

## PERFORMING THE FEMININE IN A FAREWELL TO ARMS

DANIEL S. TRABER

*Texas A&M University at Galveston*

WHEN THE TOPIC IS GENDER IN *A Farewell to Arms* there is a distinct gap between the critical response and the textual signals Hemingway offers us to answer that inevitable question: How should a reader approach the characterization of Catherine Barkley?<sup>1</sup> As the protagonist's love interest, as one of the "Hemingway women," Catherine is Exhibit A for those aiming to prove Hemingway's misogyny. In the last two decades this reading has occasionally been countered with attempts to salvage Catherine's narrative function, along with Hemingway's authorial intentions. My reading will side with the latter project to argue for an anti-essentialist Hemingway who uses his central female character to critique gender roles and their naturalized social functions.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, the constructed nature of female/feminine identity is such a central issue that it should affect how a reader makes sense of practically every creative element in the novel. *A Farewell to Arms* offers a sophisticated study of gender—both masculinity and femininity—as a self-conscious performance, yet that idea is filtered through Hemingway's characteristic subtlety and irony.

The response to Catherine Barkley has long been mixed. Simone de Beauvoir, a founding postwar voice for the critique of patriarchal ideology, reads Catherine as an anti-mythic representation of a woman. Beauvoir applauds Hemingway for "regard[ing] women as fellow creatures," for creating a female "without mystery" who is a "human being" (295). But even critics in our own time have not always seen it that way. Jamie Barlowe-Kayes offers a brutal summary of the varied ways Hemingway trivializes his female characters:

Women are inspiration, muses, sexual temptations and release from sexual tension; they serve as nurturers, solvers of domes-

tic problems, and creators of conditions which allow men to go on accomplishing—and making decisions. Even Hemingway's ways of holding women in esteem marginalized them—kept them as objects, playthings, nurturers, allotting them the no-power of domestic power. (175)

There is no doubt Hemingway is guilty, in both his life and writing, of these infractions, but the accusation is not so easily applicable to the case of *A Farewell to Arms*. The protagonist, Frederic Henry, is not a mirror image of Hemingway. The autobiographical aspects of the story drawn from Hemingway's 1918 love affair with Agnes von Kurowsky—the nurse he met in Milan while recuperating from war wounds—are best left in an attic trunk, packed away as a mere framework for the plot rather than the impetus for finally writing a revenge fantasy against the “strong” woman who rejected the young Ernest as he was entering manhood ten years before.

Instead, Catherine should be read as a woman with agency, someone attempting to find meaning and achieve a sense of psychological equilibrium against the background of war. The moments of willful submissiveness and self-erasure that so anger some critics come only after Hemingway gives the reader clues about Catherine's strategy for surviving in a world where conventional ideas once accepted as true have become shaky ground for creating a sense of self. The death of her fiancé has pushed Catherine into a modernist suspicion of the belief systems and abstract notions disseminated by those seeking to control the meaning of the war.

I am not the first to follow this line of argument. Sandra Spanier makes a similar case, but argues that Catherine uses love to survive the chaos of a fragmented universe.<sup>3</sup> In Spanier's reading, Catherine creates a “valid alternative existence” by “submerg[ing] herself in a private love relationship” (86). I partly agree, but the idea that this adopted feminine role and imaginary life based on love contribute to “a private world...of her own construction” is rooted in a particular understanding of love and how Catherine deploys it (76). This is a common approach in analyses of Catherine's role-playing. But the novel does not present love as a transparent, unmediated emotion or idea. Rather, the traditional romantic configuration is a product of the dominant culture, and Catherine's discourse of love/romance as a means to salvation draws on dominant terms, despite her indulging in premarital sex and having a child out of wedlock (although, as

Comley and Scholes inform us, “a declaration of love was the minimum prerequisite for sexual intercourse between well-bred people” at this time [36]). Falling back on conventional discourses of femininity helps Catherine fit herself back into a peg-hole, not subvert the conformity of the board. However, I will argue that she is subversive to a limited degree.

