



The Faculty of Arts and Education

MASTER'S THESIS

Study programme: LMLIMAS - Advanced Teacher's Education for levels 8-13	Spring term, 2024 Open
Author: Morten Olsen (signature author)
Supervisor: Professor Peter Paul Ferry	
Title of thesis: "Man is not made for defeat": Hegemonic Masculinity, Manhood, and Emasculation in Ernest Hemingway's <i>The Sun Also Rises</i> and <i>The Old Man and the Sea</i>	
Keywords: American literature, Ernest Hemingway, Manhood, Masculinity, Hegemonic Masculinity, Emasculation	Pages: 62 + attachment/other: 8 Stavanger, 08.05.2024

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Peter Paul Ferry, as it has been thoroughly enjoyable to work together on this project. The guidance, feedback, and informative discussions throughout the process of writing this thesis have been invaluable.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Abstract	iv
Introduction	1
Chapter I: Theorizing Hemingway Scholarship, Hegemonic Masculinity, Manhood, Emasculation, and Performative Masculinity	3
1.1. Hemingway Scholarship	4
1.2. Masculinity and Masculinity Studies	6
1.3. Hegemonic Masculinity	8
1.4. Homosociality	11
1.5. Manhood and Manhood in America.....	12
1.6. Emasculation: Impotence and Aging	17
1.7. Performative Masculinity	21
Chapter II: Representations of Hegemonic and Non-Hegemonic Men: Navigating Hemingway's Masculinities	23
2.1. Hegemonic Representations: Pedro Romero and Joe DiMaggio	24
2.2. Non-Hegemonic Representations: Jake Barnes and Santiago.....	32
2.3. Hegemonic Idealizations: The Oppression of those who Represent Otherness.....	36
Chapter III: Representations of Emasculated Men: Jake and Santiago's Pursuit of Manhood	42
3.1. Physically Redeeming their Emasculated Manhood	43
3.2. Imaginatively Redeeming their Emasculated Manhood	48
3.3. Successfully Redeeming their Emasculated Manhood?.....	55
Conclusion	59
Works Cited	63

Abstract

Ernest Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises* (1926) and *The Old Man and the Sea* (1952) are narratives of masculinity that depict the struggles of the emasculated protagonists Jake Barnes and Santiago. To aid the exploration of how Jake and Santiago navigate the effects and consequences of their emasculation, the present thesis utilizes the theory of Hegemonic Masculinity and the concepts of Manhood, Homosociality, Impotence and Aging as Emasculation, and Gender Performativity. The prism of Hegemonic Masculinity helps illustrate how the non-hegemonic protagonists measure themselves up against hegemonic representations and idealize hegemonic performances of masculinity. Moreover, the conceptualization of Manhood and a focus on impotence and aging as emasculation helps illustrate how both protagonists attempt to redeem their manhood through physical and imaginative performances of masculinity. A key contrast emerges between the narratives in Jake Barnes' futile plight compared to Santiago's affordances of gratification in his attempts at redemption. However, both works are ultimately interrelated narratives that thematize the intricacies of emasculated men navigating the complex landscape of men and masculinities in the search of ideal manhood.

"Man is not made for defeat": Hegemonic Masculinity, Manhood, and Emasculation in Ernest Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises* and *The Old Man and the Sea*

Introduction

The Sun Also Rises (1926) and *The Old Man and the Sea* (1952), works at opposite ends of Ernest Hemingway's literary output, offer two distinct yet interrelated narratives of masculinity that point to major issues that underpin Hemingway's work as an author. Despite the apparent disparity between the social and melodramatic world of *The Sun Also Rises* (*TSAR*) and the isolated and primitive landscape of *The Old Man and the Sea* (*TOMATS*), both works intricately explore the complexities of men and masculinity through the protagonists, Jake Barnes and Santiago. The crucial factor that distinguishes Jake and Santiago as Hemingway's representations of manhood are their struggles with emasculation. Jake is implied to have suffered a phallic war wound as a soldier in the Great War, and is consequently left impotent and unable to perform despite having a strong sexual desire. Santiago is emasculated by his old age, and the old man struggles with his sense of manhood as he notices his dwindling strength and increasing feelings of loneliness and dependency. The narratives of Jake and Santiago illustrate how the protagonists measure their emasculated manhood up against their ideas of ideal men, and attempt physical and imaginative performances of masculinity in order to redeem their sense of manhood.

The three chapters of this thesis set out the key elements that drive Jake Barnes and Santiago's narratives of masculinity. Chapter one has two key aims: first, it begins by presenting critical trends in Hemingway scholarship to highlight the relevance of masculinity perspectives in the vast field of critical discourse on Hemingway and his fiction, and to contextualize the project's position in this critical landscape. Second, the chapter establishes a critical framework of key contexts, concepts, and theories that are important to aid the project's exploration of the Hemingway texts. The concepts of Hegemonic Masculinity, Manhood, the contextualization of manhood in 20th century America, Homosociality, Impotence and Aging as Emasculation, and Performative Masculinity provide a rich and fluid analytical lens to unravel the complexities of manhood and masculinity as depicted in *TSAR* and *TOMATS*.

The second chapter employs the concept of Hegemonic Masculinity to illustrate how Jake and Santiago craft and measure their performances of masculinity up against the hegemonic figures of Pedro Romero and Joe DiMaggio. This, the chapter argues, is to inspire

Jake and Santiago's attempts at redeeming their sense of manhood by establishing an example of what the ideal man, in their eyes, is capable of demonstrating. The chapter also underlines the irony that—in their efforts to get closer to the hegemonic male in question, either physically or imaginatively—Jake and Santiago further concretize their status as non-hegemonic men distanced from the hegemony. This is illustrated through two points: First, in Jake and Santiago's passive depictions as avid fans and spectators of the masculinity-fueling sports of bullfighting and baseball. And second, in their contrast and distance to Romero and DiMaggio, both of whom are portrayed as actively performing hegemonic athletes that the protagonists idealize. The final key argument of the chapter suggests that Jake and Santiago's view of their masculinity within this hegemonic framework lead them to imitate and glorify the hegemonic virtue of the oppression of those who represent otherness. Jake Barnes performs his homophobia against a crowd of homosexual men, and Santiago glorifies his memory of marginalizing a racial minority. This in order to strengthen their sense of manhood by closing their distance to hegemonic virtues and ideals.

The third and final chapter points to the inevitable central condition of Jake and Santiago's emasculation. The chapter argues that the consequences of impotence in Jake's narrative and aging in Santiago's narrative force the protagonists to attempt to redeem their manhood, and reclaim what is both lost and threatened, through physical and imaginative performances of masculinity. On the one hand, Jake tries to assert a physical dominance in a fight versus Robert Cohn, and tries to find sexual gratification to satisfy his desire through imagining himself sexually potent. On the other hand, Santiago is willing to sacrifice his life for the physical conquest of the great marlin, and the old man imaginatively feminizes the sea as a reaction to his loneliness, in order to replace the lost feminine comfort and companionship he suffers in his old age.

Ultimately, Ernest Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises* and *The Old Man and the Sea* are narratives of masculinity presented through the lens of emasculated protagonists. While their emasculating conditions may differ, the works illustrate an interrelated nature in how the men experience and navigate their struggles with their sense of manhood. By viewing the narratives through the prism of Hegemonic Masculinity and concepts of Manhood, Homosociality, Emasculation, and Gender Performativity, the correlations—and deviations—between the narratives of masculinity in *TSAR* and *TOMATS* are untangled as Hemingway's texts thematizes the rich and complex experiences of emasculated men.

Chapter I: Theorizing Hemingway Scholarship, Hegemonic Masculinity, Manhood, Emasculation, and Performative Masculinity

To deconstruct how the emasculated Jake Barnes and Santiago struggle with their sense of manhood, it is necessary to establish a framework of contexts, theories, and concepts aiding the close readings of the Hemingway texts. This chapter first explores relevant scholarship on Ernest Hemingway and *The Sun Also Rises* and *The Old Man and the Sea*, to demonstrate how perspectives on masculinity is prominent in critical discourse on Hemingway, and to contextualize this project within the rich critical landscape of Hemingway scholarship.

The chapter then focus shifts to Raewyn Connell's theory of Hegemonic Masculinity, which examines how dominant forms of masculinity exert power and influence over other men. The theory helps to later illustrate how Jake and Santiago are non-hegemonic men who measure themselves up against hegemonic figures and idealize the hegemonic oppression of otherness, to strengthen their sense of manhood. Connell's theory is expanded upon in the contextualization of Homosexuality by Hammarén and Johansson, Sedgwick, and Bird, who further explore the intricacies of men's attitudes and behaviors in the presence of other men.

The concept of manhood is essential to this project, and in this chapter, it is established through Vandello and Bosson conceptualization of Precarious Manhood, and Michael Kimmel's contextualization of manhood in 20th century America. Manhood is presented as a precarious social status that is easily lost and hard to attain, which is a crucial theme throughout Hemingway's narratives of masculinity. Contextualizing the concept of manhood in 20th century America sheds light on how Hemingway's narratives are written in a period where the concept of manhood was challenged and fragmented as men were seeking new ways to gratify their sense of manhood.

Jake and Santiago's struggle with manhood is manifested through their respectively emasculating conditions of impotence and aging. The chapter then explores how impotence and aging are fundamental to challenging one's identity and sense of manhood through the research of Annie Potts and Glendenning et al. Crucially, Jake and Santiago's emasculation fuels them to redeem their manhood, which is expanded on with Judith Butler's theory of Gender Performativity and Thomas Strychacz' application of Butler's theory to Hemingway's fiction. Butler suggests gender is realized through performed acts culturally associated with one's sex, aligning with Strychacz' use of the theory to identify how Hemingway's male representations deliberately perform acts of masculinity to strengthen their sense of manhood.

1.1. Hemingway Scholarship

Ernest Hemingway and his fiction are both renowned and criticized for his substantial thematization of men and masculinities. In discussing the scholarship and criticism of the author and his fiction, influential Hemingway scholar Thomas Strychacz states: "nothing has been more characteristic of Hemingway scholarship than its reliance on biographical material in order to mediate aesthetic and philosophical problems in his work" (*Hemingway's Theaters* 2). Hemingway is perhaps one of the most prominent authors in the literary genre of the *roman-à-clef*: the novel blurring fiction and non-fiction. Indeed, critics and readers might argue it is so blurred, that, in the words of critic Loren Glass, "the principal challenge to Hemingway critics has always been located in the vexed relation between literary biography and literary criticism" (qtd. in Mazzeno 195). Hemingway was a man larger than merely his writings and work as an author, and he left much of himself, his experiences, and his acquaintances in his fiction. In turn, perhaps understandably so, critics have tended to analyze his fiction through a biographical lens — arguably to the disservice of the narrative elements of his texts.

This critical trend is noted in an early 1933 criticism of Hemingway and his non-fiction book about bullfighting, *Death in the Afternoon* (1932), as critic and writer Max Eastman writes:

[...] some circumstance seems to have laid upon Hemingway a continual sense of the obligation to put forth evidences of red-blooded masculinity. It must be made obvious not only in the swing of the big shoulders and the clothes he puts on, but in the stride of his prose style and the emotions he permits to come to the surface there. (96)

Eastman suggests that Hemingway's obsession with death, brutality, and 'manly' appearance both in his person and writing was a sort of posturing and performance caused by 'some circumstance', as to imply an insecurity in the author's sense of manhood. Eastman extends his criticism into a metaphor that led to an infamous physical confrontation between Hemingway and Eastman, as he writes: "a literary style, you might say, of wearing false hair on the chest" (96). This suggests that Hemingway's hypermasculine writings purposely attempts to simulate a masculine essence, but in the eyes of Eastman, this simulation is rendered shallow and performative.

The notion of performativity in the context of Hemingway is notably later thematized in Thomas Strychacz' article "Dramatizations of Manhood in Hemingway's *In Our Time* and *The Sun Also Rises*" (1989). The critic stresses the importance of how performances of masculinity are theatrical in their dependency on an-looking crowd to evaluate the performances. Strychacz would later elaborate on this idea in his book *Hemingway's Theaters of Masculinity* (2003), where he briefly establishes the theatre theory of Bertolt Brecht and the Gender Performativity theory of Judith Butler to aid his exploration of performances of masculinity throughout Hemingway's fiction. However, Strychacz is not alone in exploring this topic. Elliot (1995), De Baerdemaeker (2007), Puckett (2013), and Armengol (2020) apply the concept of performativity in examining Hemingway's fiction, showing how performative readings have a long and continued presence in scholarship on the American author.

However, while Strychacz, Elliot, and Puckett apply the aspect of performative masculinity to Jake Barnes and *The Sun Also Rises*, applications of the concept to Santiago and *The Old Man and the Sea* is arguably critically underdeveloped aside from Strychacz' examination in *Hemingway's Theaters of Masculinity*. This contrast in the critical discourse between the writer's first novel and last novella is further reflected in regard to Jake and Santiago impotence and aging. Rudat (1990), Fore (2007), Klaver (2012), and Kübler (2022) have published critical works examining Jake's impotence, and invokes concepts of disability, queering, and feminization to consider the implications of his war wound.

For decades, Jake Barnes has and continues to be studied for his war wound and impotence — all the while Santiago and his aging has not received similar focal critical attention beyond Cooperman's early investigation in the 1965 article "Hemingway and Old Age: Santiago as Priest of Time". Certainly, Santiago's old age is not critically disregarded, as, for example, Stephen and Cools (2013) later notes that Hemingway used *TOMATS* "as a means of revising his code of grace under pressure to consider how a man manifests this grace when facing defeat or old age" (77). However, allocating more attention to Santiago's aging and the consequences it has on his sense of self, may prove pivotal in further understanding Hemingway's depiction of the old man and other representations of emasculation.

1.2. Masculinity and Masculinity Studies

Gender and masculinity perspectives have long been—and continues to be—a central force in the critical investigations of Hemingway's fiction. In viewing *The Sun Also Rises* and *The Old Man and the Sea* as interrelated narratives, the present project enters a critical landscape that has widely and actively covered the emasculation of Jake Barnes, and has arguably overlooked the emasculation of Santiago. In carrying out this project which focuses on both Jake and Santiago's emasculation, it is then necessary to shift the focus to the larger theme and concept of masculinity, which is at the core of the critical framework that shapes the close readings of *TSAR* and *TOMATS*.

Throughout history men have dominated studies in all fields—whether it is history, literature, religion, and academia—as both researchers and the target audience (Hearn and Howson 19). However, as Hearn and Howson (19) and Gottzen et al. (1) argue, men have been an 'absent presence' in gender research and studies despite their prominent role as researchers. The male gender was historically considered "the benchmark against which everything else about human nature is explained" (Hearn and Howson 19), as the 'neutral' or 'natural' gender. For centuries, gender studies mostly carried out a general study of both genders or focused on women, whereas a focal lens on males as individuals or as a collective went mostly unproblematized and unchallenged (19).

This changed, however, with psychologists Terman and Miles' theory of the sex-role identity in their 1936 study "Sex and personality". The study notes observations made of men in the 18th and early 19th century, such as men 'escaping' from their breadwinner and provider roles, the number of men unfit for service during WW1, and fears of feminization argued from, e.g., women's rising prominence as teachers (Pleck 23). In discussing the function of the sex-role theory, Joseph Pleck writes:

[...] for each sex, there is a psychologically normative or ideal configuration of traits, attitudes, and interests that members of that sex demonstrate to varying degrees. Men (and women) are psychologically normal to the extent that they possess these sex-appropriate characteristics and psychologically deficient or abnormal to the extent that they do not. (23-24)

Terman and Miles suggest normative traits, attitudes, and behaviors for men and women which in turn builds a foundation of beliefs of what are deemed acceptable and normal in the

confines of one's sex. Their theory laid the foundation for future theoretical developments that saw *role theories* emerge, that enacted views of gendered behavior and traits acquired through socializing within a culture and period. Crucially, Terman and Miles establishes "masculinity" and "femininity" (M–F) as concepts of objective gender measure that went on to be used in gendered tests of children, to measure whether their preferences to multiple choice questionnaires correlated with the normative beliefs and expectations of their gender (Pleck 25, Kimmel *Manhood in America* 206–210).

Following the sex-role theory, Gottzen et al. discusses how masculinity and men's studies would receive research attention in the 1970s when the notion of the 'absent present' male gender was challenged. Critical inquiry by gay and feminist critics into the social constituents of men conceptualized *men* and *masculinity* as focal topics of study and theory, which saw notable rise in prominence between the 1980s and 1990s (1).

One of the major critics in masculinity studies that emerges during this period is the Australian sociologist Raewyn Connell, who in her early writings in 1979 challenges the notions of the role theories. Notably, Connell argues the inability of the theories to grasp and recognize power relationships between—and especially within—gender dynamics (Demetriou 338-339), as well as not recognizing the diversity of masculinities and femininities (340). In her influential work *Masculinities*, initially published in 1995, Connell asserts that to speak of masculinity is to speak of "doing gender" in a culturally specific way" (68). She argues that masculinity only exists in contrast to femininity, as the concepts constitute traits, behaviors, and expectations that are socially attributed to be masculine or feminine (68).

In further exploring the concept of masculinity, Connell critiques four major strategies of defining masculinity: essentialist, positivist, normative, and semiotic claims (68–70). Connell argues that essentialist definitions are arbitrary and lacking universality; she posits that positivism relies on gendered typifications; she critiques normative definitions for setting unattainable standards; and finds semiotic claims too limited (69). The sociologist develops her own theory of masculinity to address the shortcomings of existing role theories, as she suggests shifting the focus from presenting masculinity as an object (a natural character type, a behavioural average, a norm), to understanding the processes and relationships through which gender is enacted (71). Connell's definition of masculinity places the concept in the relationship between genders: how men and women engage that place in gender relations, and the effects of their engagement with "bodily experience, personality, and culture" (71).

