ISSN: 1753-5794

Ernest Hemingway's 'Fathers and Sons': An Evasive Confession about Paternal Roles and Masculinity

Teodora Domotor*

Modernist fiction found one of its main storylines in the development of gender identity, sexuality, and desire freed from the restrictions of morality.[1] Such topics are openly discussed in James Joyce's *Ulysses* (1922), D. H. Lawrence's *Women in Love* (1920) and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1928), as well as John Dos Passos's *Manhattan Transfer* (1925). This essay sets out to explore an alternative portrayal of gender and sexuality in Ernest Hemingway's 'Fathers and Sons', a short story that appeared in the collection entitled *Winner Take Nothing* (1933).[2] Hemingway projects the stereotype of the reserved, prudish, heterosexual American father in this text, but his illustration is deceptive. The story relies heavily on the author's "iceberg principle" of minimal details, but his theory of omission is, in fact, a theory of manipulation, which he achieves through the modification of language and interpretation. According to this theory of manipulation, the author makes crucial points conspicuous through withheld knowledge. The function of unstated elements is to mask insecurity: in 'Fathers and Sons' we encounter the father's insecurity concerning his sexual orientation and his "manly" worth based on social conventions[3], as well as the son's implied reservations about the father-son dynamic. Nonetheless, silencing and masking intensify the

* Teodora Domotor completed her PhD at the University of Surrey. She is currently exploring the link between the trauma of fatherlessness and the subject's gender development, social functioning, and emotional competence. She can be reached at teodora.domotor@hotmail.com.

ISSN: 1753-5794

unrepresented: unsaid elements draw attention to themselves. The author redefines modernist standards through his technique of narrative estrangement and thus challenges the status of the white heterosexual American male in the 1930s. Focusing primarily on the *ambivalent* relationship of the central protagonist, Nick Adams, and his own father, the text portrays the psychological trauma of having a physically present yet emotionally unavailable paternal figure, resulting in subjectively developed coping mechanisms. Nick's frustration finds an outlet in covertly rebelling against normativities forced upon him.

'Fathers and Sons' follows the path of Nick as he returns to his hometown in Northern Michigan.[4] He drives through the countryside with his young son sleeping next to him in the car. Nick tells most of the story through memories of his own childhood. The homecoming evokes in him feelings that he suppressed a long time ago. As he recalls his past, he articulates his anger and shame about his father who not only left a negative impact on his son's development, but who also scarred him for life. Examining the portrayal of Nick's frustration as well as his anxious masculinity, I shall interrogate such psychoanalytic concepts as trauma, abjection, and coping mechanisms which appear to govern the entire story.

Hemingway delves into the fragility of conventional images of masculinity which appear to correlate with the figure of the father in several of his stories. One of the most comprehensive Nick Adams collections entitled *In Our Time* (1925) addresses this issue directly. The book introduces the reader to Nick Adams, charting his development - including that of the father-son relationship - from childhood innocence to adult understanding. Distress-based attachments underpin 'Indian Camp', the second tale in the cycle of *In Our Time* (1925). The narrator juxtaposes the "other" against the idealised American father who eventually fails to live up to fathers' expected role. As a child, Nick accompanies his father, a medical doctor, to an Indian[5] camp to deliver a baby. The young boy is in shock while he

ISSN: 1753-5794

witnesses the brutal – albeit successful – operation. He becomes upset when he realises that his father is oblivious to the suffering mother's screams. His father distances himself from the woman, which does not only imply a professional distance, but also a more obvious distancing by physical retraction from her. Dr Adams treats the woman's body as a territory without agency or voice, a kind of uninhabited land he takes possession of and must control. His mark is left on the Indian woman's body. As a supposedly superior white man - according to contemporary social norms promoted by White Anglo-Saxon Protestants - he uses his power to regulate Native American affairs including the subordination of Indian women. 'Indian Camp' explores domination on several levels. We can see that a white man *dominates* in a non-white camp, a doctor *controls* the body of a patient, and a father *gives orders* to his son.[6]

In the story, the father is portrayed as an individual who enjoys playing an important role in both his son's life and that of the entire society. Thomas Strychacz (1989) claims that his behaviour is equivalent to a professional artistic performance (similar to that of an actor or director) and that he desires approval of his talent. Most of all, he wants to perform in front of his son. Young Nick is the most important audience who can either validate or reject his father's manhood.[7] The place where the Indian baby is being born in 'Indian Camp' is essentially a feminine and emotional territory. This "womb-space" is transformed into a "male arena" as soon as Nick's father enters. He represents authority even over the Indian father who stays in his bed helplessly. The doctor invites his son to watch him as he performs his role, expecting admiration from the child. Yet, when the white doctor finds the Indian father's corpse (he commits suicide during his wife's operation), he becomes an observer himself. Ironically, Nick also turns his eyes from his father to the Indian man. The audience's (Nick's) attention is diverted to the Indian man, denying Nick's father any confirmation of his manliness and power. Hence the father's authority becomes unstable.[8]

ISSN: 1753-5794

Nick may have felt safe in his father's company at first, but we can see that his sense of security is only temporal. This is further emphasised in 'The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife', the third story in the collection, which reflects the complexity of the child's role. In this narrative, the doctor is humiliated by Indians while, most probably, his son hears everything. Here, the Indians speak (and theirs is the last word) and the white doctor is silenced. Hemingway thus reverses power relations in 'The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife'.[9] The father figure who initially attempted to provide physical security to the child in 'Indian Camp' is gone; now it is the child who has to attain power to shield the father. When Nick's father instructs his son to see his mother, the boy objects: "'I want to go with you,' Nick said".[10] Strategically positioned, Nick must come to his father's rescue.

In both 'Indian Camp' and 'The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife' the father is dismissed as inadequate, powerless, and incapacitated. Paternal roles are mocked. The texts identify the father as an incompetent role model, challenging and questioning the validity of heteronormative masculinity prevailing in America at the time. Existing psychological research pertaining to the multiple roles of the father draws attention to the connection between paternal absence and the child's gender development and social functioning.[11] The impact of fatherlessness - in the psychological and emotional sense - is given prominence in 'Fathers and Sons', too, through the conflicted relationship of Nick and his father who - like in the aforesaid stories - may be a resident parent here, but who avoids genuine emotional involvement with his son.

The first sentence of 'Fathers and Sons' already speaks volumes about Nick's background and the environment that he used to inhabit. As he travels home he discusses the landscape and a town that he goes through at great length.

