse and feeling, something Lawrence depicts as mechanized and "cold hearted," is for Hemingway merely an example of mastery and thus an exhibition of masculinity. The stress that Hemingway places on action can be seen in Pedro Romero's actions during his bullfights. Romero "avoided every brusque movement [...] never ma[king] any contortions" that did not include "the faked look of danger" used by other bullfighters, which often "turned bad and gave an unpleasant feeling," and instead "[giving] real emotion, because he kept the absolute purity of line in his movements."²⁸ The importance of the action for Hemingway is made apparent through this passage, as it is through Romero's actions that emotion is created rather than emotions leading to action. Diverging from the Lawrencian construction, in which emotion drives action, one's ability to perform an action well by exhibiting dominance is an example of masculinity for Hemingway. The other bullfighters work to create feeling through those artificial means and they do not succeed, as what the audience is left does not last; those bullfighters emphasize the sensation and the "look of danger" rather than the act itself. Romero, however, is successful as he places his performance above emotion or feeling, and thus creates real enjoyment for the spectators by performing the act of bullfighting crisply and correctly. Romero exhibits control himself during the bullfight as his movements are never "brusque" or contorted but performed with a

²⁸ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 171.

smoothness, as “the holding of his purity of line [...] dominated the bull by making him realize he was unattainable, while he prepared him for the killing.”²⁹

Romero’s performance in the ring reflects Harold Kaplan’s “heroic value” of “virility” that “suggests the mastering of reality [and] the spirit of dominance that is masculine.”³⁰ Romero is in control of his body as well as the bull with whom he is fighting, as well as the emotions and feelings of those watching. While the other bullfighters artificially concoct feeling, namely that of danger, Romero’s precise moves create a “good feeling” in those who watch, as he exerts his control over the bull by “prepar[ing]” to kill him, rather than rushing it to create the greatest amount of emotion through sensation. The well performed action, one that is not influenced by rushing towards the kill or a desire to artificially create danger, leads to the best outcomes as well as being an example of the Hemingway male asserting his masculinity.

These differences in regard to the essential qualities of masculinity and how it is constructed in the world appears related to each author’s interpretation of World War I and what they viewed as being the war’s lasting influence, as each author’s construction of masculinity is, in some way, affected or tied to their views on the war. Hemingway’s views on control and the will and its central role in his construction of masculinity reflects a view of World War I that neither glorifies nor completely condemns the conflict itself. Hemingway’s attitude towards the war, as shown through his writing from this time, is utilitarian as he

²⁹ Hemingway, *Sun Also Rises*, 172.

³⁰ Kaplan, *The Passive Voice*, 104.

seeks to portray the war without actively commenting on it. The war, like the physical or psychological wounds that affected Hemingway's male characters, was a painful initiation into a world of brutality and chaos, while also providing an understanding of how to survive in that world by attempting to maintain self control and mastery and the opportunity to exhibit those traits. Hemingway does not hide the war's brutality behind a sentimental veneer of patriotism, yet the war also has an apparent function as it teaches the male something valuable, helping him to truly behave like a man and exhibit Hemingway's construction of masculinity. Phillip Young describes "Hemingway's world" as one that "is ultimately at war-- war either in the literal sense [...] or figuratively as marked everywhere with violence, potential or present, and a general hostility"³¹; the war was not some horrific exception, but rather one particularly poignant manifestation of the world in which Hemingway lived. The war itself was neither good nor bad, it merely *was*, and his male characters could use it as an opportunity to exhibit his constructions of masculinity either during its fighting or in the aftermath.

For Hemingway, what has been affected by the war's brutality was not how a man should act or what he should do but instead the concepts that led him to act that way, particularly ideas of honor and patriotism and traditional notions of chivalry. What did not change in the wake of the war were the actions a man should undertake, namely ones that valued stoicism, performance and control. The behavior and actions of the true man were the same for Hemingway after the

³¹ Young, *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration*, 243.