1.3. Hegemonic Masculinity

The concept of *power* and its complexities in gender relations stands as a central idea in Connell's theory, as highlighted in her criticisms of role theories that did not sufficiently capture the intricacies of the power dynamics within and between genders. In an aim to understand the power dynamic in the relations among men, the sociologist develops a framework of masculinities that recognizes the diversity of men and their configurations (social roles and identities) in interaction with women and other men.

The concept of Hegemonic Masculinity is paramount to this project's exploration of Hemingway's narratives of masculinity, as the concept provides a framework to identify and discuss how and what legitimizes the "unequal gender relations between men and women, between masculinity and femininity, and among masculinities" (Messerschmidt 86). Connell cites the concept of 'hegemony' as derived from the Italian Marxist philosopher Antonio Gramsci (*Masculinities* 77). In "Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony" (1975), Bates explains the basic premise of Gramsci's hegemony as the idea that man is not ruled by power alone, but also by ideas (351). The term "Hegemony", with its political origins, was applied in the context and study of the political and intellectual power of governments and ruling classes (351). And hegemony, Bates comments, is "political leadership based on the consent of the led" (352), which is legitimized by the spread and popularization of the views of the leadership (352). Gramsci's concept of hegemony can thus be viewed as what legitimizes and retains the power of a ruling party, and its power to dominate and influence its subordinate parties.

In Connell's investigation of relations among men, the hegemonic term aims to investigate what legitimizes and retains the power and domination of a ruling party of men—or, the hegemony—who exert their dominance and influence over men who do not have the social configurations of a hegemonic male. The similarity of hegemonic masculinity to her criticisms of normative definitions of masculinity is notable, where only few men actually fully realize and practice all the patterns of the hegemony. However, many men gain from the 'patriarchal dividend' in the social dominance of women, the subordination of men such as homosexuals, and the marginalization of racial minorities (*Masculinities* 79). Connell argues it cannot be taken for granted that the "most visible bearers of hegemony are always the most powerful people" (77), and that holding power does not necessarily mean one practices it to all respects, such as her example of a powerful Sydney businessman who at the same time was a figure in the local gay social scene (77).

The appearance of power is crucial to hegemonic masculinity, as Connell notes that the ideals of masculinity within a culture does not necessarily align with the personality of most men, or even the hegemonic bearers of masculinity themselves (*Gender & Power* 184–185). In what is notably depicted in Hemingway's representations of hegemonic masculinity, Connell argues that a central force in maintaining the hegemony is the creation and idealization of unattainable ideals, such as famous movie stars or famous athletes who are distinctly distanced from the everyday man and everyday achievements (185). Yet, these unattainable ideals sustain the power of the hegemony as ideals that men are motivated to support: "Few men are Boggarts and Stallones, many collaborate in sustaining those images" (185).

In the dialogue between the hegemonic ideal and actual manifestation, Connell stresses the necessary relation between either collective or individual institutional power and the cultural ideal, in pointing to how hegemonic ideals need practical power in order to defend their part in the hegemony (*Masculinities* 77). Although, Connell argues, the hegemony can be challenged and is not in a static and secure state, as it stands to be challenged and changed with time and culture (77). The standing hegemonic masculinity though, serves as the prime example of manhood that other men position themselves against, and legitimizes the subordination of women and undermined social groups (Messerschmidt & Connell 832).

Similar to how masculinity only exists in its dichotomy with femininity, hegemonic masculinity only functions in its dichotomy with femininity and non-hegemonic men. In Connell's hierarchy of masculinities, the hegemony exists in opposition to a set of non-hegemonic masculinities: *complicit*, *marginalized*, and *subordinated* (*Masculinities* 76). *Complicit masculinities* acknowledge the normative aspect of hegemonic masculinity and how most men do not fully realize it but benefit from it. Connell uses the example of the man watching sports on TV as opposed to the professional actually playing, and hegemonic men who actively dominate women as opposed to complicit men who show active and mutual respect for women in their families, yet are still complicit in a society where they actively benefit from the advantages of their gender (79–80). *Marginalized masculinities* capture the interplay between class and race relations between masculinities, and depict how minorities and lower classes can be targets of domination by the hegemony (80–81). Lastly, *subordinated masculinities* look to the subordination of men antithetical to hegemonic beliefs, such as homosexuals who are compared to women as they are both oppressed on a systematic and cultural level (78). These non-hegemonic categories are crucial as they recognize the richness of masculinities that exist within a culture, and they depict how hegemonic

masculinities exert their influence—or domination—over other groups of men in order to maintain and establish their dominance within a time and culture.

The concept of hegemonic masculinity has seen vast growth since its inception in the 1980s, and it continues to be a central force in discourse on men and masculinities. In the article "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept" (2005), Connell and James W. Messerschmidt proposes an evolution of the concept in response to the criticisms of the hegemonic theory. They highlight criticisms who found the theory to engage in character typology and generalizing men's experiences, vaguely depicting who actually represents the hegemony, and its lacking consideration of gender relations, and a dissatisfactory tackling of the masculine subject (836, 838, 839, 841). In response, Connell and Messerschmidt's article aims to reformulate the concept in four areas: "the nature of gender hierarchy, the geography of masculine configurations, the process of social embodiment, and the dynamics of masculinities" (847). In doing so, the scholars emphasize and reinforce the relations among masculinities, and especially the agency of non-hegemonic men, and women, in the relations among and between genders (847, 853). Subsequently, Connell and Messerschmidt stress the cultural and geographical relevance in discussing hegemonic masculinity because of its increasing impact and importance in a globalized world (849).

Messerschmidt again revisits the concept of hegemonic masculinity in "The Salience of 'Hegemonic Masculinity'" (2019), and again emphasizes how it continues to be a driving force in critical discourse and studies on men and masculinities (85). However, the key motivation of his article is to stress his view that the concept has been "terribly misunderstood" in its use (86). Messerschmidt argues that the hegemonic concept has been too frequently equated with characteristics of masculinity and specific groups of men (88). Instead, he stresses Connell's initial intention with the concept: a model that helps identify what contributes to legitimate unequal relations between genders (90).

Connell's framework of hegemonic and non-hegemonic masculinities is crucial to this project's exploration of Hemingway's narratives of masculinity. It aids the project in recognizing the richness of Hemingway's masculine representations, as his narratives arguably thematizes the complex dynamic between idealized and damaged figures of manhood. Chapter II discusses how hegemonic and non-hegemonic figures are represented and crafted in Hemingway's texts, arguing that the non-hegemonic and emasculated protagonists idealize and seek hegemonic figures in order to fuel their sense of manhood and inspire their attempts at redeeming it.

1.4. Homosociality

The concept of homosociality is important as the concept elaborates on the relations between men and masculinities. In "Homosociality: In Between Power and Intimacy" (2014), Hammarén and Johansson note how the concept of homosociality is frequently used in men and masculinity studies as a concept of social dynamics that help maintain the hegemonic masculinity in a society (1). However, they criticize a scholarly 'overexploitation' of the concept as reducing it into an "descriptive term" (1) that is just "used to show how men bond, build closed teams, and defend their privileges and positions" (1).

Instead, to highlight the complexities and depth of homosociality, they refer to Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick who was instrumental in developing the term in her study *Between men: English literature and male homosocial desire* (1985). According to Sedgwick, homosociality is a concept that describes the social bonds and interactions between the same sex (1). She argues it is derived as an analogy to homosexuality, where it instead is applied to relations such as male bonding: "which may, as in our society, be characterized by intense homophobia, fear, and hatred of homosexuality" (1). Sedgwick's use of homosociality emphasizes how homosocial bonds exist in a discontinuity with homosexuality, and as the homosocial process and desire of male-bonding takes place (males turning attention to other males), it exists in continuum with a homosexual panic: a fear of the homosocial bonding falling into homosexual desire. In consequence, homosociality leads to an accentuating of men's heterosexuality and a hatred and subordination of homosexuality (Hammarén and Johansson 2).

Sociologist Sharon Bird further explores the implications of homosociality in her study "Welcome to the Men's Club" (1996):

[...] homosocial interaction, among heterosexual men, contributes to the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity norms by supporting meanings associated with identities that fit hegemonic ideals while suppressing meanings associated with nonhegemonic masculinity identities. (121)

Bird argues that homosocial interactions between men, which Sedgwick exemplifies with relations such as friendships, mentorships, and rivalries (Sedgwick 1), can actively reinforce the traits and norms of the hegemony and suppress non-hegemonic qualities (Bird 121). This, as established by Connell, results in asserting the hegemonic masculinity's domination of

women and the subordination and marginalization of masculinities not aligned with hegemonic configurations. Furthermore, Bird argues that homosociality does so through three key core components: *emotional detachment*, a suppression of emotions and expressions of intimacy (Chodrow qtd. Bird 122, 125); *competitiveness*, which promotes an individuality and separation from other men in that there is a masculine fear of being weaker and worse than other men, where weakness is attributed to femininity (Gillian qtd. in Bird 122;127–128); and *sexual objectification of women*, which establishes a notion of male superiority and women as lesser — often as objects of sexual conquest (Johnson qtd. in Bird 121; 128–130). Bird notes these components as being essential homosocial qualities that help maintain the hegemony; however, her findings (130–131) reflect what Connell stresses in similar manner: not all men individually share or conform to these qualities, although they are present and observed as collective characteristics that exist in the relations among men.

1.5. Manhood and Manhood in America

In the continued process of presenting foundational concepts that informs this project's close readings of *The Sun Also Rises* and *The Old Man and the Sea*, it is necessary to establish the essential concept of *manhood*, followed by the important context of manhood in 20th century America. This is important as manhood distinguishes itself from 'masculinity' in being a social status that Jake and Santiago struggle with due to their emasculation, and consequently aim to redeem. Furthermore, the context of manhood in America is key in manifesting how Hemingway's works are written in a period where the traditional complacency and understanding of manhood was shattered by major cultural shifts such as the immigration, industrialization, and World Wars, as American men were consequently left searching for new ways to gratify their sense of manhood.

Manhood: A Precarious Social Status

In the study "Hard Won and Easily Lost: A Review and Synthesis of Theory and Research on Precarious Manhood" (2013), Vandello and Bosson conceptualize manhood, and present it as "a precarious social status that is both difficult to achieve and tenuously held" (101). The critics argue that manhood is something that has to be attained and maintained through publicly verifiable acts of masculinity (102), which is crucial in tandem with Butler's gender

performativity theory to understand why and how Hemingway's men perform and attribute so much value to gendered acts in assessing their own—and other's—manhood.

Vandello and Bosson's thesis is based on three 'tenets' of precarious manhood that they evidence in their study: *elusive*, *tenuous*, and *verifiable*. Manhood is *elusive* in being a social status that is hard to achieve; it is *tenuous* in being easily lost, such as through femininity or losing one's job; and it is *verifiable* in requiring action and public proof as men need to prove they are deserved of their manhood, and therefore seek validation through the public action (102).

According to Vandello and Bosson, these tenets have observable implications on men's behavior and attitudes in light of precarious manhood (104). They note implications on men's stress and anxiety as induced by their gender role, which in the context of men particularly relates to factors that would cause a loss of manhood or being seen as lesser masculine compared to other men (104). In addition, the researchers observe aggressive and risk-taking behavior caused by gender anxiety, which is motivated by the need to demonstrate one's manhood and manliness to halt questions or uncertainties regarding their manhood (104-105). Lastly, and which in particular has been touched on with both hegemonic masculinity and homosociality, Vandello and Bosson observe an avoidance of femininity (105). They found that men avoid stereotypically feminine interests and roles as they can induce loss in gender status, even if the activity is of individual interest. Conversely, the researchers note that: "When unconcerned about their manhood, men in this study reported heightened feelings of autonomy ..." (105), highlighting how distancing from the demands and expectations of manhood may in turn result in greater emotional and mental well-being (105).

It is important to note that Vandello and Bosson acknowledge the limitations of their study, recognizing that it may appear generalizing and may not apply universally to all men and their attitudes of manhood (108–109). However, their tenets and implications of precarious manhood are informing concepts that can contribute to analyze attitudes and behaviors of men, which is integral to the explorations of Hemingway's depictions of manhood. The study helps establish an understanding of the relationship between masculinity and manhood. Here, manhood functions almost as an end-goal; a social status that men aim to obtain and desperately want to avoid losing, and which they obtain, maintain, and regain through performances of masculinity.

Manhood in America

Building on the concept of manhood, American sociologist Michael Kimmel grants us another influential and informing perspective of its complexities in the article "Masculinity as Homophobia" (1994), which contextualizes the term in an American cultural context. Notably, he presents the American masculine culture's understanding of manhood through psychologist Robert Brannon and his "rules of masculinity" (1976): "No Sissy Stuff!" in avoiding all forms of femininity; "Be a Big Wheel" in accumulating "power, success, wealth, and status"; "Be a Sturdy Oak" in being calm and stoic and "never showing your emotions at all. Boys don't cry"; and lastly, "Give 'em Hell", which is to take risks and be aggressive. (qtd. in "Masculinity as Homophobia" 125–126)

Brannon's 'rules' strikingly correlates to the discussion of hegemonic masculinity, homosociality, and manhood thus far, highlighting the rejection and marginalization of the feminine; demonstration of power as a virtue of manhood; a reluctance of showing emotion; and aggression and risk-taking as key virtue. Similar to Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity, Kimmel stresses how men realizing all these rules are unlikely; however, they serve as virtues men are measured up against (126). Moreover, Kimmel introduces the concept of manhood as a cultural construction that is "neither static, nor timeless" (120). The perception of manhood is something historic that changes with time and culture, much like the hegemony. The ideals of manhood in the 20th century did not necessarily resemble the ideals of the 19th century, as they are fluid and dynamic; however, a static essence is maintained: "We come to know what it means to be a man in our culture by setting our definitions in opposition to a set of "others"—racial minorities, sexual minorities, and, above all, women" (120).

Kimmel subsequently invokes the homosocial concept and argues how it is a critical component of manhood due to how men demonstrate their manhood in order to seek approval from other men who "watch us, rank us, and grant us acceptance" (128). Women become sort of a currency in this inherently sexist dynamic, as Kimmel argues (129) they are used by men to measure and boast their masculine feats to other men to validate their manhood. Furthermore, he explains how this sexism is interwoven with both homophobia and racism (133), which are staples to the hegemonic existence and its homosocial implications.

It is notable how Kimmel then argues that manhood in America has developed its opposition to "otherness": the ethnic, racial, sexual, and gendered 'other' to the straight white American male. In particular, Kimmel argues that homophobia is conceptualized due to a

fright of being considered feminine: A complex fright that consists of the fear of other men and their ability to 'unmask' them for being less masculine, and not measuring up to them (*Manhood in America* 8). Moreover, the notion of a racial 'otherness' presents an interesting dynamic. Early 20th-century European immigrants were considered too emotional, and mid 20th century Asians too physically weak and inferior ("Masculinity as Homophobia" 134), which stands in stark contrast to the attitudes towards African Americans who were racially stereotyped with hypermasculine traits: e.g., being overly sexually aggressive or violent (135). In other words, the presence of the sexual and ethnic 'other' sparked a defensive reaction in American men:

Being seen as unmanly is a fear that propels American men to deny manhood to others, as a way of proving the unprovable—that one is fully manly. Masculinity becomes a defense against the perceived threat of humiliation in the eyes of other men [...] (135)

Kimmel demonstrates how ideals of manhood often align with the masculine hegemony, which, through power and influence, creates an opposition and 'otherness' to groups and traits that threaten the hegemony or one's sense of manhood. In other words, men defending their manhood may express a disdain for both a lack—and excess—of masculinity.

In *Manhood in America* (1996), Kimmel details the virtues, ideals, and expectations that constituted the American understanding of manhood from the 1700s into the late 1900s. Kimmel strikingly turns to Hemingway as an example for this period, arguing his masculine-prototype persona and his masculinity-centered writing found a "cynicism and emptiness" in modern American masculinity (214), which he argues led to Hemingway's turn to fragmented Europe for a lost American manhood (214). It is indeed notable then, to consider the position of *TSAR* and *TOMATS* as narratives placed in the foreign landscapes of Paris and Pamplona, and Cuba, respectively. Yet, as seen with Jake's reflections on his American identity and being an ex-patriate, and Santiago's obsession with American baseball and Joe DiMaggio, Hemingway's narratives never fully distance themselves from his American roots. This reflects the importance of retaining a lens that contextualizes manhood in an American background and perception when examining Hemingway's fiction.

Kimmel describes how the American understanding of manhood evolved from a conception where 'manhood' was synonymous with adulthood. As British and other European settlers colonized America, their transition into independent and responsible roles (18–19)

propelled men toward an American manhood epitomized by the "self-made man". The self-made man was a breadwinning capitalist who thrived in the free market (22): he accumulated wealth and power, and he proved himself in the public sphere of the marketplace (23). He was competitive at heart, and it laid the foundation for a new image of America: "restless, insecure, striving, competitive, and extraordinarily prosperous" (43).

By the turn of the 20th century, the Civil War, the American industrial revolution, and heavy immigration had caused a massive cultural shift in American history and in the understanding of manhood (83). The market opportunities of the self-made man became slim and difficult as the markets became crowded. This loss of man's identity and agency was accelerated by women and minorities entering the workforce (85–87), which fueled sexist, xenophobic, and racist attitudes that turned men defensive and hostile.

Importantly, Kimmel argues that sports perhaps became the most important vehicle to re-create manhood (137), which is important in establishing Jake and Santiago as non-hegemonic figures. Kimmel argues that, in order to demonstrate their manhood, men developed an interest in big-game hunting, taking after Theodore Roosevelt; and sports such as weightlifting, baseball, and tennis that helped instill "moral as well as physical virtue" (137). Sports, then, became an important arena for boys to be taught—and men to demonstrate and celebrate—bodily and mental virtues of manhood in controlled arenas, unlike the destructive tensions and patterns of poverty and unemployment.

