

CHAPTER 2

ELEMENTS OF MASOCHISM IN HEMINGWAY'S WORK

Hemingway's depictions of masochism, by turns subtle and dramatic, abound in his most important works. This chapter discusses the most salient features of masochism as recognized by commentators, both those within psychoanalysis and those who question many of its premises. Among these are fetishism, humiliation, suspense, the contract, and pain. Sodomy, while it is inherently masochistic, may not be common to all masochists. Yet it *was* important to Hemingway and is discussed below. But I would like to begin by touching upon another theme common but not exclusive to masochism that runs throughout Hemingway's fiction: the desire of the male and female lovers to merge their identities into one, an idea that radically questions theories of sexual difference. This desire for a symbiosis has become an important element in recent theorizations of masochism. Hemingway's preoccupation with this theme merits some exploration.

SYMBIOSIS AND THE RESISTANCE TO INDIVIDUATION

Many Hemingway scholars have noted the numerous attempts of his male and female lovers to blur their identities into each other's. In a perceptive essay Gajdusek (writing of *The Sun Also Rises*) states: "without the cross-over into the always dangerous territory of the other, and a moment of psychic integration with the other, without the daring and surrender of self that take place when *two become one*, there is no possible redemption" (emphasis in original 40). Gajdusek suggests that Hemingway knows deeply "the male way to heterosexual love is through recognition that the 'otherness' is part of oneself, and the supremely necessary male act is to dismember and eradicate . . . the fear of it" (40). Gajdusek sees this process as a necessary step

toward individuation that takes place in Hemingway's characters and in most "successfully" socialized heterosexual males. The idea of individuation is important to psychoanalysis and has been treated at length by Freud, Jung, Lacan, and others. Yet, one can make a case that Hemingway's characters dwell so excessively upon the idea of symbiosis that they resist individuation and seek defiantly to remain within the protective sphere of the Other.

In her cinematic study, Studlar remarks that, "[s]eparation is required by masochism's structure of desire, a desire that seeks to overcome individuation and restore symbiosis but cannot tolerate the danger of closing the gap" (180). She refers to "the fundamental human conflict of symbiosis/separation" and finds it at work in the films she discusses and in masochism in general (193). This view approximates Jacques Lacan's "myth of the lamella," which he adapts from Plato's *Symposium*.¹ In the *Symposium*, Aristophanes states:

The sexes were not two as they are now, but originally three in number; there was man, woman, and the union of the two, having a name corresponding to this double nature, which had once a real existence, but is now lost, and the word "Androgynous" is only preserved as a term of reproach.²

Human beings who were of box sexes, according to the story, were proud and content but also so terrible that the gods feared them and so split them in two. Humanity was so unhappy at this disunion that life became a constant effort to re-achieve a unity with the self. The idea behind this myth is the basis of much of psychoanalysis. According to Lacan, "the search by the subject [is not] of the sexual complement, but of the part of himself, lost forever, that is constituted by the fact that he is only a sexed living being" (205). The striving for such symbiosis is a rebellion against the individual "sexed living being," the idea of sexual difference. This pursuit of the forever elusive union with the self is conducted through sexuality. In Freud (and Lacan) this sought-after unity has affinities with the desire to be one with the mother, to return to a pre-birth state, or even the desire for a sibling. To complement the story of Aristophanes related by Lacan, Eby finds a possible source of incestuous desire in an alternative take on the myth of Narcissus offered by Pausanias in the second century (170). According to his view, Narcissus was not in love so much with himself as with his sister. Upon her death, he saw her image in his own reflection in the water and in this he recognized that "part of himself," which he thought was "lost forever" in Lacan's

words. Eby writes that this “would have sounded remarkably familiar to Hemingway” (170).

This desire for symbiosis contains elements of narcissism and the seeking of the subject’s self in another, or a yearning to be at the breast or in a pre-birth stage. Individuals may attempt to satisfy this desire by many different means including masochism. The important point is that the goal of the drive is a union with a part of the self. This ideal union can be approximated through a desire for the pre-Oedipal “oral mother” as Deleuze contends. Or it can also take the form of a desire for a sibling. In the case of Hemingway, his aversion toward his mother precludes a conscious desire for her. Yet this aversion does not extend to his sisters with whom he was close. Hemingway’s lovers often demonstrate a propensity to treat each other almost as brother and sister, or to attempt to merge their dual identities into one. This provides an example of the “symbiosis/separation” that Studlar describes. Such desire for this symbiosis/separation characterizes masochism. Of this desire, Smirnoff states: “The symbiotic relation, as found in masochism, makes use of suffering, pain, and humiliation, not in order to obtain pleasure, but as a symbolic representative of both the unattainable fusion with [and] the impossible separation from the primary sexual object” (72). Hemingway’s lovers consistently seek this “unattainable fusion.”

Many of Hemingway’s depictions of sexual relationships between men and women demonstrate the couple’s desire to merge identities: to “both be alike” (AFTA 299); “brother and sister” (FWTBT 67); “can’t tell who is who” (GOE 17); or “Couldn’t I be you?” and “I’m you now” (ARIT 146). In the early story “Soldier’s Home,” young Helen says to her older brother Harold, “Couldn’t your brother really be your beau just because he’s your brother?”³ The posthumously published, “The Last Good Country,” which Lynn calls a “filial love story” (57) centers on the travels of a young Nick Adams and his sister, Littless, who run away from home together. Littless cuts her hair short to match her brother’s and at one point, “sat on his lap and held her arms around his neck and rubbed her cropped head against his cheek” while telling him an imaginary story about being a “whore’s assistant.”⁴ After too much of this kind of talk, Nick tells her, “Get off my lap,” (532) because as Lynn suggests, “he gets an erection” (57). Such explicit incestuous desire for a sibling indicates that although Hemingway wished to disavow the mother, he did not feel an alienation from the totality of the female sex. Hemingway’s potential lovers in *A Farewell to Arms*, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, *Across the River*, *The Garden of Eden*, and other works express the wish to merge identities as an approximation of such a pre-Oedipal symbiosis.