ISSN: 1753-5794

> There had been a sign to detour in the center of the main street of this town, but cars had obviously gone through, so, believing it was some repair which had been completed, Nicholas Adams drove on through the town along the empty, brick-paved street, stopped by traffic lights that flashed on and off on this traffic-less Sunday, and would be gone next year when the payments on the system were not met; on under the heavy trees of the small town that are a part of your heart if it is your town and you have walked under them, but that are only too heavy, that shut out the sun and that damped the houses for a stranger; out past the last house and onto the highway that rose and fell straight away ahead with banks of red dirt sliced cleanly away and the second-growth timber on both sides.[12]

Similar to the abovementioned duality that characterises the relationship of Nick and his father, dichotomy dominates several areas of life in their neighbourhood, too. The traffic lights flash on and off, the highway rises and falls, the street offers comfort, "a part of your heart if it is your town"[13], but at the same time it creates apprehension in that the trees "shut out the sun and that damped the houses for a stranger"[14]. The unusually long sentence alludes to the volatility of the town, but more importantly, it warns Nick about the unpleasantness ahead if he moves on physically as well as in memory. There is a "sign to detour"[15], but Nick refuses to follow it. He insists on facing whatever is ahead of him because the landscape promises hope: "banks of red dirt"[16] are swept aside and young second-growth trees line the road. It signifies that the filth and immorality of the past became marginalised and a fresh, new life has commenced.

While the environment may have changed, Nick voices his own transformation too: he establishes his foreignness. "It was not his country but it was the middle of fall and all of this country was good to drive through and to see"[17]. Nick may assert his "otherness", but he is too familiar with the land to convince the reader that it has not been his country. He carries on observing and narrating the place in meticulous detail. He introduces its agriculture to the reader - "cotton", "corn", "sorghum", "soy beans", "peas" - and he starts "hunting the country in his mind"[18] revealing childhood memories evidently linked to this wildlife environment.

ISSN: 1753-5794

> In shooting quail you must not get between them and their habitual cover, once the dogs have found them, or when they flush they will come pouring at you, some rising steep, some skimming by your ears, whirring into a size you have never seen them in the air as they pass, the only way being to turn and take them over your shoulder as they go, before they set their wings and angle down into the thicket.[19]

The level of detail Hemingway puts into describing the hunting experience dramatically changes the tone of the story. "Hunting this country for quail as his father had taught him, Nicholas Adams started thinking about his father"[20]. As soon as his father enters his thoughts, the implied meaning of Nick's words transforms from anxious and complex to blatantly aggressive. The concealed implication of the passage of hunting for a bird corresponds to Nick's desire to hunt down his father in a similar manner. Later on in the memoir he recalls an experience of angering his father as a child; the image of hassling the birds thus echoes Nick's getting between his father and his "habitual cover"[21]. Nick remembers how his father used to "flush" and "come pouring" at him "whirring into a size you have never seen"[22]. His father's presence is not comforting but physically threatening and predatory.[23] The small child supposedly realises that the only way of surviving the father's violence is by taking him "over your shoulder"[24] or shooting him.

The method of eliminating the father may be compared to hunting for a bird, but in addition to desire for revenge, the imaginary fight also triggers anxiety in Nick. He remembers his father having "[t]he big frame, the quick movements, the wide shoulders, the hooked, hawk nose, the beard that covered the weak chin, you never thought about - it was always the eyes. [...] They saw much farther and much quicker that the human eye sees [...] His father saw as a big-horn ram or as an eagle sees, literally"[25]. Although Nick often mentions that the only feature he liked about his father was his "finest pair of eyes"[26] or "wonderful eyes"[27], in general he considers him a fearsome, beastlike, and disgusting subject. Nick places great emphasis on his sense of physical revulsion towards his father's body

ISSN: 1753-5794

odour. His father "sweated very much" when working in hot weather and Nick "hated the smell of him"[28]. "[O]nce when he had to wear a suit of his father's underwear that had gotten too small for his father it made him feel sick and he took it off and put it under two stones in the creek and said that he had lost it"[29]. The narrator reveals that Nick had made his father sniff the underwear to prove he was right about the smell, but his father remained adamant that it was clean, forcing Nick to wear it. After pretending to have lost the garment, Nick "was whipped for lying"[30]. The function of the father's "wonderful eyes"[31] now connotes a colonial gaze. Nick stands in for the "colonised other" (substandard childlike being) and thus he is repeatedly infantilised in the text. His inferior position contributes to the reinforcement of the white American father's (man's) superiority. As Thomas Strychacz (1989) describes it in his analysis of performativity, white American men need an audience that sees and thus confirms their superior masculine status.[32]

His father's imposition of power upon his child (by making him wear his used and smelly underwear) infuriates Nick. The narrator continuously reveals that Nick's father was only armed with superior physical strength, not with superior intelligence or honesty, thus he lost his credibility in his son's eyes:

> Afterward he had sat inside the woodshed with the door open, his shotgun loaded and cocked, looking across at his father sitting on the porch reading the paper, and thought, "I can blow him to hell. I can kill him". Finally he felt his anger go out of him and he felt a little sick about it being the gun that his father had given him.[33]

This passage represents the only moment in the text when Nick manages to articulate his frustration directly. The narrator frequently admits that Nick "was very grateful to his father for bringing him to know"[34] how to use a gun. Nick's father "was a great hunter and fisherman"[35] who taught his son what Midwestern fathers ought to teach to their offspring. He was "sound on those two things"[36] and even his own father - Nick's grandfather - "was a great wing shot too"[37]. Nick mastered the art of shooting from his father. Nonetheless, he

ISSN: 1753-5794

now considers turning against his tutor by using his own manly power, the gun, to kill him. He contemplates utilising the very object that his father provided him with: "His father gave him only three cartridges a day to hunt with and he had a single-barrel twenty-gauge shotgun with a very long barrel"[38]. Instead of shooting his father or feeling remorseful for the thought, however, he decides to "dispose" of the man in an alternate way: "Then he had gone to the Indian camp, walking there in the dark, to get rid of the smell"[39]. Nick recedes into the shadows.

The recurring illustration of darkness - in a figurative sense as well - dominates the episodes to follow. It is intentional that the narrator emphasises hunting and guns here. Not only is he communicating Nick's fury and violent tendencies by listing images linked to the reign of darkness (and thus the destruction of innocence) when remembering the father, he is also eager to demonstrate Nick's desperate attempt to prove his bravery and manly worth. The complex era of the 1920s-1930s that witnessed the reconfiguration of gender stereotypes created a sense of urgency to maintain "manly control". Phallic images enforce Nick's anxious desire to establish and verify his manliness: "shotgun loaded and cocked", "very long barrel", "long splintered pieces of wood", "hard, hot trail", "flag pole", "log", and "jack-lights"[40]. He also parades his masculine power in the Indian camp: he has sexual intercourse with Trudy, a Native American woman, several times and he also threatens to kill her brother if he dares to visit Nick's sister: "If Eddie Gilby ever comes at night and even speaks to Dorothy you know what I'd do to him? I'd kill him like this"[41] - says Nick, showing off his "manly" fighting skills. As masculine gender identity is a social construction, the surface of the text conforms to contemporary Midwestern definition of manhood. Masculinity, as it emerges in the author's fiction, was defined by societal expectations and cultural assumptions. The dominant model of Midwestern masculinity included physical ability, outdoor living, and a courageous disposition. In his 1929 memoir John Emmett Nelligan

ISSN: 1753-5794

(1969) summarised this sentiment about exemplary Midwestern men, as follows: "They were strong and wild in both body and spirit, with the careless masculine beauty of men who live free lives in the open air. They seemed the finest specimens of manhood I had ever seen. [...] Drunk or sober, they would fight at the drop of a hat and fight to a bitter finish. They had their code".[42]