In *The Sun Also Rises*, Hemingway associates Brett Ashley’s appearance and behavior with characteristics of masculinity, but Catherine Barkley emphasizes femininity, albeit one always countered by a tough cynicism. Despite that “masculine” attribute (see Spanier and Hatten), Hemingway does not completely allow Catherine to think her way outside the gender bias society has ingrained in her. Before too quickly critiquing this character, and the author, for relying on traditional conceptions of “what women are like,” one should note that these are the discourses Catherine has at hand. It is more productive to view her inability to think outside the old knowledge as revealing both the limited options offered to her and her desperation to reconstruct a personal center. I contend that Hemingway is problematizing gender by having Catherine appropriate the woman-in-love persona as a tactic to pull together the broken pieces of her life. Scholars typically treat Catherine’s “love strategy” as a well-intentioned evasive maneuver. But as a woman who consciously performs, or mimics, the expectations of femininity, Catherine is hardly unaware of her actions, nor is she simply “crazy” as she offhandedly remarks. She may be experiencing a sense of psychological turmoil, but she is perfectly sane in her chosen method for dealing with it. She opens a space for agency between the cracks of wanting the lie and *knowing* it is a lie (a move akin to Wallace Stevens’s theory of a Supreme Fiction).

Hemingway reveals Catherine’s self-consciousness through her repeatedly calling attention to her role-playing. She often removes the mask, allowing her cynicism to cut through the romantic fantasy. When the two lovers first meet, Catherine makes comments revealing her relationship to the status quo. She asks Frederic why he joined the Italian army, and he replies, “There isn’t always an explanation for everything.” Catherine responds, “Oh, isn’t there? I was brought up to think there was” (18). The conversation then turns to the swagger stick Catherine carries, leading to the story of her dead fiancé and how the stick was sent to her by the boy’s mother as a memento of their love. These statements present Catherine as a young woman either influenced by the mandatory social codes of the dominant culture (“brought up”

to believe them) or dragged into them by those who still believe. The mother's act of sending the swagger stick demands that Catherine play the gendered role of the grieving sweetheart. Then a sudden shift in attitude occurs. She becomes a worldly, jaded modern woman, stating, "I didn't know about anything then" (19). Here Catherine refers to the fact that she never had sex with her fiancé (waiting for marriage seems to be another value she was "brought up" with), but the line also sets the reader up for the revealing dialogue that follows. When she started nursing on the front, Catherine imagined that her fiancé "might come to the hospital where I was. With a sabre cut, I suppose, and a bandage around his head. Or shot through the shoulder. Something picturesque." The brutal truth, however, is that "[t]hey blew him all to bits" (20).

This vacillation between romantic fantasy and hard-boiled cynicism informs many of the scenes where Catherine and Frederic are together. Chapter VI is the key early example, while her death scene is the best late one. In the former, she enacts a romantic drama, casting Frederic in the role of her dead lover. The dialogue proceeds with Catherine moving from one melodramatic line to the next, giving Frederic his script for the fantasy: "And you do love me?"; "Say, 'I've come back to Catherine in the night.'"; "I love you so and it's been awful. You won't go away?" Frederic as narrator intercedes to comment on how he thought she was "probably a little crazy" and on how he viewed the romancing as a game (30). But Catherine does as well, as he soon discovers when she takes off her mask:

This is a rotten game we play, isn't it?... You don't have to pretend you love me. That's over for the evening.... Please let's not lie when we don't have to. I had a very fine little show and I'm all right now. You see I'm not mad and I'm not gone off. It's only a little sometimes. (31)

Catherine manipulates condoned expectations of feminine behavior and desire—and Frederic's reaction suggests she has done it effectively. But when she verbally changes her costume, Hemingway is deconstructing gender, showing it as open to question and a self-conscious shaping. Not only can Catherine change her behavior and attitude, she is cognizant of the stereotypes and the expectations attached to them. Her use of terms associated with insanity to describe this transformation fall into an ambiguous gray

area. It's not that she is genuinely "crazy"; instead, she uses the word because at this early stage she knows this is the only framework Frederic (or herself for that matter) has to make sense of what she has done.<sup>4</sup> To be "mad" will explain away the disjunction between her feminine and cynical personae in a way that avoids deeper questions about the authenticity of gender. (And who wants to have that conversation on a first date?)