Lacan stresses “the essential affinity of every drive with the zone of death” (199). These pre-Oedipal desires can never be fulfilled in life. They seek an idealized possibility in death and represent *Thanatos*, the Death Instinct. Of masochism’s flirtation with death, Studlar writes:

In choosing death, an ambiguous, even illusory triumph is created, especially in masochism, where desire is secretly ruled by the infantile fixation. Death provides a victory over the limitations of repressive reality and the promise of a transcendence of socially bound identity. It offers the only possible liberation from the repetition of desire. (84)

Masochism’s relationship with the Death Instinct finds expression in Phillips’s comment that in masochism, “one gets a foretaste of mortality” (154). Studlar asserts that “masochism’s obsession with death may be interpreted either as the expression of a universal urge or as the result of the masochistic wish for complete symbiosis with the mother and a return to nothingness” (123). Because the masochist does not, in reality, seek death, the apprehension of the object of desire can only be accomplished through some degree of fantasy.

In an alternative ending in the manuscript of *The Garden of Eden*, discussed by Robert E. Fleming, David and Catherine Bourne contemplate a suicide pact in an effort to affect a permanent symbiosis.⁵ Catherine looks back with regret and says to David, “Remember when I used to talk about anything and everything and we owned the world? . . . All we had to do was see it and we owned it.”⁶ She is chastened now after her breakdown and confinement at an asylum in Switzerland. “If it goes bad again,” she continues, “so I’d have to go back to the place, can I, may I do it the way Barbara did?”⁷ Catherine is referring to the suicide by drowning of Barbara Sheldon after the death of her husband Nick in the same novel. She asks David, “Would you do it with me?” And he says, “Sure.”⁸ As Sacher-Masoch writes: “Nothing comes easier or more naturally to lovers than mutual suicide.”⁹ Eby finds that the provisional ending of *The Garden of Eden* “holds out the possibility of merger in mutual obliteration” and “acknowledges the fundamental loss masked by the fetish” (258). Dying together represents a fantasy of overcoming the separation and achieving a symbiosis and reunion.

FETISHISM

Another method of seeking what Smirnoff calls the “unattainable fusion with . . . the primary sexual object” (72) is through the fetish.

Studlar remarks that “children, regardless of sex, use *transitional objects* to ease the separation from the mother” (emphasis in original 40). According to some researchers and theorists, the fetish provides the tangible and very physical link between the child and the idealized mother and allows at least an illusory sense of reunion that can be realized through the agency of fantasy. Eby exhaustively explores the many manifestations of *Hemingway’s Fetishism* and any attempt to add to his discussion presents a daunting task. The following brief notes build upon his work and hopefully complement it, even if occasionally disagreeing.

Deleuze writes that “there can be no masochism without fetishism in the primary sense” (32). Deleuze indicates Freud’s view of the fetish that at the sight of the female genitals, the male believes the female has been castrated and finds comfort in “the image or substitute of the female phallus” (31). Studlar quotes Freud’s assertion that the fetish itself “saves the fetishist from becoming a homosexual by endowing women with the characteristics which makes them tolerable as sexual objects” (209). Here again, Freud seems to assert that the masochist or fetishist does not realize that he actually is, or should be (or would be without psychoanalysis at any rate), homosexual. Psychoanalysis finds that the fetish, as an Oedipal phenomenon, allows the individuation and socialization of potentially dysfunctional males. Studlar again quotes Freud who wrote “the fetish is a penis-substitute for the missing penis of the mother and hence a means of defense against castration anxiety—and nothing else” (40). While not agreeing entirely with Freud’s proposition, Deleuze nevertheless continues by identifying several characteristics:

Fetishism is first of all a disavowal (“No, the woman does not lack a penis”); secondly it is a defensive neutralization [as opposed to a negation] . . . in the third place it is a protective and idealizing neutralization (for the belief in the female phallus is itself experienced as a protest of the ideal against the real; it remains suspended or neutralized in the ideal, the better to shield itself against the painful awareness of reality). (31–32)

Eby’s compelling psychoanalytical portrait of Hemingway accepts the Freudian view of the fetish as the substitute for the mother’s imagined penis. Yet Eby also states that the fetishist “disavows not only the penisless state of women, he disavows sexual difference itself,” (171) which represents a considerable broadening of Freud’s more narrow approach to the fetish as “a defense against castration—and nothing else.”

Anthony Storrs calls fetishism, not a perversion, but “a triumph of human imagination.”¹⁰ This imagining or “memory” of the female phallus forms the basis of Freudian explanations of fetishism.

Theories of masochism are divided on the issue of the female phallus. According to Deleuze, the imagining that goes into masochism ascribes a phallic authority to women that finds symbolic representation in the fetish. Silverman and Studlar appear to disagree though for different reasons. Silverman claims that “the castration which is synonymous with sexual difference is not endemic to the female body” and calls attention to “projection” by which “female subjectivity represents the site at which the male subject deposits his lack” (60). Other scholars discussed by Studlar dispute that the fetish must constitute solely the restoration of an imagined female “lack” and hold that if “the male child wants to be united with the first object of oral gratification and erotic stimulation as well as have the breast (and perhaps the womb) himself, then fetishization of the female reflects the child’s disavowal of lack in relation to the mother” (41).¹¹ Paraphrasing some of these theories, Studlar, in agreement with Eby’s comment above, notes that the fetish represents “the child’s own wish to become both sexes” (40). Such a desire is incompatible with the revulsion and fear that, according to Freud, all males feel upon first viewing the female genitals. Studlar quotes John Ellis’s point that pornography, with its “massive dissemination of images of female genitals,” refutes Freud’s view of “the fright of castration which probably no male human being is spared” at the sight of a naked woman (39). Studlar also quotes Erik Ericson’s view that “it does not seem reasonable to assume that observation and empathy,” qualities so well developed in Hemingway, “would so exclusively focus on what is not there” (39). Studlar remarks that “Freud failed to adequately acknowledge or investigate the role of the mother as an active, independent, powerful, and even threatening figure” (15). Deleuze and Silverman appear to accept the basic Freudian concepts even while revising them, while Studlar seeks to remove the idea of “castration anxiety” and a corresponding “penis envy” from the formulae of fetishism. In all three cases, they seek to expand upon the theory of the fetish and its importance.

