

T. C.
ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

**THE TEST OF MANHOOD IN ERNEST HEMINGWAY'S A FAREWELL TO
ARMS AND FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS**

THESIS

QAIDAR RAHIM RASHID

Department of English Language and Literature

English Language and Literature Program

Thesis Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ferma LEKESIZALIN

February 2016

T. C.
ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES



**THE TEST OF MANHOOD IN ERNEST HEMINGWAY'S A FAREWELL TO
ARMS AND FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS**

M.Sc. THESIS

QAIDAR RAHIM RASHID

(Y1412.020018)

Department of English Language and Literature

English Language and Literature Program

Thesis Advisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ferma LEKESIZALIN

February 2016



T.C.
İSTANBUL AYDIN ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜ

Yüksek Lisans Tez Onay Belgesi

Enstitümüz İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Ana Bilim Dalı İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı Y1412.020018 numaralı öğrencisi **Qaidar Rahim Rashid RASHID**'nin "THE TEST OF MANHOOD IN ERNEST HEMINGWAY'S A FAREWELL TO ARMS AND FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS" adlı tez çalışması Enstitümüz Yönetim Kurulunun 01.02.2016 tarih ve 2016/03 sayılı kararıyla oluşturulan jüri tarafından *iyibiciliği* ile Tezli Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak *kabul*.....edilmiştir.

Öğretim Üyesi Adı Soyadı

İmzası

Tez Savunma Tarihi :19/02/2016

1)Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Ferma İ.FKESİZALIN

2) Jüri Üyesi : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Öz ÖKTEM

3) Jüri Üyesi : Yrd. Doç. Dr. Gillian Mary Elizabeth ALBAN

Qaidar
.....
Gülüm
.....
Gillian
.....

Nor Öğrencinin Tez savunmasında **Başarılı** olması halinde bu form **imzalanacaktır**. Aksi halde geçersizdir.

FOREWORD

It is a pleasure to express my acknowledgement for those who made this study possible.

First and foremost, I would like to express my profound gratitude and deep appreciation to my great teacher and thesis Supervisor Professor Ferma Lekesizalin that constantly motivated me to keep working on my thesis and guided me with her constructive and valuable feedback. Without her direct help and guidance this thesis would not have been materialized.

I would similarly like to express my profound gratitude to Istanbul Aydin University/ English language and literature department for their constant assistance throughout writing this thesis.

I also owe a very important debt to Professor Gordon Marshall who offered technical assistance and sincere encouragement.

Special thanks also to my colleague Diyar Esa who has always encouraged me to finish writing the thesis.

Additionally, I cannot find adequate words to express my gratitude to my friend Azad Abubakr who made meaningful contribution to the study.

Furthermore, I am indebted to my family for their enthusiastic support and strong encouragements. Finally, my deepest appreciation goes to my brother Askandar Rahim for the financial support and his morale-boosting that made it possible to finish my thesis.

February 2016

Qaidar Rahim Rashid

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IV
ÖZET	V
ABSTRACT	VI
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Manhood in Hemingway’s <i>A Farewell to Arms</i> and <i>For Whom the Bell Tolls</i>	1
1.2 The Modern Era and the Lost Generation	6
1.3 Liberation of Women in the Modern Era	9
1.3.1 Masculine Ideal prior to the First World War.....	10
1.3.2 Changing Masculine Ideal during the Post-War Period	14
2. A FAREWELL TO ARMS	20
2.1 Henry’s Struggle for the Manhood in Battlefield.....	21
2.2 Henry’s Disenchantment with his Manhood, War and His Existence	28
2.3 The Outcome of Henry’s Quest for Manhood.....	33
3. FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS	35
3.1 Jordan’s Struggle for Manhood in the Spanish Civil War	36
3.2 Jordan’s Disenchantment with War and Its Effect on His Manhood	42
3.3 The Outcome of Jordan’s Quest for Manhood	48
4. CONCLUSION	50
Different Perceptions of Manhood	50
REFERENCES	55
RESUME	58

ERNEST HEMINGWAY'IN A FAREWELL TO ARMS VE FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS'DAKI ERKEKLİK TESTİ

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada Ernest Hemingway'in iki romanda iki ana karakter, Frederic Henry ve Robert Jordan eril kimlik, tartışır. Henry Silahlara Veda ana karakter ve Ürdün için Bell Gişeleri ana biridir. Geçmişte, edebiyat eleştirmenleri sert erkeksi özellikleri gösteren bireyler olarak Hemingway'in ana erkek karakterleri tespit almıştı. Önceki Eleştirmenlerin görüşlerin aksine, ben Hemingway merkez erkek karakterler, yani Henry ve Ürdün kendi eril toplumsal konumlarına ilişkin mücadelede ve onlar neredeyse onların erkeklik kanıtlamak mümkün olduğunu savunuyorlar. Biyografik bilgiler ve roman psikanalitik sorular önceki vurgu işaretli aksine, bu çalışmada eril kimliğin inşasında dikkat öder. Konunun Benim tartışma erkeklik toplumsal yapı üzerine kuruludur. Bu Birinci Dünya Savaşı ve İspanya İç Savaşı katılmak için Henry ve Ürdün kurşun motifleri inceleyerek içerir. Henry ve Jordan arasında çeşitli benzerlikler olmasına rağmen, bunlar, özellikle yönden birbirinden farklıdır. Henry savaşı katılarak onun erkeksi kimliğini yeniden dışında hiçbir yolu yoktur. Ancak, çok geçmeden savaşa olmak, onun erkeksi kimliğini savunmak için bir yol olmadığını öğrenir. Diğer bir deyişle, savaş erkeklige için yaptığı arama ile onu büyüünden bırakır. Sonuç olarak, o savaş ne de aile yaşamında ne onun erkeklik iddia ederek mutluluğu bulmak için sonunda yapamaz onun erkeksi kimliğini yeniden inşa etmek için yaptığı umutsuz girişimleri ile yaptığı düş kırıklığı karşısında şaşırır. O dolayı sevgilisi Catherine ve onun ölü çocuğun ölümüne perişan ve umutsuz hale gelir. Öte yandan, Ürdün savaş bırakın ve onun idealleri tehlikeye ediliyor olmasına rağmen, onun arkadaşları ve onun sevgilisi Maria korumak için mücadele tutmak için değil, hakkında fikrini oluşturur. Bunu yaparken, Ürdün pek tatmin bulmak ve bu şekilde onun erkeklik test zafer kazanmak için yönetir. Ürdün azami derecede kaybı duygusu ile üzerine hakim olduğu. Savaş erkeklik hazineyi ortaya çıkarmak için bir araç iken, Henry erkeklige kanıtlamak için yaptığı girişimleri başarısız olur. Ancak, Ürdün, onun idealleri ve o başlangıçta için Amerika'yı terk etti ilkelerine bağlı kalarak yoluyla belirli bir dereceye kadar başarılı.

Anahtar kelimeler: *Hemingway, Erkeklik, Cinsiyet Roller, Henry, Ürdün, Eril Kimlik, Silahlara Veda, Çanlar kimin için çalışıyor İnşaattı Krizi.*

**THE TEST OF MANHOOD IN ERNEST HEMINGWAY'S A FAREWELL TO
ARMS AND FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS**

ABSTRACT

The present study discusses the masculine identity of two main characters, Frederic Henry and Robert Jordan, in Ernest Hemingway's two novels. Henry is the main character in *A Farewell to Arms*, and Jordan is the main one in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. In the past, literary critics had identified Hemingway's main male characters as individuals that demonstrate tough masculine traits. In contrast to the previous critics' views, I argue that Hemingway's central male characters, namely Henry and Jordan are in struggle with regard to their masculine social positions and they are hardly able to prove their masculinity. In marked contrast to the previous emphases on biographical readings and psychoanalytical analyses of the novels, this study pays careful attention to the construction of the masculine identity. My discussion of the subject is based on the social construction of manhood. This involves examining the motives that lead Henry and Jordan to participate in the First World War and in the Spanish Civil War. Although there are several similarities between Henry and Jordan, they differ from each other in particular aspects. Henry has no way except rebuilding his masculine identity by joining the war. However, he soon finds out that being involved in the war is not a way to assert his masculine identity. In other words, the war leaves him disenchanted with his search for manhood. Consequently, he is overwhelmed by his disenchantment with his desperate attempts to rebuild his masculine identity as he is eventually unable to find happiness by asserting his manhood neither in the battlefield nor in family life. He becomes distraught and desperate due to the death of his lover Catherine and her stillborn child. On the other hand, Jordan makes up his mind to stay in battlefield and keep on fighting to protect his friends and his lover Maria despite the fact that his ideals are being compromised. In doing so, Jordan hardly manages to find satisfaction and gain victory in showing his manhood in this manner. Jordan prevails over with a sense of loss to the utmost degree. While the war is a means to uncover the treasure of manhood, Henry fails in his attempts to prove his manhood. Yet, Jordan succeeds to a certain degree through being committed to his ideals and principles which he initially has left America for.

Keywords: *Hemingway, Crisis of Masculinity, Gender Roles, Henry, Jordan, Construction of Masculine Identity, A Farewell to Arms, For Whom the Bell Tolls.*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Manhood in Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls*

The goal of this study is to explore the construction of the manhood through examining the ideas, actions, choices, and motives of the two central characters, Frederic Henry and Robert Jordan, in Ernest Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Critics such as Philip Young and Earl Rovit had previously described the Hemingway's leading male characters as individuals that display tough masculine behaviors during heroic struggles. They claimed that Hemingway tried to portray the bravery of American male despite facing conflicts. Young argued that the leading characters of Hemingway were constructed as "heroes" and Rovit pointed out the same fact but used the term, "tyro". According to them, "hero" or "tyro" is constantly full of energy and ready to overcome every obstacle that life puts in his way. In addition, despite having his own emotional and physical pains, the 'hero' manages to win through in the end (Young, 1965 & Rovit, 1963). To the contrary of the claims made by the previous critics of Hemingway, I contend that Hemingway's male leading characters, Henry and Jordan are in struggles with regard to their male identity and they hardly manage to prove their masculinity or even sometimes they cannot prove it. In contrast to the previous biographical readings and psychoanalytical analyses of both novels, this study examines the construction of the masculine identity of Henry and Jordan. The idea that gender roles are formed through culture, tradition and society has been expressed by numerous social theorists. Michel Kimmel is one of the most remarkable theorists in the field, and in his *The Gendered Society*, he states that "our identities are a fluid assemblage of the meanings and behaviors that we construct from the values, images, and prescriptions we find in the world around us" (2011, p. 113). To clarify, it is our interactions, not our biological characteristics that build our gender identity. Due to the fact that gender identities are formed by social and cultural encounters, they constantly

come under the influence of the prevailing historical and cultural forces of society. Thus, gender identity is not considered as naturally given neither as a global principle; however it is continuously changing and its cultural and historical context has to be taken into consideration.

American literature of the 20th century and particularly novel mirrored certain norms of a society that was loaded with conflicts and changes. The people experienced two heartbreaking and catastrophic wars that led American society to despair and loss. The entire country suffered from political, racial, social, and gender crises. In other words, the main characteristics of the 20th century America were based on social and political shifts. From a political aspect, it was a period in which a number of states in Europe were on the verge of breaking off their relations with each other and ending up in the First World War. From a social aspect, it was an era in which women fought for independence and emancipation; thus their fight gave birth to redefinition of the masculinity in society. Despite the fact that masculine standards did not melt away, they underwent considerable modifications. They were about to take up different social positions in a novel environment prior to and following the First World War. Especially, during the interwar period, the masculine standards underwent a change. Furthermore, a new tension was rising in European countries, fascism gained a widespread support. The fascist ideology posed a serious threat to freedom and liberal principles. The tensions between capitalism and socialism increased and led to a war.

Ernest Hemingway (1899–1961) is one of the most renowned authors of the world literature and furthermore, he is “the embodiment of the lost generation” (Lathbury, 2005, p. 22). He is also considered as a prominent author of the modern era and his works were read extensively in the West. During twenties and thirties, he proved himself in the sphere of literature and journalism. He reported the details of the Spanish civil war and the two world wars. Hemingway exposed the moral and social evils of his age in his works. Hemingway’s personal experiences permeated his novels. During the First World War, United States established alliances with Italy, France and Britain against Austria-Hungary and Germany at that time, Hemingway went to Europe in order to join the army but he was refused due to bad eyesight. Later he enlisted in the Italian Red Cross

and worked in ambulance service as a chauffeur during the war. However, he left his work due an injury in his leg (Goodheart, 2010, p. 8). In addition, by the time, the Spain entered Civil War in 1936; Ernest Hemingway travelled to Spain and worked as a war reporter for the North American Newspaper Alliance (NANA). Hemingway backed the left-wing Republicans. The Republicans endorsed a democratic-based rule of the country. In the end, the Republicans lost the war and thus, the right-wing Nationalists succeeded in establishing a totalitarian regime in 1939. Throughout the Spanish Civil War, Hemingway conveyed the news of the war to the world in order to inform them the details of the war. Hemingway took a humanitarian stand on the war and openly denounced the Nationalists for their brutal acts such as massacring people and subjecting the workers to bombardment. For Hemingway, the evil acts done by the Fascists could never be seen “without hatred and anger” (Hemingway, 1982, p. 4). In other words, Hemingway strongly condemned the massacres committed by the Fascists. It is his personnel experiences that reflected in *A Farewell to Arms* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* which will be investigated in this study. War, political tensions, and the devastating battlefields mostly remain in the background of both novels. His works deal with the choices and motives of the individuals, especially men, and the thorny issue of the relationship between masculinity and idealistic values. Examining those values is more fascinating than focusing solely on political conflicts. On that account, the present study endeavors to elucidate key factors in driving the central characters of both novels to be separately involved in the Spanish Civil War and the First World War. In order to give close attention to examining the manhood of these characters, it is necessary to explore the major changes in the political and social structure of that age. Those changes are equally applicable to the choices, motives, and actions of both Henry and Jordan.