Fishing, like hunting, is an activity that characterises Midwestern masculinity in America.[43] Hemingway often connects these leisure interests to the bonding process of fathers and sons. Yet, in the same way as other Hemingway stories where the father is either physically or emotionally absent, 'Fathers and Sons' highlights disillusionment in the father-son dynamic and anxiety about preconceived gender roles. For young Nick, masculinity seemed to be primarily defined not by society's set of expectations, but by that of his own father. Nick confesses: "He was always very disappointed in the way I shot"[44]. This cathartic statement reveals much more than a father's disapproval of his son's method of hunting, though. The story makes it clear that Nick's father has extraordinary vision; Nick cannot see as his father sees. One may suggest that the father's disappointment is therefore related to Nick's less than ideal vision, not his hunting skills (and, by extension, not his masculinity). Considering that the doctor is an intelligent man, however, we may conclude that he surely understands the given, inborn and, in most cases, unchangeable nature of physical features. His disappointment in his son thus underlines much more than dissatisfaction with a simple bodily characteristic. Accordingly, Nick's statement implies that he was never good enough as a *male* in his father's eyes, hence the man's emotional departure and lack of intimacy with his son. The father may never have appreciated and, worst still, never considered his son a man.

Paternal acceptance or rejection and frail father-child relationships have a predictive power on future adult outcomes. Not only does the exploration of fatherhood extend the

ISSN: 1753-5794

investigation on narrative portrayals of anxious masculinity, but delving into men's studies from a parental developmental perspective generates a particularly complex interdisciplinary inquiry. 'Fathers and Sons' directly illustrates the difficulty of coming to terms with the eternal void that the absent father creates in his son. Nick gives examples of withdrawn love, struggle for acceptance, and multiple regression through characteristically upsetting images. The struggles that his character is portrayed to convey depict a straightforward and observable psychological fact that Ronald Rohner (2012) summarises, as follows: if children's *need* to be loved by their parents is not satisfied adequately, children tend to respond in a corresponding way. The negative effects (such as the development of inadequate behaviour or excessive dependence) are the consequences of feeling *rejected*.[45] The warmth dimensions of parenting must be considered in Nick's case, too. Jerome Kagan (1978) claims that "parental rejection is not a specific set of actions by parents but a belief held by the child".[46] Parental acceptance-rejection is therefore studied as either a perceived subjective experience or a phenomenon reported by an outside observer. Parental behaviours - regardless if those are real or perceived - can produce negative emotions in children. If they feel unloved and rejected, their need for positive responses increases. Should their emotional yearning (whether subconscious or admitted) for comfort, support, and care remain unfulfilled in childhood, the need becomes more complex in adult life. Rejected subjects often seek out surrogate attachment figures from whom they expect (and get) positive regard.[47]

Nick, who fails to receive appreciation and acceptance from his father, becomes defensively independent. People who experience rejection in their childhood tend to grow up to be less emotionally expressive adults. This signifies their defence mechanism against further pain. They become less emotionally responsive; they have difficulty accepting as well as expressing love. The great amount of psychological hurt generates defensive independence

ISSN: 1753-5794

in some affected individuals. Defensive independence, similarly to healthy independence, contains relatively few indications of yearning for positive response. Nonetheless, defensively independent people continue to crave warmth, constant reassurance, and stable emotional support without consciously recognising it. They also often display signs of counter rejection where they reject the people who rejected them.[48] The simultaneous, albeit subconscious, existence of counter-rejection and yearning, the duality of feelings, the conflict of ambivalence shape Nick's mindset. The relationship between him and his father keeps changing. Nick contemplates taking revenge on his father for the lack of support and guidance: he rejects principles that his father holds sacred. A metaphorical statement signifies Nick's rejection of his father at one stage: "The towns he lived in were not towns his father knew. After he was fifteen he had shared nothing with him"[49].

Following the humiliation to which the father subjected his son, Nick moves from his father's terrain to that of Indians.[50] The camp experience crystallises his thoughts on masculinity, relationship, and sexuality. He elevates himself and ridicules his father by exposing the old man's incompetence in terms of sexual education. The narrator verbalises that Nick's father "was unsound on sex" and "Nick's own education in those earlier matters had been acquired in the hemlock woods behind the Indian camp"[51]. Nick recounts the overflow of misleading messages from his father: "A bugger is a man who has intercourse with animals", "Mashing [...] is one of the most heinous crimes", and "His father had summed up the whole matter by stating that masturbation produced blindness, insanity, and death, while a man who went with prostitutes would contract hideous venereal diseases and that the thing to do was to keep your hands off people"[52]. The false explanations obviously did not make sense to young Nick. His "imagination was both stirred and horrified"[53] by his father's teachings. "He thought of various animals but none seemed attractive or practical" and he "pictured the great tenor [Enrico Caruso] doing something strange, bizarre, and heinous with

ISSN: 1753-5794

a potato masher to a beautiful lady"[54]. Nick concluded that "when he was old enough he would try mashing at least once"[55]. We witness the failure of an authority figure who is unable to offer substantial advice to his son, leaving it to the young boy to lean on his own understanding.[56]

The combination of Victorian primness and misinformation that Nick's father adheres to confuses his son.[57] Susan F. Beegel (1998) argues that Nick's childhood innocence or ignorance about homosexuality may sound comic to the reader, but it is very tragic for Nick. When Hemingway uses the terms "bugger" and "mashing" he is representing moments in a young boy's normal, emerging sexual curiosity, but the boy's development is disturbed by lacking an adequate role model and honest instruction. The word "bugger" refers to anal intercourse, but it only involves animals in criminal law. Making animals the object of homosexual desire, the father's teachings become odd and ambiguous in a story where hunting, fishing, and the father-son bond are of key importance. There is no reference to homosexual incest on the father's part in 'Fathers and Sons', but we do witness the exposure of his sexual frustration. He is portrayed to suffer from urges (masturbation, prostitutes, same-sex eroticism) that cannot be relieved.[58]

Hemingway refrains from openly describing homosexual relationships. Yet, it is male sexuality that deviates from the stereotypical that informs his characterisation. His representation of heterosexuality seems to be limited to portraits of eternally dysfunctional people and couples. The consciousness of Hemingway's texts is troubled by the "manly" hero's constant, ultimately doomed quest for desire. In the case of 'Fathers and Sons', Nick does not dare to delve into the interrogation of his father's repressed erotic yearnings. When he thinks about his father's anxieties, he immediately intends to divert his attention from him. He wants to forget and write his father out of his system.