Hemingway exhibits many fetishes, among them his near obsession with hair-cutting and salons, which lead inexorably to sexual adventures. Smirnoff remarks that “[t]he close relationship between fetishism and masochism has so far not been sufficiently explored” and adds that the idealized woman “is actually taking the place of the fetish” (70). In Hemingway, as Eby points out “*The hair is itself*

a symbolic female phallus,' and all of Hemingway's fetishized women are phallic women" (emphasis in original 43). Often, but not always, Hemingway's women characters have short hair or talk about having it cut short. Brett Ashley in *The Sun Also Rises* exhibits "hair brushed back like a boy's" (22). When Marie Morgan in *To Have and Have Not* (1937), who sports a short coif, suggests that she may let her hair grow out, Harry tells her to "keep it like it is" (116).¹² Maria has a cropped haircut in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, as do many women in the short stories. Catherine Barkley in *A Farewell to Arms* talks about cutting her hair short and Catherine Bourne, in *The Garden of Eden*, cuts hers very short. In contrast, Renata in *Across the River* has long flowing tresses that appeal no less to the colonel than do the short hairstyles of Brett to Jake or Catherine to David Bourne. Barbara and Janet, in the deleted sections of *The Garden of Eden* and *Islands in the Stream*, also have long, shoulder-length hair and they make over their men in their own image.

Hair, for Hemingway, serves as a gateway to transgressive sexuality. The Bournes' matching short haircuts along with their nude sunbathing appear as part of an overall effort to transform their appearance, to sculpt their bodies to become almost interchangeable along the lines suggested by a sculpture by Rodin. Spilka and Burwell¹³ discuss the importance of Rodin's statue, "based on Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Baudelaire's *Les Fleurs du Mal*," that impressed the Bournes so greatly in a passage deleted from the published version of *The Garden of Eden* (Spilka 285). The statue depicts two naked women kissing and embracing and seeming to merge into one androgynous form. In bed together, Catherine reminds David of the Rodin statue and asks, "Are you changing like the sculpture?"¹⁴ This deleted dialogue occurs immediately before Catherine sodomizes David for the first time, which corresponds to page 17 of the published novel. Hemingway depicts both Catherine and David as endeavoring to merge and each to become "both sexes."

Hemingway indulged his passion for hair by becoming an amateur coiffeur himself, cutting and dyeing the hair of his fourth wife, Mary. Eby makes the point that in the years following World War II, this passion became a compulsion and that Hemingway worked obsessively, cutting and coloring not only Mary's hair but his own (201–203). He left behind a record of this in unpublished letters to Mary, in one of which he writes, "If a girl has a right to make her hair red I have—I've fought enough fights so no one can say anything to me. . . . So I will be a red-headed kitten when I see you."¹⁵ And only with difficulty was Mary able to dissuade her husband from having his

ear pierced and wearing an earring. Eby sees this as part of “Hemingway’s transvestic impulses” (212). Though he is careful to say that he cannot imagine “Hemingway posing in front of the mirror, wearing lipstick, high heels, and an evening gown,” Eby also “suspect[s] Hemingway occasionally imagined” such a “transvestic self-image” (212). While cross-dressing is not inherently masochistic, it has become a staple in many masochistic fantasies as “forced feminization.”¹⁶ Eby does not relate Hemingway’s fetishism to masochism. Although no evidence exists to support the contention that Hemingway was an occasional transvestite, if as Eby suggests, he crossed-dressed in his imagination, this fits into the masochistic ensemble. And Hemingway, no doubt, had memories of his childhood when he was forced by his mother to wear little girls’ outfits and this must have recurred to him painfully over the years. This may, indeed, be one of the reasons that he did not cross-dress even if part of him subconsciously wished to.

Another instance of fetishism—the amputee—occurs not only in *The Sun Also Rises* but also in a bedroom scene in *To Have and Have Not*. Harry has lost an arm in a gun battle. In bed with Marie, she tells him, “Go ahead. Go ahead now. Put the stump there. Hold it there. Hold it. Hold it now. Hold it” (114). Though not indicated in the text, the location of “there” can be surmised even without exclamation points which Hemingway disdains. In addition to Harry’s missing arm, ruined limbs characterize Colonel Cantwell and, of course, Jake Barnes. Of the women these three characters love, Eby suggests, “the erotic attraction to amputees, seen in Renata, Marie Morgan, or Brett Ashley, is a classic sign of penis-envy” (56). The physical liabilities of Cantwell, Harry Morgan, and Jake serve better to illustrate Silverman’s point that “the male subject, like his female counterpart, might learn to live with lack” (65). These characters embody lack as a permanent condition of their subjectivity. Rather than Renata, Marie, and Brett entertaining penis-envy, it seems more likely that Cantwell, Harry, and Jake wish to endow their lovers with the phallus. These Hemingway’s heroes divest themselves of a phallic sexual agency and transfer it to their wives or girlfriends. Their women accept this agency as a gift, a masochistic tribute, rather than necessarily desiring it in the first place.

Toni Morrison sees the obsessive suntanning of the characters in *The Garden of Eden* as the “fetishizing of color.”¹⁷ She sees the efforts of David and Catherine to darken themselves as an example of “Africanization,” a theme that her essay develops at length and that is discussed in Chapter 6. Fetishism also presents itself in *The Garden of Eden*

when Marita leaves her martini behind at the bar and David “raise[s] it to his lips and found as it touched his lips that it gave him pleasure because it was hers” (127). Evidence of fetishism occurs in *A Farewell to Arms* in the hospital when Catherine Barkley penetrates Frederic’s anus, as she administers an enema to him, which they both clearly enjoy. “There, darling,” she says, “Now you’re clean inside and out” (104). In case the reader has missed this, Frederic, as narrator, repeats on the next page, “I was clean inside and outside and waiting for the doctor” (105). The enema as fetish represents another common feature of masochism.

Another type of fetish appears in *A Farewell to Arms* in the description of Catherine in what seems almost a dominatrix outfit. She wears “hobnailed boots and a cape and carried a stick with a sharp steel point” (302)—a dream-image for a heterosexual male masochist seeking female domination. In Frederic’s first meeting with Catherine, she carries a curiously fetishistic accessory. Frederic describes her appearance: “Miss Barkley was quite tall. She wore what seemed to be a nurse’s uniform, was blonde and had a tawny skin and gray eyes. I thought she was very beautiful. She was carrying a thin rattan stick like a toy riding-crop, bound in leather” (18). This description of Catherine Barkley in her nurse’s outfit holding a riding crop could fit a professional dominatrix in certain scenarios. It is impossible to know if Hemingway deliberately tries to evoke such an aesthetic image here but, whether intentionally or not, he clearly does so.