Following the 1920s, the threats on manhood imposed by market competitiveness and the presence of 'otherness' worsened (192, 194), and was exacerbated by demoralization from WWI and the economic crash of the Great Depression. These contexts deeply emasculated the once autonomous breadwinning man (192–193), now struggling to embody authority for his sons (201–202). Hostile attitudes toward racial and ethnic 'others' intensified, and there were fears of feminization due to women's increasing prominence in society (206–207). WWII presented conflicting demands, urging men to sacrifice themselves for their country, while also calling for a new model father figure to combat social issues. This saw the rise of a new 'family culture' that embraced the domestic father (245). However, despite the acceptance of new virtues of manhood, a void remained where "once adventure, risk, and sexual passion once had reigned, or at least in their dreams" (251). This led to a contemporary crisis of masculinity, leaving men searching for new meanings of manhood halfway through the 20th century, which Kimmel deems the "contemporary crisis of masculinity" (259).

Vandello & Bosson's conceptualization of manhood and Kimmel's contextualization of manhood in America are integral to this project's critical framework. The framework aids the

understanding of why men are forced to defend and redeem their precarious manhood, and the destructive measures that these processes encourage, such as homosocial violence and oppression of racial and sexual minorities. Additionally, Kimmel's contextualization of manhood in America provides a foundation to understand the context from which Jake and Santiago emerge in Hemingway's narratives of masculinity, and how their turn to sports for virtues of masculinity reflect the behavior of American men in a conflicted century where the American perception of manhood was fragmented.

1.6. Emasculation: Impotence and Aging

While demonstrating, achieving, and defending one's sense of manhood are core elements of the present thesis, it is important to establish the concept that deals with the loss of one's sense of manhood: *emasculation*. Emasculation in its literal sense concerns the castration of the male and the making of a eunuch; however, in the context of this project it is more useful to utilize emasculation in its predominant and metaphorical meaning: 'unmasculine' behavior, attitudes, and traits that are damaging to one's sense of manhood, and an obstacle in realizing the ideals and expectations of the reigning hegemonic masculinity.

As discussed, manhood is elusive, tenuous, and needs to be demonstrated and maintained through verifiable demonstrations (Vandello and Bosson 101–102). By not measuring up to others, one is seen as a less masculine, or as feminine, which may provoke behaviors such as aggression and risk-taking to retrieve one's status of manhood (105). The contextualization of manhood in America has looked at emasculating examples such as unemployment and how men avoided stereotypically female interests in fear of being emasculated; however, many emasculating factors are temporary and can be redeemed. This leads to discussing emasculation in the light of the emasculating conditions that specifically influences Jake Barnes and Santiago who face permanent stages of emasculation through impotence and old age.

Emasculation: Impotence

In "The Essence of the Hard-On" (2000), Annie Potts argues how the impotent man's failure to gain an erection and perform with it heterosexually "infiltrates his flesh, action, and thoughts" (85). Impotence reflects a man's deficiency and his failure to utilize one of the main signifiers of the male gender (87). Potts builds on the concept of masculinity to argue how an

impotent penis is the antithesis to ideals of manhood: it is weak, it lacks control, and it cannot act (94).

It is conversely crucial then, to consider her remark that physical impotence does not cancel out sexual desire or reflect mental inadequacy (99). Potts discusses how men can act out sexual desire in a variety of ways with the male body (100); however, the culturally established narrative and expectations of sexual desire and performance is attached to penetration. As such, impotence does not permit the male to attain and defend his manhood through his sexuality. This is a key point in regard to Jake Barnes, whose driving conflict is an insatiable sexual desire that he cannot satisfy due to his physical impotence.

One of the more detrimental facets of impotence in light of the male's perception of manhood, is perhaps Potts' argument that the impotent man is desexed, feminized, and emasculated: "like a woman—he has no control over his body" (94). This tension is represented in Chapter II's discussion of the oppression of otherness, where it is argued that the impotent Jake Barnes displaces a strong self-hatred onto a group of homosexuals that he deems himself unfairly likened to. In the article "Erectile Dysfunction and the Post War Novel" (2012), Klaver draws similar lines between impotence and unmasculine roles, as she compares impotence to homosexuality: how the impotent man and homosexual both represent a failure to act according to the heteronormative ideals of manhood (3). Needless to say, there is a stark difference between impotence by injury, age, mental disorder, or related matters, and that of impotence by sexual desire for another gender. However, it establishes a cultural foundation that equates, or likens, the impotent heterosexual male—who might live by and strive for the ideals of hegemonic manhood—and the homosexual: the subordinated masculinity.

To further contextualize readings of how Jake Barnes' impotence in *The Sun Also Rises* drives destructive behavior and attitudes—particularly towards homosexuals—and how the impotent man in return redirects his sexual desires vicariously, it is useful to consider the implications and medical discourse of impotence in a post-WWI Western society. Klaver notes how the prevalent discourse at the time considered impotence a mental issue: Freud attributed it to the Oedipal complex and a mourning for a lost mother (3), and Wilhelm Stekel, an Austrian psychologist who wrote a study on male impotence in 1927, also owed it to psychological causes:

In the returning soldier, Stekel identifies the causes of impotence as: absence of love for the wife or mistress, jealousy, auto-eroticism, regression, anxiety, fantasies of rape and murder, anger towards women, and homosexuality practiced during soldiering. (3)

Klaver discusses how Stekel rejected physical causes for impotence, such as a case of a soldier's impotence from a horseback injury, which Stekel argued was caused by the riding motions giving masturbatory impulses (3). This discourse of mental causation as opposed to physical did not make room for returning soldiers to find some sort of solace in their impotence being a physical injury out of their control. Instead, it intensified their mental pressures and anxieties of being different to and not measuring up to other men (4).

Potts and Klaver's observations on impotence demonstrates how impotence is emasculation in, perhaps, one of its more prominent forms. In discussing manhood and masculinity, the topics of heteronormative sexual domination and objectification of women has perpetually been depicted as ingrained in the demonstration and defense of one's manhood. And as reflected with Jake as an impotent male, the inability to perform sexually and gratify one's desires—and being likened to a subordinated and feminized group of masculinities in the process—may be fundamentally detrimental to one's manhood and sense of self.

Emasculation: Aging

While impotence is considered one of the natural implications of aging, it is not the only implication that is central to emasculating the aging male. In Glendenning et al.'s study "Men's Attitudes to Aging: Threatened, Performed, and Negotiated Masculinity" (2017), the scholars investigate aging men's (65+) attitudes towards their masculinity. The findings reflect implications related to a loss of identity as a result of retirement and no longer representing roles as working men and breadwinners (132-134). In addition, findings reflect emasculation in the men's relationship to their aging bodies (135), where they note "degradation", "wear and tear" (135), and notably a self-awareness of the limitations of their bodies in physical activities (136). The scholars note old men's feelings of being made invisible by younger competitors in sports (136), and by younger women in general (137). Thompson (2006) echoes this sentiment as an invisibility-making of 'genderless' old men in venues such as academia and the "contemporary social life" (633).

Glendenning et al. further observes the essence of the aging experience in their findings as experiences of physical limitations, physical unattraction, and notions of being reminded daily of their old age, which is stereotyped as weak and dependent on others (138).

The scholars also echo the sentiments of demonstrating manhood as previously discussed with Vandello & Bosson: as the aging man felt his masculinity threatened by his own experience and the stereotypes of his age, it encouraged him to attempt to reclaim his manhood through physical activities such yardwork, volunteer work, and distancing themselves further from feminine acts such as cooking (139–141). In particular, findings reflect how instead of comparing themselves to—and competing with—the superior masculine younger men, older men instead compared themselves to men their age, which lessened the blow on their physical limitations, and let them still take pride in their abilities and performances of masculinity (144). Despite their consciousness of old age, these reactive measures combat the uselessness, dependency, and weakness that are culturally attributed to them through the normative expectations of hegemonic masculinity (146). The researchers argue how hegemonic ideals held by older men are rooted in the mid 20th-century ideals from their youth, and how "the main characteristics of the hegemonic masculinity model remain remarkably stable" (135).

In "Aging as emasculation?" (2018), literature and masculinity scholar Josep Armengol discusses 20th century critical views on aging through major 20th century critics and writers whose arguments notably coincide with the previous discussions of men and masculinities. Armengol writes how Simone Beauvoir views the aging population as a "marginalized social group" (qtd. in "Aging as emasculation?" 356) in suggesting that aging men and women are—due to sexual discrimination—"disempowered as dependent objects" (356). Beauvoir's argument of aging people as a marginalized social group notably coincides with one of Connell's four masculinities, which—combined—emphasizes the emasculation of aging, and is key to Chapter II's argument of Santiago as a non-hegemonic masculinity.

Armengol subsequently cites Betty Friedan, who additionally acknowledges the emasculating aspect of aging as, Armengol writes, "men she interviewed felt feminized due to their growing weakness and dependency" (356). It is interesting how the aging men in question, like Potts' findings on impotent males, similarly finds feminization in their emasculation. Connell's hegemonic masculinity, Vandello and Bosson's concept of precarious manhood, and Bird's arguments of homosociality all suggest an aversion to femininity in men's understanding and negotiations of manhood and masculinity, and this sentiment is yet again reflected in men's negotiation with their aging emasculated identities.

The studies on aging masculinities are integral to understanding Santiago's struggle with his emasculating old age in *The Old Man and the Sea*. In particular, Chapter III will employ selected findings from particularly Glendenning et al.'s study in order to aid the argument of Santiago's emasculation, as he navigates the landscape of a challenged manhood through a sense of loneliness, dependency, and loss of strength that stems from his struggles with his old age.

1.7. Performative Masculinity

In the discussion of precarious manhood, it is noted how Vandello & Bosson argues the importance of demonstrating verifiable acts of manhood in the process of proving and defending one's precarious manhood (102). Additionally, Sedgwick's concept of homosociality as discussed by Bird, Hammarén and Johansson, and Kimmel, highlights how the competitive sphere of males in homosocial relations stresses the importance of heteronormative and masculine behavior, as to not be seen as lesser, weaker, and feminized in light of the masculine ideals. With this in mind, from the field of gender studies it is possible to utilize theory established in the late 20th century which gives more depth to the process of demonstrating one's manhood, with Judith Butler's theory of *gender performativity*.

In regard to the perception of hegemonic masculinity and manhood, it has been established how they are culturally established, maintained, and developed as fluid concepts that are neither static nor timeless (Kimmel, "Masculinity as Homophobia" 120). Judith Butler's *Gender Trouble* initially published in 1990, expands upon this notion and argues the distinction between the biological *sex* assigned at birth, and the socially constructed *gender* enacted through behavior, traits, and attitudes that are culturally and socially constructed as masculine or feminine (Butler 9-11). However, in regard to Butler's thinking, this project limits its scope to the performative nature of her theory, of which she writes:

As in other ritual social dramas, the action of gender requires a performance that is repeated. This repetition is at once a reenactment and reexperiencing of a set of meanings already socially established; and it is the mundane and ritualized form of their legitimation. (191)

Butler argues how the gendered status is unstable and precarious, and requires a stylized repetition of gendered public acts (191). Demonstrating one's manhood, or, performing

masculinity, then, entails that the demonstration and performance of acts, traits, behaviors, and stereotypes that are culturally established to be associated with men and masculinity. It is to embody and demonstrate what is normatively expected of one's gender. As the discussions on hegemonic masculinity, homosociality, manhood, and emasculation thus far has demonstrated, to perform anything besides what is expected of oneself as man, is regarded as feminizing—or, emasculating—performances which may fundamentally damages one's sense of manhood.

The second point on the performative nature of masculinity looks to critical discourse which directly utilizes Butler's gender performativity theory to examine Hemingway's fiction. In *Hemingway's Theaters of Masculinity* (2003), Thomas Strychacz investigates how the American author's male characters have a need to evidence and fashion masculine signs for an observing and evaluating audience in order to be interpreted as men. Strychacz theorizes a "theater of manhood", where men act and perform on the social stage for evaluating men who approve or reject their performance (6). The Hemingway scholar utilizes Butler's theory for how she "emphasizes the role of performance in constructing gendered identities" (19). He combines it with theater theory of 20th century German playwright Bertolt Brecht, whose theory of the social *gest* intended to capture how an actor's simple gesture on the stage could reflect an external social meaning for the audience (44-45). Strychacz utilizes Brecht's *gest* to build on Butler's performativity theory, in establishing how masculine acts in Hemingway's fiction can reflect the social process of man performing masculine acts in order to evidence his manhood for an evaluating audience (46, 6).

However, the question of an audience may raise a question regarding that, unlike in Jake Barnes and other male characters in *TSAR*, Santiago is not in the perpetual presence of an audience to observe evaluate his performances of masculinity (244). In the context of *TOMATS*, most of Santiago's formative time in the narrative is spent in isolation and without an audience. It is then important to recognize how Strychacz notes: "Santiago, I contend, is quintessential Hemingway insofar as his exploits take place in anticipation of and before the actual or implied presence of an audience" (258). Strychacz argues that despite the isolated narrative, the anticipation of audience becomes as valid as its presence, as the audience is ultimately manifested in the final scenes of *TOMATS*. As such, Santiago in his isolation at sea may be seen to perform his masculinity as much as Jake Barnes in his social landscape of Paris and Pamplona. Strychacz' 'theater of manhood' becomes important to aid the exploration of how masculinity is performed and evaluated in Hemingway's narratives of Jake and Santiago navigating their struggles with emasculation.

Chapter II: Representations of Hegemonic and Non-Hegemonic Men: Navigating Hemingway's Masculinities

As narratives of masculinity, *The Sun Also Rises* and *The Old Man and the Sea* explore Jake Barnes and Santiago's relations among other men. In their respectively emasculating conditions of impotence and aging, Jake and Santiago struggle with their sense of manhood as they feel they cannot—or struggle to—perform the virtues of manhood expected of them as men. In turn, the protagonists measure themselves up against other men that, in their eyes, are ideal representations of manhood. In the first Hemingway narrative, Jake Barnes idealizes the young bullfighter Pedro Romero who puts his life at stake in his performances of masculinity and exudes a dominating strength over other men and women. In Hemingway's later narrative of masculinity, Santiago idealizes Joe DiMaggio—a legendary baseball player—who has demonstrated skills that have transcended him beyond baseball, as well as embodying Santiago's valued virtue of grace under pressure. In presenting these contrasting depictions of manhood between the emasculated and the ideal, it is necessary to explore the relations between them to uncover the structures and influences that drive Hemingway's emasculated men to seek hegemonic expressions of manhood.

Raewyn Connell's conceptual hierarchy of masculinities is integral to explore and understand the relations between men. Chapter I discusses Connell's suggestion that in order to understand gender, it is necessary to consider gender relations (*Masculinities* 76). The sociologist subsequently argues that to understand the gender relations between men, it is important to recognize more than one type of masculinity due to complex factors such as class, race, and sexuality (76). In what functions as a hierarchy of masculinities, Connell presents four varying groups of masculinities: *Hegemonic masculinities*, the most powerful, oppressive, and influential men within a culture; *Complicit masculinities*, men who do not fully enter the hegemonic role but benefit from its existence and may not oppose nor contribute to the structural oppression of others; *Marginalized masculinities*, men who follow hegemonic norms, but due to factors such as race or class they are oppressed by the hegemony; and lastly, *Subordinated masculinities*, men who are actively oppressed and subordinated due to characteristics that conflict with traditionally Western hegemonic beliefs, such as homosexuality (77–81).

Connell's theory emphasizes how this "[...] relational approach makes it easier to recognize the hard compulsions under which gender configurations are formed, the bitterness as well as the pleasure in gendered experience" (76). The critic's framework of masculinities

is integral to understand the effects and consequences of the bitterness—or more specifically the emasculation—Jake and Santiago's sense of manhood suffer as men distanced from the hegemony.

In this thesis, the non-hegemonic groups will be collectively referred to as *non-hegemonic masculinities* to utilize a generalizing term of masculinities distanced from the hegemony. The application of this term is built on Connell's note that her categories are not intended to represent fixed character types, but rather a configuration of different practices in response to situations in a changing structure of relations among men (*Masculinities* 81). There is a fluidity in Connell's masculinities where men can enter multiple categories, rather than being fixated into a specific type. In applying Connell's framework to *TSAR* and *TOMATS*, this fluidity functions to highlight the richness of Hemingway's masculinities. Jake and Santiago, in their emasculated distance from the hegemony, oscillate between Connell's categories of non-hegemonic masculinities in their attempts to achieve their view of an ideal hegemonic manhood. The use of *non-hegemonic masculinities* thus recognizes the fluidity of Connell's framework, but functions to focus the scope of the project to Jake and Santiago's distance from the hegemony as non-hegemonic men, rather than which specific category they belong to.

This exploration of the relations among masculinities in Hemingway's narratives of masculinity is divided between three subsections: the first section discusses how Pedro Romero and Joe DiMaggio are constructed as idealizations of manhood—or, hegemonic figures—in the eyes of Jake and Santiago. The second point looks to how Jake and Santiago are illustrated as non-hegemonic masculinities: men distanced from the hegemony. This is argued through the lens of the Hemingway protagonists' shared passion for sports—an important vehicle for virtues of manhood in Hemingway's 20th century America—as Jake and Santiago crucially identify as spectators as opposed to performing athletes. The third and last section in this chapter argues that Jake and Santiago respectively imitate and glorify the oppression of otherness, a defining structure in hegemonic masculinity, for self-serving gratification in their struggles with emasculation.