In this chapter, an overview will be provided regarding modern era, the Lost Generation and Hemingway as a pioneering writer of the generation. In addition, the concept of masculinity and what kind of transformations it went through historically and socially in the western culture and society prior to and following the First World War will be introduced to the readers. The discussion on gender roles which broke out amongst authors in the early of the 20th century can be defined as only a combat between masculinity and femininity (Gilbert and Gubar, 1988). This platitude is apparently a

clear depiction of the battle for authority in gender norms that took place at the beginning of 20th century. Male and female gender roles are essentially conflict with each other. The understanding of one gender is influenced by any change in the other one, in the meantime, the same consequences can be perceived on the other as well. It is crucial to comprehend the reciprocal connection between both genders in scrutinizing the alterations in masculinity which happened during this period. The conventional idea of masculine gender depends totally on the oppositional mood of gender roles. The traditional perception of manhood is described as an antipathy towards any feature which culturally symbolizes femininity (Reyna and Cadena, 2006, p. 2). Due to considering weakness as a feminine feature, men think highly of power and strength. Moreover, because of associating women with emotion, men employ rationality. The traditional creation of gender perception leads to the idea that manhood symbolizes rationality, and females being symbolized by their bodies, emotion and sexuality (Gardiner, 2005, p.36). One of the clear implications of this paradigm of manhood perception is that it leads to sexual and emotional subjugation since emotionality is deviled as female features. The durability of traditional manhood identity relies completely on the repression of females. Traditional femininity emerges from the conception that males are superior to females. This conception of manly superiority has grown all over history due to the dominance of patriarchal values in society. As a matter of fact, the perception of Henry and Jordan regarding manhood will be examined. As stated previously, historical shifts changed the masculine values and men of the era had no choice except putting up with the shifts. Prior to the First World War, the male individual governed the society and the female individual was marginalized and this situation had shaped the behaviors of the members of the society. Women lived a domestic life and were mainly responsible for the domestic tasks, taking care of the house and children. Their role was largely defined as the angel in the house. Motherhood was the supreme duty of a woman. In another section of this opening chapter, the focus will be shifted towards a past president of America namely, Theodore Roosevelt since he had played a big part in the issue of masculinity at the modern era. Roosevelt is particularly significant due to his ideological position. His ideas significantly affect both Jordan in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* and Henry in *A Farewell to Arms*. In the final section

of this chapter, some lights will be shed on particular circumstances following the First World War and the new social status of combat soldiers in a community that had changed while they were a long way away from it. Briefly, the aforementioned social change is really essential for examining the manhood of both Jordan and Henry, and for revealing the factors that pushed them to separately participate in the Spanish Civil War and the First World War.

This thesis particularly explores the involvement of Henry and Jordan in the First World War and the Spanish Civil War. In a chapter dedicated to *A Farewell to Arms*, the thesis will describe the causal factors leading to the appearance of Henry in the First World War because it is strange seeing an American individual in the Italian front against the Austrian one. Furthermore, the thesis will deal with two major subjects; first, it will investigate the noticeable effects of evolving masculine values on Henry to take part in war as a member of American society. A comparison will be made between the function of war as a discloser of masculine identity and the disappeared patriarchal position of men in the whole families of America. The thesis will elucidate the understanding of Henry for those two opposed concepts of masculine identity and explain which one is ultimately applicable on him. The second subject, that the thesis is going to deal with, is the factors that cause Henry to both rejoice at and denounce the war. This changing attitude of Henry toward war represents his disenchantment with it. This section of discussion will entirely be based on the issue of disenchantment and the Lost Generation. Ultimately, the present thesis will cover the factors moving Henry to be present at battlefield and the factors driving him to escape the battlefield. Additionally, the thesis will explain the reasons which cause Henry to become disenchanted with every choice that he is making and the way he experienced it. He will be in pursuit of his masculine identity in an environment wherein women are about undergoing the liberalization process. Briefly, the second chapter will examine issue Henry's attempts to discover his own identity during the First World War.

Throughout the penultimate chapter, the study will revolve around *For Whom the Bell Tolls* and its central character Robert Jordan. It will deal with masculine qualities of Jordan that previously examined in the personality of Henry. It is really noteworthy to

perceive the way masculine ideals had modified after more than a decade and how Jordan comprehends them. And besides, the study will deal with the casual factors driving Jordan to go to battleground and to remain therein the study will similarly provide a direct comparison between those factors and the ones of Henry. Thus, it is going to be easily noticeable why Henry flees from the battlefield and why Jordan stays therein. And in this way, the difference between the way Henry and Jordan see masculine ideals will become clear. Jordan will be put under discussion in two sections; first, the masculine identity of Jordan will be discussed and then it will be compared with the one of Henry. In the second section, the study will concentrate on examining idealistic values of Jordan in an era in which there were fierce debates over the fascist ideology and the communist ideology. The current study will illustrate the direct impacts of those heated debates on Jordan's manhood, his position about them and the factor that moves him to hold a certain position. Contrary to the idea that Jordan may not be a party activist, but he may have his own motives to opposing fascism. It is worthwhile to deal with what those motives are, the way they shift during the course of the fiction, and what choice Jordan finally makes.

In conclusion, the present study provides a comparison between the masculinity of Henry who is involved in the First World War, and the one of Jordan who is involved in the Spanish Civil War. The different constructions of manhood in *A Farewell to Arms* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* may partially be determined by the time span that comes between their publication dates. It is obvious that political issues such as Fascism appear mostly in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* than *A Farewell to Arms*. There are issues that arise regarding the way masculine values and idealistic values are perceived by central characters in both fictions.

1.2 The Modern Era and the Lost Generation

The modern literary era started around the beginning of 1910 and ended approximately in 1945. In terms of literature, modernism could be defined shortly as a new literary movement that was experimental and questioned blind acceptance of ideas (Lauter, 2014, p. 485). In this era, literature underwent transformations. The scientific and technological evolutions made the changes in literature possible (Morley, 2012, p. 10-

11). Modernism was full of contradictions because it criticized the patriarchal and traditional structure in society (Lauter, 2014, p. 486).

The prominent advocates of modernism were the Lost Generation writers (Morley, 2012, p. 147). Those writers were denominated as Lost Generation by Gertrude Stein (Monk, 2008, p. 58). They were the lost young generation because they went to war at their early ages, thus they missed the period of their education and socialization; besides, it was impossible for them to be educated and sociable again (Stein, 1971, p. 52). They were comprised of a number of writers like Hemingway, F. Scott Fitzgerald and John Dos Passos. They moved to Paris during the first and second decade of the 20th century. According to Morley, They left America in order to understand its geographical context more plainly (2012, p. 149). However, according to another scholar, the migration of American authors was because of the tensions between the changes stemmed from developments of science and empiricism and conservative Christian Church (Donaldson, 1996, p. 91). Morley states that the members of the Lost Generation took a mutual interest in creating a new thing in literature and were concerned with the subject of disenchantment following the Great War (2012, p. 148). The Lost Generation writers experienced a sense of homelessness in the entire world. They were in quest of a means to create a firm foundation for “meaningful values and experience” (Lauter, 2014, p. 494).

The lost generation and the Great War were inseparably intertwined. The involvement in war was their essential experience and this experience ended up leaving the war. (2012, Morley, p. 147-148). The Lost Generation was born in the aftermath of war. Malcolm Cowley believes that the generation was lost since they were “uprooted, schooled away and wrenched away from its attachment to any region or tradition.” (Cowley, 1994, p. 9). He also believes another reason behind their being lost was their way of coaching and preparation, that is to say, they were coached for “another world than existed after the war . . . The generation belonged to a period of transition from values already fixed to values that had to be created.” (Cowley, 1994, p. 9). This implies that that they can’t find meaning life although they desperately look for due to growing pressure of mechanized and industrialized and automatized modern society on the individual. The

above description directly applies to Hemingway since he has been an expatriate throughout most of his life. It similarly applies to Henry in *A Farewell to Arms* because he is lost individual and is in quest of asserting his manhood in Italy.

Hemingway was one of the leading writers of the lost generation and modern era. During the Great War, he worked as an ambulance driver in Italy for the American Red Cross. Later, he was admitted to hospital in Milan because he was injured during the war. During the war, he had been disturbed by the unpredictability of death. He took a stand against the usage of great and glorious words about war. He thought that corruption was endemic in patriotism (Lauter, 2014, p. 495). In addition, according to Hemingway that the environment of writing ought to be an environment for man. Therefore, he was accused of being a male-chauvinist (Donaldson, 1996, p. 170). He strived earnestly for presenting the male values in cultural arena (Donaldson, 1996, p. 193). Furthermore, Hemingway fell under the impact of his parents; however, he openly defied them (Lauter, 2014, p. 743). His father and his mother shared out the conjugal responsibilities in accordance with the principle of equality in partnership (Donaldson, 1996, p. 173), on the other hand, Hemingway noted that his mother was acting in a high-handed manner and he pointed the finger of blame at his father for being feeble (Lauter, 2014, p. 743, Donaldson, 1996, p. 173). As he was growing up, Hemingway and his age group had adored the bravery of Rough Riders in the American frontier during their growing up duration (Onderdonk, p. 63). In 1898, Theodore Roosevelt built up voluntary cavalry known as the Rough Riders during the Spanish-American War. Prior to taking power as the President of America, Roosevelt worked in the office Secretary of the Navy as Assistant (Sigal, 2013, p. 4). In 1899, in his talk entitled *The Strenuous Life*, Theodore Roosevelt developed a doctrine of manhood in America; it was based on living a strenuous life, exertive life and laborious life (Onderdonk, p. 63). Hemingway was interested in indulging manly pastimes and outdoor activities such as hunting, fishing and camping. During his lifetime, Hemingway had an adventures and energetic nature. During the Great War; he worked as an ambulance driver in Italy for the American Red Cross. In 1933, he had gone on safari. He was war correspondent in the time of the Second World War and the Spanish Civil war.

1.3 Liberation of Women in the Modern Era

In her book entitled *Manliness & Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917*, Gail Bederman states that ideological and historical process creates gender identity, that is to say, individuals identify themselves and others as women and men through that process (1995, p. 7). The dawn of the 20th century witnessed numerous changes in masculine values. Furthermore, the social and cultural consequences of the First World War jeopardized the conventional view of masculinity. Charles Hatten believes that a crisis of masculinity was caused by the financial and political changes of the First World War period (1993, p. 79). Societal tendencies altered towards a new concept of gender classification. Therefore, men struggled to safeguard their manhood by practicing various sports and involvement in war (1993, p. 80). Dealing with this crisis of masculine identity pervaded the literary works including Hemingway's works. Hemingway wrote down both *A Farewell to Arms* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* during the interwar period and there is more than a decade between the publication date of the above two fictions. In addition, the context of the first fiction is amidst the First World War and the context of second one is amidst the Spanish Civil War. The later novel also reflects ideological conflict, namely Fascism and Liberalism on the eve of the Second World War. The involvement of an American male individual in a war in Europe and the argument regarding the involvement may bear a close resemblance to one another. In this opening chapter, historical changes will be illustrated that had a profound impact on the covered subjects of the two fictions. *A Farewell to Arms* mainly revolves around the subject of masculine ideals such as bravery during war prior to and following the First World War. Which is also a period when that women were going through the process of governing the domestic realm and directly interfering in the public realm of society. And the aforementioned process posed a serious threat to the male ideals. Both novels deal with the issue of vanishing masculine ideals.

Gender roles underwent noticeable changes at the beginning of 20th century in the societies of the West. Social position of men and women evolved and certainly any shift in women's social position or men's social position had impacts on each other. Women achieved political, social and economic success during the early movement of feminism

(1859-1920s) and their success was a danger to special privileges of men. Additionally, women's participation in workplace did not merely defy the conventional understandings of womanhood, but it also defied the conventional notions of manhood. White women were not locked up in the private domain of society anymore. Therefore, women liberalization weakened men's position as the mere provider of the family and almost withdrew the exclusive privileges from men gained by the position. Besides, women participated in the First World War as healthcare workers in combat zones. That kind of social contact between men and women was nearly unimaginable in the century until the breakout of the War (Linker, 2011, p. 62). Catherine in *A Farewell to Arms* and Maria in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* almost play a stronger role than Henry and Jordan, in other words, their masculine identity is open to question. In United States, women gained suffrage under constitution in 1920 which is a noticeable shift in gender roles.

1.3.1 Masculine Ideal prior to the First World War

In his article *The Crisis of Masculinity, Reified Desire, and Catherine Barkley in "A Farewell to Arms"*, Charles Hatten points out that during 19th century, the manly ideals placed a huge emphasis on "personal autonomy" because it was considered as an essential requirement of manhood, to put it bluntly, Traditional points of view, patriarchal culture, and widespread literary texts encouraged men were to have full power and control over their own personality and their surroundings (1993, p.79-80). However, on the eve of the 20th century, men showed their masculinity in society less powerfully in comparison to the 19th century. Previously, masculine power took control over the society, however that power weakened on the eve of the century and men could not totally dominate the public realm anymore. From the perspective of Michael Kimmel, people generally believed that a new powerless generation was brought up by mothers. Kimmel labels this generation as "little mama's boys" (2006, p. 105), in other words, they were feeble emasculated individuals. Despite the fact that fathers endeavored to protect the manhood of their male offspring, but their attempts were foiled by themselves because they confined their spouses in the domestic realm of society. In this way, the women entirely took charge of educating family. Due to the confinement of women in domestic realm, a "feminine domestic" ideology was formed

in society (Kimmel, 2006, p. 105). Women already developed a feminine revolutionary mindset when men became aware of the consequences of abandoning the domestic realm.

Despite the fact that women remained in house mostly for bringing up infants and men were outside house providing provisions for their families, the patriarchal structure of the society was on the verge of collapsing since men were largely about being absent from private realm. (Carnes, 1990, p. 32). To put it differently, men mostly were outside home due to advancements in production methods of goods due to the long hours of work, it is possible to suppose that women began being the heads of their families. During that period, the divorce rate went up because of the social gap between women and men and so women were having no way except finding a new positions in society. When men began to become aware of abandoning the real power to a new influential generation of women, they made doomed attempts to have a hand in educating the members of their families. On the other hand, for Kimmel, it is not possible to consider those attempts as a progress of masculine ideals because they concentrated their efforts on their spouses but they thought that their attempts would possibly be fruitful with regard to their sons. The idea of manhood and domestic responsibilities were blended together, in other words, “men became convinced that in order to have their sons grow up to be “manly”, they should involve themselves more substantially in their children’s upbringing” (Kimmel, 2006, p. 107).