A pictorial representation of the beloved constitutes a ubiquitous fetish for the masochist. In the opening chapter of *Venus in Furs*, Severin’s friend, the narrator, holds a long conversation with a marble statue of Venus. Lisa S. Starks, commenting on the masochistic aesthetic in Shakespeare’s *Antony and Cleopatra*, writes of its “emphasis on the frozen scene of artistic contemplation.”¹⁸ Starks finds an instance of this “frozen scene” in the famous description by Enobarbus of Cleopatra on her barge. In a passage in *The Sun Also Rises*, Brett Ashley assumes center stage in a similar *tableau vivant*. The scene takes place during the fiesta in Pamplona before the running of the bulls. The local Spaniards, joined by tourists, revel in the street as Jake relates: “Some dancers formed a circle around Brett and started to dance. . . . Brett wanted to dance but they did not want her to. They wanted her as an image to dance around” (155). The crowd transforms Brett into a virtual statue and continues to revel with pagan abandon. This conjures up the image of woman as sacred and immobile, a representation of a goddess with the power to nurture or destroy. Deleuze finds that for the masochist, “women become exciting when

they are indistinguishable from cold statues in the moonlight or paintings in darkened rooms” (69). Studlar echoes this point when she writes, “painting and statues, like masks and dolls, exemplify the iconic suspension of spatial and temporal laws, the delay of gratification, and masochistic contemplation in the art model” (153).

On a cold morning in Venice in *Across the River*, Colonel Cantwell asks Renata to pose: “Turn your hair sideways on top of this bridge and let it blow obliquely” (187), and as she assumes this position the colonel simply admires her impervious, statue-like radiance.¹⁹ The colonel gazes helplessly upon the frozen beauty of his beloved. Later, Renata presents a portrait of herself to the colonel, her description of which—“I look as though I were rising from the sea without the head wet” (93)—recalls Botticelli’s *The Birth of Venus*. The gift overwhelms the colonel and leads him to tell her, “I love you very much. You and you portrayed on canvas” (137). He props up the portrait in his hotel room and spends much of chapters XV–XVIII in conversation with this pictorial stand-in for Renata. Just as the narrator of *Venus in Furs* converses with the statue, Cantwell addresses the portrait: “I wish your mistress was here and we could have movement” (166). Earlier he suggests: “Portrait, keep your God-damn chin up so you can break my heart easier,” but regrets his mild profanity and, “felt shame for having talked to the portrait roughly” (160–161). Apparently offended, “‘The hell with you,’ the portrait said, without speaking, ‘You low class soldier’ ” (161). Insults and verbal humiliation provide essential components of the masochistic encounter. Here, the colonel puts the deprecating words in the mouth of the portrait, further investing his masochism with fetishism. The colonel allows himself the luxury of such suspense in his time alone with the portrait. When he next meets Renata he freely confesses, “Last night, and at first light, I talked to the portrait as though it were you” (193). These chapters demonstrate an extreme form of devotion to a female subject by the notoriously macho Hemingway and highlight another aspect of a devotion already apparent in Jake Barnes and Frederic Henry.

HUMILIATION

Eby comments on the role of humiliation in the manuscript of *The Garden of Eden*. Referring to the unconventional hairstyles of Nick Sheldon and David Bourne, which they sometimes feel obliged to hide, Eby writes that the “very fact that the male protagonist needs to be coerced into wearing the fetish implies a reluctance on his part that is inseparable from an element of humiliation,” and asks, “how,

then, is humiliation related to the preservation of masculinity and how can humiliation excite?" (258). Eby answers his question in the following paragraph by citing a case history involving verbal humiliation and cross-dressing, without however, calling it masochism. Humiliation is as important to masochism as the ritualized suffering at the hands of the dominant woman.

Several similarities between *Venus in Furs* and *The Sun Also Rises* reveal themselves in the humiliation of the masochistic subject. Jake Barnes's near physical castration by a war injury and his psychic emasculation by Brett demonstrate acute examples of suffering. Brett's public affair with the young bullfighter receives Jake's humiliating acquiescence. She tells the adoring Jake: "I'm mad about the Romero boy. I'm in love with him I think" (182). Similarly, in *Venus in Furs*, when Wanda first lays eyes on the Greek she instructs Severin to "find out immediately about the man we saw. . . . Oh, what a man!"²⁰ At Brett's insistence, Jake helps arrange her love affair with Romero. She tells Jake, "Oh, darling, please stay by. Please stay by me and see me through this" (184). Brett and Jake sit at a table in the café watching the bullfighters and their entourage at another table. Brett gives Jake his orders: "Ask him to come over to have a drink" (184). This reprises the scene in *Venus in Furs* in which Wanda, arranging a rendezvous with another suitor, orders the adoring Severin to "Take this letter to Prince Corsini" (226). Reflecting on her cruelty, Brett muses, "I've always done just what I wanted," and "I do feel such a bitch" (184). Jake does as he is told and introduces her to Romero and even translates for the bullfighter when his imperfect English fails him. Brett then dismisses Jake and he leaves the café as "[t]he hard-eyed people at the bull-fighter table watched me go. It was not pleasant" (187). Twenty minutes later, Jake returns to the scene of his public humiliation and finds Brett and Romero gone.

The rival for the affections of the superior woman represents, according to Deleuze, "the hope of a rebirth of the new man that will result from the masochistic experience" (66). In *Venus in Furs*, this role falls to the character of the Greek because "when he is idealized he foreshadows the outcome of masochism and stands in for the new man" (66). In *The Sun Also Rises*, Romero provides this same model. Spilka, in an early essay, rightly sees Romero as one of "the few remaining images of independent manhood" to whom Jake attempts to measure up.²¹ The humiliation of the subject in both *Venus in Furs* and *The Sun Also Rises* serves a higher purpose than degradation for its own sake. In both cases, it leads potentially to a renewed masculine awareness.