2.1. Hegemonic Representations: Pedro Romero and Joe DiMaggio

The representations of hegemonic masculinity in Hemingway's texts are crafted through the eyes of Jake and Santiago, as the protagonists measure themselves up against their ideal figures of manhood: Pedro Romero and Joe DiMaggio. This section explores important

performances of masculinity that, in Jake and Santiago's view, constitutes the identity of their ideal representation of manhood, who this project argues, can be seen as hegemonic figures. This exploration is important to the understanding of masculinity in Hemingway's works, as it helps examine the author's formative and later representations of ideal manhood—or, hegemonic masculinity—and how such figures perform their masculinity. In addition, this exploration helps understand how and why the emasculated Jake and Santiago measure themselves up against hegemonic men, and which effect this has on their perception of manhood.

The first representation of hegemonic masculinity is the bullfighter Pedro Romero, who, in the eyes of Jake Barnes, embodies ideal manhood. This is evident through a selection of scenes that demonstrate integral facets of hegemonic masculinity: Romero's introduction as a stoic and handsome character, his violent victories in bullfighting and in the fight versus Cohn, and his domination of women and femininity as seen in his interactions with Lady Brett Ashley.

Jake's first observation of Romero's hegemonic virtues occur in Book II of *TSAR*, as the protagonist describes the bullfighter as "[...] the best-looking boy I have ever seen" (154). He continues to admire the Spaniard's appearance as he notes: "The boy stood very straight and unsmiling in his bull-fighting clothes" (154), and "He was standing, straight and handsome and altogether by himself [...]" (154). Jake's first impression of Romero depicts a stoic and professional character – emphasized by his repeated observation of his straight posture. Jake's use of repetition to emphasize Romero's qualities is swiftly revisited as Jake and Montoya talk about his behavior and appearance: "He's a fine boy, don't you think so?" Montoya asked. "He's a good-looking kid," I said. [...] "We'll see how he is in the ring," Montoya said "(154). Jake and Montoya's continuous usage of "boy" to refer to Romero functions to emphasize his youthful virility, strength, and good appearance which grants Romero a social advantage homosocially and in the oppression of women and femininity. Although Jake and Montoya are impressed by Romero's charm, Montoya's final remark advises Jake—and the reader—to not yet be fully swayed by the bullfighter's appearance: Romero must first demonstrate his skill in his professional role as a bullfighter before his manhood can be affirmed. The demand for a demonstration stresses the performative aspect of masculinity as Jake is effectively advised by Montoya to not be deceived by Romero's appearance alone.

Following Jake's meeting with the bullfighter, Romero demonstrates his skill in the ring as the protagonist's idealization of the boy is realized. "Romero was the whole show"

(157) ... "There were two other matadors, but they did not count" (158), the protagonist says as he describes the second day of bullfights. Jake's approval is later affirmed by his friends, such as Brett noting how "I've never seen him do an awkward thing" (159) and Mike saying "He'll never be frightened, [...] He knows too damned much" (159). His admiration of Romero is intensified as he emphasizes the purity and genuine nature in his bullfighting, which distinguishes him from other matadors: "Romero's bull-fighting gave real emotion, because he kept the absolute purity of line in his movements and always quietly and calmly let the horns pass him close each time" (158).

In order to further emphasize Romero's hegemonic virtues, Jake describes how following the death of another bullfighter, other matadors developed techniques that "[...] simulated the appearance of danger in order to give a fake emotional feeling, while the bullfighter was really safe" (158). Romero is distinct from his colleagues; he displays what Jake describes as "the old thing" (158), exhibiting dominating courage and bravery in his bullfighting's genuine threat of mortality. Romero does not attempt to deceive the audience; he puts his life on the line for his profession as he distinguishes himself from not just other bullfighters, but also other men. The bullfighter affirms his hegemonic masculinity and reinforces it by setting a strong example of the bravery and courage that, in Jake's view, a man is ideally capable of demonstrating.

The matador's final bullfight is a central scene that intensifies Jake's view of Romero as an ideal figure of manhood. The bullfighter endures through his injuries and bruising from Cohn's assault and delivers yet another heroic performance of masculinity: "The fight with Cohn had not touched his spirit but his face had been smashed and his body hurt. He was wiping all that out now" (205). Not only is Romero in the genuine face of danger through his pure bullfighting; he is also suffering from pain and setbacks induced by Cohn. These traits in his performance combine in order to evidence and emphasize his position in the hierarchy of masculinities, which, Jake notes, is approved by the parties Romero aims to impress: Jake the aficionado, the evaluating crowd, and his love interest Lady Brett Ashley. Jake praises the fight as "[...] like a course in bullfighting" (205) and observes that the crowd "[...] did not want it ever to be finished" (205), while Brett was left speechless: "Brett did not say anything. They looked at each other and smiled" (206). Romero's performance is lauded from all angles as Jake observes a figure of manhood that delivered an epitomized performance of masculinity through his injury and bruising. Jake observes and idealizes a form of masculinity where man places himself in genuine danger and is able to endure through hardship in demonstrating his grace under pressure.

The second key scene where Jake evaluates Romero's hegemonic virtues and measures himself up against the Spaniard occurs as the protagonist is told of Romero's fight versus Robert Cohn. The re-telling of the fight functions to construct, in Jake's eyes, how the ideal man also displays his dominance homosocially. In the fight between Romero and Cohn, Jake is told how the bullfighter was "knocked down about fifteen times" by Cohn (189), but Romero kept persevering and ultimately defeated the crying Cohn as he attempted to shake the bullfighter's hand (189). In the night prior, Jake was knocked out cold by the middleweight boxing champion (178), and in the following day, he learns of Romero who is able to withstand Cohn's assault and defeat him. This contrasting performance between Jake and Romero functions to emphasize how the protagonist does not measure up to Romero's strength and fortitude in the context of homosocial violence. The bullfighter proves he is not only dominant in bullfighting, but also in violent contests of strength between men, which intensifies the bullfighter's idealized stature in the eyes of the emasculated protagonist.

Jake's perception of Romero's relationship with Brett is the last central aspect that illustrates Romero as a hegemonic figure, as the bullfighter demonstrates both a homosocial dominance and oppression of femininity. To the point of homosocial dominance, it is notable how most of the men in Jake's group of friends are competing for Brett's love. Jake and Cohn are both hopelessly in love with her, she is engaged with Mike Campbell, and Romero also develops an interest in her. However, it is ultimately Romero—the hegemonic male—who conquers her love, much to the dismay of the competing men. Cohn is sent into a jealousy-fueled violent outburst (188-189); Mike is jealous as he passive aggressively agitates Brett:

"How's your boyfriend?"

"Damned well," Brett said. "Watch him this afternoon."

"Brett's got a bull-fighter," Mike said. "A beautiful, bloody bull-fighter". (193)

And in a sarcastic lament, even Jake realizes the emasculating effort in being the one who introduced Brett to Romero: "That seemed to handle it. That was it. Send a girl off with one man. Introduce her to another to go off with him [...]" (224).

The jealousy of the competing men illustrates how Romero affirms his position as the hegemonic figure in being Brett's chosen lover; however, as Brett ultimately leaves Romero, the break-up is caused exactly by a hegemony-affirming oppression of women and their individual expressions of their femininity. In Book III, Brett tells Jake how Romero " [...] wanted me to grow my hair out" ... "He said it would make more womanly" (227). In wanting

to change Brett's short hair which symbolizes a masculine freedom reflected in her promiscuity, Romero wants to assert his domination and be able to control her by extinguishing this freedom. In addition, Brett remarks how Romero wanted her to marry him, which yet again is to establish control and smother her sexual freedom: "He really wanted to marry me. So I couldn't go away from him, he said. He wanted to make it sure I could never go away from him. After I'd gotten more womanly, of course" (227).

Romero realizes the competitiveness of masculinity, and with Brett's short hair and sexual freedom, he feels threatened by potentially being unable to control her. The bullfighter wants to impose femininity onto Brett with long hair and the traditional gender roles of marriage. This is in order to assert the oppression of women and femininity that the hegemony enables and desires in order to be maintained, as Romero's oppressive behavior reflects how even the hegemonic male is indeed flawed. He is idolized by other non-hegemonic men for the ideals and virtues he represents through his performances of masculinity; although, despite the seemingly unbreakable masculine façade that Jake observes, Romero's manhood is also precarious. The bullfighter's aversion to Brett's unfeminine—perhaps even masculine—traits illustrate how even the hegemonic male is forced to actively be conscious of defending his manhood.

Santiago and Joe DiMaggio

Pedro Romero is a hegemonic figure that ultimately represents an unattainable ideal in the eyes of Jake and his emasculated condition. Romero's grace under pressure, his homosocial domination, and oppression of femininity are ultimately performances that Jake cannot equal. Instead of being a figure that Jake can gain gratification from measuring himself up against in his attempts to reclaim his manhood, Romero in many ways ends up representing a manhood Jake cannot achieve. It is notable then, how a contrasting function is depicted in the dynamic between Hemingway's later protagonist, Santiago, and his ideal figure of manhood: Joe DiMaggio. Instead of seeing a radical counterpart in terms of masculine expression, Santiago sees an ideal man that he can empathize with and who can inspire his attempts at a masculine redemption.

Joe DiMaggio in *The Old Man and the Sea* is the second key representation of hegemonic masculinity in Hemingway's narratives of masculinity. In another contrast to Romero in *TSAR*, it is necessary to note how Joe DiMaggio is not a fictional character, and his presence in the novella is only depicted through Santiago's imagination. Joe DiMaggio was an

American baseball player hailed as one of the greats of the sport through his active career as a player between 1936–1951 for the New York Yankees. As such, due to the baseball player being a real-life figure, it may indeed be necessary to consider a select few aspects of DiMaggio's life and career in this exploration. In the novella, Santiago makes references to DiMaggio that arguably requires the modern reader to acknowledge crucial details from outside of the text to fully understand how Santiago portrays the baseball legend as an idealized figure of masculinity, and in this project's argument, a hegemonic figure.

By the novella's publication in 1952, DiMaggio would likely be a recognizable name to the Hemingway reader—not just as a baseball player—but also a celebrity. At the time, Hemingway in all likelihood would expect the reader to be familiar with the baseball great, which makes it necessary to consider some external details to inform the reading of how Santiago views DiMaggio. In James Plath's exploration of baseball in *TOMATS*, he notes how critic C. Harold Hurley argues that "Hemingway invites the reader to consider the significance of the external events recorded in the sports section to the internal events delineated in the novel" (qtd. in "Santiago at the Plate" 66), as he argues the significance of narrative points and details in the novel as representations of real events.

This exploration of Santiago's idealization of Joe DiMaggio and how he conversely emerges as a hegemonic figure is divided between two points: first, by looking at scenes in the novella where the old man establishes DiMaggio's greatness as a baseball player, and second, how Santiago sees him as the idealization of manhood.

The significance of DiMaggio as a man is first established in the early pages of the novella as Santiago and Manolin are discussing baseball. The old man notably emphasizes DiMaggio's significance by telling Manolin how he is of greater importance than both his team and his teammates:

"They [The Yankees] lost today," the boy told him.

"That means nothing. The great DiMaggio is himself again."

"They have other men on the team."

"Naturally. But he makes the difference. [...]" (*TOMATS* 9–10)

Having previously told Manolin to "have faith in the Yankees" (7) and how the team "cannot lose" (6), Santiago now seems particularly unbothered by the Yankees losing as "DiMaggio is himself again" (9). To explain this, Plath builds on Hurley's thesis and corroborates this with DiMaggio's 1941 baseball season, where the player built a historic streak of consecutive "hits"

(a batter safely reaching at least first base after hitting the ball). Plath explains that individuality is only greater than a team's result during a personal streak (74), and DiMaggio's streak, as of 2024, still stands as the greatest ever accomplished in baseball. The Yankees losing, then, is insignificant as long as the DiMaggio is able to demonstrate his exceptional prowess.

Santiago's awe is much-warranted, as the baseball-legend's streak is argued to transcend the sport and enter into the American masculine consciousness: "The Streak shone as a portent of America's brilliant rise to superpower, and made DiMaggio her poster boy for valor, victory, and God-Given grace." (Cramer 161). Adding onto the narrative of his greatness transcending his sport, one might also recall the lyrics of Simon & Garfunkel's famous *Mr. Robinson* (1968): "Where have you gone, Joe DiMaggio? Our nation turns its lonely eyes to you" (Simon & Garfunkel 3:02-3:09). It is no surprise then, that Santiago seeks DiMaggio as a hegemonic representation in light of a stature that strongly exemplifies the hierarchal contrast between the performer and the spectator. DiMaggio not only transcends his team and teammates, but he is even presented as the poster boy for virtues of American masculine exceptionalism. This dynamic reflects exactly the idea Connell presents in *Gender and Power*, where men idealize unattainable hegemonic ideals as "Few men are Boggarts and Stallones, many collaborate in sustaining those images" (185).

The second integral point to Hemingway's later representation of hegemonic masculinity is Santiago's view of DiMaggio as the embodiment of ideal manhood. Santiago's idealization of the baseball player is illustrated through notable scenes where the old man draws parallels between himself and DiMaggio through the player's fisherman lineage and his famous 1949 comeback.

In multiple scenes throughout the novella, Santiago remarks how DiMaggio's father was a fisherman: "They say his father was a fisherman. Maybe he was as poor as we are and would understand" (*TOMATS* 10). Santiago finds a lot of pride in recognizing the fisherman lineage of DiMaggio, which may function to reflect his own relationship with the younger Manolin whom he early on tells to "Go and play and baseball" (3) instead of fishing sardines, perhaps as to envision himself as the father figure to Manolin becoming as great as DiMaggio. In drawing this parallel between himself and DiMaggio, Santiago grounds the baseball-player by pulling him down from his mythical stature that transcends baseball, making him someone Santiago can relate to and empathize with. DiMaggio's fisherman lineage proves to Santiago that even someone in the sphere of a fisherman may be capable of transcending the confines

of his occupation: directly inspiring the old man's aim for redemption in his emasculated plight.

Santiago also importantly looks to DiMaggio's 1949 comeback to imagine a parallel between the two, as the old man refers to the baseball player's bone spur injury: "But I must have confidence and I must be worthy of the great DiMaggio who does all things perfectly even with the pain of the bone spur in his heel" (41). In late 1948, the baseball player suffered a long-term injury from a bone spur, as media questioned whether the player was going to retire and ever return (Cramer 261). However, DiMaggio would have a heroic return over half a year later, where he was key to triumphing in a victory that would laud him with praise:

There wasn't time enough, or words enough, to write that scene, that game, that series, and That Man ... who'd lifted himself from his bed of pain, to triumph ... no, to *conquer* ... no, to *vanquish!* ... (269)

Cramer's praise seems remarkably similar to the praise the readers could apply to Santiago after his performance in *TOMATS*, or even Pedro Romero's in his last bullfight. Indeed, while one could draw parallels between the bone spur and Santiago's cramp, it establishes a stronger parallel to his aging. After going eighty-four days without fish in his old age, with deep scars on his body, and a sail as a "flag of permanent defeat" (*TOMATS* 3), Santiago would presumably be considered at the end of his days within his profession as well. As much so, that the young boy's parents ordered him not to accompany Santiago at sea anymore, as they think he is *salao*: "[...] which is the worst form of unlucky" (1).

In order to consequently defy the belief that his days as a fisherman is coming to a close, Santiago looks to DiMaggio as the model of what a man is capable of in the face of hardship, in other words, grace under pressure. The narrative of DiMaggio proving his greatness following an injury that led people to question his abilities and his future, is strikingly similar to the old man's plight. Santiago defies the imposing physical and mental consequences of his aging in demonstrating a performance of masculinity that defies his own, and others', expectations of himself. As such, the hegemonic masculine figure Joe DiMaggio appears as a model for manhood: what a man can endure and what a man is capable of. When Santiago attempts to hook the marlin, he motivates himself by thinking how: "I must be worthy of the great DiMaggio [...]" (41), as reaching his level of masculine performance would leave him capable of any achievement. In addition, Santiago imagines his hero's approval after defeating the marlin: "But I think the great DiMaggio would be proud of me

today" (62), which is to show the old man truly feels he performed to his limit. Unlike Jake who can only see a counterpart and receive no masculine gratification from Romero, Santiago looks to his ideal of manhood with pride and comfort in his own performance.

2.2. *Non-Hegemonic Representations: Jake Barnes and Santiago*

In *TSAR* and *TOMATS*, the illustration of Jake and Santiago's distance from hegemonic masculinity is aided by their passion for sports. The interplay between the athlete and the spectator reflects the precarious nature of manhood, where the athlete, or man, is continuously evaluated by the spectator who approves or rejects their performances. The relationship between the spectator and athlete seemingly emerges as a vital arena for the performance of masculinity in Hemingway's texts — aiding the exploration of Jake and Santiago's non-hegemonic masculinity that distances them from the hegemony.

This distance establishes a complex dynamic that drives power and influence between the protagonists, the hegemony, and their idealized figures of manhood. It has been discussed how the hegemonic representations are depicted; however, to fully understand the effects of this distance, it is then necessary to explore how Jake and Santiago are represented as non-hegemonic masculinities. Identifying Jake and Santiago as non-hegemonic is building on Connell's claim that her categories of masculinity are not fixed character types (*Masculinities* 81), and men can occupy multiple categories. The most crucial aspect is then to note how the hegemonic men stand in contrast as non-hegemonic masculinities (complicit, marginalized, and subordinated), as a man is either hegemonic, or not. Therefore, it is necessary to maintain the focus on how Jake and Santiago are forged as non-hegemonic rather than which specific type of masculinity they embody. This is explored through three central points: The role sports played in the consciousness of 20th century American masculinity; how Hemingway's sports of bullfighting and baseball specifically engages the performance of masculinity; and lastly, how Jake and Santiago's identity as passive spectators forges their identity as non-hegemonic masculinities, and emphasizes their distance from the hegemony.