A chief embodiment of American masculinity was Theodore Roosevelt. Roosevelt was a president of America; he represented both masculine ideals of the old era and the intellectual tendency of the modern era. As an adventurer, hunter, and fighter, he was an embodiment of manhood. He was powerful and strong masculine model for American men. Moreover, the media of the United States drew an analogy between him and Oscar Wilde and labeled the latter as “Jane Dandy” (Kimmel, 2006, p. 120). He thought that he was in need of highlighting his masculine identity because he was in pursuit of being a real political figure. Similarly, in *A Farewell to Arms*, Henry may be modeled after Roosevelt. He possibly thinks that he is obliged to join the army in order to prove his manhood; in April 1885, Roosevelt travelled to region of Dakota for fighting. It is

possibly apparent that the major casual factors driving Henry to join the military of Italy was to reach the level of masculine ultimate model in America, a model that was associated with Roosevelt. It is under this circumstance that the central character in *A Farewell to Arms* namely Henry is obliged to demonstrate his manliness in society. He deserts the military in hope of establishing a household and achieving a patriarchal renown, a hope that had been shattered prior to joining the army. Ahead of the First World War, men faced the same challenge as Henry. By 1900s, the gap between male and female children was huge compared to the previous years because fathers were frequently putting their efforts into educating their sons in order to prove the masculinity of themselves and their sons. Kimmel states that a young man that had no love for war in “fighting” was regarded “unnatural” (2006, p. 107). Henry directly falls into that category because as a young man he should fulfill the expectations of society and demonstrate his masculine identity. Thus, he joins the army; however he has no motivation for doing that. He merely imitates what the other men do at that period for proving their masculinity which is fighting.

During the same period of history, Lord Baden Powell established the Boy Scouts in Britain. Women were responsible for teaching boys at schools, and Powell called for teaching them some manly manners too as they were becoming mature. Ultimately, Powell remarked that it is only men that are able to teach manhood and “those who are half men, half old women” cannot perform that task (Kimmel, 2006, p. 105). The Boy Scouts of America took a step further and provoked boys to have reaction against wars such as the wars against the Native Americans. In addition, Boy Scouts also detested the industrialized culture of cities because it represented “money grubbing machine politics, degrading sports, cigarettes, false ideals, moral laxity and lessening Church power – in a word: City rot” (Macleod, 2004, p. 32). Hemingway’s characters often prefer a social structure wherein freedom and manhood are priorities, in other words, and they often do not favor a modernized industrial social structure. It is obvious that the central character of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* namely Robert Jordan falls into this category because he feels love for nature:

He felt comfortable and sleepy now from the wine and lying back on the floor of the forest he saw through the tree tops the small afternoon clouds of the mountains moving slowly in the high Spanish sky (Hemingway, 1995, p. 26).

The love of nature is a masculine ideal for Americans because it provides an opposite environment to the modern industrialized society to American male. The manly figures surrounding the Boy Scouts openly encouraged a quiet and natural life, but modern urban life encouraged a life of luxury for the young boys. On the other hand, the future of these boys is still uncertain because they were the first generation of educated children that had to fight for preserving their patriarchal position in society. Furthermore, they were a new male generation that brought up in modernized surroundings for the first time; they were obliged to get to work in a less masculine atmosphere while the previous generation had different working conditions and a more masculine atmosphere. Secret fraternal societies like the Freemasons flourished, thus men had a way to feel joy and were relieved by accompanying one another and they happily lived a “cultural and domestic life without feeling feminized” (Kimmel, 2006, p. 114). Men were initiated into these fraternal circles by a special ritual that implied resurrecting in a more lacking masculine atmosphere. In the modernized environment, men were actually envied by women (Kimmel, 2006, p. 115). Following 1920s, fraternal societies would face losing their significance because men would begin getting along with the modernization of society and they established their own associations in the working environment. Besides, the study will explain that Robert Jordan would have much less problems than Henry with regard to masculine ideals because Jordan would begin accepting the evolved circumstance.

It is also possible to make an analogy between Roosevelt and Jordan in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Once Roosevelt became an object of ridicule due to his skinny body, but he kept going. This value of perseverance and being committed to a cause reflected in Jordan’s character. Jordan decided to fight for a cause at the beginning, thus his commitment may possibly be a deciding factor for not leaving the Spanish Civil War when he comes to know that the cause does not deserve fighting for. Roosevelt took a step further, and began to promote The Strenuous Life. One of his great talks was

similarly entitled with the aforementioned term, *The Strenuous Life*. Roosevelt detested the idle lifestyle; he had remarked that “our country calls not for the life of ease, but for the life of the strenuous endeavor (Roosevelt, 2009, p. 10). This idea is projected in the character of Henry and Jordan since they live a challenging life. They are constantly in quest of proving their manhood. The test of masculinity through a tough life is a concept that is possibly applicable to Robert Jordan and particularly to Frederic Henry. The famous speech of Roosevelt is the same as the speech of those men that seek to participate in war and prove their masculinity again because they notice a feminine danger ahead. It is probably amidst war; Henry perceives that living with Catherine Berkeley, his girlfriend, gives him a deserving and reasonable meaning to his masculinity. In other words, a possible factor driving Henry to go to battlefield was to carry out Roosevelt’s command for redefining masculinity because Roosevelt encouraged tough masculine ideals for men (Kimmel, 2006, p. 123). Furthermore, Roosevelt built wildlife sanctuary and national parks as well for promoting love for nature and respecting natural environment as a crucial aspect of virile lifestyle. The aforementioned adoration for natural environment reappears in the portrayal provided by Henry and Jordan. So, there is a belief that mannish lifestyle and love for nature are intertwined and this belief originates from the philosophy of Roosevelt. Kimmel highlights that Roosevelt provided his people with a necessary custom for forming a strong masculine ideal (2006, p. 124), an ideal that was extremely appealing to those men that were afraid of their own powerlessness in an “increasingly complex” environment (Parker, 1973, p. 35). In spite of this, masculine ideals yet would remain under threat in America.

1.3.2 Changing Masculine Ideal during the Post-War Period

In the beginning of 20th century, the feminist enlightened unconventional women emerged and were known as “the New Women”. Men occasionally overemphasized their masculine traits as a reaction to the hazards of the New Women. Bederman affirms that men energetically attempted to strengthen their masculine position during last decade of 19th century and the first two decades of 20th century in America (1995, p. 5). Fraternal associations, sports such as boxing and gymnastics became were growing

popular. Henry as an American male is goes to gymnastics in Lausanne in Switzerland (Hemingway, 1929, p. 331). He attempts to show his manhood through doing gymnastics. American men followed different strategies to reconstruct their manhood because they found themselves in dilemma with regard to their traditional understanding of masculinity (Bederman, 1995, p. 16).

Masculinity was on the verge of losing social privileges during 1920s. Throughout that period, women gained the right to vote and began occupying or appearing in places of business. Men believed that they were in need of reconfirming their manly social status. To put it differently, Kimmel points out that following the First World War, men were not probably enjoying much confidence in the working environment and they were in need of rebuilding their masculine identity (2006, p. 136). Due to the outbreak of the First World War, men's social position was shifted. The key focus of the Rehabilitation schemes and propaganda campaigns was recovery. In contrast to the past wars of America, men were not promised to receive any retirement benefits, but they were widely anticipated to recreate their manhood by reentering the marketplace or surprisingly going back to battlefield. The concept of full recovery was heavily highlighted by advertisements showing prosthetic arms and legs as Linker affirms that prosthetic body parts paved the way for health workers and the entire individuals of American society to be under the delusion that technological innovations probably ensure the complete recovery of the devastated human beings of the war (2011, p. 7). As a injured soldier, Henry may find himself disenchanted with war in the end, that is to say, he may not eventually consider war as place for reaffirming his manhood, this issue of disenchantment will be explored fully in the next chapter. In the wake of the First World War, gender roles considerably evolved. The combination of conventional understandings of both men and women roles was partially caused by the war. As a matter of fact, the post-war period was a watershed moment in the history of America. Due to witnessing the realities of the war, the historians and the people perceived dramatic change after the First World War. They saw the postwar American society as an entirely different environment. In other words, the war created changes in American lifestyle because it produced a lost disenchanted generation and the New Women

(Dumenil, 1995, p. 3). This means that it is apparently hard for men like Henry and Jordan to assert their manhood since they were living in that period.

The eruption of the First World War was a historic milestone in breaking up the 20th century and its aftermath directly impinged on all social levels of the West. During 19th century, the imperialists already brought the world into escalating conflicts. In 1914, the conflicts got to the culminating point and almost every young man was thrown into war around the world. Yet the cruelty of modern war was not perceived till the battle broke out. The use of automatic firearms, chemical weapons, and other types of heavy weapons ended in devastating and mounting death toll because the military forces of all countries strived for implementing modernized and developing war strategies. Purseigle states that due to the influence of war on society and the intensity of brutalities that was witnessed during the war, some chroniclers describe the Great War as “the harbinger of a brutalized twentieth century” (2005, p. 4).

The destructions brought by The First World War produced a culture in which conventional customs largely disappeared. Traditional gender roles were subjected to examination in the aftermath of the Great War. The model of both masculine and feminine identity started to fall into pieces in a society wherein traditional conventions did not seem to be applicable in modern lifestyle. The war shook the very foundation of the masculine ideals. The traditional concepts of vigorous manhood and masculine courage clashed with the conventional notions of heroism and masculine bravery fell into conflict with the exposures of war veterans to war. The American men found opportunity for demonstrating their masculinities when the Great War broke out, and they travelled to European countries to join the battlefronts. However, According to Elaine Showalter, the First World War was a catastrophe because it caused men to suffer from masculine identity crisis. By all means, that war inflicted hardship and difficulty upon masculinity (1987, p. 171). In the battlefield, men went through a sense of loss and panic and they suffered from mental disorder and shell-shock. Combat veterans were not capable of discovering a means of livelihood and the vast majority of them felt despair and empty. Pessimism infused the mind of young men. To put it differently, the

masculine factors driving men toward war resulted in disenchantment rather than empowering masculinity. The Great War weakened masculine ideal.

After the Great War, gender roles underwent numerous evolutions. Women took up the job positions of men because men had not been present at work environments (Joseph, 2003, p. 65). At that moment, thus it was possible for women to unshackle themselves from the conventional gender restrictions. The rate of female employment was substantially high. Women handled their own economic status and led their own life (Vernon, 2002, p. 43). That is to say, the benefits which women reaped in the wake of the war heightened the pressing concerns of men. Throughout the war men were sent to battlefield and came back to a social environment in which gender norms had shifted dramatically. Women were provided with job openings, for this reason, they were able to gain financial freedom and become self-sustaining. Due to their financial success, the social position of women shifted. According to Smiler, women were entering the men-only spheres and having privileges like “the workplace, and engaging in material comforts” (2008, Smiler et al. , p. 268). West points out that the bitter experience of war shattered any illusion that war is a theater for demonstrating masculinity. In that case, the credibility of the conventional masculine ideals was dramatically diminished by war (West, 2013, p. 107). This grave crisis could be noticed in Hemingway’s characters such as Fredric Henry and Robert Jordan.

According to Kimmel, the small triumphs of the beginning alleviated the crisis of manhood; however, a new terrible feeling of restlessness reappeared (2006, p. 127). Since most of the soldiers faced having mental disorder, women took their positions and therefore women were eventually somehow able to leave the domestic realm. The masculine position of men in society was seriously undermined because women began to raise their families. It is during these historical and social changes that Henry in *A Farewell to Arms* decided to escape battlefield in order to earn a livelihood for his prospective spouse and their baby. He saves his manliness. In the case of not leaving the battlefield, he may identically have other war veterans’ fate, which is inability to sustain life. When Henry ultimately comes to know that his existence is merely miserable and pointless, he reflects the despair mood of the Great War veterans. In other words, the

idealized masculine image of Roosevelt faded away because harsh realities of war considerably weakened manhood. The markets and industrial firms paved the way for only-men job professions in order to vitalize masculinity, however these endeavors were small or futile. Kimmel affirms that the presence of women both at place of business and at the domestic environment appeared to be the central dilemma (2006, p. 131). Feminization pervaded the entire society. The novels of inter-war period covered the aforementioned issues. According to Kimmel, even though Hemingway detested the high-class lifestyle wherein he had been raised and attained a tough artisan-like manhood, his fictions demonstrate the fragileness of masculine ideal following the Great War (2006, p. 141).

In brief, it is evident that during the early of 20th century and the interwar period, masculinity had considerably changed in the American culture. At the beginning of the century, the way of living had shifted dramatically. The patriarchal society faced challenges in an environment wherein mental power began to step into the shoes of masculine power. In other words, despite the separation of the domestic realm and the public realm in society, female individuals dominated the society by educating infants. Once male individuals come to know that the division between realms of society had ended up undermining masculinity, the chance of being free from women domination had already been ruined. Although men started teaching manhood to their sons and the Boy Scouts started promoting masculine qualities, the efforts of the new male generation to demonstrate their masculinity had been abortive. Once Roosevelt appeared as an apparent national figure of high masculine values in the modern era, the bewildered men ultimately discovered the pioneer to be guided by. It is under this circumstance that the central characters namely Henry and Jordan were involved with war in both novels, *A Farewell to Arms* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. By means of his adventures, Roosevelt had directed numerous male individuals of his country; Henry and Jordan are among those individuals. As a response to Roosevelt's command, Henry goes to battlefield and Jordan decides to fight for a cause at the beginning; however he will still be committed to the cause when he comes to know that the cause does not deserve fighting for. On the other hand, following the Great War, it would be increasingly evident that the masculine ideal was entirely collapsing in American society. The combat veterans faced having

shell-shock and mental disorder, therefore, women took partly their positions in workplaces and were eventually capable of leaving the domestic realm to some extent. The masculine position of men in society was undermined because women partially began to be the provider of their families. To put it differently, there was not any influential position for war veterans in society since feminization even began dominating the working environment.