In the fantasy of *Venus in Furs*, Severin's final outrage at being whipped by the Greek with Wanda's encouragement leads him to reject his masochism, though many critics find a lack of sincerity in Sacher-Masoch's supposed "cure," including Smirnoff who calls the wish for such a cure an "absurd claim coming from a masochist" (66). Jake Barnes, on the contrary, does not disavow his masochism (or his pessimism) at the end of *The Sun Also Rises*. His masochism remains compatible with the "rebirth of the new man" that Deleuze describes (66). Through his suffering Jake achieves a rebirth of sorts as he rescues Brett Ashley and when she remarks on the "damned good time" they could have had, he replies, "Yes. . . . Isn't it pretty to think so?"—implying, perhaps, a willingness to continue with her and endure more suffering if she wills it (247). Hemingway actually wrote a few pages of a sequel to *The Sun Also Rises* in which both Jake and Brett appear, lending credence to the belief that the ending of the novel suggests possibilities for a renewal between them.²²

Brett's attitude toward Jake differs markedly from the pity or contempt one might expect from a woman who has cuckolded her man. Brett is so assured of her dominance over Jake (and many of the other male characters) that she does not need to pity him. For she loves him and tells him, "I simply turn all to jelly when you touch me" (26). She is well aware of what he suffers for her throughout the novel. Jake's sexual lack is difficult for Brett to bear and she refers to her love for him as a "hell on earth" (27) because of her frustration over his physical condition. But as a woman with sexual needs she seeks satisfaction from others. Despite Jake's lack and his masochistic devotion to her, Brett both respects him and relies on him. He is the only man in the novel who she can trust. In this sense, Jake has become a new man by transcending his suffering and emerging cleansed and renewed through his masochistic relationship with Brett.

Earlier in the novel, when Jake asks Brett to live with him, she replies, "I don't think so. I'd just *tromper* you with everybody. You couldn't stand it" (55). Jake assures her that he could because "I stand it now" (55). As we have seen, the despotic woman who takes on other lovers in the presence of the worshipping masochist forms an essential part of the literary fantasy in *Venus in Furs*. Jake acknowledges his humiliation and accepts it, just as Severin does. Jake, as narrator and Hemingway's presence in the text, exhibits a superior attitude toward another lovesick admirer of Lady Ashley, Robert Cohn, who "follow(s) Brett around like a poor bloody steer" (142). This characterization follows a conversation describing steers as the hapless victims of the bulls in the *corrida*. Cohn refers to Brett as Circe

“who turns men into swine” (144) and feels she is a “sadist.” But Mike Campbell taunts Cohn and corrects him by saying, “Brett’s not a sadist” (166) and indeed she is not for as we have seen, the dominant woman of masochism cannot be truly sadistic. Throughout the novel Brett’s triumphs over men do not come about through sadistic impulses but rather through an overabundance of empathy and attempts, however misguided, at communion. Brett’s humiliation of Cohn earns him Jake’s contempt because Cohn cannot accept the suffering she metes out to him, unlike the masochistic Jake who wallows in it.

SUSPENSE

Deleuze writes that “[w]aiting and suspense are essential characteristics of masochism” (70). He and others have remarked on the absence of an aggressive masculine impulse in masochism in favor of a deferred gratification heightened by suspense. This suspense works in two ways. First: the application and withdrawal of painful stimuli (which to the masochist is pleasurable) heightens the sense of anticipation and tension. The regular or irregular pauses that punctuate the lashes of the whip or the strokes of the cane would be one example of this suspense. The masochist waits for the punishment he is sure will come but the uncertainty of the timing gives rise to suspense. The other form of suspense occurs in the deferral of sexual gratification that, ironically, produces pleasure. We have seen this quality at work in the suspension of gratification that characterizes Colonel Cantwell’s night in the hotel with only the fetish of Renata’s portrait for company.

According to Studlar, “Masochistic pleasure does not reside exclusively in the whip or the kiss but also in the suspenseful anticipation of bringing the fantasy to life” (24). The deferral of male sexual gratification characterizes masochistic literature. Certainly, Jake Barnes suffers from this suspension of sexual satisfaction throughout *The Sun Also Rises*. He spends most of the novel in a state of suspended, deferred gratification, all the while longing for Brett and displaying a willingness to accompany her anywhere and even to introduce her to other men so long as he can remain in her presence. In *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, when Maria apologizes to Robert for being unable to have intercourse due to her pain, she proposes alternatives. Robert declines her offer, choosing to remain in suspense, to defer gratification, thinking, “I’ll need all of that there is tomorrow” (369), implying a sublimation of his sexual energy into the heroic actions he must undertake the next day. Robert refuses to seek sexual release without satisfying Maria. His refusal of Maria’s offer of some alternative sexual favor

occurs shortly before he lapses into “a voluptuousness of surrender into unreality that was like a sexual acceptance of something . . . only the delight of acceptance” (370). Robert here, despite his disappointment, demonstrates that, in Studlar’s words, “pleasure is taken in desire unfulfilled” (126). Siegel refers to this as “eroticized sexual frustration” (33). This escape into an unreality, an imagining, forms a crucial element in the masochistic aesthetic discussed by Studlar and Deleuze. Studlar remarks: “Stillness within movement creates a mystical suspension of time reflecting the ultimate masochistic entrapment of infantile fixation” (129). We have seen how, in *Across the River*, Renata controls the movements of the colonel, telling him when to move and when to keep still. He willingly submits to her commands and her entrapment of him in their erotic encounter in the gondola (141–147) and as Michael Reynolds notes, “Cantwell brings the young girl to a sexual climax” (216). Brenner suggests that the colonel “manually induced her [Renata’s] orgasm” (161) although the text is unclear about the details.

In a perceptive reading of *Across the River*, John Paul Russo argues that in this scene, Renata “experience[s] three orgasms to Cantwell’s none” (166). Russo, like Brenner (161), identifies the first orgasm at the point in which the narrator remarks that “the great bird had flown out of the closed window” (ARIT 144), which is not the first time that Hemingway has used a similar phrase as metaphor for sexual climax.²³ After this, while the colonel is eager to gratify Renata again she tells him: “But it is too soon now. Don’t you know how a woman feels?” When *she* is ready, after the colonel pours her a drink, Renata asks/orders him: “Let’s do it again, please, now I am in the lee” (145). The colonel and Renata cover themselves for shelter and at the point of her orgasm, “the girl had shifted too, under the blanket, with the wind getting under the edge of the blanket; wildly” (145). Afterwards, exalting in her satisfaction while appropriating the colonel’s military identity, Renata triumphantly declares, “I just took the city of Paris” (146). Renata suggests the third orgasm when she asks the colonel: “Do you think we could once more if it would not hurt you?” (147).²⁴ The colonel places Renata’s pleasure before his own and neither insists upon, nor is he offered, any corresponding sexual release as he remains in a suspenseful anticipation, which is gratification in itself. Like many women in contemporary erotic masochistic literature, Renata confirms, in Russo’s words, her “sexual terror” over the colonel (167). As Russo puts it: “Renata has satisfied her selfish desire: She has experienced three orgasms, avoided sexual penetration, and refused orgasm to her partner” (167). The colonel

gratefully submits to this treatment just as in much masochistic fiction the dominant woman declines genital penetration and denies orgasm to the submissive man. In *Renata and the colonel*, Hemingway renders characters who embody several of the qualities of the dominatrix and her slave.