Hemingway presents the conflict between the surface performance of gender, as read by those outside Catherine, and her own interpretation of her behavior and utterances. Judith Butler's *Gender Trouble* deconstructs the nature/culture binary by theorizing identity as a performance that can be chosen and thereby parodied as a method of critique. Performativity conceptualizes how one's sense of self is formed but can also be reformed. Regulatory narratives naturalize categories of sex, gender, class, race and nationality to legitimate the status quo and to shape and contain identity. Butler's answer to this problem is to manipulate the forms of identity available to us:

[The] subject is not *determined* by the rules through which it is generated because signification is *not a founding act, but rather a regulated process of repetition* [of those enforced discourses and gestures, so] it is only within the practice of repetitive signifying that a subversion of [the imposed] identity becomes possible. (Butler's emphasis, 145)

Thus, one can "perform" an identity using the mainstream codes and meanings, but a parody of the naturalized role can expose that identity as a construct. To treat identity as something we can create gives us more options and some control over the self. This enables people to assume subjectivities that transgress the rules of gender identity; nevertheless, it is always dangerous ground, replete with both negative and positive potential, since one must often appropriate a negative stereotype the dominant culture uses to (mis)represent the Other.

Hemingway portrays this negative potential when Catherine claims she will copy the behavior of prostitutes—doing and saying exactly what the customer wants—to "be a great success" as Frederic's lover (although she will later speak of disliking this particular role [152, 294]). This scene contains those famously disturbing lines: "I want what you want. There isn't any me

any more. Just what you want" (105, 106). Has Catherine confused the difference between masquerade and mimicry? In Luce Irigaray's terms, masquerade is an alienated or false version of femininity arising from a woman's awareness of male desire for her to be his Other; therefore, a woman experiences desire not in her own right but as the man's desire situates her. For example, a woman who dresses to satisfy male desire fits herself into a certain image. Mimicry, like Butler's parody, occurs when the woman deliberately assumes the feminine style and posture assigned to her in order to uncover the mechanisms by which it exploits her. According to Irigaray:

One must assume the feminine role deliberately. Which means already to convert a form of subordination into an affirmation, and thus to begin to thwart it.... To play with mimesis is thus, for a woman, to try to recover the place of her exploitation by discourse, without allowing herself to be simply reduced to it. It means to resubmit herself...to "ideas," in particular to ideas about herself, that are elaborated in/by a masculine logic, but so as to make "visible," by an effect of playful repetition, what was supposed to remain invisible... (76)

There is desperation in Catherine's voice when she proposes to make herself into an object of desire, yet there is also a guarded, self-knowing sarcasm warning the reader to question her commitment to the idea. The sincerity of Catherine's submissiveness, along with her proclamations of love, becomes questionable when acting feminine is simply a choice. The idea of becoming "a great success" once she suppresses her self shows that she *hasn't* been doing this. Offering Frederic the fantasized image he desires and saying what he wants to hear reveal her ability to read male desire and treat sexuality as just another game, another series of strategic maneuvers to help her make sense of the world and survive in it.<sup>5</sup>

That this subversion is still rooted in hegemonic assumptions of femininity reveals the ever present problem with this method of transgression. The act may not be read ironically, or the agent herself may lose sight of the original purpose. Michel Foucault's theories of transgression and discursive practice offer a method for solving this quandary. Foucault defines transgression as "exposing the limits." Authors are actually more concerned with delineating the boundaries rather than attempting to move

beyond established restrictions. “The limit and transgression depend on each other for whatever density of being they possess: a limit could not exist if it were [sic] absolutely uncrossable and, reciprocally, transgression would be pointless if it merely crossed a limit composed of illusions and shadows” (“Preface to Transgression” 34). There is no existence beyond the limits—that is a void which can be neither narrated nor represented. In other words, only by going up to the edge of what is “condoned” can we imagine what is absent, what is excluded. While it may not affect the balance of power, acknowledging such cultural parameters gives a clearer idea of how the social world has been demarcated.