2. A FAREWELL TO ARMS

During the Great War, Ernest Hemingway enlisted in the Red Cross in Italy and worked as a chauffeur of ambulance service in the country at the beginning of 1918. At that time, Italy were in a coalition with America, France and Britain against Germany and Austria-Hungary. During his stay in Italy, Hemingway's experiences deeply left great impact on him and they would eventually be the cause of writing one of his greatest well-known novels, *A Farewell to Arms*. This novel, in which the dreadful facets of war have been exposed, is a remarkable literary work for examining the manhood of its leading character namely Frederick Henry. It is throughout the First World War, Henry an American lieutenant is employed in Italian military as an ambulance service manager in battlefield and front lines. He becomes infatuated with a nurse named, Catherine Barkley. He gets wounded during a bombardment and is admitted to a hospital in Milan where his love affair with Catherine develops. Eventually, Catherine becomes pregnant and Henry has to go back to the front lines. After a short period of time, Italian military is obliged to withdraw and during the withdrawal Henry and his staff get isolated from the others. Under the great risk of being shot to death by the Italian paramilitary police forces, Henry flees from the army and finds Catharine. They jointly get into a sailing craft to Switzerland. They spend a number of months very delightedly till Catharine dies after giving birth to a stillborn baby. The novel is retrospectively related and it is indistinct when Henry begins to recall past experiences following the death of his lover.

It is clear that there should be a factor that pushes an American citizen to go to a bloody war in a European country, a war that has erupted and there is not specific reason behind the involvement of his country. He hardly can speak Italian (Hemingway, 1929, p. 7). And he is considered as an expatriate in the novel. Undoubtly, the factors drove Frederic Henry to go to battlefield do not seem quite clear. Throughout this chapter, this thesis

will investigate the two basic aspects of the fiction. First, the concept of masculinity will be discussed in the fiction and the significance of the concept both historically and ideologically in connection with the fiction. Consequently, the thesis will confine its attention to point that Frederic Henry is not glorifying war as means for proving one's masculinity; on the other hand, he is explicitly condemning war and remarking on the ongoing quest for a reconstructed masculinity with his hindsight and his decisions. The quest for masculine values functioned as a considerable factor for Henry to be involved in war because he was in a changing environment in which women were undergoing liberalization process, men was in a fight to recover his manhood prior to the First World War and the growing disenchantment occurred therein.

Ernest Hemingway's literary products present masculine values, which include heavily drinking alcohol, fighting, and females. In Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms*, the hero, Frederic Henry, participates in the battle as a way to strengthen his manhood, he enters the combat zone for this purpose during the First World War in Italy. The struggle of crisis of masculinity reflects in Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms*, specifically in Henry as a central character of the novel. In other words, battlefield initially turns out to be a way via which Hemingway's characters, in this case Henry, could show manliness because the financial and political fields deprived male people of the conventional ways of maleness since the arrival of female in the labor world.

2.1 Henry's Struggle for the Manhood in Battlefield

Ernest Hemingway explores the struggle for reconstructing masculine values in his war fictions especially in *A Farewell to Arms*:

The next year, there were many victories. The mountain that was beyond the valley and the hillside where the chestnut forest grew was captured and there were victories beyond the plain on the plateau to the south and we crossed the river in August and lived in a house in Gorizia that had a fountain and many thick shady trees in a walled garden and a wistaria vine purple on the side of the house. Now the fighting was in the next mountain beyond and was not a mile away (Hemingway, 1929, p. 5).

The preceding quote plainly demonstrates the way Henry perceives war at the beginning,

he thinks of war as something attractive and constructive. Henry is blending war with a vivid pretty portrayal of scenery in Europe. Hemingway's central characters frequently derive great pleasure from natural surroundings. This probably proves that war serves as a momentary distraction from the real issue of woman appearance in the public sphere. Furthermore, In the light of the fact that the battlefield is a place for bringing men together, a general feeling of fraternity will apparently arouse between men in that space where women is not present. In spite of Hemingway's attention to battle as a way to confirm manliness, as pointed out earlier, the battle does not serve this purpose for Henry. Henry is void of zeal and is involved in the battle with shallow manner. Along with other soldiers, he is compelled to be concerned with issues of life, death and bachelorhood, nevertheless he follows that unenthusiastically. While talking with his mate combatants, Henry continuously puts forward merely evasive responses saying that the reply cannot be stated in a straightforward way and is related to the internal part of his character. This indicates that Henry goes into the armed forces basically to found his manhood using the typical manly action of battle (Hatten, 1993, p. 83). Henry joins the Italian army so as to confirm his manly power, but stays separated from the duty as he says, "It evidently made no difference whether I was there to look after things or not" (Hemingway, 1929, p. 16). Because of this disengagement and indifferent attitude towards the war, Henry's attempt to assert his manhood through battle is initially on the verge of failure.

However, Henry begins to have a relationship with a nurse named Catherine. And before expressing his special fondness for her, he is ordered to go to the Front, wherein he is seriously injured. He is admitted to a hospital in Milan for receiving medical treatment. Although the doctors inform Henry that his treatment takes six months, but he appears particularly eager for returning to battlefield. He considers the duration overly long. This is a devastating storm that hits Henry's masculine principle of military commitment: "But I can't wait six months" (Hemingway, 1929, p. 105). The doctor treats Henry very kindly and softly asks Him: "You are in such a hurry to get back to the front?" (Hemingway, 1929, p. 105). In his reply to the doctor, Henry says, "Why not?" "It is very beautiful" (Hemingway, 1929, p. 106). The doctor says, "You are a noble young man." He stooped over and kissed me very delicately on the forehead" (Hemingway,

1929, p. 106).

The previous conversation between Henry and the doctor reveals that Henry is facing the imminent collapse of his manhood in case of not obtaining formal permission for returning to the battlefield. Currently, Henry thinks that battlefield is a place for him for proving his manhood, but he cannot manage to prove it due to his injury. Thus, he will possibly suffer from a sense of abandonment because he will not be able affirm his military commitment as a young man. Long waiting seems to be his only available option and it will entirely destroy his manhood. In her article entitled *Invalid Masculinity: Silence, Hospitals, and Anesthesia in A Farewell to Arms*, Diane Herndl talks of waiting periods, she points out that at outbreak of the First World War, men were joining the armed forces in order to reinforce their manhood through doing acts of bravery in war, but the majority of soldiers eventually realized war stands for waiting in deep ditches and their subjection to constant bombardment underground. Waiting comprises most of Henry's involvements in war: "waiting out bad weather, waiting for shelling to begin so that he can drive his ambulance, or waiting in the hospital to get well. He is wounded, in fact, while he is waiting" (2001, p. 42). While Henry undergoes waiting period in the hospital, his masculine identity goes under attacks since the doctor behaves toward him in a womanized manner, in other words, Henry describes the doctor's fingers as delicate, moreover, the doctors gives a kiss to him in an extremely delicate manner. Along with his suffering from a bodily injury, Henry feels that his manhood is on the verge of collapse because of his incapability to move freely. Henry has an urgent intense thirst for proving his manhood by returning to battlefield, but the medical expert does not comprehend his thirsty. He ultimately finds a surgeon named Dr. Valentini to perform surgery on his leg immediately in opposition to previous doctor's opinion on the surgery; in this manner, Henry will be able to rejoin the army sooner in the long run. During his recovery in the hospital, Catherine reunites with him. She assists him during receiving treatment. Following the flourish of her love affair with Henry, Catherine informs him that she is going to give birth to his infant. Becoming a father is apparently a hope for Henry to show his manhood through family life.

After his recovery from the injury, Henry rejoins the military to reaffirm his masculine

identity. It is there that the fraternal spirit becomes volatile among the soldiers in the initial part of the story; the manhood of the troops appears to be in doubt. This is shown while Henry is being left by two sergeants and simultaneously he is desperate for their assistance in order to pull out their bogged down vehicle in the mud. He intentionally executes one of the sergeants when they are running away. Henry shouts: “‘Halt,’ I said... ‘I order you to halt,’ I called. They went a little faster. I opened up my holster, took the pistol aimed at the one who had talked the most, and fired. I missed and they both started to run. I shot three times and dropped one.” (Hemingway, 1929, p. 218). At this point, Hemingway gives the readers an accurate portrayal of collapsing manliness in the lines of the soldiers.

In addition to the point that Henry opens fire on fugitive soldiers, it seems that he is also carrying out his duty as he is obliged to punish the weaklings of war. Despite that it is obvious that he will similarly escape from the battlefield later on, thus this action ultimately cannot be considered as heroic. Furthermore, Henry fails to hit one of the escaping soldiers and he has no way except leaving the rest of the action to his companion named Bonello: “I commenced to reload the empty clip. Bonello came up. ‘Let me go finish him,’ he said. I handed him the pistol.. Bonello leaned over, put the pistol against the man’s head and pulled the trigger.” (Hemingway, 1929, p. 218). This reaction of both Henry and Bonello looks awkward and casts considerable doubts on bravery in battlefield. In almost every part of the narrative, there is a sense that Henry ought to discover bravery and masculinity within himself rather than in the battle. Taking into account the aforementioned point concerning manhood, Hemingway places the leading character of that novel in a war zone that is questionable because it is strange to see an American individual in a European front. In this reasonable manner, combat zone serves as an appropriate context for Henry to prove his manhood and bravery. The previous quote elucidates that combat zone is not definitely a place for searching for bravery. This powerful image pops up again in the satirical lines wherein Henry is about earning a medal for bravery, he sees medal as an object of ridicule: “if you can prove you did any heroic act you can get the silver. Otherwise it will be the bronze. Tell me exactly what happened. Did you do any heroic act?’ ‘No’, I said. ‘I was blown up while we were eating cheese.’” (Hemingway, 1929, p. 68). It is said that Henry was carrying

several wounded soldiers on his back and helped others but he absolutely refuses it. He has no interest in any medal for bravery in any way. In other words, these satirical lines demonstrate the relationship between Henry and acts of bravery in battlefield. He goes through a similar experience in another part of the novel; he wonders how many enemy soldiers he killed, he knows for certain that he have not killed any one of them. However, he is “anxious to please” others and says “I had killed plenty” (Hemingway, 1929, p. 101). A British major informs Henry that the army almost lost the war; in addition, he tells him that “we were all right as long as we did not know it. We were all cooked. The thing was not to recognize it. The last country to realize they were cooked would win the war. We had another drink” (Hemingway, 1929, p. 142). However, the reader would consequently realize that Henry is not concerned about winning or losing the war. The only extremely courageous thing that Henry does throughout the book is his escape from the Italian paramilitary police when he is on the brink of being shot to death, however, his flight paradoxically may show his lack of bravery since he is escaping from the military and the combat zone: “I looked at the carabinieri. They were looking at the newcomers. The others were looking at the colonel. I ducked down, pushed between two men, and ran for the river,... The water was very cold and I stayed under as long as I could.” (Hemingway, 1929, p. 241). The total glories thing that Henry performs here is escaping from the Italian paramilitary police and saving his own life by throwing himself into this cold river named Tagliamento.

From this point forward, the novel takes another direction. The manliness of Henry reappears once again by the time he goes to “a gymnasium in the arcade to box for exercise (Hemingway, 1929, p. 331), and leaves Catherine, his lover, in a room. However, Henry henceforward plays another role because he is living with a pregnant woman that will prospectively give birth to a baby in the near future and as a result, becoming a father. Therefore, an alternative way is available for Henry for demonstrating his manhood which is being in charge of taking care of Catherine. Due to coming to his pregnant lover's rescue, he creates a small environment in which he manages to shoulder his familial burdens, that is to say, he takes up a patriarchal position in a familial circle. Previously, men had failed to secure this traditional position prior to the eruption of the war due largely to the considerable dominance of women in society.

During that period, women were chiefly provided the new generation with all-round education, Kimmel says that men were afraid of their sons' gloomy future because they were in danger of being "mama's boys" (2006, p. 105). In this respect, the decision about deserting the manly military sphere and its fraternal spirit similarly turns into a decision about going under family obligations and proving manhood in a whole new atmosphere. Frankly, Henry actually had played the role of a sick boyfriend during his torrid love affair with Catherine. While meeting Catherine in the first half of the novel, he did not appear to be a concerned prospective spouse; by contrast, he acted like a mama's boy. In addition, he essentially does not appear to be helpless man following his recovery from his illness and his subsequent rejoining the military for a short time.

While the cruelty of war does not succeed in providing what Henry desired, the novel exposes sexual occurrence as a method to assure masculine strength. The sexual occurrence falls into two key groups: firstly, he interacts with whores; secondly a relationship is there between Henry and Catherine Barkley. The novel initially shows the readers that relationship with women leads to ideal masculinity. While disassociating from their habituated social circles, men still had the capacity to affirm their masculine power as well as sexual independence by sexual occurrences. Nonetheless, this new form of sexual relation still hinders Henry, or the other fighters for the same issue, to confirm masculinity by carrying power above female characters. Indeed, Rinaldi, a fellow combatant, frequently visits brothels and deals with the women insensitively. He practices women objectification so that he can affirm his masculinity; however this becomes a failure as soon as the female characters turn to be acquainted. At first, Rinaldi gives a description of his connections with "girls;" yet, his views alter, furthermore he commences to mention the whores as "old war comrades" and "friends" (Hemingway, 1929, p. 65). Hatten declares that by sharing sexual aspiration, the female characters have gone through a manly experience and have to be dealt with as men (1993, p. 89). Sexual independence, especially as presented through loose sexual manners, is usually categorized as a branch of the men's experience. However, in this situation, men do not succeed in exercising sexual supremacy on women. Therefore, sexual supremacy fails to affirm masculinity; as long as women are also able to participate in loose sexual activities, the activities cannot be measured as masculine any longer.

The other type of sexual occurrence, Henry's relationship with Catherine Barkley, leads the concept of reified sexuality to be a failure. Henry at first illustrates his association with Catherine Barkley as tactical, saying, "This was a game, like bridge, in which you said things instead of playing cards" (Hemingway, 1929, p. 30). At first, the relationship is a match of policy for Henry and far from a demonstration of sentiment. He starts the relationship for the same motive of his participation in the battle as a device to strengthen his manly identity. The relationship develops as long as Henry widens emotions for Catherine; moreover it does not help to highlight his masculine power any longer. As a matter of fact, it can be argued that within the building of their relationship, Catherine Barkley presumes the manly function. A key part of such a declaration is the notion of inactivity opposed to activeness. Inactivity is most frequently regarded to become a womanly feature, whereas action and danger portray masculinity. Hatten claims that Catherine, who connects the sexual association enthusiastically in the occurrence of reified aspiration turning her to be like a prostitute, is reluctant to agree to the inactive status that the allusion present her" (1993, p. 94). Eagerly labeling herself a prostitute throughout a debate of their stay in a hotel, Catherine orally affirms her dominance over their sexual connection (Hemingway, 1993, p 152).