THE CONTRACT

The importance of the contract to masochism comes, like so much else, from *Venus in Furs*. Severin and Wanda sign a contract giving her virtual power of life and death over him. The contract, or at least a verbal agreement, forms an important part of many masochistic relationships according to some of its adherents. Whether a written or verbal contract characterizes all such relationships is open to question but enough comment on this point has been offered that it should not be ignored. In the form of the contract, according to Deleuze, “the masochist aims not to mitigate the law but on the contrary to emphasize its extreme severity” (91). The contract, he suggests, represents a means of usurping patriarchal authority from the father and transferring it to the mother. Deleuze adds, “The masochistic contract excludes the father and displaces onto the mother the task of exercising and applying paternal law” (93) and “leads straight into ritual” (94). In Hemingway’s work, both the mother and father are excluded as he elevates other women as objects of respect and reverence.

Jeffrey Jerome Cohen argues that “contractual gender” had become standardized by the twelfth century when Chrétien’s romance of Lancelot and Guinevere was written.²⁵ Cohen reads this tale through the paradigm of the masochistic contract. Masochism disrupts traditional gender relations by undermining the historical function of the contract. By doing so, according to Tania Modelski, “the entire system is exposed as a mockery.”²⁶ Deleuze writes that in “the contractual relation the woman typically figures as an object in the patriarchal system” and the very notion of the contract “is thereby implicitly challenged, by excess of zeal, a humorous acceleration of the clauses and a complete reversal of the respective contractual state of man and woman” (92). According to Cohen’s analysis:

By foregrounding agency within the paradigm of power, contractual gender opens up the dangerous possibility that sexual relationships could be figured otherwise [than “essential” norms of masculine and feminine]; even more disturbing, when a gender relationship is based upon a reconfigurable contract, it denaturalizes “sex,” “gender,” and

the power relationships of all kinds invested in imbuing these terms with their cultural meanings.²⁷

Cohen, like Deleuze, emphasizes the importance of the social history of the contract. The masochist usurps, subverts, and parodies the use of the contract that had become almost a secular sacrament in bourgeois ideology.

The contract's centrality in many masochistic relationships seems important because of the element of ritual it provides and the partners' potential enjoyment of the formal exchange of power. Masochism can, of course, exist without any contract simply by mutual agreement. Nowhere in Hemingway's work, of course, can we find anything as explicit as a masochistic contract. But in *The Garden of Eden*, Catherine's assurances of discretion to David represent both his consent to her appropriation of the phallus and their verbal contract to protect their secret. Catherine gives her word to David, "We won't let the night things come in the day" (22). Later she tells him more explicitly: "I will only be a boy at night and I won't embarrass you," and adds, "Don't worry about it please" (56). Clearly she means to reassure him that she loves him, that in the daytime he can still be the man, and that she will not compromise him either in front of others or in his own eyes, but that in the evenings he belongs to her will. Catherine's remarks here imply the kind of discretion that Hemingway would have demanded in his own marriages, and constitute a version of the masochistic contract.

Phillips describes the contract as "a private game, a psychosexual adventure, primitive and sophisticated at once, relying on trust, humour, acting ability and emotional elasticity" (25). Her remarks highlight the theatrical aspect of masochism and the contract constitutes one of its major props. Phillips also emphasizes the sense of humor. To see the contract as the actual surrender of all agency from one person to another would miss its point as a self-conscious "act" and its sense of what Phillips calls "daring playfulness" (25). Catherine in *The Garden of Eden* certainly exhibits this "daring playfulness" as she brings a reluctant David into her sexual schemes. It is only when she moves outside of the sexual realm that she becomes a threat and David abrogates the contract.

PAIN, VIOLENCE, DEATH, AND EMPATHY

In addition to fetishism, suspense, humiliation, and the contract, we have seen how bodily pain features prominently in most Hemingway

texts. Aside from his wounded heroes, he writes with obvious relish about the suffering and death of everything from soldiers and civilians to horses and bulls. Edward Said calls *Death in the Afternoon*, for example, a “studious rendering of the mechanics of ritualized suffering.”²⁸ Hemingway’s vision of life as malevolent and hostile demands a degree of surrender to its violent torrents. This surrender must take place on both the physical and psychic planes as the wounded body meshes with the wounded soul. In the masochistic worldview, woman as the natural force inflicts these wounds and this suffering. In turn, the nurturing of women gives the man strength to face his inevitable physical and emotional suffering. Hemingway’s fiction is replete with wounded masculinity. Nearly all the novels feature a man in pain as the hero and many of the short stories are built around this theme including “The Gambler, the Nun and the Radio,” “In Another Country,” “The Capital of the World,” “A Natural History of the Dead,” and many others. Often the wounds are psychological, as in “A Way You’ll Never Be,” “Soldier’s Home,” and “Homage to Switzerland.” A willingness to surrender to pain, physical or psychic, dominates Hemingway’s texts. The idea of surrender is pervasive and sensual even when not directly involving sexual activity. But the important element remains the notion of surrender.

Many wounded figures stalk through Hemingway’s fiction. Many of these characters experience a keen sense of psychological alienation as well. Commenting on masochism in the work of Sacher-Masoch and Richard Wagner, Stewart writes “men were viewed as already wounded or fragmented, subjected and enslaved to modern civilization by their own desires, which, of necessity, remained unfulfilled” (13). Many Hemingway characters, quintessential expressions of the “lost generation,” combine both physical pain and thwarted desires, and fit Stewart’s description. In Hemingway’s world, pain presents itself as inevitable and he embraces it in its many manifestations. These range from the physical wounding of his characters, the painful submission to sodomy that brings sexual pleasure, and the general physical and psychological submission to women who alternately discipline, degrade, and sustain the suffering male.