ISSN: 1753-5794

> He had died in a trap that he had helped only a little to set, and they had all betrayed him in their various ways before he died. All sentimental people are betrayed so many times. Nick could not write about him yet, although he would, later. [...] Now, knowing how it had all been, even remembering the earliest times before things had gone badly was not good remembering. If he wrote it he could get rid of it. He had gotten rid of many things by writing them. But it was still too early for that. There were still too many people. So he decided to think of something else.[59]

Several crucial details are omitted from this passage. We never actually find out about the suicide of Nick's father per se and the reasons behind it are also undisclosed. Hemingway's method of silencing creates confusion for the reader. The painstaking choice of words signifies meaning that differs markedly from the "commonsensical" readings that emerged in the twentieth century. Repressing and silencing sexual frustration draws attention to itself in this text and invites the reader to discover more than what is displayed on the surface. Hemingway preferred to call his literature instructive and not didactic.[60] We can see that he teaches, but his teaching method is indirect. He refrains from overt moralisation.

Submitting ourselves to Hemingway's guidance, we may soon discover a clear direction despite encountering silenced elements and narrative manipulation. For example, many of Hemingway's texts employ the technique of *in medias res* which is a narrative hook for eliciting the reader's interest. Using this literary device results in the lack of formal introductions and closures. Accordingly, stories with an *in medias res* start only seem to be partially completed, which - similarly to the characters themselves - gives the cycle a sense of deficiency. Hemingway presents the reader with journeys back and forth in time, insufficient information about and gaps in the protagonist's life, who is sometimes an adult and other times a child, but the experiences fail to add up to a satisfactory whole.[61] We do not see Nick's growth clearly as significant phases of his adolescence are missing from the story. The developmental period in between childhood and adulthood is never properly detailed. Through Hemingway's narrative technique and guidance we can see that the story, therefore,

ISSN: 1753-5794

functions as a cluster of fragments akin to the fragmented identity of the main character himself. There is a constant battle between Nick and the roles (son, father, lover) he has to play. His self-presentation is unstable. Hemingway foregrounds the difficulty of identity construction through Nick's experience.

Hemingway always assigns to his characters their functional roles according to scenes and points of view instead of endowing them with permanent identities. His narrator reports events with figurative details, shifting from terse language and indirect depiction to employing several literary devices such as repetition or meaningful names. The manipulated narrative allows readers to become aware of different subplots expressed in multi-modal language. The genre of the short story enables Hemingway to silence - in swift, momentary motions - what he wishes (but is prohibited) to parade: the insecure nature of Midwestern masculinity, melancholic desires (highlighting a constant sense of lack) and a sincere criticism of America's hypocrisy. He applies redundancy – a form of repetition of details – and silencing – a conscious concealment of knowledge – in his narration in order to guide the reader to uncover the truth about preconceived ideals of American manliness including fatherhood.

Rhetorical analysis of Hemingway's texts, however, poses a question in terms of the literary function of silence. The concept of narrative competence implies what the author spells out and what the readership implicitly know about the basic shape of a story.[62] Hemingway's technique of textual manipulation disturbs this knowledge. The redundancy in his stories influences reader response and interpretation. Hemingway manipulates the chronological order of events in 'Fathers and Sons' too, applying a wealth of prolepses (flashforwards) and analepses (flashbacks) in order to produce sequences of montage in the plots. Several crucial links and direct revelations are left missing, though.

ISSN: 1753-5794

Adrienne Rich (1994) rightly emphasises in *Blood, Bread, and Poetry* that we begin to understand the importance of silence "once we learn to watch for what is left out, to listen for the unspoken, to study the patterns of established science and scholarship with an outsider's eye".[63] She also warns us in 'Cartographies of Silence' that "silence can be a plan / rigorously executed [...] Do not confuse it / with any kind of absence".[64] Cheryl Glenn (2002) agrees that silence is not necessarily a sign of emptiness and, therefore, is not the same as absence: "Like the zero in mathematics, silence is an absence with a function".[65] Silencing is not a form of erasing. The primary function of silence and silencing is to transform the traditional discipline of rhetoric. It makes one question whether rhetoric can only be delivered by words and whether conventional rhetoric is the only means of signifying a form of power in communication. Fundamentally, purposeful silence carries the same significance of meaning and intention as the spoken word.[66] Hemingway masterfully utilised the narrative technique of silencing. 'Fathers and Sons' demonstrates that unspoken words often communicate implied meaning much more effectively. By noticing the evasive quality of the author's narrative we encounter his assertive standpoint about exposing American masculinity and what it promotes. His text negotiates the desire to conform as well as the inability to do so.

In 'Fathers and Sons' Nick's father wears a socially prescribed mask. His sexual frustration and the "trap"[67] that eventually leads to his suicide insinuate the presence of a harmful partner regardless if he/she is a wife or a homosexual lover. Female characters seldom receive full attention in Hemingway's fiction. Women seem to be either marginalised or ignored altogether. Accordingly, the wife is omitted from 'Fathers and Sons'. Silence about her in the storytelling voice, however, draws attention to men's fear of feminine influence on defining masculinity. When the development of masculinity is challenged by a feminine identification, it triggers a negative attitude in the male towards the female within himself and

ISSN: 1753-5794

within others too.[68] Consequently, masculinity is achieved through the negation of femininity in Hemingway's text. The father in 'Fathers and Sons' asserts his masculinity through manly sports and a heterosexual disposition. He "abjects" everything that is feminine (according to the gender norms in contemporary American society) in order to restore his manliness.

Abjection, which Julia Kristeva (1982) defines as "violent, dark revolts of being, directed against a threat", is a complex combination of thoughts. The abject lies within the *I*, but it also opposes the *I*. The abject consumes the *I* in a parasitic manner in that it wants to terminate yet merge with the ego at the same time. The abject attacks in an attempt to defend itself against threats. Abjection is a drive that is founded on loss - it is the suffering, lacking, void or pain itself that the *I* accepts and internalises.[69] Similarly to all cases of deficiency, the abject triggers desire. Abjection is thus the recognition of the "want". 'Fathers and Sons' draws heavily on the principles of abjection: the essentialist tenets of heteronormativity pressure men into "defending themselves against threats" meaning rejecting and repressing features of femininity. What this method underlines again, however, is that Midwestern masculinity clearly depends on its relation to femininity: the repression of the "other" defines manliness. The influence of femininity eternally haunts masculinity.

The second interpretation of the "trap" that demands the life of Nick's father in 'Fathers and Sons' links to the stigma of feminisation. At the turn of the century, human categories began to be reconfigured. Grouping subjects as males and females was replaced by their sexual orientation: heterosexual or homosexual.[70] Such binarisation resulted in large-scale discrimination against homosexuals who allegedly possessed "unmanly" emotional sensitivity. Accordingly, heterosexual men desperately sought to distinguish themselves from the stigmatised group of homosexuals.[71] Hemingway frequently alludes to homosexual relationships, yet he refrains from *openly* describing them. Nonetheless, he tends to hint at gender instability as an attribute originally built in humans by nature. He is preoccupied with

ISSN: 1753-5794

the combination of femininity and masculinity in the psyche, which reinforces the type of manliness that he represents and portrays.[72] Unlike the stereotyped, socially prescribed masculine perseverance that has been constrained upon Hemingway's male figures, we can construct the ingredients of a latent homosexual in Nick's father. The fact that he was "sentimental"[73] underlines his deviation from the contemporary masculine ideal. We also know that "they had all betrayed him in various ways"[74] which may refer to his exposure as a homosexual. Yet, the issue of homoeroticism was not one that could be discussed, let alone defended, in the 1930s: "it was still too early for that. There were still too many people"[75].