war but the motives behind them were altered; Hemingway envisioned a masculinity that was self-fulfilling and allowed an individual to maintain control over a world placed out of control after World War I. By way of analyzing the influence of Stephen Crane upon the work of Hemingway, Phillip Young articulates how both authors “often dedicated [...] their work work to the annihilation of romantic idealism and lies” and were “stubbornly self-reliant” while “disdain[ing] those who would not strike out for themselves” as well as “violat[ing] the dress, language, frankness and behavior [of] the genteel traditions of their periods.”³² It was these things that Hemingway rejected in the wake of the war, but he still sought to maintain the stoicism that persisted during those previous times through his male characters. Hemingway challenged a current of thought that persisted in the pre-war era, articulated by George Mosse, that “heroism, death and sacrifice on behalf of a higher purpose in life [were] set attributes of masculinity,”³³ while upholding a tradition that Michael Roper defines as “manliness [...] judged largely in terms of external qualities [...] a man’s comportment, his physical appearance and performance”³⁴ or what Mosse identified in “the revolutionaries in France” as “heroic stoicism and dignity” and “quiet strength.”³⁵ Rather than exhibiting strength and self control in order to adhere to some societal standard for propriety, the Hemingway male maintains

³² Young, *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration*, 193.

³³ George Mosse, *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1996), 51.

³⁴ Roper, “Between Manliness and Masculinity,” 347.

³⁵ Mosse, *The Image of Man*, 51.

his stoicism solely for himself in order to enact the only control possible in a world unmoored from the traditional belief systems that had been defiled as a result of the war.

Lawrence's view of masculinity, one defined by an essential masculine impulse that stood in contrast to the automated industrial world, also reflects his views on the World War I. Lawrence's thoughts in regard to the war can be characterized as extremely negative, while also inscribing the events with a certain kind of apocalyptic significance. Jae-Kyung Koh summarizes Lawrence's belief that "the War was a kind of eruption of repressed impulses" and "its massive destructiveness" was the result of "both the length of time during which these had been denied full expression and to the corruption of impulse which is a result of repression."³⁶ Lawrence interpreted the war as the manifestation of suppressed impulses, specifically those impulses that had been repressed at the hands of a Christian culture that pervaded throughout Europe, which emphasized control and mastery over impulses to maintain "the supremacy of love, submission, and humility,"³⁷ to again reference Koh. Scott Sanders notes how "in [Lawrence's] works written during and immediately after the Great War, the yearning for annihilation frequently dominates," yet out of that destruction wrought by this culture of repression comes "the only hope for renewal of the world" through this "holocaust, a violent collapse of industrial civilization,"³⁸ which would lead man to properly embrace the impulse and turn away from

³⁶ Koh, "Lawrence and the Great War," 165.

³⁷ Koh, "Lawrence and the Great War," 165.

³⁸ Sanders, "Lady Chatterley's Loving," 1.

mechanized constructions. The destruction caused by the war, which stemmed from a society that valued control and the regulation of impulse, would eradicate that regulating impulse enabling man to be free to act according to his most natural instincts.

Lawrence envisioned that a world would emerge after the destruction of the war, which would be a new opportunity and a chance to revert to a previous existence not tainted by the industrial. Eugene Goodheart notes how “Lawrence [was] drawn to the myth” of the Garden of Eden and it was “part of Lawrence’s strenuous effort to overcome evil [...] not so much [by] proposing a wild abandonment to passion as [by] trying to connect passion to the moral and religious life.”³⁹ Lawrence envisioned an Edenic existence that would emerge after the Armageddon that was the First World War, where impulse would not be repressed and allowed to be authentically expressed in such a way that could be considered “moral” to Lawrence. Thus Connie and Mellors functions as the harbingers of this new existence, closer to what Lawrence hoped the world would be like in the aftermath of the apocalyptic destruction of the First World War. The old world and its great war “ma[de] mincemeat of the old Adam and the Old Eve,”⁴⁰ and thus Mellors and Connie can be a new Adam and Eve in the world that will emerge in the wake of the war, standing as “embodiments” of what Virginia Hyde refers to as “biblical types, like Adam and Eve” as Lawrence

³⁹ Goodheart, *Lawrence: The Utopian Vision*, 164-65

⁴⁰ Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, 217.

imparts upon them “the intensity and immediacy of life.”⁴¹ Mark Spilka notes how a text like *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* is “clearly [...] a call to individual regeneration,”⁴² and that regeneration occurs as a result of embracing the masculine impulse that had been sublimated leading up to World War I but has been freed from its constraints in the war’s aftermath.