Additionally, Catherine reveals that she is not interested in the social set of laws, but she is obsessed with sexual desire, which denies her mate of the manly status as an initiator sexually (Hatten, 1993, p. 95). When she confesses her emotions for Henry, Catherine lets Henry know that she desires to shorten her hair, stating, "I want you so much I want to be you too" (Hemingway, 1929, p. 290). Declaring this speech, Catherine intends to eradicate gender categorization by identically turning into the man she feels affection for. Henry apparently does not carry any authentic masculine power concerning their relationship; and she is preventing him from objectifying her. Accordingly, the relationship, akin to the battle and loose sexual activity, does not help to Henry strengthen his masculinity.

Catherine's challenge to the set gender positions goes beyond her authority of sexuality. She also reveals a lot of independence, which Hemingway noticed as a manly model. In the last section, the location changes from the death and life circumstances of battle to

that of the delivery of Catherine's and Henry's infant. This vital view undermines gender; Henry shows weakness as he frequently begs, "God please do not make her die. I'll do anything you say if you don't let her die" (Hemingway, 1929, p. 330). Henry's rejection carries a clear sense of weakness and extreme anxiety to agree to his spouse's fate. Catherine calmly consent to the loss of her life, telling Henry, "Don't worry darling...I'm not a bit afraid" (Hemingway, 1929, p. 330). Hatten claims that dying boldly, she challenges and overcomes the fearful situation, which death brings to her, in a womanly version of a battleground, and furthermore she gains the exact kind of heroic reputation that constantly evades Henry (1993, p. 96). Despite the fact that Catherine is a woman, she is the merely character who has the competence to show a firm masculinity.

Catherine turns to be the essential device for the triumphant expression of a manly experience (Hatten, 1993, p. 96-7). Hemingway praises masculinity possibly in an ironical way for the merely character, who is able to express authentic masculinity, is the woman protagonist. Hemingway portrays the infirmity of masculinity through the hero, Henry. For Henry, the battle does not confirm masculinity; however, it unveils his weakness. Consequently, Hemingway adopts the battle as a device to scrutinize masculine power, not having the same end. Undoubtedly praising boldness and independence, Hemingway attributes the masculine features to the heroine, and the battle undermines the allotment of masculine power to the combatant.

2.2 Henry's Disenchantment with his Manhood, War and His Existence

Henry may not be consequently considered as a representative of a tough American masculine ideals due to the devastating effects of war on him as Thomas F. Strychacz affirms that "Henry is physically and psychically damaged, and therefore potentially a seriously disabled spokesman for masculine values" (2003, p. 95). To put it differently, the war is surrounding Henry and a chaotic and disenchanting future awaits him. Ray B. West states that as an individual of twentieth century Henry's life is full of disenchantment with attaining "the ideals it had been promising throughout the nineteenth century" (1970, p. 15). The disenchantment is one of the underlying themes of the novel. Lost Generation writers including Hemingway experienced the feeling of disenchantment with society and war after the Great War. Therefore, as a lost

individual, Henry experiences a sense of disenchantment with war and the social environment of American during nineteenth century. I believe that part of Henry's disenchantment is caused by the collapse of the masculine values in American society because it is clear that a causal factor driving Henry to war in Italy is to recover his masculinity. Undoubtedly, there are possibly several other factors at play in Henry's travel to Italy, they will be later discussed.

However, the highly significant factor is certainly the quest to rebuild his masculine identity. In the beginning of the third chapter of the novel, Henry effectively shifts his focus from the beauty of a Gorizia's scenery onto the aftermath of war on it, and vice versa: "When I came back to the front we still lived in that town. There were many more guns in the country around and the spring had come" (Hemingway, 1929, p. 10). He keeps on describing this scenery affected by war, in addition, he provides the reader with an image of masculine values that are under fire in modern society due to the appearance of women: "I saw the town with the hill and... the mountains beyond, brown mountains with a little green on their slopes. In the town there were more guns, there were some new hospitals, you met British men and sometimes women, on the street, and a few more houses had been hit by shell fire" (Hemingway, 1929, p. 10). On the other hand, his passionate and detailed portrayal of the town probably demonstrates that he is apparently enjoying his masculinity that he has lost in social sphere of America. The relationship between the town's scenery and its urbanization functions as a representation of rival conceptions of masculine ideals and it throws the survival of the masculine ideals into serious doubts in the societies of modern era including American society.

Henry's involvement in war can be considered as a final bid for reconstructing his masculine identity, in other words, it appears that there was not an obvious motive for Henry to go to battlefield in Italy except to flee from a social environment wherein men were not able to secure their liberty, therefore, through his travel, he is attempting to restore his liberty. Besides, Henry actually takes pleasure in his love affair with Catherine at the beginning and after healing his wound, he actually rejoins the military with a considerably revived masculine spirit. However, during his expeditions against

the shackles of American society, he does not actually take pleasure in the social liberty that he had hopelessly yearned for.

It is reasonable to expect that Henry experiences disenchantment with war during inpatient treatment and finds out that the war in Italy is not what he was looking for. However, his whole disenchantment with warfare does not initiate during receiving his medical treatment. Besides being disenchanted with warfare, Henry wishes for enjoying a comfortable existence with his lover. Henry reluctantly decides to go back to battlefield that he detests. His blind faith in going to war is shaken. He is faced with two problematic decisions either leaving Catherine behind or fleeing from the war forever. Fleeing from the war is a more difficult decision, but he is actually compelled to go back to war, thus possibly no option is left to him due to his hardly surviving conventional morality. It appears that this conventional impulse pushes him rejoining the Italian army. But as a lost individual, Henry calls the conventional views of war into doubts; therefore he deserts the army again. He believes that conventional “abstract words such as glory, honor, courage, or hallow were obscene beside the concrete names of villages, ..., the numbers of regiments and the dates. Gino was a patriot, so he said things that separated us sometimes” (Hemingway, 1929, p. 196). He questions the glorification of war, thus he says that “there were many words that you could not stand to hear and finally only the names of places had dignity.” (Hemingway, 1929, p. 196).

The above speeches of Henry plainly demonstrate his growing doubts over the glorification of war. The Italian soldier named Gino as a flag-waver is speaking of being extremely enthusiastic about defending one’s homeland and thus being a glorious martyr due to commitment to that cause; on the other hand, Henry rejects these claims and considers them as hollow expressions. He is constantly “embarrassed by the words sacred, glorious and sacrifice” (Hemingway, 1929, p. 196). To put it simply, he perceives these expressions as a meaningless in the face of the widespread devastation caused by war. For him, discussing war is not much about useless abstract ideas as it is about the death of human beings and the concrete realities. Probably, at the very time that Henry going back to battlefield subsequent to leaving the hospital, it is fairly obvious that his exact position is with Catherine, that is to say, he can find his manhood

by going under family obligations. The complete glories thing that Henry does is fleeing from the Italian battle police and saving his own life by throwing himself into the Tagliamento River: “I looked at the carabinieri... I ducked down, pushed between two men, and ran for the river, my head down. I tripped at the edge and went in with a splash. The water was very cold and I stayed under as long as I could. I could feel the current swirl me and I stayed under until I thought I could never come up.” (Hemingway, 1929, p. 241). At this point, Henry is on the verge of being killed, but his escape paradoxically may demonstrate his lack of bravery because he is fleeing from the battlefield and the military.

Furthermore, Henry dramatically goes through disenchantment in the wake of deserting the military. Henry finds out that the correct position to rebuild his masculine identity is with his lover Catherine. Hemingway was probably able to give a happy ending to the story at the very moment that Henry and Catherine reunited with each other, and this ending in an incredibly powerful way would demonstrate the war as the root of all evil confronted with beauty of a lovely couple’s comfortable lifestyle, however, he did not give that ending to the story. By extending the story, Hemingway as leading figure of the Lost Generation wants to show that Henry politically and morally experiences disenchantment with warfare, furthermore, this disenchantment infiltrates into his love affair with Catherine. After rebuilding his romantic relationship with Catherine, Henry as a lost individual undergoes a sense of hollowness and meaninglessness about life, this experience resembles to the same sense experienced by the Lost Generation writers following the Great War since, as Augustyn says, they were “disenchanted young expatriates in postwar” world (2011, p. 139). In other words, Henry fruitlessly attempts to find meaning for his actions.

Towards the end of the novel, Henry and Catherine move to Switzerland and get settled there. They desperately wait for the birth of their child. Catherine goes into a difficult labor and dies in childbirth. The baby also dies at birth. Thus Henry undergoes a total despair, he faces a catastrophic future and the feelings of disappointment fill him:

I could see nothing but the dark and the rain falling across the light from the window. So that was it. The baby was dead. That was why the doctor looked so tired. But what if he never breathed at all. He hadn't. He had never been alive... Maybe he was choked all the time. Poor little kid. I wished the hell I'd been choked like that. No I didn't. Still there would not be all this dying to go through. Now Catherine would die. That was what you did. You died. You did not know what it was about" (Hemingway, 1929, p. 349-350).

As it is stated above, Henry becomes quite disenchanted with life as he notices his repeated attempts to survive and rebuild his manhood are fruitless from the beginning. The above passage demonstrates the absolute senselessness of life as perceived by Henry because life takes back everything from him and makes him extremely desperate. Hemingway artistically employs short simple sentences to depict the hollow and painful feelings of Henry in this unpleasant situation. Every dreadful accident befalls Henry and they are fully beyond his grasp, he cannot figure out the reasons behind them. He appears as a downhearted individual belonging to the Lost Generation. The preceding passage clearly exhibits the almost complete collapse of Henry's masculinity since his masculinity is tearing down due to the awfulness of battlefield and the ongoing meaningless battle of life. Thus, He connects the fate of the tough masculine values such as honor, bravery and fearlessness with an inescapable decline rather than war. He may not have expected this fate at the beginning of his travel, but the ending of the story shows that the tough masculine values do not coexist alongside war. Plainly, the end of the novel is essentially melancholy. Henry escapes from the warfare and the military in order to rebuild his manhood through shouldering household responsibility, however, he becomes totally deprived of everything since Catherine gives birth to a stillborn baby and eventually dies in childbirth. Hemingway exhibits the unattainability of a peaceful life following the First World War; therefore, Henry becomes the very embodiment of the Lost Generation. It is obvious that Henry makes abortive attempts to build a loving patriarchal family and he finds himself in total despair.

Ultimately, Henry goes through three stages of disenchantment. First, he joins battle in Italy since he lives in a social environment wherein his masculine identity is constantly in considerable danger of being undermined from the beginning. The manhood of individuals like Henry was socially under fire as it was discussed in the opening chapter.

Henry tries to prove his manhood by joining the Italian military, however, by the time, he falls in love with Catherine, he begins to find out that his manhood cannot be proven by being involved in war. Therefore, he looks for masculinity in the unification with his lover and going under family obligations. In other words, he eventually performs an action that he is not able to do anymore in America. Furthermore, following his love affair with Catherine and leaving the hospital, he rejoins the Italian front merely as a dull routine, that is to say, he does not rejoin for the sake of good reputation. In addition, after his final escape from the battlefield, Henry completely resolves to shoulder family responsibilities in order to show his masculinity, even though his escape may be considered as a pusillanimous deed. On the other hand, following his doomed attempts to build a happy familial life, Henry finds himself lost because his son has been stillborn and his lover dies in childbirth at the end. As a veteran of the Great War, he is finally left with completely meaningless life.

2.3 The Outcome of Henry's Quest for Manhood

To sum up, Henry joins the Italian army to rebuild his manhood during a historical period that traditional tough masculine roles were under danger in the societies of the West including American society. Despite the fact that Henry is interested in the glorification of war at the beginning, but he almost immediately finds out that battlefield is not an environment for reconstructing his manhood. The Italian combat zone merely causes him to be disenchanted with his idealistic views concerning war and doing acts of bravery during the war. His outstanding act of bravery is deciding to desert the Italian army. Following the recovery from his injury, he does seem fully prepared to leave the battlefield, thus he rejoins the army merely with a sense of compulsion rather than a courageous act. On the other hand, by the time, he finds out that taking on family commitments is the right way to prove his manhood, he deserts the army forever. That is to say, what he is looking for to prove his manhood through is not warfare; it is rather through taking on family commitments that he has been in quest of even prior to his travel for joining the Italian army.

Nevertheless, disenchantment overwhelms Henry during his quest for manhood and understating his social existence. He initially decides to leave America and join the

Italian army due to his disenchantment with the American society. In other words, he feels that his masculine social position is under fire, thus he goes to war to rebuild his masculinity, however he quickly finds out that being involved with war is not the perfect answer that he is looking for. During his involvement with war, he experiences disenchantment with military glory, thus he escapes from the military. His escape may apparently be associated with lack of bravery, but it is simultaneously considered as an act of bravery because he attempts to build a family life with his lover, Catherine after his escape. However, his attempt to build a peaceful family life becomes abortive because Catherine gives birth to a dead baby and she dies in childbirth, thus he becomes totally disenchanted with the whole life and he falls into a black deep despair.

Henry becomes the embodiment of the male lost individual during the beginning of the twentieth century, an individual that desperately fights for proving his manhood and falls completely into despair. In addition, Henry serves as the personification of the Lost Generation following the First World War. He suffers the misery of recreating his true masculine identity as a war veteran in a changed social environment. It is highly unlikely that Henry would be able to enjoy a peaceful life and liberty, moreover, to prove his manhood as a lost individual following being involved with the First World War.

3. FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS

Spain was in the middle of a civil war in the late 1930s. Since the King Alfonso XIII intentionally gave up the throne and chose exile, the country had been in chaotic situation since 1931. This was followed by violent competition for power lasting five years. The violent competition was between the Fascist Nationalists under the command of General Francisco Franco and the Republicans. That conflict reached its militaristic climax in 1936 which continued till 1939 and finished with the victory of the Nationalists (Thomas, 2013, p. 900). The Spanish civil war is known by its brutal start. All around the country, the local farmers rebelled against fascists. More than five hundred people were killed in the first month of the battle (Thomas, 2013, p. 263). In his novel, *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940), Ernest Hemingway narrates the continuing struggle of Robert Jordan and his Republican companions against the fascists during the fall of 1937. *For Whom the Bell Tolls* was published after more than a decade of the publication of *A Farewell to Arms*. It is one of Hemingway's remarkable war-fictions. The fiction was set during the Spanish Civil War, almost at the beginning of the Second World War. By that time, there was escalating political conflict that would cause the eruption of the Second World War. Fascist ideology was widely receiving support and becoming a threat to the West. Under this circumstance, the central character of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* namely Robert Jordan goes to war against the right-wing Nationalist armed forces led by General Franco. To put it simply, *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is another Hemingway's novel exploring the atmosphere of war and manhood. However the novel is dissimilar to *A Farewell to Arms* in several facets. *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is quite prolonged story that turned into a remarkable achievement of Hemingway. One year after the end of the Spanish Civil War, the novel was published. Robert Jordan works as a lecturer in America. But he chooses to leave America and join the Republican guerrilla fighters against the fascists. He turns into an experienced and

skilled fighter in explosion operations. On a specific mission, he is assigned as a fighter to explode a bridge as an attack against the fascist fighters. In addition, the plot of whole novel happens in only three days but a number of sub-plots are retrospectively narrated.