The cultural context from which literary works emerge at the moment of production is not at all insignificant; the texts and other discourses together create meaning and a nexus of interpretations. Although the short story collection of *Winner Take Nothing* was published in 1933, the characters in 'Fathers and Sons' are products of the late Victorian and early modernist period. As it happens, intolerance surrounded homoeroticism during that time. The paradoxical era declared homosexuality a mental disorder, same-sex relationships were considered perverse and immoral, societies (Committee of Fourteen, The Society for the Suppression of Vice) were set up to provide authorities with information on gay activity in order to aid the eradication of "sin" in America, and violence against homosexuals was overlooked.[76]

Nick's articulation of disgust, disappointment, and shame about his father dominates the text. Correspondingly, gloominess and darkness appear more and more frequently in the story (for example, "black muck of the swamp", "under the trees", "it was getting dark", "walking there in the dark", "buried"[77]). The atmosphere reflects ambivalence, though. The dark quality also implies the possibility that Nick, through his sad memories, might attain a certain level of clarity and light in the end.[78] As Nick arrives into the deepest past, he may be able to reconcile with the loved and loathed father figure. Nick temporarily leaves his chosen

ISSN: 1753-5794

country, France, to return to America in an attempt to face his painful past. Because his childhood trauma is unclosed and incomplete, Nick creates a distance in several ways: between past and present, son and father, America and Europe.[79] The dichotomous representation of Nick's life results in a crucial revelation: hunting down his father merges into hunting for himself. Richard McCann (1990) argues that hunting for his father in memory becomes a hunt for the father in Nick's inner self. The father is essentially internalised in Nick. Nick splits into two characters: he is both a writer and a child, and the two selves overlap. Nick becomes a father to his younger self now. His internalisation of fatherhood may enable him to grow up and attempt to create a world for himself that markedly differs from what his father advocated.[80] His father avoided sexual explicitness and he intended to enforce the mask of reserved, pure, socially conforming, moral, heterosexual masculinity on his son. His supposedly homosexual inclinations signify his hypocrisy which adds to Nick's rejection of him. The lies and emotional inexpressiveness of Nick's father blocked off their ties to each another. Nick may have been physically involved with his father in "reality" in that the man was not absent in their household, but because his father was emotionally inconsistent and increasingly unavailable, Nick is eager to become emotionally detached from him in his imagination now. As McCann (1990) claims it, Nick's new way of thinking is free and independent from his father. It is a highly instinctual life that he has led, but at least it is uncorrupted by his father's sentimentality: Nick embraces the world his father warned him against.[81]

Nonetheless, it seems that Nick is unable to completely detach himself from his father. When his young son wakes up next to him in the car, he keeps asking Nick about his grandfather and why they never visit his grave. The child's straightforward questions and comments reconnect Nick with his past again. Arthur Waldhorn (2002) claims that unlike other middle-class American men of his generation, Nick never becomes capable of

ISSN: 1753-5794

discarding the past in order to be able to hold on in the present. He cannot let go of the memory of his father's life and death.[82] The paramount issue here is not what the father took away from his son by being emotionally and now physically absent, but what he left behind. Cathy Caruth (1996) argues that a story of trauma, as a narrative of a belated experience, does not represent the telling of an escape from death or destruction; it rather demonstrates its endless impact on a person's life. She also questions whether trauma itself is an encounter with evil, or the ongoing experience of having survived it.[83] Indeed, Nick's character demonstrates how traumatic events in the past haunt him eternally. He is unable to let go of the traumatic childhood experience of being rejected, humiliated, and perhaps unloved.

A small minority of people who have experienced the trauma of rejection by attachment figures (primarily parents) manage to establish emotional stability in their lives. Psychology calls these individuals "copers" based on their sense of self-determination and internal psychological resources for suppressing or at least minimising the detrimental consequences of (perceived) rejection. The two subcategories within coping include affective copers - whose emotional and overall mental health remained relatively good despite the experienced rejection - and instrumental copers - who are seemingly thriving in their professional lives and other task-oriented activities, but whose emotional and mental health is impaired.[84] Nick embodies instrumental coping. The recurring memories of his unstable father figure buttress the fact that the man's presence and his negative influence shall never disappear from his son's mind. Nick may have established a separate, seemingly detached, successful life abroad, but the psycho-developmental portrayal of his character verifies eternal scars that the inconsistency of his father has generated.

Hemingway describes men's inner struggle through a fragmented subject: Nick is a product of anxiety. Debra Moddelmog (1999) draws attention to this dilemma when she analyses the male's scars in Hemingway’s narrative. She rightly claims that the wounds are

ISSN: 1753-5794

indices of a man's toughness. Nick's forced coping skills underpin the myth of invincible white masculine heterosexuality in America at the time. Mythical representations carry a similar falsity to desire as all myths are false. We constantly create myths to accommodate our future which we cannot possibly know. We cannot control desire and its outcome. The autonomy of the human is non-existent. White masculine heterosexual heroic power - indicated by the manly scar - is thus a form of American mythopoeia, the creation of a national myth concerned primarily with optimistic *visions* of strength, which cannot actually be achieved. Correspondingly, Moddelmog (1999) argues that instead of pacifying the anxieties, the wound ultimately increases them, exposing what it is meant to conceal. This phenomenon appears to shift the masculine body into the domain of the feminine or that of the homosexual.[85] Moddelmog (1999) maintains that the frequent recurrence of the wound in Hemingway's fiction signifies heteromasculinity. It confirms that a man's man has been injured – in other words, he has passed the test of masculinity – and he endures pain. Nonetheless, because the hero openly exhibits his wounds, it makes us contemplate whether he does so to impress women or rather to prove his masculinity to other men.[86] The function of the wound becomes similar to that of the mask. Attempts to give rise to anxiety-related drives in the conscience meet psychological resistance (represented by defence mechanisms) which the assertion of the manly wound and wearing a mask embodies.