Foucault’s theory of discursive practice clarifies Catherine’s plan to create a modicum of personal freedom. He writes, “I am supposing that in every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organised and redistributed according to a certain number of procedures, whose role is to avert its powers and its dangers” (“Discourse” 216). “[R]ules of exclusion” proscribe certain forms of speech and content. In determining what is proper and acceptable, the dominant culture—Frederic’s faceless “They”—tries to prevent dangerous opposing ideas from public dissemination. Catherine’s voice and actions will not bring down the social order; she cannot be framed as a wholly subversive rebel. However, by having her expose the limits and call attention to the arbitrariness of the lines, Hemingway has Catherine move from blind acceptance of gender expectations to manipulating them as a means to an end.

These lines and limits can also be described as the borders of a society. Borders are a product of anxiety, a way of controlling what comes in and goes out. For Catherine, the demarcation of the permissible and the fear of border crossing are about condoned knowledge and the truth of representation (i.e. what is accepted as true). This apprehension is played out metaphorically in *A Farewell to Arms* when the couple absconds to Switzerland. As a deserting soldier, Frederic is literally a criminal, while Catherine is a figurative outlaw of gender. In taking a path that will decrease their chances of being spotted by the *guardia di finanza*, their cat-and-mouse game with the border patrol resonates with dual meaning. Switzerland is the safety zone where Catherine (and Hemingway) will be able to bend the concept of gender further than before. When the couple passes the Swiss border they are almost giddy, excitedly talking of what they will eat for breakfast and of how “fine” and “lovely” everything looks

instead of worrying about how they need to continue evading capture. Once the spatial borderline is crossed, they hope to move into a new psychic territory where they can become the arbiters of the permissible.

The Switzerland chapters are hardly a fantasy of utopian freedom and equality; they are more like an experiment in marking out a gray area cut short by Catherine's death. Even in the politically neutral space of Switzerland there are certain rules; for example, Italians are not allowed in Brissago due to the war, although it is more usual that "[t]here are always both sides at a customs town," as Catherine notes. The couple must deal with the Swiss lieutenant's routine questions, but once the money comes out, with their promise to visit his father's hotel, everything is all right and the mood becomes more "practical" (281). The two policemen in Locarno are no different, they obey the rules in a lazy way by asking rudimentary questions but are easily misdirected by Frederic. Their only concern is whose hometown offers the best winter sports. None of these uniformed authority figures exemplifies a strict adherence to the laws and codes. Their indifference, in pointed contrast to the interrogation Frederic witnesses on the front (223–224), is a sign of a new mood in a new space—perhaps even a new way of doing things.

Frederic and Catherine settle into a mountain chalet and over several months, as they wait for the baby, establish a peaceful life of unmarried bliss, although not a life free of gender convolutions. Marc Hewson describes Switzerland as "an area outside the masculine laws of war and, by extension, outside the laws governing gender identity" (57). His analysis builds on Hélène Cixous's theory of *écriture féminine*, arguing that the novel moves away from phallogocentric models and values. Hewson, like several pro-Catherine critics, still argues that she teaches Frederic how to love selflessly,<sup>6</sup> but his ideas on the couple's time in Switzerland are quite useful. Of special note is his discussion of hair (including Frederic's beard) as a code of gender that shows Catherine's willingness to "modulat[e] their gendered selves by playing with the conventions" (58). She speaks of cutting her long hair—abandoning the more traditionally feminine style—so they will look alike. Her statement, "I want us to be all mixed up," should affect how one reads those ostensibly self-negating lines about wanting to be like Frederic and not living when he is away (300). She does not desire an erasure of self, nor a simple reversal or inversion of their genders; instead, she is proposing to rewrite her identity by integrating a subjectivity that would locate her beyond "normal" gender patterns.