Besides, there were causal factors driving Jordan to be involved in that war. It is obvious that the war context of Henry and Jordan is significantly different; therefore, the degree of similarities and differences between the causal factors moving Henry and Jordan to go to separate wars is investigated. There are particular factors pushing Henry to join the Italian army during the First World War and there are also particular factors driving Jordan to be involved in the Spanish Civil War. In other words, despite the differences regarding the historical context, it appears that Hemingway questions the male ideal in portraying these expatriates. Additionally, a close investigation is going to be conducted on the impacts of fascist ideology on the portrayal of Jordan. The fascist ideology was known for its powerful body of leadership. Accordingly, the present chapter primarily explores the casual factors moving Jordan to be involved in Spanish Civil War, moreover, compares and contrasts his actions and motives with those of Henry.

3.1 Jordan's Struggle for Manhood in the Spanish Civil War

It is obvious that Henry, the central character of *A Farewell to Arms*, desperately attempts to rebuild his masculine identity. However, his attempts are doomed to fail dismally. He turns into a completely lost individual. On the other hand, in sharp contrast with Henry, Jordan constantly handles his state of affairs in an efficient manner. He is not apparently in despairing pursuit of rebuilding his masculine identity and similarly, he apparently represents a number of tough masculine values. He normally feels a kind of tranquility that Henry is deprived of because he remains very much aware of the fact that he hardly will be able to leave the battlefield alive. Hemingway witnessed personally a number of wars abroad including the Spanish Civil War and the Great War. His love for Spain inspired him to show the desperate communities namely, the Communists under the suppressions of Fascists in Spain. He moved to Spain as an American and he explored Spain from the perspective of an American in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. He shows the difficulties that Americans faced during their travel to abroad because of the foreign political strategies of America at that time. For instance, in the opening pages of

For Whom the Bell Tolls, the Spanish Republicans do not believe in Jordan as an American who has just arrived to fight for the Republican cause, however, they later find out that he is their friend not their foe. In other words, in contrast to his country's policies, Jordan does not play a part in supporting fascism.

Jordan has embraced the likelihood of being died as a result of executing a dangerous mission to explode the bridge. But he is seemingly afraid of a certain ramification of this likelihood which is his lack of opportunity to enjoy the rest of his moments with his lover, Maria after exploding the bridge, to put it differently, he is not afraid of the loss of his own life. Yet, Jordan manages to appreciate the present moment; this appreciation becomes quite apparent when Hemingway depicts the Jordan's adoration for gorgeous Spanish scenery at the opening chapter of the novel. The adoration for nature reappears in the portrayal of other characters such as Henry when they are feeling inner calm. The adoration of nature appears in Henry when he joins the Italian military and believes that he hopefully is going to rebuild his tough masculine identity. He skillfully blends his comments on the breathtaking scenery with the ones on war. In both cases natural environment serves as a flight from the restrictions imposed on individuals. Through being present in beautiful natural surroundings, Henry is fleeing from a social world wherein men are losing their male dominance; by contrast, Jordan is fleeing from the bitter realities of war: "He felt comfortable and sleepy now from the wine and lying back on the floor of the forest he saw through the tree tops the small afternoon clouds of the mountains moving slowly in the high Spanish sky" (Hemingway, 1995, p. 26).

Jordan's masculine identity looks obscure because he is aware of the fact that he is possibly facing inevitable death in the near future. He becomes infatuated with Maria; moreover, he desires to spend the rest of life with her happily although he is not certain to live for a long time. His desire does not look radically dissimilar from Henry's desire. In almost every part of *A Farewell to Arms*, Henry is in ongoing quest of reconstructing his manhood, a quest that ultimately ended up falling him into deep despair as an individual who experienced the First World War. Besides, Jordan understands that his inevitable death is close at hand, and yet he is making a futile endeavor to live a meaningful existence. Therefore, the function of the battle environment is almost the

same in both novels. In *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, the battleground becomes a place for Jordan to raise his masculine voice. In contrast with Henry in *A Farewell to Arms*, Jordan originally desires to discover his masculine voice in the battleground and in the unwavering commitment he shows therein. Nevertheless, Henry wants to raise his masculine voice through escaping the battleground.

In addition, due to merely putting his characters into a theater of war and therefore providing them with an opportunity to be in pursuit of their masculine identity, Hemingway is not regarded as a writer who glorifies war. Anselmo as perceptive old Spanish guerrilla fighter and as a best friend of Jordan, shows his absolute hate for war and killing when he is asked by Jordan concerning his previous experiences with killing people. He admits that that has killed others previously “but not with pleasure”, and yet he believes that “it is a sin to kill a man. Even Fascists whom we must kill. To me there is a great difference between the bear and the man and I do not believe the wizardry of the gypsies about the brotherhood with animals. No. I am against all killing of men.” (Hemingway, 1995, p. 41). Here, Jordan takes a humanitarian stand and condemns killing of human beings.

Both Jordan and Anselmo symbolize rational understanding in the fiction. Furthermore, Despite the fact that Anselmo passionately fights against the Fascists, and yet he and Jordan even consider eliminating their opponents morally inferior. However, the moral awareness of the guerrilla fighters does not undermine their masculine values as it is shown plainly in Andrés’s boyhood memory of bullbaiting: “He loved the bullbaiting when he was a boy...He looked forward with excitement, delight and sweating fear to the moment when, in the square, he would hear the clatter of the bull's horns knocking against the wood of his travelling box” (Hemingway, 1995, p. 364). The meticulous detail on bullbaiting lasts longer and dominates some other pages of the novel. Andrés explains all the phases of the sport in detail from the perspective of almost all players. On the other hand, the nature of the game revolves around the inclination for killing which is surprising because it seriously throws reasonable doubts over his intense dislike for shedding the blood of other people in combat zone. It is true that that Andrés is interested in the game, but there are specific limits with regard to masculine principles

embraced by Jordan and his friends including Andrés. They are committed to adore what is natural and admire traditional masculine conventions, moreover, they are intensely yearning for fighting for a worthwhile cause and defending their own lofty principles, however, they absolutely do not want bloodshed for the purpose of bloodshed. Or Just like the Anselmo's speech on Jordan: "He must have killed much, but he shows no signs of liking it. In those who like it there is always a rottenness" (Hemingway, 1995, p. 197). The preceding speech shows the guerrilla fighters' strong dislike for bloodshed without any totally legitimate purpose.

In a letter to his literary editor Maxwell Perkins in late September 1936, Hemingway expresses his passionate yearning for traveling to Spain (Hemingway, 1981, p. 454), but the passionate yearning does not entirely appear in Jordan. He originally joins the Republican armed forces due to his political beliefs and due in part to his passion for Spain and its people. On the other hand, Jordan immediately understands the acts of brutality perpetrated by both parties, thus he morally feels increasing doubts, but he does not leave the battleground merely because of his continuing commitment to his companions and the cause that he supports. Once more, Jordan is dissimilar to Henry in this place. Following leaving hospital, Henry rejoins the army just as a dull routine, to put it differently; his return is not for the purpose of good reputation. Furthermore, he finally deserts the army and resolves fully to take family responsibilities in order to rebuild his masculine identity.

In spite of his similar meaningless war environment to Henry, Jordan remains committed to his friends, the cause he is fighting for and his manly values up to the painful ending. When Henry flees from the battlefield forever, his life leads to total disenchantment. Similarly, Jordan lives in a war zone, but he does not leave it despite the factors that constantly shake his ideological belief and his manhood. Consequently, his commitment to his close companions and his belief provides him with a sense of majesty in the painful ending, a sense that Henry is deprived of. It is not absolutely true to claim that Henry is entirely deprived of that sense of majesty. However Henry's ultimate disenchantment with life is thoroughly dissimilar to the self-control that Jordan achieves in the end because Jordan achieves his self-control by the time he considers suicide, but

he eventually makes his mind up to remain alive as much as possible in order to delay Fascist fighters and die for the cause he originally committed to. In other words, Jordan has a sense of “completely integrated now” (Hemingway, 1995, p. 471).

As it is obvious, both novels are concerned with life during the time of war and there is dissimilarity in the depiction of manhood provided by Hemingway in both of them. However, the dissimilarity is predictable as long as the specific publication date of both fictions is taken into consideration. The setting of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is a period wherein fighting against the fascist ideology is unavoidable as it happens for Hemingway too, therefore, the war circumstance apparently has a dual function during a period wherein liberal principles are thrown into doubt, in contrast, the war circumstance of *A Farewell to Arms* only functions as a representation of crisis of manhood which is the dominant subject addressed in the novel. Henry seemingly rebuilds his manhood by escaping from battlefield, but Jordan discovers his manhood through remaining in battlefield and the acts of bravery he carries out therein despite his pessimism about the whole of mankind.

The main distinction of Henry’s masculinity is noted by the time he escapes from the military through jumping into the Tagliamento River, his masculinity seems to be cast into doubt. In respect of military, Henry’s escape is probably considered as an action that displays his total lack of courage, an action that would definitely come under censure from Jordan. However, it is possible to consider Henry’s escape as a required act of bravery since it gives him a suitable opportunity to become the head of a household and prove his manhood in society. Being committed to a cause is real bravery for Jordan although his commitment ends up sacrificing his own life for the sake of the cause. In other words, his commitment deems as extremely significant because he lives in an era wherein fighting against the fascist ideology is more popular than fighting for masculine identity in society. The brutal acts perpetrated by opposition forces of the war causes Jordan to become aware of the hollowness of the life, thus he belongs to the Lost Generation. However, they make up their minds differently with regard to staying in battlefield due to the dissimilarity of their period. Henry decides to be active rather than passive; his activeness is probably the determining factor behind his enlistment in the

Italian army. He tries to prove his masculinity in this way. Later, he deserts the battlefield because his efforts are of no importance therein, in other words, he tries to be active in another way. He attempts to show his manhood through another means namely, shouldering the burden of family responsibility. Jordan and Henry are almost identical in the way they resolve to do what is necessary for asserting their masculine identity regardless of the eventual outcomes of their separate resolutions.

The existence of Catherine and Maria is another valid point that affects the test of manhood in both stories. It is obvious that war environment does not offer any satisfactory answer to both Henry and Jordan in respect of building their masculine identity. Henry flees from the Italian military because war causes him to undergo dramatic disenchantment with the real meaning of his masculine identity, and Jordan becomes disenchanted with the ideology he has embraced when he witnesses the transgressions made by the opposition forces of the war. However, the existence of women implies the revival of their manhood. Frederic J. Svoboda affirms that during passing through Tagliamento River, Henry strangely undergoes revival; however Catherine's tragic demise gives him irretrievable breakdown. Likewise, Jordan experiences revival by virtue of his romantic relationship with Maria (2000, p. 165). In other words, romantic attachment somehow serves as a means for confirming Henry's and Jordan's manhood.

In the first place, Jordan declares that he has no spare time to spend with women. Moreover, in spite of the fact that he confesses forging relationships with a number of Spanish women, he states that he has never become infatuated with anyone of them. This contributes to his commitment to his duties as fighter of the Republicans, since his prime concern is his work rather than indulging in romance. On the other hand, he asserts that he is need of making love to revive his masculine strength prior to every assignment and it is not a big deal if he makes the love in reality or merely in his mind. Surprisingly, he is not sure about the reality of his initial lovemaking with Maria since he believes that "Maybe it is like the dreams you have when someone you have seen in the cinema comes to your bed at night and is so kind and lovely. He'd slept with them all that way when he was asleep in bed" (Hemingway, 1995, p. 137). It may be claimed that

Jordan is apparently deprived of sex due to his mounting excitement at the likelihood of lovemaking with Maria. But he contrarily shows several indications of attractiveness to Maria in the beginning, like the thickness of his neck. Jordan's love affair with Maria dramatically affects his understanding of life, because he contemplates whether the nature of one's lifespan is more important than the length of the span or no. Even though he initially confesses the likelihood of his death, he does not think highly his former life. But he ultimately compensates for his lost days:

I have fought for what I believed in for a year now. If we win here we will win everywhere. The world is a fine place and worth the fighting for and I hate very much to leave it. And you had a lot of luck, he told himself, to have had such a good life. You've had just as good a life as Grandfather's though not as long. You've had as good a life as any one because of these last days (Hemingway, 1995, p. 467).

Jordan is fortunate since if he did not build up romantic relationship with Maria throughout his last days, he would have not passed away peacefully. Moreover, he would have possibly mourned his previous life. To put it bluntly, romantic relationship grants a meaningful existence to both Henry and Jordan. Henry recreates his masculinity through his intimate relationship with Catherine, to put it differently; Catherine breathes a new life into Henry's manhood. Jordan undergoes disenchantment with the actions of guerrilla fighters and the battle too, however he finally remains committed to the cause by means of safeguarding Maria. In the last moment, Jordan does not take his own life because of his special attachment to Maria. Furthermore, Maria essentially empowers Jordan to reach his prime goal in life since he desires to live life to the fullest during his remaining few days of lifetime. He becomes a shield for his friends including Maria because he is infatuated with Maria. Even though Jordan dies tragically but he ultimately has led a meaningful existence. In spite of their dissimilarities, Henry and Jordan remain steadfast in their decision to leave battlefield or not. However, they both eventually undergo disenchantment with war and resort to romantic relationship to rebuild their masculinity.