Although the physical wounds in Hemingway’s fiction do not, of course, result from masochistic sexual activity, their preponderance, together with nonphallic sexuality and passive sodomy, convincingly demonstrate masochism. According to psychoanalysis, masochism first becomes apparent in infantile sexuality when desire for an incestuous relationship with the mother or the father is repressed. The child becomes aware of the sense of guilt in association with the incestuous

desire. The parent metamorphoses into the punishing authority rather than the loving nurturer. The desire for the incestuous relationship becomes a desire for punishment by the father. As Dorothy Hayden points out, “The fantasy of being beaten becomes the meeting place between the sense of guilt and sexual love.”²⁹ Hemingway exhibits the sense of guilt in much of his work. Deleuze, however, questions the overall accuracy of the Freudian Oedipal model and presents alternative routes to masochism insisting that the father must be “disavowed,” not transformed into the punisher. Hemingway goes one better and disavows both the mother and the father. Though he does not express “the fantasy of being beaten,” he hardly needs to, given the variety of physical suffering to which he subjects his characters.

Masochism nearly always involves the application of some degree of violence, usually not very severe, or at least the threat of it. In the light of some revisionist interpretations of Hemingway’s work, his cult of masculine violence needs reemphasis. Violent activity foregrounds the action in *A Farewell to Arms*, *To Have and Have Not*, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, and *Islands in the Stream*, and many short stories. The memory of past violence informs both *The Sun Also Rises* and *Across the River*. The violence of blood sports forms the objects of scrutiny in *Death in the Afternoon* and *Green Hills of Africa*. Virtually the entire Hemingway *oeuvre* is invested with violence and a malevolent vision of the world. A disturbing aspect of this preoccupation reveals itself in not only the act of violence but also with the results of such acts, that is, dead bodies. Much of Hemingway’s writing, from the very earliest to the latest, dwells on observations of death. Much of this dying is done by the animal victims of blood sports but primarily Hemingway presents human death. This near obsession surfaces abruptly in the collection, *In Our Time*, the book that established Hemingway’s reputation. In the introductory pages, “On the Quai at Smyrna” (added when Scribners republished the collection), Hemingway presents wartime images of dead civilians, women clutching dead babies, corpses floating in the harbor, and crippled mules abandoned in the water of the bay. As Jeffrey Meyers points out, this vignette conveys Hemingway’s empathy with both the human and animal victims of cruelty (101). Images of death and serious injury proliferate in *In Our Time*: German soldiers get picked off as if in target practice; revolutionaries hang six cabinet ministers; cops shoot down Hungarian “wops”; bulls gore matadors and horses; a man commits suicide by slitting his throat with a razor; a punch-drunk boxer receives blows from a blackjack; five prisoners are hanged. Edmund Wilson, in his introduction to *In Our Time*, points to the

focus of Hemingway's work as the exploration of "[s]uffering and making suffer, and their relation to the sensual enjoyment of life."³⁰ This reflects Studlar's comment that "characteristic of the masochistic scenario of desire is the participant-players' assumption of various ego or superego positions, their shift in power positions from inflicting to receiving pain" (52). The remarks of both Wilson and Studlar imply sadomasochism but the quality of empathy lifts Hemingway's work above true sadism. Wilson sees this as "always in the long run, a losing game" (xi), further suggesting a type of moral masochism. Hemingway adopted the code of the sportsman as the best method (vague as it is) to negotiate the world. Accepting the inherent hostility of the world, one could at least play by its rules and view the suffering of others with empathy since such suffering could easily fall upon oneself.

Moral masochism, defined by Freud as one mode of this "perversion," occurs due to an "unconscious sense of guilt" and becomes apparent when "[t]he suffering itself is important" regardless of who or what brings it about (XIX 165–166). This has some relation to the "self-defeating personality disorder" that modern psychiatry had substituted for the term "masochism." Silverman defines moral masochism as occurring, "when the ego begins to enjoy and indeed to provoke the super-ego's severity" (160). It seeks an expiation of guilt and exists in some individuals who wish to suffer violence and a martyrdom similar to that of Jesus Christ and other Christian saints. Starks maintains

[T]he representation of spirituality in terms of physical and mental anguish does not preclude the erotic; indeed, it indicates its involvement in the erotic. Physical and mental torments lie at the heart of the erotic fantasies underlying Christian mysticism and, in varying degrees, the discourses of medieval and early modern Christianity, a belief system that revolves around the central sacrifice of Christ.³¹

Although Silverman distinguishes between its "moral" and "Christian" varieties (197), both can represent a kind of masochism with a cause. But rather than fixate moral masochism as a species distinct from the other masochisms of psychoanalysis, it seems more appropriate to view it as merely an element often present in masochism proper. Hemingway and his characters accept their many injuries as an integral part of human experience and the best of them suffer these wounds as stoically as Christian martyrs. As H.R. Stoneback argues in detail, Hemingway took his Catholicism much more seriously than most biographers acknowledge and his embrace of this

religion was neither “nominal” nor “bogus.”³² And while Stoneback may overestimate these religious convictions, Hemingway appears to have had a great respect for the Church throughout his life even if he did not practice the religion very faithfully and heaped scorn upon some of its representatives.³³ The sensuality inherent in Hemingway’s view of suffering as both morally and physically redemptive, does not contradict his self-identification as Catholic.

More than one driving force works in the desire of the masochist. Commentators have suggested that the early Christian flagellants may have gratified the libido while mortifying the flesh. Krafft-Ebing cites examples of cases of “the excesses of religious enthusiasm” (212, 237). Clearly, the highly developed moral sense typical of the purer forms of Christianity would present itself to the religious flagellant. A sophisticated sense of compassion and empathy would accompany this highly developed morality. As Christopher Newfield points out, Hawthorne provides an example of a religious flagellant in Reverend Dimmesdale in *The Scarlet Letter*.³⁴ Newfield maintains that Dimmesdale’s masochism serves no larger social purpose other than to expiate his own guilt. Yet, the expiation of guilt combined with a larger social compassion can reveal themselves in empathy. A belief in the sense of a guilt shared by all of God’s human creations is, of course, a cornerstone of Christian belief. Hemingway’s fiction secularizes this essential Christian empathy. The bodies of his characters provide the site upon which the punishments of fallen humanity are visited. His preoccupation with the suffering of others represents not a sadistic voyeurism but a relatively pure empathy toward those in physical or psychological distress. This is most apparent, perhaps, in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, as the victims of both fascist and loyalist violence are portrayed with empathy.