First and foremost, Jake and Santiago's interest in bullfighting and baseball reflects emerging virtues of manhood during Hemingway's time of writing in 20th-century America. In Michael Kimmel's exploration of Manhood in America, the sociologist notes how sports instilled a moral and physical virtue, as they developed "courage, steadiness of nerve ... resourcefulness, self-knowledge, self-reliance ... the ability to work with others ..." (Walker qtd. in *Manhood in America* 137). Kimmel argues that sports were "perhaps the most

important vehicle to re-create manhood" (137), providing a new venue for men to prove their manhood outside of work. Hemingway's inclusion of sports in his narratives of masculinity may be seen as to illustrate an arena through which his characters can perform their masculinity as actively performing athletes or passive spectators.

The first key sport in Hemingway's narratives of masculinity is bullfighting. Bullfighting distinguishes itself as a sport by pitting man versus nature in a violent amalgamation of sport and primitivity. Puckett argues that it is a "[...] 'stylized hunt', a performative reenactment of hunting [...]" (145), as bullfighting develops theatre and sport out of primitive survival. A similar transformation occurred with hunting in 20th-century America, where "It [hunting] returned as recreation and proving ground" (*Manhood in America* 136), notably with Theodore Roosevelt's infatuation for big-game hunting, a pursuit famously—or infamously—indulged in by Hemingway throughout his life and writing.

Hemingway elaborates on his admiration for bullfighting in *Death in the Afternoon*: "Bullfighting is the only art in which the artist is in danger of death and in which the degree of brilliance in the performance is left to the fighter's honor" (qtd. in Ozwald 341–342). The sport distinguishes itself in its violent and genuine mortality — traits that elude traditional sports and even hunting, where man is the predator, and the animal is his prey. Bullfighting, on the other hand, pits the weaponized man and animal together in a deceptively equal dance of death. Nevertheless, in *Death in the Afternoon*, Hemingway importantly focuses on the honor in bullfighting, as he emphasizes the term's Spanish counterpart: "Called *pundonor*, it means honor, probity, courage, self-respect, and pride in one word" (qtd. in Ozwald 341–342). These virtues strikingly resemble the virtues that Kimmel highlighted as induced by sports. Bullfighting then, is perhaps Hemingway's ideal arena for depicting sport to serve as a test of manhood due to its *pundonor* and mortality.

In the context of the emasculation of Jake Barnes, bullfighting helps illustrate a man searching for an identity that accumulates the *pundonor* associated with bullfighting, as the protagonist centers his masculinity around identifying as an *aficionado*. Jake takes great pride in identifying as an *aficionado* — which he explains as "Aficion means passion. An aficionado is one who is passionate about bull-fights" (*TSAR* 126). Jake's passion for bullfights is what drives the narrative to Pamplona in Spain, as he wants to experience the festival of San Fermin, an annual celebration famous for its *encierro* (the running of the bulls) and the *corrida de toros* (the bullfights). Repeatedly, Montoya—fellow aficionado and Pamplona local—affirms Jake's identity: "But he's [Bill Granger] not aficionado like you [Jake]" ... "But he's not aficionado like you are" (126). The respect granted by his identity

enables him to not only be recognized within the community of aficionados, but Jake also engages in talks with bullfighting critics (163), he discusses bulls with Romero (164), and during bullfights he has the role of explaining its events and details to his friends (204): "I sat beside Brett and explained to Brett what it was all about" (158).

Jake being depicted as the passively spectating aficionado and not the actively performing bullfighter functions to emphasize the distance between himself and hegemonic masculinity. Jake may wield the exclusive identity of an aficionado, but like he may also engage in fights and flirt with women, he is ultimately distanced from the hegemonic male that establishes his identity from actively performing and evidencing his manhood, which Jake cannot. Jake is impotent, but its consequences is not confined to his ability to perform sexually: it has captured his identity and placed him in a hierarchy of masculinities where he is deemed non-hegemonic. Despite gaining from the benefits of being a male, he is forced to measure himself against hegemonic figures due to the deficiencies he senses in his manhood.

Hemingway's second narrative of manhood in *TOMATS* shifts from the violent and brutal arena of the bullfight to a traditionally American sport with baseball. While baseball does not exhibit the mortality and violence of the bullfight, it functions to the reflect Kimmel's observation on sports and manhood, where men develop physical virtues of manhood through sports, as to identify with activities that revolve around strength, fortitude, and homosocial competition (*Manhood in America* 137). Kimmel highlights baseball in particular for its "spectacular rise" (137) during the 20th century, where Roosevelt would include it on a list of "true sports for a manly race" (140). Baseball, Kimmel argues, instilled civil virtues of obedience, self-sacrifice, discipline, and hierarchy, but also allowed the "[...] the release of potential aggression in a heathy, socially acceptable way" (140-141). In baseball, excessively aggressive and competitive behavior is ultimately governed in a controlled arena with authoritative figures to regulate the rules of the game (140). Compared to bullfighting, baseball ultimately demonstrates a lower ceiling of tolerated aggressive expressions of masculinity; yet, it remains an arena where men can both test and evidence their manhood and *pundonor*: ideal virtues of manhood.

Santiago does not explicitly regard himself as an aficionado of baseball in *TOMATS*; however, his continuous *aficion* for the sport certainly makes it an applicable term, as critic Mary Cruz notes the "[...] *aficion* that Santiago feels for the ball [...]" (qtd. in Plath 67). Santiago's passion for the sport is emphasized by James Plath's observation that "It's no wonder, then, that structurally *The Old Man and the Sea* [...] begins and ends with baseball" (69). In the early pages of the novella, Santiago tells Manolin that he has "[...] yesterday's

paper and I will read baseball." (*TOMATS* 6), and towards the end of the novella, asks Manolin to "Bring any of the papers of the time that I was gone" (81). Furthermore, even during his isolation at sea, Santiago has a longing for the results of baseball he is missing: "I wonder how the baseball came out in the grand leagues today" (27) and a day later: "This is the second day now that I do not know the results of the *juegos* [matches], he thought" (41). Santiago, like with Jake and bullfighting, is demonstrated to be highly engaged in making sports integral to his life and identity as both emasculated men embody the role of the non-hegemonic spectator in sports that instill important virtues of manhood.

Hemingway's shift to a sport that does not revolve around death and mortality in *TOMATS* may suggest that Santiago—who focused on violence as a test of manhood in his younger days—no longer sees violence as an integral virtue of manhood in his old age. Instead, the shift to baseball marks a shift from death and mortality to a sport wielding team-based and nonviolent virtues, where the athlete is not expected to put his life on the line to prove his masculinity. The athlete is left room to demonstrate virtues of manhood in the baseball arena; however, unlike the younger Jake Barnes who sees the dance between life and death as the ultimate performance of masculinity, Santiago's in his old age and humble conditions may have grown to see through the naïve and credulous demands of mortality in the bullfight. To Santiago, it may be argued, survival is a conscious act, and not something that can be simulated in an arena. The arena, rather, is suitable for sports like baseball that ultimately values life, yet continues to challenge the masculine consciousness by instilling moral and physical virtues in being a stage where men can evidence their manhood.

The presentation of Santiago as passionate about baseball, like with Jake Barnes and bullfighting, does contribute to depict his passive and non-hegemonic distance from the hegemony. Santiago's passion for baseball is a way for him to actively engage himself in an arena centered around homosocial competition and virtues of manhood, like Jake's identity as an aficionado is a means of fashioning himself with the virtues of a sport glorifying brutality and mortality. On the one hand, while bullfighting prompts Jake to find the hegemonic figure of Romero, who ultimately does not grant the protagonist any gratification in his attempt to redeem his manhood. Santiago, on the other hand, finds a hegemonic figure through baseball who instead inspires his goal of redemption by being a figure Santiago can liken himself to through their shared grace under pressure and defiance of critical expectations imposed upon their abilities.

2.3. Hegemonic Idealizations: *The Oppression of those who Represent Otherness*

This thesis argues that Jake and Santiago are emasculated and non-hegemonic protagonists that are attempting to redeem their manhood. The exploration has looked at Jake, who may have realized that Romero's performances are beyond what he can be able to perform himself, and Santiago, who was fueled by DiMaggio's performances of masculinity. However, it is crucial to note that the scope of hegemonic masculinity and its influence and impact on a culture is not merely limited to the presence and influence of a particular individual. In other words, while the project may only be able to identify the hegemonic representations in *TSAR* and *TOMATS* in Jake and Barnes' idealized men, Pedro Romero and Joe DiMaggio, that is not to imply these figures are the only influences on Jake and Santiago's view of ideal masculinity and manhood. Rather, they are recognized as clear textual representations that the protagonists measure themselves up against and interact with physically or imaginatively.

In turn, Hemingway's early and later narratives of masculinity also crucially depict exactly the profound influence of hegemonic masculinity that extend beyond the presence of Pedro Romero and Joe DiMaggio. This exploration of this profound influence will focus on two scenes in particular where Hemingway's texts depict a definitive idealization of the hegemonic oppression of otherness: Jake Barnes and his homophobia in Book I of *TSAR*, and Santiago and his marginalization of the "negro" of Cienfuegos in *TOMATS*. These scenes illustrate how Jake and Santiago are influenced by their distance from hegemonic masculinity, and consequently imitate and glorify a hegemonic oppression of otherness in order to strengthen their own sense of manhood and close the hegemonic distance.

The first central scene that depicts a hegemonic oppression of otherness is Jake Barnes' homophobia towards a crowd of homosexuals who enter his gaze:

A crowd of young men, some in jerseys and some in their shirt-sleeves, got out. I could see their hands and newly washed, wavy hair in the light from the door. The policeman standing by the door looked at me and smiled. They came in. As they went in, under the light I saw white hands, wavy hair, white faces, grimacing, gesturing, talking. (*TSAR* 23)

In Jake's narration he establishes his oppression and subordination of homosexuals by focusing on the men's feminine traits. In the article "Performance Art: Jake Barnes and 'Masculine' Signification in *The Sun Also Rises*" (1995), Ira Elliot argues that "the

homosexuals are scorned for their obvious concern with appearance" (79), such as their "white hands" implying feminine hands that are unlike the colored, scarred, working hands of a 'real' working-man. Jake also focuses on their "newly washed, wavy hair" as to emphasize the femininity in having long, clean, and styled hair, instead of what Elliot notes as the reticence and rigidness associated with masculinity (79). Jake presents the group as different from himself and 'real men', which is made evident as the policeman smiles at Jake to illustrate how they are briefly able to have a shared understanding in thinking of themselves as different—and better—than the homosexuals they subordinate (79).

The most defining moment in Jake's imitation of the hegemonic subordination of homosexuality is subsequently illustrated as he reflects on the crowd of young men:

I was very angry. Somehow they always made me angry. I know they are supposed to be amusing, and you should be tolerant, but I wanted to swing on one, any one, anything to shatter that superior, simpering posture. (*TSAR* 23)

Jake's use of "they" carries a duality as he not only refers to the crowd of men in particular, but also homosexuals in general, where "they" is used to establish a distance, or, otherness, between himself and homosexuality. He even recognizes progressive views that "they" are not harmful and that he ideally should tolerate homosexuals, but Jake admits a violent anger he wants to exert in order to break the pride and comfort they find in—what he views as—their feminine fashioning and posturing.

In response to this anger, Elliot asks "[...] but what, precisely, is he [Jake] so angry about?" (83), as the critic suggests two answers to this question that touches on the performance of masculinity and Jake's impotence. Elliot's first argument is that this seemingly excessive violent desire may be seen as Jake's anger at the stereotypical homosexual performance of masculinity which distorts the traditional barriers between masculinity and femininity (83). Elliot notes that the very reason Jake is able to categorize them as homosexuals is because he observes external signs—feminine traits and behaviors—that crafts a performance of masculinity distorted by femininity (80). If not for this "gender-crossing", Jake would not be able to 'read' their sexuality. Elliot's argument is substantial then in suggesting that what Jake reads as the crowd of men arrive is not sexuality but gender (80). In other words, Jake's anger is in large part owed to the performance of femininity in the male body, and not necessarily the sexual act of homosexuality itself; rather, the feminine identity and performance that homosexuality typifies (80). This reading ultimately supports the notion

of Connell's hegemonic masculinity where she cites gay theorists in writing that: [...] from the point of view of hegemonic masculinity, gayness is easily assimilated to femininity. And hence—in the view of some gay theorists—the ferocity of homophobic attacks (*Masculinities* 78). Homophobia has also been demonstrated as crucial points in the conceptualization of Homosociality and Precarious Manhood, where homophobia and the aversion of homosexuality is almost a pre-requisite in maintaining a masculine pride. The hegemonic form of masculinity that Jake is influenced by, and aims to imitate, is maintained through the domination over femininity — making the stereotypically homosexual performance of masculinity just as important to subordinate as women, the structurally "correct" signifiers of femininity.

Elliot's second explanation of Jake's anger importantly argues that part of "[...] his anger is self-hatred displaced upon the homosexual" due to his impotence (83). In the context of *TSAR* as a narrative of masculinity, the impotent protagonist Jake Barnes is de-sexed and sexually likened to the homosexual as neither are able to perform a normative use of the main signifier of their gender, the phallus. Due to his war-inflicted wound, Jake is forced to suffer due to his festering heterosexual desire, while, the homosexual—who Jake's sexual ability is likened to—is able to maintain what Jake observes as a "superior" and "simpering" posture in being comfortable in their position. This posture implies a pride and comfort that Jake seemingly cannot imagine himself to ever find. Elliot argues that Jake is threatened by what he sees as this homosexual superiority, as they are able to find a belonging in what Jake—and the hegemony—views as a wrongful masculine state (84). Meanwhile, Jake is left in an internal state of distress by the infeasible demands and expectations of masculinity, which—in turn—makes Jake's violent anger at the homosexuals fueled by a consequent jealousy and displaced self-hatred.

Instead of acting on his anger, Jake decides to leave and enter the bar next-door, which ultimately is exemplary of how he is unable to fully realize his imitation of hegemonic masculinity. Jake is clearly influenced by a hegemonic subordination of homosexuality in expressing his violent fantasy; although, like sexually, he cannot—or in this instance, will not—act on his desires. Leaving the bar is an active form of protest, but one that is ultimately powerless in establishing, what he considers, the superiority in his normative understanding of manhood. Jake's lack of hegemonic potency is even emphasized as he drops his protest and returns to the bar, merely because "the beer was not good" at the bar next-door (*TSAR* 23). Jake Barnes would ideally be a hegemonic figure to match his influences, he would ideally perform a dominating sexuality over femininity with women such as Lady Brett Ashley, and

he would ideally be able to violently act on the sight of a group of homosexual males. Yet, as the narrative of *The Sun Also Rises* persists in manifesting, Jake's impotence leaves him externally powerless to act on his internal desires, as crucially depicted in his futile attempt at a hegemonic oppression of otherness.

The second important scene that depicts the influence of hegemonic masculinity is in *TOMATS* as Santiago displays a marginalizing oppression of otherness in glorifying a memory of his younger days when he arm-wrestled with a "great negro" (*TOMATS* 42). An important detail to establish in this discussion is that—unlike Jake who is actively performing his homophobia after he has suffered his emasculation—Santiago's scene is from his past, prior to his emasculation in old age. However, why this scene stands out in particular, and what makes it applicable in Santiago's aim to reclaim his manhood, is how the emasculated old man specifically uses this memory of his past in order to fuel him with confidence. A memory in which an Afro-Latin male, perhaps deliberately left unnamed, is defined by his race and stereotypically hypermasculine strength, and faces his destruction at the hands of Santiago as a younger man who then becomes "Santiago el Campeón" (43). While Santiago may not be demonstrating his oppression of ethnic otherness in his emasculation, his memory of enacting it serves as a core memory he idealizes to grant himself pride and confidence:

At the sun set, he remembered, to give him more confidence, the time in the tavern at Casablanca when he had played the hand game with the great negro from Cienfuegos who was the strongest man on the docks. (42)

In "Cultural Imperialism, Afro-Cuban Religion, and Santiago's Failure in *The Old Man and the Sea*" (2006), Philip M. Melling argues that "Santiago's racial attitudes come alive [...]" (14) in this scene. Notably, the Afro-Latin male is defined merely by his race and his strength. Despite remembering how the man was considered "the strongest man on the docks" (*TOMATS* 42), which would imply that he was a known character, and considering him "a fine man and a great athlete" (43), he is only referred to as the "negro", "great negro", and "negro from Cienfuegos" (42-43). Unlike DiMaggio who Santiago also seeks for confidence and who is always referred to by name or "the great DiMaggio" (42), the Afro-Latin's identity does not seem to have any relevance or importance to Santiago.

This idea of Africans being characterized by hypermasculinity is stressed by Kimmel, who notes how the opposition to "racial otherness" in 20th century American manhood crafted stereotypes against African immigrants for hypermasculine traits ("Masculinity as

Homophobia" 135). This resembles the image painted of the great negro in *TOMATS*, especially by naming his reputable strength on the dock. A detail of the negro's shadow is even included to emphasize his physicality: "The negro's shadow was huge and it moved on the wall as the breeze moved the lamps" (*TOMATS* 43). While little effort is left to describe what makes the negro a fine man, Santiago's recollection spares little detail of what emphasizes his hypermasculine features to establish a self-serving contrast between them.

Melling argues that "Santiago therefore, gains in 'confidence' at the expense of the black community" (14) in reminiscing about defeating him. The devastating blow handed in this racial oppression is described in Santiago's memory of his second fight with the negro, where "he had won it quite easily since he had broken the confidence of the negro from Cienfuegos in the first match" (*TOMATS* 43). Santiago not only takes pride in having beat the negro defined by his strength, but also in having completely broken his confidence. In destroying the negro in what he has shaped him by—a great athlete and the strongest man on the dock—Santiago is victorious in a manner that defeats the perception of what Santiago presents as the negro's redeemable trait. In the eyes of Santiago, the negro is relegated to simply being defined to his race as the perception of his strength is crushed. Santiago's memory even shows this transition, as he first remembers him as "the great negro" (42) and last as "the negro from Cienfuegos" (43).