Nick's struggle as a son and now a father himself elicits the central dilemma: masculine role - and thus the ability to camouflage pain - proves to be the source of burden. Shame over his father's weaknesses forces Nick to try to redeem what his father lost. He must become a better role model for his son than what his own father was to him. Although the story finishes before delving into details about Nick's paternal skills (for example, we do not get to know whether he has discussed sexual experiences, erotica, and similarly intimate issues with his son), the reader sees how Nick as father passes the key conflict on to his child:

ISSN: 1753-5794

the male is doomed to suffer the loss of the boy's world, but he is unable to forge a new life for himself. [87] Nick managed to escape to a foreign land, far from his father, but the old man's influence has remained constant. Nick wonders whether his offspring will follow in his footsteps. His fear materialises when his son voices his own opinion: "I hope we won't live somewhere so that I can never go to pray at your tomb when you are dead"[88]. Nick realises he is the same as his father and his own son will estrange from him too.[89]

In addition to the conflict of ambivalence - the co-existence of love and hatred for the paternal figure - 'Fathers and Sons' encompasses severe self-criticism as well. Nick could never earn his father's love as his father's puritanical ideals and high expectations of his son invited disappointment. We are presented with an unresolved ambivalence towards the ideal father. When Nick attains a level of understanding about his past he realises that he constantly refused to identify with his father. Pamela Boker (1996) claims that the older Nick feels as guilty as if he had pulled the trigger himself when his father committed suicide. It is indeed this sense of guilt that renders mourning difficult if not impossible for Nick. Consequently, the son, out of anger as well as guilt, will continue to live in "another country" of repressed grief. The only possibility for coming to terms with his father's (and men's) fallibility is for Nick to understand that the heroic ideal father (and man) - whom he lost through disappointment - can be replaced by a disappointing yet human father (and man) to whom the son can relate much easier. The son could, therefore, forgive and accept him, and finally grieve over his death.[90]

Nick promises his son that they will visit the grandfather's grave. "'We'll have to go', Nick said. 'I can see we'll have to go'"[91]. Accordingly, Paul Strong (1989) says that the story ends on a hopeful note. The promised journey signifies a bond of love between father and son.[92] Joseph M. Flora (1982) agrees that the mellow note of conclusion offers hope for a less complicated future.[93] Erik Nakjavani (1995) further elaborates on the possibility of

ISSN: 1753-5794

reconciliation. He declares that the "promise *salvages* the past by making intelligible its natural link in memory with the present and the future".[94] Susan F. Beegel (1998) disagrees with the suggestions that 'Fathers and Sons' has a positive ending. She argues that Hemingway's "hinting" technique underlines threat rather than hope in the last sentence of the text. Because the wildlife environment has been deteriorating in several aspects (for example, as the story progresses the landscape becomes darker and darker and white men enter untouched Indian territories), the "natural link" *binds* past to the future. The land will not recover to its original state,[95] nor will the ideal father-son relationship materialise itself. Hemingway avoids explicit portrayal of the American man's sense of deficiency, though. Self-image construction, based on the awareness of "lack" is still of considerable aesthetic relevance in 'Fathers and Son'. The father's high expectations of his son - despite his own concealed shortcomings - make Nick desire features that he recognises as missing in his identity. Lack and longing for completion define his character which comes across in his restlessness. His "pilgrimage" of revisiting a loathed place underpins his motivation to acquire knowledge and to come to terms with what he has lacked.

The bitterness that Nick feels about his father informs even the conclusion of this story. Jackson J. Benson (1969) claims that every boy's father must take up the responsibility of living up to the stature of a hero. In 'Fathers and Sons', the father becomes much more than just a man and he embodies much more than the son's disillusionment in heroic expectations.[96] The duality of victim-victimiser that exists in Nick's father prompts the son's excessive rebellion: emotional outbursts, sexual explicitness, hostility, violence, and cynicism. The father's failure in several respects suggests his own deficiencies as well as his unfairly exaggerated expectations of his son. Nick's father may be dead, but like the countryside and Nick's childhood, he will never be wholly gone,[97] despite Nick's desire to eliminate him. His father is more "alive" than ever before. His life and his failings, therefore,

ISSN: 1753-5794

signify the scheme of men's fate.[98] The father's ghost-like function creates presence out of his absence, which ceaselessly haunts the son.

[1] Peter Childs, *Modernism* (London: Routledge, 2000), p. 85.

[2] Ernest Hemingway, 'Fathers and Sons', in *The Short Stories* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1995), pp. 488-499.

[3] Ralph Greenson (1993) connects the engendering of masculinity to the father's role. He claims that the stable gender identity of a male child is based on his identifying with his father as well as dis-identifying from his mother. If this method of dis-identification from the mother does not take place, the development of the male's stable gender identity will most probably fail too (Greenson 1993, 258-64). Based on Greenson's dis-identification theory, Carl P. Eby (1999) argues that Hemingway's anxious masculinity stems from his own upbringing characterised by instability in terms of gender development. Hemingway's mother, Grace, had caused a fracture in the writer's masculine identity by dressing him like his sisters and also by naming him after her own stage name, Ernestine (Eby 1999, 93). Eby suggests a fundamental identity between wearing fetishised female clothing and wearing the fetish object to negotiate a phallic-feminine identification (Eby 1999, 303). Yet Hemingway's identification with a male role model was equally disturbed. He shared a close bond with his father thanks to their mutual interest in nature and hunting. He still could not identify with the "weak or denigrated" man because he witnessed how his father, Dr Hemingway, too became "emasculated" by his wife (Eby 1999, 103). Women's role comprised childbearing and homemaking until the 1920s and they made modest gains afterwards (Hawes and Shores 2001, xxii). As Grace Hemingway's example demonstrates it, many women felt frustrated about home confinement. Grace, who later on pursued a career in music, became increasingly negligent with household chores. As a result, Dr Hemingway took over cooking and cleaning and Grace went on her annual vacation alone (Reynolds 1998, 109). Soon it was Grace who became much better known in their town and Dr Hemingway turned into a reclusive, nervous man. The mother was the "driving social force in the family" and when the children needed a strong male role model, they turned to her (Reynolds 1998, 108-10). Women of the period had little way of real power in society, but they managed to undermine their husbands' (and sons') masculine worth by manipulating them at home. Accordingly, the volatility of gender identity construction is a commonsensical phenomenon for Hemingway and he treats it as one in his fiction, too. Although I refrain from stating that Hemingway's stories denote his own life, they certainly fictionalise his principles.

[4] See Richard McCann, 'To Embrace or Kill: "Fathers and Sons"', in Jackson J. Benson, ed., *New Critical Approaches to the Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990), p. 266., or Frederic J. Svoboda, 'The Great Themes in Hemingway', in Linda Wagner-Martin, ed., *A Historical Guide to Ernest Hemingway* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 157.

[5] Hemingway refers to Native Americans as 'Indians' in this story in accordance with contemporary usage of the term.

[6] Amy L. Strong, 'Screaming Through Silence: The Violence of Race in 'Indian Camp' and 'The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife', *The Hemingway Review*, Number 16. 1, 1996, pp. 19-29.

[7] Thomas Strychacz, 'Dramatizations of Manhood in Hemingway's *In Our Time* and *The Sun Also Rises*, *American Literature*, Number 61. 2, 1989, pp. 245-60.

[8] Ibid, pp. 247-49.

[9] Amy L. Strong, *Race and Identity in Hemingway's Fiction* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), p. 22.

[10] Ernest Hemingway, 'Fathers and Sons', in *The Short Stories* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1995), p. 103.

[11] Henry B. Biller, *Fathers and Families: Paternal Factors in Child Development* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1993), p. 57.

[12] Ernest Hemingway, 'Fathers and Sons', in *The Short Stories* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1995), p. 488.

[13] Ibid, p. 488.

[14] Ibid, p. 488.

[15] Ibid, p. 488.

[16] Ibid, p. 488.

[17] Ibid, p. 488.

[18] Ibid, p. 488.

[19] Ibid, pp. 488-89.

[20] Ibid, p. 489.