Further violence occurs in the famous scene of the retreat from Caporetto in *A Farewell to Arms* in which Frederic Henry narrowly escapes a firing squad. Hemingway shows compassion for the hapless Italian officers forced to pay with their lives for the incompetence of their superiors. *To Have and Have Not* features graphic civilian violence among the smugglers and Cuban exiles of Key West. *For Whom the Bell Tolls* takes place, literally, in an armed camp. In the posthumous *Islands in the Stream*, hero Thomas Hudson methodically removes bullets from badly decayed dead bodies, victims of a massacre that occurred over a week earlier (322–326). These victims have been exposed to the ravages of tropical heat and scavenging land crabs but Hudson does not flinch as he stoically completes his grim task. The same novel contains a seemingly gratuitous reference to the

dismembered corpse of a woman found in a river bed (240). This incident does nothing to advance the plot of the novel and seems to provide nothing more than another excuse to depict a gruesome corpse. Indeed, many of the episodes in *Islands in the Stream* seem disconnected and it has generally been regarded as an artistic failure though recent criticism, especially the work of Burwell, has somewhat altered this view. Yet Hemingway knew, as publishers have long known, that random visitations of scenes of mayhem jolt the reader and rivet attention. What allows Hemingway's work to rise above the sensational in such scenes is his enduring quality of empathy.

The short story "A Natural History of the Dead," consists, in part, of a taxonomy of death in which Hemingway seems to indulge a juvenile urge to shock his readers. Hemingway saw significant action in a noncombatant position in World War I when he was still little more than an adolescent. He covered both the Spanish Civil War and World War II in the role of a supposedly unarmed journalist. (However, Hemingway continually went about armed to the alarm and dismay of his fellow journalists.) He personally witnessed death at close range. He and Martha Gellhorn spent time in China during the brutal Japanese occupation. Even before American troops were committed to World War II, Hemingway organized, and got government backing for, a dangerous if somewhat farcical submarine-hunting expedition in the Caribbean. Hemingway's portrayal of violence in nearly all of his work indicates almost a morbid interest in the death and dying he so often witnessed. He was wounded in World War I and suffered many physical injuries throughout his life, from gunshots to plane crashes. His literary expressions of extreme violence seem remote from the much more mild forms of violence usually associated with masochism. Yet the propensity to absorb violence as both observer and recipient marks the Hemingway code hero and this heroic quality is consistent with personal masochism. As Siegel states, "what is generally called heroism involves the conscious choice of suffering. To this extent all literature exists in reference to an intertext that connects masochism with a kind of idealized masculinity" (33). Hemingway, more than most authors, embodies this intertextuality as his characters willingly endure suffering and even certain death, as does Robert Jordan when he chivalrously sends Maria to safety in an act of individual heroism in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Robert's act presents itself as all the more unselfish as he places the security of Maria and his comrades above his own. Robert's heroism is not unrelated to his self-denial, his "pleasure taken in desire unfulfilled" (in Studlar's words) in his lovemaking with Maria. This sensual quality of his heroism does not diminish it.

At times, some of Hemingway's battered characters express pleasure in receiving their injuries. An unnamed alcoholic vet in *To Have and Have Not* confesses to the "secret" of how he can take so much punishment. "It don't hurt," he says, "Sometimes it feels good" (203). While this comment comes from a marginal but sympathetic character and not from a Hemingway hero, the expression of the correlation of pleasure with pain can be seen as a reflection of the author's feeling. Hemingway often spoke and wrote of his many injuries with obvious pride. The sensual pleasure in the endurance and toleration of this pain combined with both guilt and empathy are essential to masochism.

Few of Hemingway's leading characters provoke violence, though Harry Morgan in *To Have and Have Not* constitutes a notable exception. But neither do most of these characters shrink from violence, usually considering it a duty especially in war. This conforms to the long-standing Christian theory of the just war and with Victorian ideals of Muscular Christianity, though Hemingway, of course, secularizes these ideas. Hemingway's own personal acts of aggressive violence occurred during his hunting and fishing expeditions. His most serious violence toward human beings occurred in World War II, according to biographers, when some say he almost certainly killed some German soldiers in a couple of skirmishes in France (Meyers 400). More recently, William E. Coté questions the veracity of these accounts.³⁵ Hemingway's boastful letters with exaggerated kill counts, varying from 26 to 122, are regarded as unreliable (88). Coté concludes that "it is not clear that he killed anyone, or if he did, he did not kill twenty-six people, much less 122" (102). Coté also notes that even if Hemingway did not participate actively in killing human beings, he certainly at least observed it and suggests that this may account in part for his postwar depression and his psychological deterioration during the 1950s (103). Aside from these wartime incidents, most of Hemingway's violence took the form of modest fisticuffs with friends or rivals, some of which were given wide play in the press. In general, Hemingway's primary response to victims of violence, other than his own, appears as empathy. In all his writing about men at war and even in his accounts of his hunting experiences, the reader never encounters anything resembling true sadism in the Hemingway hero. The passage in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, in which Pilar recounts the massacre of the "fascists," engineered by her amoral man, Pablo, contains such implicit empathy with the victims that when the novel was published Hemingway was criticized by communists and other volunteers who served in the International

Brigades. Even in his stories of hunting a concern, often receiving explicit statement, surfaces for the fate of a suffering animal. Abandoning a wounded animal to bleed to death, rather than pursuing it to administer a merciful kill shot, violates Hemingway's sportsman ethics. He advocates the same for humans in especially desperate circumstances in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (162–163). Having suffered numerous wounds himself, he endows his characters with a tremendous capacity for pain. The avoidance of necessary pain represents cowardice. The acceptance of necessary pain represents courage, the primary virtue of the Hemingway code hero.

The many Hemingway heroes who suffer physical wounds highlight his masochistic vision. Frederic Henry receives shrapnel in his leg in *A Farewell to Arms*. Harry in "The Snows of Kilimanjaro" contracts gangrene. Harry Morgan has his arm shot off in *To Have and Have Not*. The dying Richard Cantwell, in *Across the River*, has both a bad leg and a bad hand. And in the most dramatic wound, Jake Barnes has lost a good portion of his genitals in *The Sun Also Rises*. In the same novel, Count Mippipoulous exhibits for Jake's admiration the arrow wounds he has received in "seven wars and four revolutions" (60). But in addition to wounds caused by violence, by the penetration of bullets and shrapnel, Hemingway's male heroes occasionally get penetrated in the bedroom as we shall see.