The hegemonic oppression of otherness in Santiago's memory of defeating the negro of Cienfuegos is perhaps not fueled by hatred like Jake's homophobia, but the memory contains glaring traits of marginalization in order to internalize virtues of hegemonic masculinity. In his isolation at sea Santiago does not have the room to exert his dominance over other masculinities, which invokes this specific memory to fuel him with confidence and masculine gratification. Santiago no longer dreams of great performances of masculinity like he used to (12), but the narration of his memory leaves little room to believe Santiago's racial attitudes would have changed in his old age. The negro, in his memory, is shaped by his race and hypermasculine strength, in what is a self-serving act to invoke Santiago's own feelings of strength and greatness. This self-serving act ultimately came at the cost of the negro losing half of what he is defined by, as only the trait of his marginalized race remains.

This exploration has investigated the hegemonic influence on Hemingway's emasculated protagonists as Jake and Santiago imitates and glorifies hegemonic behaviors in order to strengthen their sense of manhood. Important scenes depict how Jake and Santiago—non-hegemonic masculinities distanced from the hegemony—attempt to close this distance by respectively imitating and glorifying a hegemonic oppression of subordinated homosexuals

and a marginalized racial minority. However, ultimately all men involved in this process are non-hegemonic representations. This dynamic between non-hegemonic masculinities illustrates the complex structures and relations in the meetings between men. Hegemonic virtues become models for performances of masculinity that Hemingway's emasculated men idealize in what may be seen as a zero-sum game of non-hegemonic manhood, where the masculinity of the other is further subordinated and marginalized for the gratification and strengthening of Jake and Santiago's own sense of ultimately emasculated manhood.

Emasculation has thus far been referenced to as fundamental conflict in Jake and Santiago's narratives. In this project's next crucial point in the exploration of the Hemingway texts, it is necessary to center the scope of the analysis to Jake and Santiago's emasculation as to understand how Jake's impotence and Santiago's aging forges the anxieties that pressurize the emasculated men to redeem their manhood.

Chapter III: Representations of Emasculated Men: Jake and Santiago's Pursuit of Manhood

In *The Sun Also Rises* and *The Old Man and the Sea*, Jake Barnes and Santiago illustrate the profound impact emasculating features have on men and their sense of manhood. Jake Barnes suffers from a physical war wound that has left him impotent, and Santiago is emasculated by his old age as he is self-conscious of the protruding physical and mental limitation imposed upon him. In this exploration of Hemingway's emasculated men, two perspectives on emasculation are essential: Annie Potts' and her exploration of male impotence in "The Essence of the Hard On" (2000), and Jonathan Glendenning et al.'s exploration of the emasculation of aging in "Men's Attitudes to Aging: Threatened, Performed, and Negotiated Masculinity" (2017). The research of Potts and Glendenning et al. aids the chapter in aligning aspects of Jake and Santiago's emasculation with research of men's emasculated experiences from studies on impotence and aging. In addition, Vandello & Bosson's (2013) study on manhood is important as they argue that manhood is precarious – a social status difficult to both attain and maintain (101). This is echoed in the exploration of Jake and Santiago who are emasculated; put at a disadvantage in ways men might be seen to claim and defend their sense of self. In turn, they both search for redemption in order to prove, in their view, that they are not lesser than other men, and, indeed, not less than what they think a man is capable of.

This chapter examines Jake and Santiago's attempts at redemption through three integral points: First, Jake and Santiago both engage in physical performances of masculinity to redeem the physical deficiencies in their sense of manhood, which is illustrated in Jake's fight with Robert Cohn, and Santiago's heroic conquest of the Marlin. Second, it is essential how Hemingway's protagonists seek imaginative measures of redemption, as Jake seeks sexual gratification in an impotent body through imagining himself sexually potent, and Santiago feminizes the sea as a reaction to lost feminine comfort and companionship in his isolation and loneliness in old age. Lastly, by assessing Jake and Santiago's attempts at redemption, it helps reveal the contrasts and similarities between Hemingway's early and later representations of emasculated men. Both protagonists yearn for physically violent and imaginative acts of masculinity to redeem their lost sense of manhood; however, unlike Jake Barnes whose attempts at redemption are futile, Santiago is granted gratification in his emasculated journey.

3.1. *Physically Redeeming their Emasculated Manhood*

In Jake and Santiago's attempts at physically redeeming their emasculated manhood, it is notable how Jake's fight with Cohn and Santiago's conquest and defense of the marlin are performances rooted in violence. Josep Armengol argues how Hemingway's writing frequently thematizes violence as a test of manhood ("Gendering Men" 83), and notes how man versus nature contexts incite both tests of manhood through animal killings and violence between men (83). Comparatively, in their exploration of manhood as a concept, Vandello & Bosson notes how men—in the pursuit of manhood—might display aggressive and risk-taking behavior in order to display their manhood and to not be seen as weak (102). Violence and manhood function as interrelated themes in Hemingway's narratives of masculinity, and is the foundation for the performances of masculinity that, in the eyes of Jake and Santiago, will redeem their sense of manhood.

The first key performance is depicted in revisiting the fights of Robert Cohn; however, this time with a focus on his fight versus Jake. In the scene, Jake's identity and manhood is directly challenged by Cohn, who accuses Jake of being a 'pimp'. In the climax of Book II, Cohn is aggressively interrogating the fiesta group of Brett's whereabouts in light of her absence, as it is believed she is with the bullfighter Pedro Romero. Jake is upset by Cohn's aggression and tells him to "Go to hell!", to which Cohn responds: "I'll make you tell me' [...] 'you damned pimp" (*TSAR* 178). Cohn accuses Jake of being a 'pimp'—a man who controls prostitutes and arranges their sexual encounters. The insult is made in light of Jake not only introducing Brett to Romero, but also to Cohn himself. Cohn's insult incites a situation where Jake's manhood will be assessed in front of the evaluating audience of the fiesta group. He must either defend his dignity or let Cohn be the superior masculine figure. Subsequently, Jake—in perhaps his most potent and masculine performance in the entire narrative—decides to act:

I swung at him and he ducked. I saw his face duck sideways in the light. He hit me and I sat down on the pavement. As I started to get on my feet he hit me twice. (178)

Jake swinging first depicts him as escalating the quarrel, despite Cohn's aggressive demeanor. This detail is not merely a technicality as the two would inevitably have fought at some point, but it serves to emphasize the bravery in Jake's punch to prove his manhood. He exhibits the aggressive and risk-taking behavior suggested as a response to threats of manhood by

Vandello and Bosson (102). Jake is not just starting a fight with anyone; he starts the fight knowing he will probably lose. As the very first sentence in the novel is regarding Cohn, and it describes how "Robert Cohn was once middleweight boxing champion of Princeton" (*TSAR* 9).

Cohn's insult voices the shame Jake has in his emasculated behavior. Jake's manhood is not only directly threatened by being called a pimp, but also by whether he will respond or not. By choosing to fight, despite knowing he will likely lose, he retains a masculine pride that grants him approval from both him and his evaluating group of friends. The day following the fight, Brett tells Jake "I heard Cohn had hurt you" (193), to which he replies "No. Knocked me out. That was all" (193). Jake may have been hurt, or offended by Cohn's insult, but in striking first he feels as though he has defended his manhood and created an outcome where he is physically defeated, but his pride and dignity is unharmed. This sentiment is closely echoed by Santiago in *TOMATS*, where he states that "A man can be destroyed but not defeated" (66). There would seem to be this recurring theme in Hemingway's narratives that despite being beaten physically, it does not necessarily result in the defeat of one's manhood.

However, the precarious nature of manhood is depicted as Jake is swiftly forced to reevaluate his masculine performance as Pedro Romero surpasses the protagonist in being able to physically defeat Cohn. Following his beating of Jake, Cohn learns the whereabouts of Brett's lover Romero and proceeds to batter the young bullfighter:

"He'd [Romero] been knocked down about fifteen times, and he wanted to fight some more. [...] He was weak, but Brett couldn't hold him, and he got up. Then Cohn said he wouldn't hit him again. [...] So the bull-fighter chap sort of rather staggered over to him [...] hit him [Cohn] just as hard as he could in the face, then sat down on the floor." (*TSAR* 189)

The violence depicted in this scene illustrates an elevated performance of masculinity in the violent test of manhood, reminiscent of Jake's. However, Romero—whom Armengol describes as representing "the epitome of male bravery and heroism" ("Gendering Men" 83)—ultimately is victorious in his brawl with Cohn. Bill of the fiesta group asserts how "that's quite a kid" (*TSAR* 189), compared to Jake who he jokingly calls "the human punching-bag" (186). Romero depicts a performance of mental and physical endurance and fortitude as "Cohn couldn't knock him out" (188). While Jake heroically attempts to stand up for himself,

his performance in the fight ends up parallel to his sexual performance. It lacks the potency of the hegemonic masculine figure who can display his dominance over women and other men in tests of manhood. Romero embodies this potent masculinity, and thus he ends up replacing and outperforming Jake Barnes not only physically, but also sexually in his relationship with Brett. Jake's brief masculine gratification illustrates the elusive nature of precarious manhood, which is not only challenging to obtain, but also easily lost.

From the examples of Jake and Santiago, it is notable how the emasculated man in the Hemingway text is driven to physically perform actions in order to display a potent manhood. In moving to Santiago in Hemingway's later narrative of masculinity, it is apparent how this performative theme persists between Hemingway's early and later work, and is an important aspect to Jake and Santiago's sense of manhood. In the second narrative depicting a physical attempt at redemption, Santiago's struggle with his emasculation yet again influences the Hemingway protagonist to demonstrate his manhood through a performed violence. Whereas Jake's physical emasculation is reinforced and manifested in fighting Cohn, in this later Hemingway narrative, Santiago's emasculation materializes in his conquest of the marlin and his defense of the marlin from assailing sharks.

First and foremost, Santiago's conquest and defense of the marlin is preceded by characterization which establishes the emasculated foundation of Santiago's character: an old and unlucky man. After going eighty-four days without a fish, the narrator describes how the sail of Santiago's ship is like a "flag of permanent defeat" (*TOMATS* 1) to signify how Santiago is not just unlucky, but that it might be the end of his days as a fisherman. He is old, with hands that have scars from fishing that are "as old as erosions in a fishless desert" (1). His hands represent all the battles he has endured and his physical fatigue. Yet, the narrator notes how "Everything about him was old except his eyes and they were same color as the sea and were cheerful and undefeated" (1). Santiago's eyes illustrate how his spirit remains firm, youthful, and undefeated, even in the face of his old age and eighty-four-day streak of defeat.

However, Santiago is not impervious to his old age, rather, how he holds himself against the expectations of an aging man's strength and capabilities is a driving conflict in the narrative: "I told the boy I was a strange old man [...] now is when I must prove it" (40). In wanting to prove he is 'strange', he wants to prove how he is more capable than what others assume of aging men; he wants to be an exception to the rule. Especially important is his emphasis on wanting to "prove", as Santiago knows he must demonstrate it and it must be evidenced in order for his performance to be approved by the audience. As suggested by Glendenning et al. (2017), the aging man feels he is threatened by the stereotypes of his age,

which encourages him to attempt to reclaim his manhood (139-141). Santiago reflects Glendenning et al.'s suggestion that aging men compare themselves to other aging men in order to take larger pride in their masculine performances (144). As in his attempt to hook the marlin, Santiago displays how he considers himself not only a man, but an old man: "He cannot know that it is only one man against him, nor that it is an old man" (*TOMATS* 28). His distinction concretizes how he is prone to thinking of himself as weaker due to being an old man, but not exclusively. Subsequently, he thinks "I wish I could show him what sort of man I am" (39) and "I will show him what a man can do and what a man endures" (40). This contrast reflects how Santiago's behavior recurringly slips into a weaker and more dependent line of thinking, which the reality of his situation quickly pulls him out of. When he speaks of himself as an old man, he doubts himself, much like when he says "I wish I had the boy", only to immediately correct himself: "But you haven't got the boy. You have only yourself [...]" (30). This illustrates Santiago's struggle between succumbing to the emasculating identity and expectations of an old man, and wanting to prove to others—and himself—his true manhood.

The reality of aging's physical consequences does not make evidencing his manhood a simple task. In attempting to reel in the marlin, Santiago experiences a cramp that illustrates the strained dichotomy between his mind of high spirits and his aging body: "I hate a cramp [...] It is a treachery of one's own body, [...] humiliates oneself especially when one is alone" (37). Yet, Santiago's grace under pressure endures the treachery of his body, as he later concludes "pain does not matter to a man" (53), as he thinks he has to "Keep your head clear and know how to suffer like a man" (59). In the tug of war with the marlin, he recognizes how the fish is exhausting him, but his devotion to the fight becomes one of two outcomes: either Santiago dies, or the marlin dies: "I do not care who kills who" (58). Yet, like Romero narrowly dodging the horns of the bull who made him sweat (*TSAR* 205), the hero endures and is victorious in his battle with nature.

Nevertheless, Santiago's time for celebration is brief and short-lived as the victory in catching the marlin becomes almost symbolic of the Vandello and Bosson's conceptualization of manhood. Attaining it is strenuous and difficult, and everything after is anything but permanent as it is perpetually challenged and put under test, as both Santiago and his manhood are when groups of sharks attack the marlin's carcass. Notably, after beating off a first wave of attacks, Santiago's strain leads him to question his plight: "You did not kill the fish only to keep alive and sell for food, he thought. You killed him for pride and because you are a fisherman" (*TOMATS* 67). Seemingly, Santiago is aware of the performative aspect in catching the marlin. He recognizes that his motives may not have been as pure and that of an

old man who "[...] no longer dreamed of [...] great occurrences nor of great fish [...]" (12). Santiago's reflection reads as brutally honest, and it might reveal the performative motives of his three-day plight. However, his realization that it may have been for pride is short-lived, and upon the next attack of the sharks, Santiago returns to the demands of manhood in having to defend himself and the great fish.

Similarly to Jake's violent attempt at reclaiming his manhood, violence also becomes a central force in Santiago's performance of his masculinity. But Santiago's former battle is somewhat different, as the quarrel with the marlin is a brutal display rooted in respect for the suffering fish. He considers it his "friend" (46) and "brother" (58, 63), despite ultimately slaughtering it, much like how Romero and Jake discuss the "very nice" (*TSAR* 164) bulls ahead of his first bullfight in novel. However, unlike Jake's violent test of manhood featuring a homosocial contest, Santiago's test is yet again versus nature as he has to defend his marlin from assailing sharks: "This was a fish built to feed on all the fishes in the sea, that were so fast and strong and well armed that they had no other enemy" (*TOMATS* 64). The description of the sharks is almost akin to hegemonic men, as they assert their position in the sea through domination over other species. In fighting the sharks, Santiago is put to the test as he has to defend the marlin not just as a fish, but as the fruit of his labor which may be necessary to evidence his masculine performance to his village. Santiago is driven to brutally kill with tools and then his hands, with the latter marking his desperation. Ultimately his defense fails, and only bones remain of the marlin as he recognizes that "He knew he was beaten" (77).

The old man seemingly fails the terminal test of his manhood as he sails ashore with only the marlin's carcass to show for. Yet, in one way it might suggest how Santiago's violent plight is somewhat similar to Jake's fight with Cohn. In fighting the sharks, Santiago remarks: "'But a man is not made for defeat,' he said. 'A man can be destroyed but not defeated'" (66). Cohn, the middleweight boxing champion, leaves Jake knocked out and aching, and the sharks devour the marlin and exhausts Santiago and drains him of his physical strength. In the aftermath, both men are arguably destroyed, but like Santiago suggests — they are not necessarily defeated. The sentiment of the quote expands upon how in Hemingway's narratives of masculinity a man might be broken down physically, but his determination, pride, and manhood are of superior matter. Jake briefly finds redemption in the violent test of manhood versus Cohn despite being beaten, similar to how Santiago might find success in conquering the marlin despite it being devoured by sharks. However, as is illustrated in the later evaluation of the narratives of Jake and Santiago, they deviate in suggesting whether the protagonists are ultimately granted gratification by these redemptive efforts.

3.2. *Imaginatively Redeeming their Emasculated Manhood*

The idea of an imaginative redemption points to Jake and Santiago's pursuit of a sense of their manhood that they view is absent in their experience as emasculated men. On the one hand, Jake Barnes has lost his ability to have sexual intercourse, and this arguably leads him to an imaginative pursuit of sexual gratification. On the other hand, Santiago is wounded by the death of his wife and consequential loneliness in his old age, and it is this that arguably leads him to seek lost feminine comfort and companionship through imaginatively feminizing the sea. In examining Jake and Santiago's attempt at an imaginative redemption, another major correlation appears in how Hemingway's protagonists react in their emasculated conditions.

In Hemingway's first narrative of masculinity, Jake's impotence is a major conflict as it obstructs the realization of both his sexual and romantic relationships, which consequently leads him to seek sexual gratification imaginatively. This impotence manifests in Jake's interactions with two key women, Georgette Hobin and Lady Brett Ashley, as he is unable to gratify his sexual desire. Notably, Georgette and Brett reflect how women in *TSAR* have a narrative role of being means through which men demonstrate their ability or inability to perform their masculinity through the domination of women.

An important scene illustrating Jake's impotence is when the protagonist meets the prostitute Georgette, whose function in the novel is to introduce the reader to Jake's wound and the notion of his complicated relationship with women. To this point, it is necessary to recall an observation noted by Potts: impotence does not obstruct male sexual desire (Potts 99). In this scene, Jake manifests his sexual desire as he is portrayed to be "watching" (18) Georgette; a "good-looking girl" (18) he initiates contact with at a café. However, as Georgette responds to his advances and later attempts to kiss Jake, the reader is presented with Jake's inability to engage sexually. Jake avoids her advance and blames it on a sickness that, when questioned, he says "I got hurt in the war." (20). Jake acts on his instincts and desire, but retreats as he is reminded of his impotence. In addition, Georgette is presented as someone to underline and satisfy his desire; however, he is unable and—arguably—unwilling to do so. Her brief presence and how she fades out of the narrative in light of Brett's introduction and central role throughout the text, in turn reflects Georgette's expendable role. In reference to his comment about his war injury, Jake says that him and Georgette could have discussed the war further, although he remarks how "I was bored enough" (20); illustrating how his sexual desire is undermined by his romantic and intellectual disinterest in her. In other words, even if Jake was sexually potent, he may not have had further interest in Georgette. This notes

how Jake may not ultimately be fueled purely by a sexual desire to dominate women — a performative trait that is tied to homosocial and hegemonic virtues of masculinity.