However, those controlling impulses were not completely eradicated by the destruction of the war, at least not to the degree that Lawrence seemed to desire, as remnants of the society that brought forth World War I persisted and often inhibited the achieving of the masculine essence. Lawrence portrayed a world where men had a choice between embracing the primitive and true nature of man to create something that can be sustained or continuing to embrace control through mechanization that will ultimately prove fruitless. Sanders outlines how Clifford Chatterley, the paralyzed patriarch of Wragby, “epitomized [...] those who, resuming power after the Armistice, set about intensifying the very processes that led to war”⁴³; Clifford’s emphasis on control and action, as well as his immersion into the field of coal mining in the wake of his injury, prevented him from properly embracing that which is left of his masculine impulse and thus he cannot lead the creation of the new post-war society. For Lawrence, the war’s aftermath functioned as an opportunity for mankind to actively reject, in the rubble and wreckage left by the war, the systems of control and regulation in

⁴¹ Virginia Hyde, *The Risen Adam: D.H. Lawrence’s Revisionist Typology* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), 208.

⁴² Spilka, *The Love Ethic of D.H. Lawrence*, 194.

⁴³ Sanders, “Lady Chatterley’s Loving,” 5.

favor of embracing the masculine impulse, to turn away from the processes that had led to war in the first place. Lawrence sought something new, a fresh start and opportunity for man to embrace what is truly theirs and had been repressed previously by the constructions of society.

This aftermath, in which man was afforded the opportunity to reclaim his masculine impulse, contrasts greatly with Hemingway's view of the war as initiation, as man could not help but embrace the new constructions of belief in regard to masculinity in Hemingway's construction of masculinity. The wound is a defining characteristic of the Hemingway male, as it provides him with the understanding to fully embrace the control and mastery that must be exhibited in the modern world. By contrast, Lawrence's man must actively choose to embrace his masculine essence while rejecting control and the will, that which stifles and negatively affects the masculine essence. The destruction, which challenges and upsets what already existed, is not enough as there must be something new created to take its place. Lawrence wanted man to create a new system that emphasized the self and impulse, which would occur through the complete rejection of what came before, while Hemingway shifted what had been previously emphasized and appropriated it into something somewhat different.

Though Hemingway and Lawrence each addressed, in their respective fictions, how masculinity is created and can be affected by physical and psychological wounds, they differed in the effects that wounding had as well as how that masculinity was exhibited in the wake of that injury. For Lawrence, it came in the form of a rejection of control to stress the essential masculine

impulse that had been repressed through the will, which would allow the male to heal his physical injury or psychological trauma. Hemingway, by contrast, stressed control and mastery as the means by which a man proves himself, particularly through one's performed actions as well as through the repression of impulse and emotion. Each of these author's approaches to masculinity, in turn, appeared to reflect their views in regard to World War I and were affected by the conflict. For Hemingway, the war functioned much like the physical or psychological wounds suffered by his male characters; it was horrific, yet it initiated one into a better understanding of masculinity. Lawrence, on the other hand, had an entirely negative view of the war and interpreted it as the result of a culture that actively sought to repress our natural instincts, as those impulses eventually boiled over and exerted themselves through this catastrophe. But there was hope for Lawrence, that in the wake of this cataclysm, a new society could arise from the ashes of the previous one that would more fully embrace the impulse as well as the masculine essence. Understanding the distinctions between each of the authors constructions of masculinity, as well as how they reflect each author's interpretation of World War I, will allow for a deeper and richer understanding of the connections and divergences between these two seminal authors of the Modernist period. And by fully understanding how these authors treat masculinity, particularly as it is affected by physical or psychological wounds, we can also deepen our understanding of the larger ideas behind the writings of each.