This interpretation is seemingly undercut by Catherine's repeated declarations of love for Frederic and the joy she feels with him; however, those moments are just an extension of the role she has chosen to construct her separate peace. Before going into labor, page after page depicts Catherine as a cloyingly happy but possessive and insecure "wife." This performance began at the Italian resort before they left for Switzerland (251), but now is conducted in such an extreme fashion that one should ponder its sincerity. One clue to reading this performance occurs soon after Catherine avows that she wants to "mix up" their identities. They are on the subject of how "crazy" she was upon their first meeting, when she says, "And I'm not crazy now. I'm just very, very, very happy" (300). Earlier pro-Catherine critics might take this as more proof of how love has cured her problems. I read it as proof that the *idea* of love is Catherine's sought-after cure. The thrice-repeated "very" strikes me more as Catherine trying to convince *herself*; she is desperate to believe she is happy living out the wifely part. Back in Italy she says she will "be ashamed" so as to comfort Fergy's sense of propriety (247). These are just words Catherine says to make her friend feel better, yet are they really that dissimilar from her admission in Switzerland that she does not wish to "offend any one" (309)? Does this help to explain the rationale behind the performance, especially the possibility of "offending" Frederic if she does not profess an undying love for him?

The dying comes three chapters later when the sanctuary of Switzerland is shown to be illusory (and the hospital scenes provide answers to the above questions). Catherine dies because there is no other way for Hemingway to conclude his argument about cultural constructs honestly. Catherine's gender experiment fails because the biology of her sex is a final trap she cannot escape. We should not interpret her death as Hemingway killing off a female hindrance to his male protagonist's freedom (Fetterley 60, 67); rather, Catherine dies in the ultimate performance of "what women do." What is "natural" to the female sex ultimately kills her.

The childbirth scene succinctly enacts the entire discursive battle Catherine has waged throughout the novel. When the contractions begin she wants to live up to the "good wife" role by bearing the pain "without any foolishness"; she even feels ashamed when the pain decreases, as though she is not living up to her gender (315). In a final attempt to conceal the negative with a facade of cheerful optimism she calls the pains "good ones." But the mask of dutiful femininity slips off when the pain grows and she turns to the anc-

thetic. The change is weighted with symbolism since the gas is delivered through a mask, now a substitute for the failed mask of femininity. Catherine's statements continually refer to her needing the gas: "I want it now," "I want it again," "*Give it to me. Give it to me*" (Hemingway's emphasis 316, 319; see my note 6). The gas numbs the fear of death, which is simultaneously the fear of life. The naturalized "good wife" is no longer in the room; she is replaced by someone who openly demands an artificial peace. The gas is a metaphor for traditional feminine identity. Both function to numb Catherine, helping her to escape her physical and psychic discomfort. And there is a suggestion that Frederic now grasps her dilemma when he makes a comment with a poignant double meaning: "Thank God for gas, anyway. What must it have been like before there were anesthetics?" (320).

Throughout the novel Hemingway occasionally gives the impression that Catherine has convinced herself that conventional gender roles are natural, but in the end only the gas can help. In the end, "marriage" and having babies—the old values—are futile salves to the disruptions of modernity. Once Catherine begs for more anesthetic by insisting she'll be "good," any prior talk of self-erasure becomes just romantic tripe used to conceal her feeling of being adrift and at the mercy of forces she cannot control. Conventional feminine identity was once the only thing she thought could bring order to her life, but it fails her when she admits, "They've broken me. I know it now" (323). As she dies, she turns on Frederic, telling him not to touch her, but then dons the feminine guise one last time by saying, "Poor darling. You touch me all you want" (330). But that is the last of it. Catherine ends her life with the hard-boiled stance she displayed when Frederic first met her: "I'm not afraid. I just hate it. . . . I'm not a bit afraid. It's just a dirty trick" (330, 331). John Beversluis argues that "Catherine dies still believing the Myth of Romantic Love" (24). I, on the other hand, don't read her as *ever* truly and wholly believing it, and in her final minutes there is no more acting, no more pretending, no more living up to social and cultural expectations—just a staring down of the facts with the cold eye of existential realism, a "masculine" grace under pressure rather than "feminine" hysteria.