[21] Ibid, p. 489.

[22] Ibid, p. 489.

[23] Susan F. Beegel, 'Second Growth: The Ecology of Loss in "Fathers and Sons"', in Paul Smith, ed., *New Essays on Hemingway's Short Fiction* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 81.

[24] Ernest Hemingway, 'Fathers and Sons', in *The Short Stories* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1995), p. 489.

[25] Ibid, p. 489.

[26] Ibid, p. 491.

[27] Ibid, p. 498.

[28] Ibid, p. 496.

[29] Ibid, p. 496.

[30] Ibid, p. 496.

[31] Ibid, p. 498.

[32] Thomas Strychacz, 'Dramatizations of Manhood in Hemingway's *In Our Time* and *The Sun Also Rises*', *American Literature*, Number 61.2, 1989, pp. 245-60.

[33] Ernest Hemingway, 'Fathers and Sons', in *The Short Stories* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1995), pp. 496-97.

[34] Ibid, p. 490.

[35] Ibid, p. 498.

[36] Ibid, p. 490.

[37] Ibid, p. 498.

[38] Ibid, p. 493.

[39] Ibid, p. 497.

[40] Ibid, pp. 489-96.

[41] Ibid, p. 493.

[42] John Emmett Nelligan, *A White Pine Empire: The Life of a Lumberman* (1929) (St. Cloud, MN: North Star Press, 1969), p. 37-8.

[43] Timothy Crumrin, 'Sports and Recreation', in Richard Sisson, Christian Zacher and Andrew Cayton, eds., *The American Midwest: An Interpretive Encyclopedia* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2007), pp. 869-76.

[44] Ernest Hemingway, 'Fathers and Sons', in *The Short Stories* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1995), p. 498.

[45] Ronald P. Rohner, Abdul Khaleque, and David E. Cournoyer, *Introduction to Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory, Methods, Evidence, and Implications* (Storrs-Mansfield, CT: University of Connecticut, 2012), pp. 4-5. Available on the World Wide Web: http://www.cspar.uconn.edu/INTRODUCTION-TO-PARENTAL-ACCEPTANCE-3-27-12.pdf (Accessed 29 November 2012)

[46] Jerome Kagan, 'The parental love trap', *Psychology Today*, Number 12, 1978, p. 61.

[47] Ronald P. Rohner, Abdul Khaleque, and David E. Cournoyer, *Introduction to Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory, Methods, Evidence, and Implications* (Storrs-Mansfield, CT: University of Connecticut, 2012), pp. 1-4. Available on the World Wide Web: http://www.cspar.uconn.edu/INTRODUCTION-TO-PARENTAL-ACCEPTANCE-3-27-12.pdf (Accessed 29 November 2012)

[48] Ibid, p. 6.

[49] Ernest Hemingway, 'Fathers and Sons', in *The Short Stories* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1995), p. 496.

[50] Nick's decision to gain sexual experience in an Indian camp intensifies his rebellious behaviour. Nancy R. Comley and Robert Scholes (1992) argue that 'sexual mythology for Hemingway was deeply rooted in so-called primitive cultures outside the West (tribal fantasy). Within Nick's sexual fantasy in 'Fathers and Sons' sexual truths lie not at the centre of 'standard' heterosexual practice but at the margins: in what the society of Hemingway's parents would have called perversion or miscegenation. (Nancy R. Comley and Robert Scholes, 'Tribal Things: Hemingway's Erotics of Truth', *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, Number 25. 3, 1992, 277-78.)

[51] Ernest Hemingway, 'Fathers and Sons', in *The Short Stories* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1995), pp. 490-92.

[52] Ibid, pp. 490-91.

[53] Ibid, p. 490.

[54] Ibid, pp. 490-91.

[55] Ibid, p. 491.

[56] Jonathan A. Austad, *Hemingway and Hitchcock: An Examination of the Aesthetic Modernity* (Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest, 2008), p. 102.

[57] Jackson J. Benson, *Hemingway: The Writer's Art of Self-Defense* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1969), p. 11.

[58] Susan F. Beegel, 'Second Growth: The Ecology of Loss in "Fathers and Sons"', in Paul Smith, ed., *New Essays on Hemingway's Short Fiction* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 81-2.

[59] Ernest Hemingway, 'Fathers and Sons', in *The Short Stories* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1995), pp. 490-91.

[60] George Plimpton, 'The Art of Fiction: Ernest Hemingway', in Matthew J. Bruccoli, ed., *Conversations with Ernest Hemingway* (Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 1986), p. 128.

[61] Peter Messent, *Modern Novelists: Ernest Hemingway* (New York, NY: St Martin's Press, 1992), p. 47.

[62] Jonathan Culler, *Literary Theory – A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 83.

[63] Adrienne Rich, *Blood, Bread, and Poetry*. Selected Prose 1979-1985 (New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Company, 1994), p. 46.

[64] Adrienne Rich, 'Cartographies of Silence', in *The Dream of a Common Language*. Poems 1974-1977 (New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Company, 1978), p.17.

[65] Cheryl Glenn, 'Silence: A Rhetorical Art for Resisting Discipline(s)', *Journal of Advanced Composition*, Number 22. 2, 2002, p. 263.

[66] Ibid, p. 282.

[67] Ernest Hemingway, 'Fathers and Sons', in *The Short Stories* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1995), p. 490.

[68] Karl Augustus Menninger, *Love Against Hate* (New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1942), p. 58.

[69] Julia Kristeva, *Powers of Horror – An Essay on Abjection* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1982), pp. 1-5.

[70] Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1990), p. 2.

[71] E. Anthony Rotundo, *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1994), pp. 275-78.

[72] Mark Spilka, *Hemingway's Quarrel with Androgyny* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1990), pp. 2-3.

[73] Ernest Hemingway, 'Fathers and Sons', in *The Short Stories* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1995), p. 489.

[74] Ibid, p. 490.

[75] Ibid, p. 491.

[76] Kristofer Allerfeldt, *Crime and the Rise of Modern America: A History from 1865-1941* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2011), pp. 159-62.

[77] Ernest Hemingway, 'Fathers and Sons', in *The Short Stories* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1995), pp. 492-99.

[78] Richard McCann, 'To Embrace or Kill: "Fathers and Sons"', in Jackson J. Benson, ed., *New Critical Approaches to the Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990), p. 266.

[79] Ibid, p. 267.

[80] Ibid, pp. 269-70.

[81] Ibid, pp. 269-70.

[82] Arthur Waldhorn, *A Reader's Guide to Ernest Hemingway* (1972) (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2002), p. 53.

[83] Cathy Caruth, *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), p. 7.

[84] Ronald P. Rohner, Abdul Khaleque, and David E. Cournoyer, *Introduction to Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory, Methods, Evidence, and Implications* (Storrs-Mansfield, CT: University of Connecticut, 2012), pp. 8-9. Available on the World Wide Web: http://www.cspar.uconn.edu/INTRODUCTION-TO-PARENTAL-ACCEPTANCE-3-27-12.pdf (Accessed 29 November 2012)

[85] Debra A. Moddelmog, *Reading Desire: In Pursuit of Ernest Hemingway* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1999), p. 121.