Conclusion-- Masculine Studies and the Future of Hemingway and Lawrence Scholarship

By considering how Ernest Hemingway and D.H. Lawrence constructed masculinity as well as how they portrayed the effects of physical and psychological wounding upon those constructions, one can better understand the nature of their respective philosophical approaches toward the world as well as the aim and focus of their writing. For Lawrence, what emerged was the emphasis on internal processes and feelings, and thus Lawrence's fictions became thought experiments, or vehicles by which Lawrence can examine and expand upon concepts related to the psychological. However, just as his construction of masculinity conflicted with Lawrence's, Hemingway's approach to fiction reflected through this construction differs as well. Rather than delving into the psyche and examining human impulses and consciousness, Hemingway sought to write in a utilitarian style, suppressing thought and diminishing commentary while focusing on purely conveying the actions of his characters. These constructions of masculinity are not mere personal expressions of belief, but rather things that connect to a certain aesthetic that they put forth in their literature. In addition to these artistic distinctions, what also emerges through this investigation is an appreciation of the depth and complexity of the subject of masculinity. Far from being a monolithic concept, masculinity is a nuanced and unique construction, particularly in the Modernist era, and thus is worthy of extensive study and consideration. Though both Hemingway and Lawrence are

writers often cited as examples of “masculinist modernism,”¹ to quote Thomas Strychacz, there are very radical divergences in their constructions of masculinity. Because the problem of biography has plagued the critical discussions of these writers in particular, introducing a richer and fuller construction of masculinity might serve to reinvigorate the scholarship being created about these authors.

The critical dialogue on Hemingway and Lawrence has been fraught with complications and perils that have hindered contemporary exploration of their literature. Stephen Clifford identifies one polemical issue as being the “overriding tendency to read Lawrence’s and Hemingway’s fiction through the authority of biography [...] install[ing] the ‘real’ Lawrence or the ‘actual’ Hemingway.”² Clifford touches on the tendency, within the critical discussions of these authors, to emphasize biography and look to the texts as the means by which one can understand the life of the author rather than how those works reflect an aesthetic or philosophical vision. In addition, countless challenges have been mounted by feminist critics, something Balbert describes existing within Lawrencian criticism as “feminist displeasure with [Lawrence that] can be revealed as reductive and misleading,”³ a claim that could very easily be applied to Hemingway as well. These polemics, related to gender and biography, have made extending the discussion on both of these authors a difficult and almost unwieldy task. To again reference Clifford, “critics have spent a great deal of ink and energy in exhuming

¹ Strychacz, *Dangerous Masculinities*, 2.

² Clifford, *Beyond The Heroic “I,”* 14.

³ Balbert, *Lawrence and the Phallic Imagination*, 3.

artifacts of the biographical author in the fiction of both [authors],”⁴ preventing scholarship from being produced that presents anything new, as the critic is bound to the author’s biography to validate their claims. These issues are particularly apropos in regard to masculinity, as the scholarship considers constructions of masculinity in the texts and then moves outward to interpret the author’s life. However, this approach can only go so far and what must occur is an analysis of masculinity that can be linked to narrative constructions, rather than to create a biographical narrative.

By turning towards masculinity as something that can be considered and analyzed, rather than something that is merely assumed, as I have done in this project, insightful scholarship about both Hemingway and Lawrence will result and the critical discussion can be reinvigorated. Masculinity and its constructions should be examined, as it is far from the singular and reductive concept it is sometimes depicted as being in the contemporary discourse. That authors traditionally associated with “masculinity,” like Hemingway and Lawrence, can produce such radically different constructions show us that masculinity was not one idea that all believed in, but something that authors such as Hemingway and Lawrence created and established for themselves. Masculinity is far from a singular ideal, and only by fully examining the nature of masculinity in all its constructions and forms can we reach more interesting and insightful conclusions in regard to gender and literature.

⁴ Clifford, *Beyond The Heroic “I,”* 22.

Through the study of these two authors and discerning how vastly divergent their constructions of masculinities were, the need to establish a theoretical conception of masculinity that is not a mere binary to be placed in a dialectic relationship with the feminine or other notions of sexuality becomes more apparent. To assume a kind of masculinity that functions in this dialectical role is reductive and hinders feminist discourse as well, as it assumes a masculine *status quo* that is always true and cannot be challenged. Far from a mere counterpoint to the feminine, masculinity is a concept rich in complexities, and by considering how authors such as Hemingway and Lawrence represent what it means to be a man we can reach interesting and deeper analyses of their literature. Both Hemingway and Lawrence would benefit greatly from further and richer consideration of their constructions of masculinity, as it would help to reconcile ideas of gender, biography and history into the literary analysis of these authors, which would yield more imaginative and informative criticism to serve as a catalyst to restart the discourses on these canonical authors.