The labor pains are symbolic of Catherine's life pains, so Hemingway's theory of the biological trap can be extended to include social definitions and limitations as other traps built upon biology. In short, nature kills, or, to be more specific, a closed, restrictive theory of the "natural" destroys both Catherine and her son. Hemingway does not always make this obvious, as I

have argued elsewhere, because he deploys a “politics of ambiguity,” a strategic uncertainty, to challenge the world’s supposed transparency. In *A Farewell to Arms*, Hemingway’s interrogation of gender gives the reader little, if anything, to base a sure system of morality or belief upon—not even love. The symbolic order demanding our obedience—Frederic’s “They”—will break us all sooner or later, men and women alike. A broader perspective would understand Hemingway’s purpose as a call for readers to view all ideologies—not just the ones about gender and identity—with deep suspicion.

I have not been able to include all of the large and small moments where Catherine knowingly performs a conventional gender role, or where she calls attention to Frederic’s doing the same, not to mention those places where they both disrupt gender stereotypes. Masculinity is also problematized in the novel, and in the same way, as Frederic strives to choose between competing male identities. Stephen Clifford even defines Catherine’s narrative function as being “to break down Frederic’s commitment to a masculine code of behavior” (246).<sup>7</sup> Yet it is the treatment of femininity I find most intriguing because it undermines not only the conventions of identity but also the stereotype of Hemingway as a simple misogynist. Neither discourse holds as absolutely true, and I believe this novel gives us the tools to understand why.

#### NOTES

1. See Spanier (76–80) for a detailed summary of the critical responses to Catherine Barkley. The newly published critical anthology, *Hemingway and Women*, contains only one essay dealing with *A Farewell to Arms* and Catherine Barkley at length—a possible sign of the low regard in which the novel and character are held when gender is the issue.
2. Some might find the formalist language of authorial intention a paradox in an essay informed by poststructuralist and postmodern theories. I have no problem mixing the two, but I don’t think they are quite so opposed in the first place. While later theorists emphasize the reader’s interpretation rather than a single correct analysis, they are also concerned with tracing and demystifying sources of power. In other words, there is still intention in the world. Yes, this is my interpretation of the novel and I’m making a case to prove it, but the supporting evidence, processed through a certain theoretical machinery, must come from the text. In other words, I’m willing to give Hemingway the benefit of the doubt that the novel’s apparent critique of gender roles was intentional.

3. Other critics who take this position include Hays, Lockridge, Stubbs, and Wexler. Linda Wagner Martin elaborates on the novel's similarities to the classic romance, where desire, not sex, is what keeps the plot in motion. I would argue instead that Catherine's use of romantic conventions actually ends up mocking them.
4. Hays and Spanier diagnose Catherine as suffering from war trauma. Wexler attributes Catherine's trauma to her guilt over not having sex with her fiancé before his death in battle.
5. The survivalist ethos I attribute to Catherine echoes the "code hero" rhetoric of Jake Barnes in *The Sun Also Rises*, who just wants to know "how to live" in the world. Thus, she becomes more than a tool of character development for Frederic. A parallel also exists between Jig in "Hills Like White Elephants" (1927) and Catherine. Jig appears to subjugate herself to the desires of her mate—"I don't care about me"—but she contradicts him and resists the American's attempt to stereotype her concerns as typically feminine when she says, "I don't [feel] any way. I just know things" (53). I consider this further proof that Hemingway's thoughts on gender in *A Farewell to Arms* are neither accidental nor an inexplicable anomaly since he was already working in a similar vein.
6. Hays points to this scene as proving Frederic learns how "to serve" and to love without concern for himself; his model has, of course, been Catherine. Hewson, Spanier, Stubbs, and Wexler all make the same point in their varied ways.
7. For other studies of masculinity in the novel see Cohen, Elliott, Hatten, Strychacz, and Solotaroff.