[86] Ibid, p. 130.

[87] Richard McCann, 'To Embrace or Kill: "Fathers and Sons"', in Jackson J. Benson, ed., *New Critical Approaches to the Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990), p. 273.

[88] Ernest Hemingway, 'Fathers and Sons', in *The Short Stories* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1995), p. 499.

[89] Richard McCann, 'To Embrace or Kill: "Fathers and Sons"', in Jackson J. Benson, ed., *New Critical Approaches to the Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990), p. 272.

[90] Pamela Boker, *The Grief Taboo in American Literature* (New York, NY: New York University Press, 1996), pp. 204-5.

[91] Ernest Hemingway, 'Fathers and Sons', in *The Short Stories* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1995), p. 499.

[92] Paul Strong, 'Gathering the Pieces and Filling in the Gaps: Hemingway's "Fathers and Sons"', *Studies in Short Fiction*, Number 26.1, 1989, p. 58.

[93] Joseph M. Flora, *Hemingway's Nick Adams* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), p. 247.

[94] Erik Nakjavani, 'The Fantasies of Omnipotence and Powerlessness: Commemoration in Hemingway's "Fathers and Sons"', in Frederic J. Svoboda and Joseph J. Waldmeir, eds., *Hemingway: Up in Michigan Perspectives* (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1995), p. 95.

[95] Susan F. Beegel, 'Second Growth: The Ecology of Loss in "Fathers and Sons"', in Paul Smith, ed., *New Essays on Hemingway's Short Fiction* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 102.

[96] Jackson J. Benson, *Hemingway: The Writer's Art of Self-Defense* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1969), p. 13.

[97] Richard McCann, 'To Embrace or Kill: "Fathers and Sons"', in Jackson J. Benson, ed., *New Critical Approaches to the Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990), p. 266.

[98] Jackson J. Benson, *Hemingway: The Writer's Art of Self-Defense* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1969), p. 14.

Bibliography

Allerfeldt, Kristofer, *Crime and the Rise of Modern America: A History from 1865-1941* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2011)

Austad, Jonathan A., *Hemingway and Hitchcock: An Examination of the Aesthetic Modernity* (Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest, 2008)

Beegel, Susan F., 'Second Growth: The Ecology of Loss in "Fathers and Sons"', in Paul Smith, ed., *New Essays on Hemingway's Short Fiction* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1998)

Benson, Jackson J., *Hemingway: The Writer's Art of Self-Defense* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1969)

Biller, Henry B., *Fathers and Families: Paternal Factors in Child Development* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1993)

Boker, Pamela, *The Grief Taboo in American Literature* (New York, NY: New York University Press, 1996)

Caruth, Cathy, *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996)

Childs, Peter, *Modernism* (London: Routledge, 2000)

Comley, Nancy R. and Robert Scholes, 'Tribal Things: Hemingway's Erotics of Truth', *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, Number 25. 3, 1992

Crumrin, Timothy, 'Sports and Recreation', in Richard Sisson, Christian Zacher and Andrew Cayton, eds., *The American Midwest: An Interpretive Encyclopedia* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2007)

Culler, Jonathan, *Literary Theory – A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)

Eby, Carl P., *Hemingway's Fetishism: Psychoanalysis and the Mirror of Manhood* (New York, NY: State University of New York Press, 1999)

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

Glenn, Cheryl, 'Silence: A Rhetorical Art for Resisting Discipline(s)', *Journal of Advanced Composition*, Number 22. 2, 2002

Greenson, Ralph R., 'Dis-Identifying from Mother: Its Special Importance for the Boy (1968)', in Dana Breen, ed., *The Gender Conundrum: Contemporary Psychoanalytic Perspectives on Femininity and Masculinity* (London: Routledge, 1993)

Hawes, Joseph M. and Shores, Elizabeth F., eds., *The Family in America: An Encyclopedia* (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2001)

Hemingway, Ernest, 'Fathers and Sons', in *The Short Stories* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1995)

Hemingway, Ernest, 'Indian Camp' and 'The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife', in *The Short Stories* (New York, NY: Scribner, 1995)

Kagan, Jerome, 'The parental love trap', *Psychology Today*, Number 12, 1978

Kosofsky Sedgwick, Eve, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1990)

Kristeva, Julia, *Powers of Horror – An Essay on Abjection* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1982)

McCann, Richard, 'To Embrace or Kill: "Fathers and Sons"', in Jackson J. Benson, ed., *New Critical Approaches to the Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990)

Menninger, Karl Augustus, *Love Against Hate* (New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1942)

Messent, Peter, *Modern Novelists: Ernest Hemingway* (New York, NY: St Martin's Press, 1992)

Moddelmog, Debra A., *Reading Desire: In Pursuit of Ernest Hemingway* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1999)

Nakjavani, Erik, 'The Fantasies of Omnipotence and Powerlessness: Commemoration in Hemingway's "Fathers and Sons"', in Frederic J. Svoboda and Joseph J. Waldmeir, eds., *Hemingway: Up in Michigan Perspectives* (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1995)

Nelligan, John Emmett, *A White Pine Empire: The Life of a Lumberman* (1929) (St. Cloud, MN: North Star Press, 1969)

Plimpton, George, 'The Art of Fiction: Ernest Hemingway', in Matthew J. Bruccoli, ed., *Conversations with Ernest Hemingway* (Jackson, MS: University Press of Mississippi, 1986)

Reynolds, Michael, *The Young Hemingway (*New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Company, 1998)

Rich, Adrienne, *Blood, Bread, and Poetry*. Selected Prose 1979-1985 (New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Company, 1994)

_____ 'Cartographies of Silence', in *The Dream of a Common Language*. Poems 1974-1977 (New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Company, 1978)

Rohner, Ronald P.; Abdul Khaleque, and David E. Cournoyer, *Introduction to Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory, Methods, Evidence, and Implications* (Storrs-Mansfield, CT: University of Connecticut, 2012) Available on the World Wide Web: http://www.cspar.uconn.edu/INTRODUCTION-TO-PARENTAL-ACCEPTANCE-3-27-12.pdf (Accessed 29 November 2012)

Rotundo, E. Anthony, *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1994)

Spilka, Mark, *Hemingway's Quarrel with Androgyny* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1990)

Strong, Amy L. 'Screaming Through Silence: The Violence of Race in 'Indian Camp' and 'The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife', *The Hemingway Review*, Number 16. 1, 1996

_____ *Race and Identity in Hemingway's Fiction* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008)

Strong, Paul, 'Gathering the Pieces and Filling in the Gaps: Hemingway's "Fathers and Sons"', *Studies in Short Fiction*, Number 26.1, 1989

Strychacz, Thomas, 'Dramatizations of Manhood in Hemingway's *In Our Time* and *The Sun Also Rises*', *American Literature*, Number 61.2, 1989

_____ *Hemingway's Theaters of Masculinity* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2003)

Waldhorn, Arthur, *A Reader's Guide to Ernest Hemingway* (1972) (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2002)