Bibliography

- Adair, William. "'Big Two-Hearted River': Why the Swamp Is Tragic." *Journal of Modern Literature* 17, no. 4 (Spring 1991): 584-588.
- _____. "Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises*." *Explicator* 60, no. 2 (Winter 2002): 91-94.
- Baker, Carlos. *Ernest Hemingway: The Writer as Artist*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- Balbert, Peter. *D.H. Lawrence and the Phallic Imagination*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989.
- _____. "From Lady Chatterley's Lover to The Deer Park: Lawrence, Mailer, and the Dialectic of Erotic Risk." *Studies in the Novel* 22, no. 1 (Spring 1990): 67-81.
- Blackmore, David. "'In New York It'd Mean I Was a ...': Masculinity Anxiety and Period Discourses of Sexuality in *The Sun Also Rises*." *Hemingway Review* 18, no. 1 (Fall 1998): 49-67.
- Clifford, Stephen. *Beyond the Heroic "I": Reading Lawrence, Hemingway and "Masculinity."* Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1998.
- _____. "Hemingway's Fragmentary Novel: Readers Writing the Hero in *In Our Time*." *Hemingway Review* 13, no. 2 (Spring 1994): 12-23.
- Daiker, Donald A. "The Affirmative Conclusion of *The Sun Also Rises*." In *Modern American Fiction: Form and Function*, edited by Thomas Daniel Young, 39-56. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1989.
- DeFalco, Joseph. *The Hero in Hemingway's Short Stories*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1963.
- Flora, Joseph. *Hemingway's Nick Adams*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1982.
- Fore, Dana. "Life Unworthy of Life?: Masculinity, Disability, and Guilt in *The Sun Also Rises*." *Hemingway Review* 26, no. 2 (Spring 2007): 74-88.
- Forster, Greg. "Melancholy Modernism: Gender and the Politics of Mourning in *The Sun Also Rises*." *Hemingway Review* 21, no. 1 (Fall 2001): 22-37.
- Goodheart, Eugene. *D. H. Lawrence: The Utopian Vision*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, [1963] 2006.

Hemingway, Ernest. *In Our Time*. New York: Scribners, [1925] 2003.

_____. *The Sun Also Rises*. New York: Scribners, 1926.

Higonnet, Margaret R. "Authenticity and Art in Trauma Narratives of World War I." *Modernism/Modernity* 9, no. 1 (January 2002): 91-107.

Hyde, Virginia. *The Risen Adam: D.H. Lawrence's Revisionist Typology*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992.

Johnston, Kenneth. *The Tip of the Iceberg: Hemingway and the Short Story*. Greenwood, FL: Penkevill, 1987.

Kaplan, Harold J. *The Passive Voice: An Approach to Modern Fiction*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1966.

Kobler, J. F. "'Soldier's Home' Revisited: A Hemingway Mea Culpa." *Studies in Short Fiction* 30, no. 3 (Summer 1993): 377-385.

Koh, Jae-Kyung. "D. H. Lawrence and the Great War." *Neophilologus* 87, no. 1 (January 2003): 153-170.

Lawrence, D. H. *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. New York: Penguin Books, [1928] 2006.

_____. *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious and Fantasia of the Unconscious*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

_____. *Women in Love*. New York: Penguin Books, [1920] 2007.

Lawrence, D. H. "In Our Time: A Review." In *Ernest Hemingway: Seven Decades of Criticism*, edited by Linda Wagner-Martin, 19-20. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1998.

Leland, Jacob Michael. "Yes, That Is a Roll of Bills in My Pocket: The Economy of Masculinity in *The Sun Also Rises*." *Hemingway Review* 23, no. 2 (Spring 2004): 37-46.

Lewis Jr., Robert W. "Hemingway's Concept of Sport and 'Soldier's Home.'" In *The Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway*, edited by Jackson J. Benson, 170-180. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1975.

Miko, Stephen. *Toward Women in Love: The Emergence of a Lawrentian Aesthetic*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1971.