## WORKS CITED

- Barlowe-Kayes, Jamie. "Re-Reading Women: The Example of Catherine Barkley." In *Ernest Hemingway: Seven Decades of Criticism*. Ed. Linda Wagner-Martin. East Lansing: Michigan State UP, 1998. 171-184.
- Beverluis, John. "Dispelling the Romantic Myth: A Study of *A Farewell to Arms*." *The Hemingway Review* 9.1 (Fall 1989): 18-25.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Clifford, Stephen P. *Beyond the Heroic "I": Reading Lawrence, Hemingway, and Masculinity*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell UP, 1999.
- Cohen, Peter E. "'I Won't Kiss You...I'll Send Your English Girl': Homoerotic Desire in *A Farewell to Arms*." *The Hemingway Review* 15.1 (Fall 1995): 42-53.
- Comley, Nancy R. and Robert Scholes. *Hemingway's Genders: Rereading the Hemingway Text*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1994.
- de Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex*. 1949. Trans. H. M. Parshley. New York: Vintage, 1952.

- Elliott, Ira. "A Farewell to Arms and Hemingway's Crisis of Masculine Values." *LIT* 4 (1993): 291-304.
- Fetterley, Judith. *The Resisting Reader: A Feminist Approach to American Fiction*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1978.
- Foucault, Michel. "The Discourse on Language." *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Trans. Rupert Swyer. New York: Pantheon, 1972. 215-237.
- . "A Preface to 'Transgression.'" *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*. Trans. Donald E. Bouchard and Sherry Simon. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1977. 29-52.
- Hatten, Charles. "The Crisis of Masculinity, Reified Desire, and Catherine Barkley in *A Farewell to Arms*." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 4.1 (1993): 76-98.
- Hays, Peter I. "Ministrant Barkley in *A Farewell to Arms*." In *Hemingway in Italy and Other Essays*. Ed. Robert W. Lewis. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1990. 11-19.
- Hemingway, Ernest. *A Farewell to Arms*. 1929. New York: Scribner's, 1995.
- . "Hills Like White Elephants." *Men Without Women*. 1927. New York: Scribner's, 1997.
- Hewson, Marc. "'The Real Story of Ernest Hemingway': Cixous, Gender, and *A Farewell to Arms*." *The Hemingway Review* 22.2 (Spring 2003): 51-62.
- Irigaray, Luce. *Speculum of the Other Woman*. Trans. G.C. Gill. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1985.
- Lockridge, Ernest. "Faithful in Her Fashion: Catherine Barkley, the Invisible Hemingway Heroine." *The Journal of Narrative Technique* 18.2 (1988): 170-178.
- Slatoroff, Robert. "Sexual Identity in *A Farewell to Arms*." *The Hemingway Review* 9.1 (Fall 1989): 2-17.
- Spanier, Sandra Whipple. "Hemingway's Unknown Soldier: Catherine Barkley, the Critics, and the Great War." In *New Essays on A Farewell to Arms*. Ed. Scott Donaldson. New York: Cambridge UP, 1990. 75-108.
- Strychacz, Thomas. *Hemingway's Theaters of Masculinity*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State UP, 2004.
- Stubbs, John. "Love and Role Playing in *A Farewell to Arms*." *Fitzgerald/Hemingway Annual 1973*. Eds. Matthew J. Bruccoli and C. E. Frazer Clark, Jr. Washington D.C.: Microcard Editions Books, 1974. 271-284.
- Traber, Daniel S. "Whiteness and the Rejected Other in *The Sun Also Rises*." *Studies in American Fiction* 28.2 (2000): 235-53.
- Wagner-Martin, Linda. "The Romance of Desire in Hemingway's Fiction." In *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice*. Ed. Lawrence R. Broer and Gloria Holland. Tuscaloosa, AL: The U of Alabama P, 2002. 54-69.
- Wexler, Joyce. "E.R.A. for Hemingway: A Feminist Defense of *A Farewell to Arms*." *The Georgia Review* 35 (1981): 111-23.