While Jake's impotence is a sexual obstacle physically and imaginatively, it is not inherently an obstacle in romantic relations, as is depicted in his intricate relationship with the heroine Lady Brett Ashley. In Chapter IV, Jake and Brett reflect on the state of their relationship as they discuss their inability to resolve the conflict of Jake's impotence, as he asks Brett "Isn't there anything we can do about it?" and she replies "I don't want to go through that hell again" (29). Their mutual romantic and sexual attraction is further emphasized with Brett saying "Love you? I simply turn all into jelly when you touch me" (28). However, Jake's impotence and inability to perform sexually is an immovable obstacle between the two engaging in a relationship together. Which, when juxtaposed with their desire for each other, leaves them mutually unable to fully move on from one another — even if Brett engages in new relationships and Jake does not.

Taking Georgette and Brett into consideration, it is clear that Barnes' character points to the text's engagement with the emasculating nature of impotence. Despite being a seemingly attractive man who is strongly desired, his inability to utilize the most prominent signifier of his gender points to the problematic performance of his masculinity. It can be argued this performance is largely destructive to the identity of his manhood, as Jake feels as though he cannot defend it through the sexual objectifications of women — a central notion to one's sense of manhood, as highlighted by Bird (122). And, as argued by Potts (87, 94), it might be said that the impotent male is feminized and de-sexed. Put simply, Jake's wound leaves him emasculated and unable to act physically despite his romantic and sexual desires. He cannot match the other male's sexual domination of the women in the narrative; in turn he is left desperate to ways to fulfil his sexual desire and exert the sexual dominance expected of the hegemonic masculine figure.

As a solution, Jake resorts to his imaginative powers to escape the physical restraints on his desire. In the discussion between Jake and Cohn of what kept the latter up at night, Cohn remarks that he was just "talking" (17). In his narration, Jake responds: "I could picture it. I have a rotten habit of picturing the bedroom scenes of my friends" (17). This clearly points to how Jake searches for sexual gratification imaginatively. It is therefore possible to draw lines between his imaginative performance and the impotence theory of Potts, who argues how impotent men may resort to performing their sexuality through methods beyond the impotent phallus (100). Jake resorts to imagining the bedroom scenes of his friends—intimate characters and familiar faces—to reproduce an activity and relation he is physically

unable to. He even considers the act a "rotten habit" (17), illustrating his self-awareness and shame in imagining the sexual relations of his friends to attempt to satisfy his desire.

This dichotomy between his mind and body is elaborated on directly in relation to Lady Brett Ashley. Following Jake and Brett's reflection on their relationship in Chapter IV, Jake goes to bed thinking about her: "I was thinking about Brett and my mind stopped jumping around and started to go in sort of smooth waves. Then I started to cry" (34). Potts argues how impotence infiltrates a man's actions, thoughts, and flesh (85). And in Jake's desire for both romantic and sexual love, impotence is not only an obstacle in his thoughts and actions, but also in his imaginative pursuit for masculine redemption. Jake's emasculated performance is not only represented physically through his impotent lack of ability, but also creatively and imaginatively. The emasculating wound manifests itself beyond his physical identity and its affordances. As the bedroom scene depicts, even his imagination allows him but a brief moment of redemption before the exterior physical wound festers and manifests itself internally and imaginatively.

The detail of Jake crying depicts the destructive nature of his impotence as he reveals himself in a moment of emasculating vulnerability caused by his insatiable desire. Hemingway generally presents Jake's behavior and narration in a stoic manner as he avoids revealing his emotions. However, the bedroom scene is one of the few notable outliers as he permits the reader a look into his emotional state. In light of Robert Brannon's abrasive third rule of masculinity, this scene can be interpreted as further emasculating Jake beyond his impotence: "In fact, proving you're a man depends on never showing your emotions at all. Boys don't cry" (qtd. in Kimmel, "Masculinity as Homophobia" 125-126). Jake is further distanced from hegemonic ideals of manhood as he is unable to perform sexually, and he reveals himself as vulnerable and emotional as his impotence brings him to tears. Moreover, this rare peek into Jake's emotional state can be interpreted as a breakdown in upkeeping his masculine façade. His impotence does not even permit him to fulfill his desire imaginatively. As such, the frustration and despair that lead him to cry boils over and Jake does not attempt to hide anything that would be assessed as damaging to his precarious manhood. In other words, the bedroom scene depicts Jake when he is no longer performing to defend or reattain his manhood: illustrating his failure in seeking imaginative redemption for his emasculation.

While Jake seeks sexual gratification imaginatively, the imaginative redemption in Santiago's narrative in *TOMATS* is characterized by the old man's desire of feminine comfort and companionship as he feminizes the sea. To diminish his loneliness as a widower and an old man, Santiago attempts to redeem his manhood through the imaginative effort of

feminizing the sea. The function of the feminized sea is to grant him the feminine comfort and companionship he deems lost and otherwise unrecoverable. In the description of the old man's home, the narrator highlights religious pictures as relics of the old man's wife: "Once there had been a tinted photograph of his wife on the wall but he had taken it down because it made him too lonely to see it ... " (*TOMATS* 6). Clearly, Santiago suffers from loneliness as a consequence of being a widower. As presented in Chapter I's theoretical framework, Glendenning et al.'s findings on the emasculation of aging depict expectations of dependency and loss of their role as a provider and breadwinner (132-134). In no longer having a wife to be able to depend on and to provide for, Santiago suffers from a loneliness that defies the masculine expectations of a man having a woman. "No one should be alone in their old age, he thought. But it is unavoidable" (*TOMATS* 28). In the case of aging, loneliness is a natural consequence due to natural death and the expectations of likely becoming a widow or widower in old age. However, while Santiago recognizes how his loneliness is inevitable, in feminizing the sea he does not want to surrender to loneliness as his lack of desire reinforces his feelings of emasculation.

It is interesting then, how the narrator's description of Santiago's dreams implies how Santiago as a widower and old man lacks a desire for women despite ultimately forging a feminine presence. Jake Barnes' imagination sought Brett in an imaginative realm that would allow him to satisfy his desire; however, Santiago dreams neither of women nor his wife: "He no longer dreamed of storms nor of women, nor of great occurrences, nor of great fish, nor fights, nor contests of strength, nor of his wife" (12). It is notable how the absence that defines Santiago's dreams and imaginative powers revolves around masculinity and demonstrating one's manhood, such as the risk-taking behavior and feats of physical strength in storms, great fish, and fights. Yet, there is also the mention of "his wife" and "women", highlighting how the romantic and sexual desire of femininity is attached to masculine ideals and interests. Moreover, in context of "no longer" (12), these acts are presented as something of his past and what used to occupy his dreams and imagination, as if they are acts he cannot perform, relate to, or imagine any more as a consequence of his old age.

Whereas *TSAR* heavily thematizes romantic and sexual relationships, they are near absent in *TOMATS*, which is perhaps reflective of the emasculating dynamics of impotence and aging. While Jake is full of desire, and the predominant conflict in the text spurs from the dichotomy between his desire and his wound-inflicted impotence, Santiago as a widower avoids thoughts and memories of his wife due to feelings of loneliness. Both his wife and women are so out of Santiago's thoughts they do not enter his dreams, and no women appear

in the narrative. This makes sense in the context of the aging men, as they are not expected to have youthful desire or potent virility, and loneliness becomes an "inevitable" outcome (28). And the descriptions of Santiago's dreams suggest that he, unlike Jake, does not think about either his wife or women to seek solace in moments of loneliness. Their absence suggests that both sexual and romantic desire are feelings of the past for Santiago. They are as absent in thought as they are physically, as shown in both his dreams and through Santiago removing the relics of his wife to not feel lonely (6).

Santiago, in suffering aging's consequences of loneliness, to some extent seemingly rejects femininity as opposed to Jake, who continuously seeks feminine resolve for his insatiable desire. Crucially, this can imply how the inflicted and abnormal essence of Jake's emasculation leaves his manhood in a state of desperation and distress, where he is powerlessly left fighting back against his impotence by seeking femininity. His impotence leaves his abilities insufficient to meet the expectations of the hegemony and young adulthood. In comparison, the natural and inevitable force of aging as emasculation carries a fundamental understanding with Santiago's perception of his emasculated identity. Santiago accepts that his wife is gone, and that he realistically is beyond the years of being romantically and sexually active with other women. Aging as a natural form of emasculation thus carries a form of self-awareness regarding one's ability and identity that distinguishes itself from the male distressed by an inflicted emasculation.

However, while women—physically and imaginatively—are absent in the *TOMATS*, there is a caveat to Santiago's desire for femininity as the old man engages in feminizing the sea. In "Heirlooms and Tea Towels: Views of Ships' Gender in the Modern Maritime Museum" (2000) Mellefont investigates how attributing feminine pronouns to inanimate objects is a historical cross-cultural phenomenon going back to the 1300s (5). Explanations range from symbolizing emotional attachment (6) to highlighting possession of something beautiful, like a woman (8). Furthermore, feminizing the sexless object is argued to symbolize male ownership and control (9). However, an interesting explanation is owed to a citation Mellefont makes: "A ship upon which one's life could depend was as near and dear as one's wife or mother" (Rogers qtd. in Mellefont 10). This illustrates the intimacy and comfort feminizing his ship can offer the sailor. In other words, the motivation of feminizing a ship can echo the motives of Santiago feminizing the sea: to seek feminine comfort and companionship in the isolation of the sea, and to deal with the textual imposition of emasculation.

To emphasize this sentiment, it is useful to look to "Santiago and the Eternal Feminine: Gendering La Mar in *The Old Man and the Sea*" (2008) where Susan F. Beegel examines Santiago's gendering of the sea. Beegel observes how "[...] the beauty of the sea assuages Santiago's loneliness for his flesh-and-blood wife" (159) in arguing that Santiago is no exception to traditional cultural figures of men intimate with feminized depictions of the sea (159). Importantly, the critic notes how feminizing the sea develops a "reciprocal obligation" (163)—or mutual respect—where the man perceiving a loving or motherly presence in the sea feels an obligation to reciprocate the favors granted by the feminine presence (163). This is important in the contrast Beegel establishes between those who feminize the sea, and Hemingway's "true sin" (154) in those who masculinize nature and depicts it as an enemy or rival (154). "Santiago rejects those who masculinize the sea" (165), Beegel argues; yet, the critic importantly notes how critical discourse has recognized the "sexist aggressions" in Santiago feminization (Merchant qtd. in Beegel 166). This is based on Santiago recognizing the sea's "wicked" potential, and the mentions of "wife" and "women" alongside "storms" and "great fish" in the narration of his old dreams (165-166). The importance of this plays into the hegemonic ideal of subordinating women and femininity, as Beegel quotes Merchant who argues "[...] such views of nature as a disorderly female force call forth the male need for rationalistic or mechanistic power over her" (qtd. in Beegel 166).

Santiago's feminization of the sea is depicted as the narrator distinguishes between Santiago and young fishermen who speak of the sea—"mar"—with the Spanish masculine article "el", in making "*el mar*" (*TOMATS* 15). Instead, Santiago opts for feminizing the sea with the feminine article "la", in speaking of it as "*la mar*" (15). In addition, further comparisons are drawn between the contrast in how young fishermen view the sea compared to Santiago:

They spoke of her as a contestant or a place or even an enemy. But the old man always thought of her as feminine and as something that gave or withheld great favours, and if she did wild or wicked things it was because she could not help them. The moon affects her as it does with a woman, he thought. (15)

In light of this feminization, it might be argued that Santiago personifies the sea and attributes it with feminine characteristics to deliberately establish a female presence. Unlike humans, the sea is not affected by aging — it does not die and neither does its physical abilities and appearance deteriorate. By feminizing the sea Santiago seeks a companion which cannot

abandon him; an eternal companion that will not decline like himself nor face death like his late wife. As such, he establishes the presence of the feminine sea, "la mar" (15). This personification is depicted as he draws parallels between women and the sea, as he notes how both can be so "kind and very beautiful" and yet "so cruel" (15). Furthermore, Santiago rationalizes both the cruel potential of women and the sea to that cannot be helped, as he draws an analogy between the tidal shifts of the sea and the belief that women's menstrual cycles are affected by the lunar cycle.

This act of feminizing continues throughout the narrative. It is possible to look to how Santiago speaks of his boat, which notably is the masculine "*el barco*" in Spanish, yet he speaks of it as feminine: "She is good", he thought. 'She is sound and not harmed in any way except for the tiller'" (77). Santiago uses feminine pronouns of "she" for his boat; however, it remains an interesting observation as opposed to the more substantial feminization of the sea, which is substantiated by the passage comparing Santiago with younger fishermen, and the passage comparing the sea with women. This may illustrate how feminizing the sea is his own conscious act made in reaction to his emasculation, while the casual feminization of his boat is culturally imposed by the traditions of fisherman cultures, as explored by Mellefont.

Yet, it is indeed interesting to note Santiago's pattern of feminizing inanimate objects. In the eyes of the old man, the sea and his boat both have the commonality of being capable of great and cruel things, even if they are not all influenced by lunar cycles. This can indicate that Santiago has a tendency to feminize what he values and wants to keep close and in good favor and fortune. It acts as a continuation of his search to replace the love and desire he once harbored for women, and especially his late wife. A search that is arguably rooted in his old age and its emasculating consequences. Thus, in the aftermath of becoming a widower and no longer having the desire to seek romantic and sexual relations, the feminized sea is his focal substitute for female companionship and desire.

Santiago and Jake Barnes are both searching for ways to redeem their manhood imaginatively; however, their plights carry a key distinction. As Jake is still equipped with sexual and romantic desire, his impotent distress forces him to attempt to resolve his emasculation by imagining himself sexually potent. Jake is imaginatively seeking femininity, while Santiago—instead of imagining his wife or other women—rather seeks to replace what he lost with the lack of feminine presences in his life: companionship and comfort. Santiago does not have to imagine himself with his wife or other women; instead, he resorts to imaginatively establishing the feminine sea where he spends all his formative time in the narrative. Hemingway's representation of masculinity illustrates how the imagination becomes

crucial in attempts to replace what is lost with emasculation – regardless of whether it is inflicted or natural. Jake, then, can only attempt to imagine himself potent as a last resort, while Santiago can only imagine the sea as a feminine representation to fill the void of lost comfort and companionship in his old age.

3.3. *Successfully Redeeming their Emasculated Manhood?*

In comparing *The Old Man and the Sea* and *The Sun Also Rises*, a central distinction emerges in exploring how the texts suggest whether the protagonists manage to successfully redeem their manhood. Whereas Jake Barnes ultimately fails to reclaim his manhood, Santiago arguably succeeds. This argument forwards on from the previously discussed points of physical and imaginative attempts at redemption. Having explored how Jake and Santiago are emasculated and how they, in turn, perform their masculinity to redeem their manhood, it is necessary to delve into the effects and consequences of these attempts. This is necessary not only to evaluate whether the protagonists manage to resolve the driving conflict of emasculation in each narrative, but also to illustrate how Jake and Santiago reflect how manhood is a precarious status that is not easily attained, and is easily lost.

To begin with, Jake's defense and demonstration of his manhood in his fight with Cohn proved an initially promising but ultimately futile act. He takes an active role as Cohn accuses him of being a 'pimp', and by throwing the first punch against a Princeton middleweight boxing champion, and he performs a brave display to defend his manhood and honor despite being knocked down. However, whatever pride he can assume from the violent test is ultimately broken as he is outperformed by Pedro Romero. Romero, who is also beaten and bruised by Cohn, endures a rain of punches only to knock out the middleweight boxing champion in a heroic display of grace under pressure. As such, despite his best efforts, Jake's performance pales in comparison to the hegemonic masculinity Romero represents, and whatever masculine gratitude Jake's performance may have yielded is ultimately broken down.

Furthermore, evaluating Jake's attempts at imaginative redemption is best reflected in the tragedy of the novel's final lines, as Jake and Brett discuss their relationship: "'Oh, Jake,' Brett said, 'we could have had such a damned good time together.' [...] 'Yes,' I said. 'Isn't it pretty to think so?'" (*TSAR* 231). It has been presented how Jake, despite his impotence, has a desire he attempts to satisfy imaginatively. This is depicted in admitting his rotten habit of imagining the bedroom scenes of his friends (17), where acknowledging it as "rotten" depicts

Jake's shame in engaging with it. In addition, the bedroom scene where he thinks of Brett in "smooth waves" before crying (34) is a notable scene to this point. In revealing himself to be crying, Jake represents the breakdown he suffers in his attempt to perform his manhood imaginatively. The scene depicts the failure in Jake's imaginative pursuit for resolve as his impotence protrudes even in his imagination. This idea is elaborated on in the significance of "isn't it pretty to think so?" (231). The tragedy in this line comes down to the realization that Jake knows their relationship can only be conceived imaginatively—yet—even that is not a possibility without his emasculating wound festering. As such, the conclusion of the narrative leaves a tragic impression of Jake and his future. In his future, Jake can only be imagined to be unable to attain his manhood and to fulfil his romantic and sexual desires, both physically and imaginatively. Jake Barnes is Hemingway's representation of a tragic masculine; Jake is young, unfairly wounded and thus emasculated, and neither is he capable of redeeming his manhood through performances of masculinity.