- Minter, David. *A Cultural History of the American Novel: Henry James to William Faulkner*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Mosse, George. *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Nixon, Cornelia. *Lawrence's Leadership Politics and the Turn Against Women*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1986.
- Roper, Michael. "Between Manliness and Masculinity: The 'War Generation' and the Psychology of Fear in Britain, 1914-1950." *Journal of British Studies* 44 no.2 (April 2005): 343-362
- Sanders, Scott R. "Lady Chatterley's Loving and the Annihilation Impulse." In *D. H. Lawrence's 'Lady': A New Look at Lady Chatterley's Lover*, edited by Michael Squires and Dennis Jackson, 1-16. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1985.
- Scheckner, Peter. *Class, Politics and the Individual: A Study of the Major Works of D.H. Lawrence*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1985.
- Schneider, Daniel. *D. H. Lawrence, the Artist as Psychologist*. Lawrence, KS, University of Kansas Press, 1984.
- Spilka, Mark. *The Love Ethic of D. H. Lawrence*. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 1955.
- _____. *Renewing the Normative D.H. Lawrence: A Personal Progress*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1992.
- Squires, Michael. "Modernism and the Contours of Violence in D. H. Lawrence's Fiction." *Studies in the Novel* 39, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 84-104.
- Stewart, Matthew C. "Ernest Hemingway and World War I: Combatting Recent Psychobiographical Reassessments, Restoring the War." *Papers on Language and Literature: A Journal for Scholars and Critics of Language and Literature* 36, no. 2 (Spring 2000): 198-217.
- Strychacz, Thomas. *Dangerous Masculinities: Conrad, Hemingway and Lawrence*. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press, 2008.
- _____. *Hemingway's Theaters of Masculinity*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2003.
- _____. "'The Sort of Thing You Should Not Admit': Ernest Hemingway's Aesthetic of Emotional Restraint." In *Boys Don't Cry?: Rethinking Narratives of*

Masculinity and Emotion in the U. S., edited by Milette Shamir, 141-166.
New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2002.

Vernon, Alex. "War, Gender, and Ernest Hemingway." *Hemingway Review* 22, no. 1 (Fall 2002): 34-55.

Wright, Anne. *Literature of Crisis, 1910-22: Howards End, Heartbreak House, Women in Love and The Waste Land*. New York: St. Martin's, 1984.

Wylder, Delbert. *Hemingway's Heroes*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1969.

Young, Philip. *Ernest Hemingway, A Reconsideration*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1966.

SCHOLASTIC VITA

Thomas Hays Bevilacqua

UNDERGRADUATE STUDY: University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas
Bachelor of Arts in English, 2008
Thesis Title: “‘Go Moan for Man’: The Structuring Presence of Catholicism in Jack Kerouac’s *Legend of Duluoz*”

GRADUATE STUDY: Wake Forest University
Winston-Salem, North Carolina
Master of Arts in English, 2009
Thesis Title: “‘It Was The Bruise of the War’: The Effects of Injury and Trauma on the Construction of Masculinity in Hemingway and Lawrence”

PAPERS AND PRESENTATIONS:

“‘Give us Peace O Lord *In Our Time*’: Hemingway, Ritual and Religion.” Ernest Hemingway Society, Lausanne, Switzerland, June 2010.

“‘A Big Structure of Confession’: The Influence of Catholicism on Jack Kerouac’s *On The Road*.” Southwest Texas Popular Culture and American Culture Association, Albuquerque, NM, February 2010.

Chair, “Spirituality and Narratives in the Beat Generation.” Southwest Texas Popular Culture and American Culture Association, Albuquerque, NM, February 2010.

“‘Yes, it was pure, in my heart’: The Countercultural Legacy of Jack Kerouac’s Catholicism.” Southwest Texas Popular Culture and American Culture Association, Albuquerque, NM, February 2009.

Chair, “Religion and Kerouac.” Southwest Texas Popular Culture and American Culture Association, Albuquerque, NM, February 2009.

SCHOLASTIC AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

2008-2010 Graduate Assistant, Wake Forest University

2007-2008 Undergraduate Research Apprentice, University of Texas at Austin

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES:

2008 Phi Beta Kappa

2007 Sigma Tau Delta