# ABSTRACTS

## ARTICLES

“Very Short Stories:  
The Miniaturization of War in Hemingway’s *In Our Time*”

**Jim Barloon**

Examines the portrayal of war in *In Our Time*. Through his fragmentary sketches, Hemingway invented a form—the vignette or “miniature”—to delineate the surrealistic horror of modern-day warfare. The vignettes constitute the miniaturization of war, drawn on a small scale not simply because one gets “scared sick looking at it,” but because the sketch more truly reflects the actual experience of war, testifying, by its very form, to a view of war as disordered and disjunctive.

“Nick Adams at a Windy Crossroads:  
Echoes of Past and Future Fictions in  
Ernest Hemingway’s ‘Che Ti Dice La Patria?’”

**Mark P. Ott**

Folder 727 of the John F. Kennedy Library’s Hemingway Collection contains an unpublished, one-paragraph fragment describing a cold wind blowing the dust off a road and a bridge. Both the catalog and Paul Smith identify the fragment as belonging to the short story “Che Ti Dice la Patria?” Together, fragment and published short story reveal Hemingway at an intriguing artistic crossroads. Their imagery reverberates from Hemingway’s earlier Nick Adams stories through his novel *A Farewell to Arms* to his late memoir *A Moveable Feast*.

“Performing the Feminine in *A Farewell to Arms*”

**Daniel S. Traber**

The critical record on *A Farewell to Arms* exhibits a decided split on whether readers approach the characterization of Catherine Barkley as proof of Hemingway’s misogyny—or his feminism. This essay takes the

latter position by reading Catherine as a device for questioning gender roles and their social function. Catherine takes control of her subjectivity by deploying a “woman-in-love” persona that allows her to maneuver in an ambiguous world. Recognizing the socially constructed nature of femininity, she manipulates gender expectations as a means to an end.

“*Death in the Afternoon* As Seen by Tomás Orts-Ramos (Uno al Sesgo)”

**Nancy Bredendick**

In 1933, the Spanish bullfight critic Tomás Orts-Ramos reviewed *Death in the Afternoon* as a highly successful effort to distance the corrido from all that is primitive and barbarous, and to attract more fans in the English speaking world. After summarizing negative views also inspired by the book, my essay explores Orts-Ramos’s enthusiasms and reservations about *Death in the Afternoon* and notes his effort to place them in the context of problems facing bullfight writing in his time. Of more than just historical interest, Orts-Ramos’s review brings into sharp focus how central the formation of new aficionados is to the work.

“Reclaimed Experience:

Trauma Theory and Ernest Hemingway’s Lost Paris Manuscripts”

**Marc Seals**

Ernest Hemingway wrote about the 1922 loss of his early Paris manuscripts in four major published works—*A Moveable Feast*, *Islands in the Stream*, *The Garden of Eden*, and *True at First Light*—although Hemingway’s editors have not always included the episode in the published versions. His repeated writing about this loss might have served as a sort of creative flashback, allowing him to face and deal with the trauma. When these works are read in order of composition and in light of modern trauma theory, a pattern of forgiveness and psychological healing emerges.

“*Vie hors serie, fin dramatique*:

The Paris Press Coverage of the Death of Ernest Hemingway”

**John Bittner**

The fact that Ernest Hemingway died on the 4<sup>th</sup> of July weekend (generally a quiet time for news) contributed to the amount and prominence of press coverage his death received in the United States. In France, there was no similar “news hole” for that period: in July 1961, the press was much