3.2 Jordan's Disenchantment with War and Its Effect on His Manhood

Similar to Henry, Jordan personifies the "Lost Generation". In spite of his involvement in war, Jordan is going to show the disenchantment of men after the First World War, that is to say, he symbolizes the way Lost Generation were disenchanted with war and humanity. Actually, his resolutions in the novel are affected by the attitude of his "Lost

Generation,” while Jordan is not a barbarous and a hero who is hungry for honor, but he is a peace-lover who has a great connection with nature as a part of his manhood. Furthermore, by holding more submissive gender characteristics that regularly ascribed to females in his relationship with Maria, Jordan re-describes the manly hero. On the other hand, without inner struggles to Jordan, the gender alterations are not going to come, as shown by so many inner discourses within the novel. Moreover, Jordan confirms that those gender alterations that occur within his love affair with Maria, and he believes that she is equal with him, so he allows himself to learn and get life experiences from her.

The harsh realities of war have influence on Jordan with regard to his masculine identity as an individual belonging to the Lost Generation. As a lost individual of the post-World War I, Jordan is going to concentrate more on the ideology of war rather than the war’s action. Due the fact that both the Spanish Civil War and The First World War exhibited the meaninglessness of human life, men gave priority to their emotional core in order to redefine the reality of life and war. Though, Jordan becomes aware of that he wishes to blast a bridge to assist the Republicans during the Spanish Civil War, his inner monologue shows that the nature is not going to make him wish to fight. As Chaman Nahal notes that Jordan is normally a submissive individual, isolated, he would relatively be a writer... or engaged in love affair, or bring up horses” (1971, p. 124). While Jordan thinks and considers his future with Maria in his homeland Montana, he makes up his mind to write about those experiences that he got during war and says, “once you write it down it is all gone. It will be a good book if you can write it. Much better than the other” (Hemingway, 1995, p. 165). Accordingly, because of desiring of writing a novel, Jordan as an artistic person, often contemplates about the nature and life. His love for nature relatively revives his manhood. Jordan has a great relation with nature and each chapter of the novel nearly always starts with his focuses on nature and then finds out that he is in an environment which is severely damaged by war. He tells Anselmo about his close relation with nature who is a guerrilla fighter, “I dislike slaying animals,” and he shows his ideological questions about war and after that he asks himself the same questions, “Do you think you have a right to kill anyone?”

(Hemingway, 1995, p. 303). While Jordan notes human beings as part of nature, it makes him advance his peace-loving nature.

Jordan experiences a lot of inner struggles as they are shown in the novel, Jordan thinks that the masculine identity of men like himself is open to doubts since humans are suffering from the cruelties of war. Men start to agree to the shifts that occur socially and culturally to their gender roles when they similarly start to perceive their masculine role differently. In many places of the novel, Jordan attempts to breathe new life into his manhood through his love for nature, life and humanity. According to Nahal, the central character does not speak to himself a lot in any of Hemingway's novels as in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* the central character namely Jordan does (1971, p. 128). This implies that he has doubts concerning his masculine identity. Despite the fact that Jordan enters into a discussion with Anselmo regarding the necessity of killing human beings at times, but he cannot manage to find any valid reason for killing human beings close to the end of the fiction. As Jordan's manhood undergoes changes due to witnessing the brutal acts committed by his own warring faction namely, the Republicans, he tries to detach himself from wishing to fight:

Listen, he told himself. You better cut this out. This is very bad for you and for your work. Then himself said back to him, You listen, see? Because you are doing something very serious and I have to see you understand it all the time. I have to keep you straight in your head. Because if you are not absolutely straight in your head you have no right to do the things you do for all of them are crimes and no man has a right to take another man's life unless it is to prevent something worse happening to other people. So get it straight and do not lie to yourself (Hemingway, 1995, p. 304).

The above quotation shows war is not a place that he has been looking for and his masculine identity cannot be reconstructed through participating in war. He considers that killing human being is not justifiable even if it is committed by his own warring faction. He tries to make up his mind concerning the value of human existence and he regards killing human beings disgraceful.

Hemingway published a number of his best-known works during political chaos of interwar years. Hemingway published his *For Whom the Bell Tolls* during late of the

interwar years. The novel explores a war between the Republicans and the Nationalists that turns into a war between Communist regime and Fascist regime in the near future. In view of this situation, it is significant to explore the causal factor pushing Jordan to be involved in this war. As a matter of fact, Hemingway's writings expose the deceitfulness of political atmosphere and the individual "cannot realize ideal beliefs and hopes through a political system", moreover, it does not give the individual a meaningful existence (Frederking. 2010, p. 14). Therefore, it is clear that Jordan does not express his admiration for communism and undergoes disenchantment with war and politics due to witnessing atrocities perpetrated by the Republicans and the Nationalists. It is hard for Hemingway to ignore the politics in the course of a war fiction like *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, however, it can be hardly considered as fiction that espouses a certain political agenda since Jordan is impartial to condemn brutal acts committed by the opposition forces of the war. In other words, Hemingway's writing constantly covers other critical issues such as horrors of war, the loveliness of companionship during difficult circumstances and the opportunities that companionship offer to the male characters in order to rebuild their manhood during the tough situations. It is the aforementioned situations that Jordan lives in.

In the light of the above lines, a question raises concerning the causal factors driving Jordan to fight on the side of the Republicans. He originally joins up the Republicans due to his adoration for Spaniards and the grave dangers that are posed by the fascist Nationalists on his liberal values:

He fought now in this war because it had started in a country that he loved and he believed in the Republic and that if it were destroyed life would be unbearable for all those people who believed in it. He was under Communist discipline for the duration of the war. Here in Spain the Communists offered the best discipline and the soundest and sanest for the prosecution of the war. He accepted their discipline for the duration of the war because, in the conduct of the war, they were the only party whose program and whose discipline he could respect (Hemingway, 1995, p. 163).

In the above passage from the novel, the reader starts understanding the fundamentals of Jordan's existing political driving forces. He is not considerably a dogmatic supporter of any explicit political doctrine or agenda without the exception of Communist doctrine.

As a man, he merely feels great affection for Spanish land and the Spanish Republicans. Spanish Republican government was liberal and its alternative was a totalitarian fascist regime. From the political aspect, liberty is the prime concern of Jordan. To put it simply, at this point, he appears to be a liberal supporter and thus his top priority is personal liberty. He initially adheres to the Republican agenda due to their firm discipline which is apparently in harmony with his liberal way of thinking. However, the level of his commitment to the Republican cause decreases by the time he witnesses acts of brutality perpetrated by both belligerent parties and apprehends that the Republicans along with Russia hatch schemes merely in their own interests. Jordan discovers that he is totally surrounded by treachery and lack of trust. He believes that the ideals that he considered lofty are no longer attainable, in other words, he is lost. It is under this circumstance that Jordan greatly resembles Henry since they both feel lost. However, Jordan creates opportunities for himself in order to improve the circumstance and remain committed to the cause he is supporting. He is fighting for safeguarding his fellow fighters, his lover Maria and his expected baby rather than fighting for the lost Communist values. And all this makes him more masculine since the ethical uncertainty concerning war is one of the main components which distinguish the 20th century war fiction from the war fictions of 19th century. The war fictions of 19th century and the past inclined towards depicting war in an idealized way, as a tradition that paved the way for reaching glory. However, following the meaningless and extensive devastation of the Great War, novels belittled the glorification of war and uncovered the dreadfulness of war. *For Whom the Bell Tolls* directly belongs to the 20th war fictions because it is a realistic depiction of war.

On several occasions, Jordan becomes aware of the transgressions made by his own warring faction, for instance, when Pilar bluntly informs him of massacring a number of Nationalists in a brutal manner:

The lines now were neither straight nor orderly and there was much and very grave drunkenness. Two men had fallen down and lay on their backs in the middle of the square and were passing a bottle back and forth between them. One would take a drink and then shout, '*Viva la Anarquial*' lying on his back and shouting as though he were a madman. He had a red -and-black handkerchief around his neck. The other shouted, '*Viva la*

Libertad!' and kicked his feet in the air and then bellowed, '*Viva la Libertad!*' again. He had a red-and-black hand kerchief too and he waved it in one hand and waved the bottle with the other"

"A peasant who had left the lines and now stood in the shade of the arcade looked at them in disgust and said, 'They should shout, "Long live drunkenness." That's all they believe in.'

"'They don't believe even in that,' another peasant said. 'Those neither understand nor believe in anything.'

Just then, one of the drunkards got to his feet and raised both arms with his fists clenched over his head and shouted, 'Long live Anarchy and Liberty and I obscenity in the milk of the Republic!' (Hemingway, 1995, p. 120).

In the above excerpt of the novel, the Republicans are vividly depicted as savages, heavy drinkers and heartless because they show no mercy to the Nationalists. Contrary to Jordan's expectations, Spaniards are taking pleasure in savagery; therefore, his hopes in them are shattered and reasonable doubts raise about the major factors behind joining the Republican fighters including his adoration for the Spaniards. On the other hand, the Nationalists are yet clearly depicted as faint-hearted fighters and inexperienced men who lack a passionate belief to adhere to. Jordan comprehends the reality of the Spanish Civil War. He becomes disenchanted with the war since he finds out that both warring factions are involved in extremely savage acts. To put it differently, the atrocious story narrated by Pilar concerning the slaughter at Pablo's hometown demonstrates that none of the warring faction of Spanish Civil War is guiltless. Both warring factions have perpetrated disgusting barbarities and crimes. Both the Nationalists and the Republicans similarly behave in the wrong manner, which is a challenge for the readers to consider one of the warring factions as ethically better than the other.

Jordan initiates his search for manhood as a loyal courageous rebel and a passionate supporter of the Republicans. In contrast to nearly all of the characters in the novel, Jordan is an American expatriate. He initially has faith in the Republican cause to such a great deal that he is keen to depart his homeland and put himself into danger for its sake. At the opening chapter of the novel, his comrade General Golz asks Jordan whether he will agree to perform an operation to explode a bridge. In response, he says that he will perform it very accurately (Hemingway, 1995, p. 6.) This shows his hope in asserting his masculine identity and his strong commitment to the Republican cause in the beginning.

However, in the last part of the novel, Jordan and his companions are running away riding on their horses to avoid the attack of the fascist Nationalists. Jordan is deadly injured when his horse stumbles and throws him down. While they are running from their enemies, Jordan is not mentioned as the rebel committed to the Republican cause anymore. In other words, while he passes away, it is his personal commitment to his companions that makes him to protect them and his lover Maria. He partly asserts his manhood since he is disenchanted with the cause that he initially showed his commitment to:

Think about them being away, he said. Think about them going through the timber. Think about them crossing a creek. Think about them riding through the heather. Think about them going up the slope. Think about them O. K. tonight. Think about them travelling, all night. Think about them hiding up tomorrow. Think about them. God damn it, think about them. (Hemingway, 1995, p. 476)

In his strenuous exertion to confront the fascist Nationalists, Jordan lands up in sacrificing his own life for the sake of safeguarding his fellow fighters and Maria but what mainly concerns Jordan, at the last moment of his life, is his companions not the Republican Cause. In other words, Jordan devotes himself for the Republicans in the beginning. During the first moments of his journey, he is entirely devoted to fight against the fascists due to his ideological beliefs, but at the time of facing death, he gives priority to his friends' wellbeing instead of the Republican Cause. To put it simply, his commitment to the Republican Cause vanishes; therefore, he partially manages to reaffirm his masculine identity.

3.3 The Outcome of Jordan's Quest for Manhood

In spite of his disenchantment, Jordan does not leave the Republican lines and continues to fight against the Fascists. But the Fascists do not symbolize the entire set of values he detests anymore. He does not go to war to defend Spaniards or their liberty with the same great spirit of the beginning because he has witnessed their brutal savage acts committed against other people. Jordan remains in the battlefield due to his attachment to his close companions including Maria. However, the Nationalists are depicted negatively in the novel. The Fascists are depicted as Cowards: "From a balcony someone

cried out, 'Que pasa, cobardes? What is the matter, cowards?'" (Hemingway, 1995, p. 108). On the contrary, Cowardice is a trait that Jordan detests as it throws doubts over his manhood. Even though Jordan finds out about the barbaric acts of both warring factions, he yet believes that the Fascists are faint-hearted and he chiefly has a general tendency for the Republicans. It is obvious that Jordan's involvement in the war undermines his admiration for the Republican Cause and its supporters, in other words, it is almost hard for Jordan to cling entirely to his idealism and the cause that he has originally come for. He depends on a variety of changing causal factors to participate in the Spanish Civil war as he stays in the combat zone due to loyalty to his friends and Maria, and his dislike for suicide at the end of the story. Thus he finally leads a meaningful existence.

In brief, Jordan initially joins the Republican armed forces during Spanish Civil War because of his attachments to Spaniards and his anti-Fascist belief as he believes that Fascists are trying to annihilate liberal values. However, he soon realizes that his own warring faction is similarly in charge of perpetrating brutal acts and there are other forces that endorse the Republicans for the sake of their own interests instead of truly striving for emancipating the Spaniards from the then Fascist regime. Consequently, Jordan becomes disenchanted with the cause he is fighting for and the warfare and yet he does not show any inclination for Fascists. The major factor that moves Jordan to stay in the war against the Fascists is safeguarding his companions and living a meaningful existence through his self-sacrifice. By the time Jordan resolves to remain alive as long as possible in order to safeguard his companions, he is performing the final act of bravery by safeguarding them. Although Jordan's defense of his companions against the attacks of the Fascists does not affect the final result of the battle, but it significantly changes the key factor behind fighting for the Republican Cause. By means of his final act of bravery, Jordan secures the safety of his close companions. Thus, he finally leads a meaningful existence to some extent and partially asserts his manhood.

4. CONCLUSION

Different Perceptions of Manhood

It appears that Jordan, who involves in the Spanish Civil War as an American, is not initially quite dissimilar to Henry who joins the Italian Front during the First World War as an American Lieutenant in *A Farewell to Arms*. On the other hand, Jordan's personality is dissimilar to that of Henry. Henry is a desperately trying to prove his manhood by going to battlefield and leaving it in order to rebuild his manhood in taking family responsibilities, but all of his decisions leave him disenchanted with war and his manhood, in other words, he fails to prove his manhood and realizes that his existence is meaningless. Although the warfare leaves Jordan dispirited, but his ongoing attempts to prove his manhood and lead a meaningful existence is relatively successful. That distinction between them is particularly stunning since both of them belong to the Lost Generation.

As lost individuals, both Henry and Jordan live in a social environment wherein their masculinity is under fire. They resort to battlefield in order to revive their masculine identity in society. However, the killing and being involved in war are not depicted as high values to adhere to and in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Jordan and Anselmo agree to the fact that being in the presence of war does not mean giving the green light to killing and brutal acts. It is obvious that war initially becomes a theater for both Henry and Jordan to show their manhood therein, but they become disenchanted with realities of war. In contrast to Henry, Jordan remains in battlefield in spite of his disenchantment and tries to rebuild his masculine identity through his romantic relationship with Maria and his attachment to his fellow fighters. In other words, Despite being aware of the massacres carried out by his own warring faction, Jordan decides not to leave the battlefield. He finally sacrifices his own life by becoming a shield for his close companions and his lover Maria against the attacks of the Fascists. Thus, he relatively

proves his manhood and leads a meaningful existence. Henry similarly goes to war, but leaves the war following his disenchantment with it in order to exhibit his manhood through taking family responsibilities. However, he finally falls into deep despair since his attempts to reestablish his masculine identity and living a meaningful existence are abortive.

When the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls* came out in 1940; the social problems faced by men were almost alleviated after the First World War. This does not imply that Jordan shares less character traits with Lost Generation than Henry. Jordan finds out that life is full despair and frustration by the time he becomes aware of the atrocities perpetrated by his own warring faction. However, Jordan makes up his own mind to lead his life as he sees fit. He knows that nothing will be rosy. He proves his manhood in a way he sees as privileged. To put it differently, he decides to follow a separate direction from Henry. While both Henry and Jordan initially sees war as a means to assume their masculine identity. Henry deserts the Italian army so as to be with Catherine and rebuild his masculine identity through commitment to family responsibilities. Jordan similarly joins the Nationalist armed forces. He fights against the Fascists so that Maria, the woman he loves, will remain protected. In this way, Jordan proves his manhood.

It is obvious that during Spanish Civil War, Jordan initially joins the guerrilla fighters due to his adoration for Spaniards and the hazards caused by Fascists to his liberal values. However, he feels growing doubts over the nature of the Spaniards when he finds out about the brutal acts committed by them. Jordan is the embodiment of the Lost Generation. By the time he understands that the principles he is supporting is lost, he remains loyal to his own principles and tries to stay in battlefield. Moreover, he resolves to not take his own life even though he is sure that his fate is only death. Through staying alive as long as possible, he manages to safeguard his friends and Maria against the attacks of the Fascists. In this point, the casual factor that pushes Jordan to safeguard them is not his initial commitment to the Republican cause and the Spaniards in spite of the fact that the Fascists are depicted as faint-hearted and lacking any principle to adhere to. By contrast, his self-sacrifice is for sake of upholding his personal principles providing his existence with a definite sense. Therefore, Jordan is probably considered

as character that finally manages to head for the exit from the depths of despair and lostness; by contrast, Henry entirely falls into deep despair and remains lost at the end.

Although Henry and Jordan live in two separate eras but the issues that distress them are almost the same. Initially, it is obvious that issues are not driven by politics. They are in search of affirming their manhood throughout the novels. Despite the appearances of the idea of politics in Ernest Hemingway's works, it is never to show the virtues of politics, on the other hand, it exposes its vices. The contrast between Henry and Jordan is indeed thought-provoking. The crisis of masculinity is the major issue that is covered in *A Farewell to Arms* and in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* despite the more than decade between their publication dates. In the novel *A Farewell to Arms*, Henry goes to war in Italy in a bid to rebuild his masculine identity since he lives in an age wherein social tough masculine roles of men are seriously weakened in America. That is to say, he fulfils Theodore Roosevelt's direct appeal for discovering manhood during modern era. During the First World War, Henry goes to war in order to reestablish his masculine identity. But shortly after his presence in the battlefield, Henry becomes disenchanted with warfare. He believes that there is no hope for asserting his manhood in battlefield. Following his encounter with the beautiful Catherine, Henry finds out that he may be able to grasp the real meaning of masculinity through commitment to family responsibilities. Henry then decides to desert the Italian army to be with Catherine, the woman he has fallen in love with. For him, it is the idea of being there to take care of his beloved and start a family with her that is more important. In doing so, he believes that he will regain the vision of showing his manhood, a vision that has driven him to be involved in a war and leave the war.

The novel *A Farewell to Arms* is completely overwhelmed by disenchantment. The central character Henry undergoes the crisis of manhood and disenchantment with his masculine role in the social environment that he lives in. His disenchantment prompts him to join the Italian army in order to perform courageous acts in battleground and thus reconstruct his manly identity. However, during his involvement in war, he comes to the realization that battleground is not the place he should be in because it does not provide him with the reconstruction of his manhood. Following his meeting with Catherine, he

decides to leave his position in the army to be with her, to start a family together and reaffirm his manhood although he rejoins the army for short period of time as he deduces that he is under an obligation to be among his fellow soldiers while confronting the enemy forces. However, shouldering family responsibilities leaves him totally disenchanted with his masculine identity and life. Life drives him into total despair because his lover Catherine gives birth to a stillborn baby and shortly after dies in childbirth. This becomes Henry's consequential disenchantment with life and manhood. He comes to the conclusion that there is no reasonable assurance about life for men like him. The accurate portrayal of the Lost Generation ideals is quite obvious in the final scene of the novel.

In the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, the main character, Robert Jordan has similar concerns to Frederic Henry, i.e. to prove his manhood. But due to his personality, he deals with them in another way. In every part of *A Farewell to Arms*, Henry makes abortive attempts to find his definition of manhood which is bliss, optimism and family life, by contrast, Robert exudes confidence in everything he does. Despite belonging both to the Lost Generation, Jordan almost constantly knows how to effectively cope with any difficult situation. The atrocities of both warring factions leave him disenchanted with the Republican cause but he upholds his personal principles in the hope of living a meaningful existence during his short remaining lifespan. He joins the war to prove his manhood but he does not leave as in the case of Henry. Nevertheless, he continues to fight for his ideals in spite of being aware of the agendas of his fellow soldiers and the massacre perpetrated by the Republicans during war. He maintains a level of drive in order to regain his manhood very much unlike the way Henry sees it. Both novels have a plot involving war though they are set years apart. In those times, both men are under the impression that their respective masculinity is important and that it has to be proven to the society. However, Henry believes that in his case, his manhood is on verge of being collapsed in American society during the outbreak of the First World War. Similarly Jordan's manhood is under threat during the Spanish Civil War. But he relatively regains his manhood through his self-sacrifice. To put it bluntly, both Jordan and Henry answers Roosevelt's appeal for proving their manhood, but Henry's attempts to prove his manhood are doomed to be fruitless. On the other hand, Jordan

hardly manages to cope with proving his manhood due to his disenchantment with his own warring faction.

At the peak of the war between the Nationalists and the Republicans, backed by the Fascists and the Communists respectively, Jordan appears to be adhering to his personal principles. He has joined the lines of the Republicans, but he does not fight for the Communists like some of his fellow fighters do. He battles the Nationalists because of his fondness for Spaniards and his anti-Fascist way of thinking, he thinks that Fascists attempts to wipe out liberal values. By the time Jordan becomes aware of the undeniable brutal acts perpetrated by the Republicans, he feels lost, that is to say, he finds himself in the same situation as Henry. But he decides to stay and fight for the sake of his companions and the woman he loves. In this way he tries to prove his manhood.

Despite their numerous similarities and their membership to the Lost Generation, both Henry and Jordan differ from each other in some ways. Henry has no way except rebuilding his social masculine identity by joining the war. However, he soon finds out that participating in war is not a means to prove his manhood through, to put it differently; it leaves him disenchanting with his search for manhood. Consequently, he is overwhelmed by his disenchantment with his vain attempts to reconstruct his social masculine identity and his existence since he is unable to find happiness and manhood in both the battlefield and family life. He is left distraught and hopeless following the death of Catherine and his unborn child. On the other hand, Jordan decides to stay on and keep on fighting to protect his comrades and Maria during the war despite the fact that his ideals are being compromised. In doing so, Jordan hardly manages to achieve a sense of victory in finding his manhood by the end of his life. Jordan relatively overcomes his lostness at last. While the war is an outlet to find the treasure that is their manhood, Henry fails miserably regarding proving his manhood, but Jordan succeeds to a certain degree by being loyal to his personal principles not the cause he originally has travelled for.

REFERENCES

- Augustyn, A.**, (2011). *American literature from the 1850s to 1945*, New York, NY: Britannica Educational Pub. in association with Rosen Educational Services.
- Bederman, G.**, (1995). *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Carnes, M.C.**, (1990). *Meanings for manhood: constructions of masculinity in Victorian America*, Chicago [etc.: University of Chicago Press.
- Cowley, M.**, (1994). *Exile's return: a literary Odyssey of the 1920s* D. W. Faulkner, ed., New York: Penguin Books.
- Donaldson, S.**, (1996). *The Cambridge Companion to Hemingway*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dumenil, L.**, (1995). *The Modern Temper: American Culture and Society in the 1920s*, New York: Hill and Wang.
- Frederking, L.C.**, (2010). The Rebel: Hemingway and the Struggle Against Politics. In L. C. Frederking, ed. *Hemingway on Politics and Rebellion*. New York: Routledge.
- Gardiner, J.**, (2005). Men, Masculinities, and Feminist Theory. In: Michael S. Kimmel, J. Hearn and R. Connell, ed., *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*, 1st ed. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Gilbert, S.M. & Gubar, S.**, (1988). *No Man's Land: The war of the words*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Goodheart, E.**, (2010). *Critical Insights, Ernest Hemingway*, Pasadena, CA: Salem Press.
- Hatten, C.**, (1993). The Crisis of Masculinity, Reified Desire, and Catherine Barkley in 'A Farewell to Arms'. *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 76–98.
- Hemingway, E.**, (1982). 'I saw murder done in Spain'-Hemingway's lost report. *Chicago Tribune*, p.4.
- Hemingway, E.**, (1929). *A Farewell to Arms*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Hemingway, E.**, (1981). To MAXWELL PERKINS, Nordquist Ranch, 26 September 1936. In C. Baker, ed. *Ernest Hemingway, Selected Letters, 1917-1961*. New York: Scribner.
- Hemingway, E.**, (1995). *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, New York, New York: Scribner.
- Herndl, D.P.**, (2001). Invalid Masculinity: Silence, Hospitals, and Anesthesia in "A Farewell to Arms". *The Hemingway Review*, 21(1), 38–52.
- Joseph, T.**, (2003). "Non-Combatant's Shell-Shock": Trauma and Gender in F. Scott Fitzgerald's "Tender Is the Night". *NWSA Journal* , 15(3), 64–81.
- Kimmel, M. S.**, (2011). *The Gendered Society* (4th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Kimmel, M.S.**, (2006). *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* 2nd ed., New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lathbury, R.**, (2005). *American modernism, 1910-1945: American literature in its historical, cultural, and social contexts*, New York: Facts On File.
- Lauter, P.**, (2014). *The Concise Heath Anthology of American Literature 1865 to the Present* 2nd éd., Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Linker, B.**, (2011). *War's Waste: Rehabilitation in World War I America*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Macleod, D.I.**, (2004). *Building character in the American boy: the Boy Scouts, YMCA, and their forerunners, 1870-1920*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Monk, C.**, (2008). *Writing the Lost Generation Expatriate Autobiography and American Modernism*, Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.
- Morley, C.**, (2012). *Modern American literature*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Nahal, C. L.**, (1971). *The Narrative Pattern in Ernest Hemingway's Fiction*. Rutherford [N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Onderdonk, T.**, (2006). "Bitched": Feminization, Identity, and the Hemingwayesque in *The Sun Also Rises*. *Twentieth Century Literature* , 61–91.
- Parker, G.T.**, (1973). *Mind cure in New England; from the Civil War to World War I*, Hanover, N.H.: University Press of New England.
- Purseigle, P.**, (2005). *Warfare and belligerence perspectives in First World War studies*, Leiden: Brill.
- Reyna, J. M., & Cadena, C. H. G.**, (2006). Masculinity, Machismo and their Relation with Familiar Variables. *Advances In Psychology Research*, 42, 1–20.
- Roosevelt, T.**, (2009). *The strenuous life: essays and addresses*, Mineola, N.Y.: Dover Publications.
- Rovit, E.**, (1963). *Ernest Hemingway*, New Haven: College and University Press.
- Showalter, E.**, (1987). *The Female Malady: Women, Madness, and English Culture, 1830-1980*, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.: Penguin Books.
- Sigal, C.**, (2013). *Hemingway Lives!: Why Reading Ernest Hemingway Matters Today*, New York: OR Books.
- Smiler, A.P., Kay, G. & Harris, B.**, (2008). Tightening and Loosening Masculinity's (k) Nots: Masculinity in the Hearst Press during the Interwar Period. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 16(3), 266–279.
- Stein, G.**, (1971). *Everybody's autobiography*, New York: Cooper Square Publishers.
- Strychacz, T.F.**, (2003). *Hemingway's Theaters of Masculinity*, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Svoboda, F.J.**, (2000). The Great Themes in Hemingway: Love, War, Wilderness, and Loss. In L. Martin, ed. *A Historical Guide to Ernest Hemingway*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, H.**, (2013). *The Spanish Civil War* Modern Library paperback., New York City: Random House Publishing Group.
- Vernon, A.**, (2002). War, Gender, and Ernest Hemingway. *The Hemingway Review*, 22(1), 34–55.
- West Jr, R.B.**, (1970). The Unadulterated Sensibility. In J. Gellens, ed. *Twentieth Century Interpretations of A Farewell to Arms*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

West, B.S., (2013). *Crowd Violence in American Modernist Fiction: Lynchings, Riots and the Individual Under Assault*, Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers.

Young, P., (1965). *Ernest Hemingway*, Minneapolis: U of Minnesota Press.



RESUME



Name Surname: Qaidar Rahim Rashid
Place and Date of Birth: 13/November/1989
E-Mail: uniqaidar@gmail.com

EDUCATION:

- **Bachelor:** 2014, Sulaimani University, College of Languages, English Department
- **Master:** 2016, Istanbul Aydin University, English Language, English Language and Literature Program

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE AND REWARDS

PUBLICATIONS/PRESENTATIONS ON THE THESIS:

- Rashid, Qaidar Rahim. (2016). The Test of Manhood in Ernest Hemingway's "A Farewell to Arms". *The International Journal Of Media, Culture and Literature*.