Whereas Jake Barnes ultimately fails to reclaim his manhood, the old man Santiago arguably succeeds. He succeeds by physically defying both his own and societal expectations of what an aging masculine is physically capable of through his conquest of the marlin. And through his feminization of the sea, Santiago accumulates the feminine comfort and companionship that helps him defy his feelings of loneliness.

First and foremost, by the narrative's conclusion Santiago has managed to separate himself from the presumed weakness and physical limitations imposed upon the aging man. Santiago expressed a desire to prove how he is a "strange old man" (*TOMATS* 40), or in other words, to prove he is an exception to the rule of diminishing ability in old age. Santiago's conquest of the marlin is the ultimate performance that displays how, despite his age, he is not any less capable than any other man. He breaks through the mental conflict of whether to consider himself an old man, or simply a man, and breaks the physical hardships of his cramps and exhaustion. Despite not successfully fending off the sharks that assail the marlin and leaving barely anything but bones, its carcass is more than what is necessary to successfully evidence his motives. His motive, which he admits, could have been for a self-serving pride (67). Strychacz argues that in bringing the carcass to the shore of the village, Santiago's motive is to present a trophy that demonstrate his strength and ability, and has the effect of evidencing that his manhood is not confined to the expectations and limitations of an old man (*Hemingway's Theaters* 199). As such, Santiago has not only successfully proven his strength to himself; he also leaves a great trophy for his village to evaluate and celebrate his

strength: "'What a fish it was' the proprietor said. 'There has never been such fish.'" (TOMATS 79).

In addition, Santiago's potent physical performance is achieved with the help of the feminine comfort and companionship of feminized sea. Instead of his performance being a sexual conquest and domination over femininity, he establishes the feminized sea for comfort and companionship to fill the void and deter the loneliness left by his late wife. Santiago has a deep-rooted fear of loneliness, as evidenced by the hidden picture of his wife and frequent longing for the boy in his isolation at sea. This fear arguably stems from the trauma of being a widower and no longer having a sexual and romantic desire of women in an emasculated old age. Like Jake Barnes, Santiago might imagine himself doomed to loneliness in his emasculated state. However, unlike Jake who has a romantic and sexual desire that he fails to satisfy, Santiago can ultimately be deemed successful. As discussed, he achieves his great masculine triumph in tandem with the feminized sea, which in turn comforts and alleviates his loneliness: "[...] he could see the prisms in the deep dark water [...] and he looked ahead and saw a flight of wild ducks etching themselves against the sky over the water, then blurring, then etching again and he knew no man was ever alone on the sea" (36).

However, it is then necessary to consider the conclusion of the narrative: "He [Santiago] was still sleeping on his face and the boy was sitting by him watching him. The old man was dreaming about the lions" (82). A prominent, although not conclusive, reading of this scene is one where Santiago is assumed to be dying (Stephen and Cools 91), as in his final conversation with Manolin he says how "'They beat me, Manolin,' he said. 'They truly beat me.'" (TOMATS 80). The reading of Santiago's death in the conclusion of the narrative is substantial. As on one hand, it fundamentally influences his physical attempt at redemption as he does demonstrate his manhood, but at the cost of his life. As such, the carcass of the marlin instead becomes a symbol of his manhood to be celebrated and admired, rather than his own living being. One might only speculate whether this is what Santiago truly would have wanted or not, as he displays both an aversion and attraction to performative acts. However, if his feminization of the sea is taken into consideration, it may suggest a comfort in Santiago's passing. As on the other hand, his passing suggests a success in feminizing the sea as a final companion that diminished his feelings of loneliness and accompanied him to his end, as he does not live to see another feminine companion widow him, like what had once hurt him greatly. Nevertheless, the intricate and polarizing aspect of his death in light of his attempts at redemption—regardless of whether he is ultimately content, or not—functions to display the unforgiving and precarious of manhood in Hemingway's texts.

It is telling that the protagonists' struggle with manhood is a core conflict thematized in *The Sun Also Rises* and *The Old Man and the Sea*. Despite the contrasts in Jake and Santiago's age, their social surroundings, and the contrasting nature of their conditions, their plights correlate in depicting men's struggle with emasculation. The protagonists depict how emasculated men take active external and internal measures to demonstrate and redeem their manhood in order to not be considered lesser than other men, or their understanding of what a man can be capable of. However, Jake's plight is riddled with feelings of hopelessness and his attempts are ultimately futile, while Santiago is granted gratification to a larger extent. An exploration of Hemingway's ecological ethos in his later writing may suggest why he grants Santiago this gratification as opposed to Jake; however, the scope of this project rather recognizes this as Hemingway depicting the richness and complexities of men in dialogue with their sense of manhood. Jake is rejected manhood, but has a lifetime to adapt and accept his situation. Santiago on the other hand, is only granted a taste of the manhood he once bestowed in his younger days as "Santiago el Campeón" (43); but he swiftly meets his final resting place, and the carcass of marlin instead of the living man becomes the symbol of his redeemed manhood.

Conclusion

The Sun Also Rises (1926) and *The Old Man and the Sea* (1952) are two narratives of masculinity from opposite ends of Hemingway's career. The present thesis investigates how the narratives correlate and diverge in depicting Jake Barnes and Santiago as representations of emasculated manhood. Hemingway's protagonists are notably both depicted as non-hegemonic and emasculated men that attempt to redeem their sense of manhood. In similar manner, Jake and Santiago measure themselves up against their hegemonic figures of manhood, they idealize a hegemonic oppression of otherness, and resort to physical and imaginative attempts at redemption. The narratives are indeed structurally similar in how both men navigate the world through an emasculated mind and body, but they also diverge in granting the Jake and Santiago gratification in their struggles with their sense of manhood. While Jake's quest for redemption is hopeless and futile, Santiago is granted gratification in his emasculated plight. However, despite the similarities and contrasts between Jake and Santiago, Hemingway's narratives of masculinity both function to thematize and tackle the rich, complex, and precarious nature of manhood through the lens of emasculated men.

One of the key similarities between the Hemingway texts is how they can be read through the prism of Raewyn Connell's concept of Hegemonic Masculinity. Utilizing the concept has aided the project in revealing important correlations and differences between Jake and Santiago. Notably, Jake and Santiago are both depicted as non-hegemonic men distanced from the hegemony. This distance is reinforced by their passive identities as spectators in the masculinity-affirming arenas of bullfighting and baseball. As spectators, their gaze is positioned in a passive contrast to athletes who actively perform their masculinity. The contrast essentially reflects their struggles with manhood throughout the narratives, as they are measured up against and distanced from their idealized expressions of manhood.

It is notable, then, how Jake and Santiago forge and celebrate these expressions by measuring themselves up against the hegemonic figures Pedro Romero and Joe DiMaggio. The protagonists' passion for sports not only not only instills values of masculinity, but it also forges their perception of ideal men. For both Jake and Santiago, their perception of idealized manhood is demonstrated to be heavily influenced by the deficiencies and voids in their own sense of manhood. Pedro Romero and Joe DiMaggio are figures that, in the eyes of Jake and Santiago, demonstrate what a man is truly capable of. The athletes become manifestations of the performances of masculinity Jake and Santiago are yearning to perform themselves.

The utility of the hegemonic prism also helps reflect how Jake and Santiago partake in the oppression of those who represent otherness. This is in order to fuel their sense of manhood and close their distance to the hegemony by performing acts which help establish and maintain the hegemony's existence. Jake's expression of homophobia and Santiago's memory of his oppression of the 'negro' are idealizations of such hegemonic acts. Despite being non-hegemonic men, Jake and Santiago reinforce the oppressed roles of the subordinated homosexuals and the marginalized Afro-Latin in order to close the distance between themselves and the hegemony. In other words, the protagonists additionally fuel their sense of manhood and self-worth by measuring themselves against other subordinated and marginalized groups of men.

The next major correlation between the Hemingway texts is revealed by the fundamental aspect of Jake and Santiago's emasculation. The protagonists respectively suffer from the emasculating conditions of impotence and aging, which invokes a struggle with their sense of manhood. In turn, this forces both into physical and imaginative attempts at redemption. Jake and Santiago's need to physically perform their masculinity springs from the major physical implications their emasculating conditions have on their sense of manhood: Jake's impotence leaves him unable to perform sexually, and Santiago's old age leaves his physical strength and virility in question. The Hemingway protagonists also seek imaginative means to replace the lost aspects of their manhood that they cannot redeem physically. This is due to the mental implications of Jake's impotence and his inability to perform sexually and satisfy his desire, and Santiago in his old age, now a widower, no longer dreams of either his wife or women, but his loneliness reflects a void of lost feminine comfort and companionship.

While the prism of Hegemonic Masculinity and Emasculation help reveal core similarities between Jake and Santiago's narratives, it is necessary to note how they also function to demonstrate key differences. These differences are depicted in how Jake and Santiago find gratification in their idealization of their hegemonic figures, and in their physical and imaginative attempts at redemption. By recognizing these deviations, they reflect how Hemingway's narratives of masculinity do not present men navigating their manhood through emasculation as a fixed and restricted experience. Instead, Hemingway depicts the landscape of men and masculinities as rich and complex.

The first key contrast is depicted in Jake and Santiago's process of measuring themselves up against Romero and DiMaggio. Romero only ends up reinforcing the deficiencies in Jake's sense of manhood, as his attempts at redemption fail in the face of Romero's performances materializing his own manhood. The bullfighter only ends up

representing an unattainable ideal for Jake, as the hegemonic athlete and non-hegemonic spectator are polarized men. This is in contrast to Hemingway's later narrative, where Santiago is able to find gratification through establishing parallels between himself and DiMaggio. As an aging fisherman wanting to defy the expectations and limitations of his aging manhood, Santiago looks to DiMaggio's fisherman lineage and bone-spur injury comeback. These parallels grounds the mythical figure relative to himself, and Santiago finds gratification in measuring himself against the baseball player. DiMaggio becomes a source of motivation for the old man when he feels physically and mentally exhausted, in the hope of aiding the performances of masculinity that may redeem his sense of manhood.

The second key point is illustrated by the contrasting gratification Jake and Santiago find in their physical and imaginative attempts at redemption. In *TSAR*, Jake attempts to prove he is physically potent as he is challenged by Cohn. Jake manages to perform a courage and bravery in facing a middleweight boxing champion; yet, his gratification is short-lived as his need to measure himself against Romero ends up diminishing his own performance. Romero—despite being beaten as well—manages to defeat Cohn and as well provide a dominating bullfighting performance through his injuries. Jake cannot help but be reminded that he does not measure up to ideal representations of manhood, ultimately fueling his emasculated identity. This is in contrast to *TOMATS* where Santiago's feeling of manhood is fueled by his physical efforts. The old man finds that his emasculating old age is wearing down his strength and abilities, and his dominant motivation is to redeem his manhood by proving he is physically capable despite his age. By conquering the marlin over a three-day battle, Santiago achieves his intended goal and physically redeems himself. Like DiMaggio, he defies the expectations and limitations imposed upon himself, showing that an old man is still capable of great performances of masculinity.

Subsequently, another important contrast emerges in the protagonists' imaginative effort of redeeming their manhood. To gratify his sexual desire, Jake attempts to redeem his manhood through imaginatively simulating sexual gratification. This is depicted in key scenes where Jake imagines the bedroom scenes of his friend and has sexual thoughts of Brett in his bed. However, Jake recognizes the emasculating aspects of his former performance as a "rotten habit", and his impotence protrudes even imaginatively as his latter effort leads to him breaking down into tears. His attempts at redemption yet again prove futile, and his perpetual failures illustrate how Jake's impotence has decisively emasculated his mind and body. While Santiago is not depicted as embodying a sexual desire like Jake, his concern for loneliness suggest a longing for female comfort and companionship as an old man and widower. It is

notable how Santiago feminizes the sea by using feminine pronouns and comparing its relationship with the moon to women's menstrual cycle. In establishing the feminized sea, Santiago finds solace in his loneliness as he believes that no man is truly alone at sea. Thus, the old man forges a feminine presence of comfort and companionship that accompanies him throughout his emasculated plight.

The Sun Also Rises and *The Old Man and the Sea* both correlate and diverge in the emasculated narratives of Jake and Santiago. However, the narratives ultimately reiterate and reinforce the richness and complexities of men, masculinities, and the very concept of manhood. Jake demonstrates an inability to break the confines of his impotence, but is left disillusioned and deserted in navigating his emasculated life. Santiago's strenuous performances grant the old man his goal, but his victory is swiftly taken from him in death as the carcass of the marlin becomes the symbol of his manhood. *The Sun Also Rises* and *The Old Man and the Sea* depict emasculated men striving for their self-constructed ideals of masculinity, as they go through all-encompassing plights that ultimately demonstrates the precarious and relentless nature of manhood.

Works Cited

- Armengol, Josep M. "Gendering Men: Re-Visions Of Violence As A Test Of Manhood In American Literature." *ATLANTIS*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2007, pp. 75–92.
- . "Aging as Emasculation? Rethinking Aging Masculinities in Contemporary U.S. Fiction." *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, vol. 59, no. 3, 2018, pp. 355–367.
- . "Performing Manhood through Animal Killings? Revisions of Hunting as a Performance of Masculinity in Ernest Hemingway's Late Writings." *Men and Masculinities*, vol. 23, no. 5, 2020, pp. 833–851.
- Bates, Thomas R. "Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 36, no. 2, 1975, pp. 351–366.
- Beegel, Susan F. "Santiago and the Eternal Feminine: Gendering La Mar in The Old Man and the Sea." *Ernest Hemingway's The Old Man and the Sea: New Edition*, edited by Harold Bloom, New ed., Bloom's Literary Criticism, 2008, pp. 153–178.
- Bird, Sharon R. "Welcome to the Men's Club: Homosociality and the Maintenance of Hegemonic Masculinity." *Gender and Society*, vol. 10, no. 2, 1996, pp. 120–132.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2006.
- Connell, Raewyn. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Polity Press, 1987.
- . *Masculinities*. 2nd ed., University of California Press, 2005.
- Connell, Raewyn., and James W. Messerschmidt. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender and Society*, vol. 19, no. 6, 2005, pp. 829–859.
- Cooperman, Stanley. "Hemingway and Old Age: Santiago as Priest of Time." *College English*, vol. 27, no. 3, 1965, pp. 215–220.
- Cramer, Ben Richard. *Joe DiMaggio: The Hero's Life*. Touchstone, 2001.
- De Baerdemaeker, Ruben. "Performative Patterns in Hemingway's 'Soldier's Home.'" *The Hemingway Review*, vol. 27, no. 1, 2007, pp. 55–73.

- Demetriou, Demetrakis Z. "Connell's Concept of Hegemonic Masculinity: A Critique." *Theory and Society*, vol. 30, no. 3, 2001, pp. 337–361.
- Eastman, Max. "Bull in the Afternoon." *New Republic*, vol. 75, no. 966, 1933, pp. 94–97.
- Elliott, Ira. "Performance Art: Jake Barnes and 'Masculine' Signification in *The Sun Also Rises*." *American Literature*, vol. 67, no. 1, 1995, pp. 77–94.
- Fore, Dana. "Life unworthy of life? Masculinity, disability, and guilt in *The Sun Also Rises*." *The Hemingway Review*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2007, pp. 74+.
- Glendenning, Jonathan., et al. "Men's Attitudes to Aging: Threatened, Performed, and Negotiated Masculinity." *AG AboutGender*, vol. 6, no. 11, 2017, pp. 126–153.
- Gottzen et al., editor. *Routledge International Handbook of Masculinity Studies*. Routledge, 2020.
- Hammarén, Nils., and Thomas Johansson. "Homosociality: In Between Power and Intimacy." *SAGE Open*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2014, pp. 1–11.
- Hearn, Jeff., and Richard Howson. "The institutionalization of (critical) studies on men and masculinities: Geopolitical perspectives." *Routledge International Handbook of Masculinity Studies*, edited by Gottzen et al., Routledge, 2020, pp. 19–30.
- Hemingway, Ernest. *The Old Man and the Sea*. 1952. Scribner, 2020.
- . *The Sun Also Rises*. 1926. Alfred A. Knopf, 2022.
- Kimmel, Michael S. "Masculinity as Homophobia: Fear, Shame, and Silence in the Construction of Gender Identity." *Theorizing Masculinities*, edited by Harry W. Brod and Michael Kaufman, SAGE Publications, 1994, pp. 119–141.
- . *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. The Free Press, 1996.
- Klaver, Elizabeth. "Erectile Dysfunction and the Post War Novel: *The Sun Also Rises* and In Country." *Literature and Medicine*, vol. 30, no. 1, 2012, pp. 86–102.
- Kübler, Martina. "'Isn't It Pretty to Think So?'—Disability and the Queering of Masculinity in Ernest Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises* and D.H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*." *The Male*

Body in Representation, edited by Carmen Dextl and Silvia Gerlsbeck, Palgrave Macmillan, 2022, pp. 287–306.

Mazzeno, Laurence W. *The Critics and Hemingway, 1924–2014: Shaping an American Literary Icon*. Camden House, 2015.

Mellefont, Jeffrey. "Heirlooms and Tea Towels: Views of Ships' Gender in the Modern Maritime Museum." *The Great Circle*, vol. 22, no. 1, 2000, pp. 5–16.

Melling, Philip H. "Cultural Imperialism, Afro-Cuban Religion, and Santiago's Failure in *The Old Man and the Sea*." *The Hemingway Review*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2006, pp. 6–24.

Messerschmidt, James W. "The Saliency of 'Hegemonic Masculinity'". *Men and Masculinities*, vol. 22, no. 1, 2019, pp. 85–91.

Ozward, Thierry. "Between Sport and Tragedy: Hemingway's Passion for Bullfighting." *Sport in History*, vol. 39, no. 3, 2019, pp. 334–349.

Plath, James. "Santiago at the Plate: Baseball in the *Old Man and the Sea*." *The Hemingway Review*, vol. 16, no. 1, 1996, pp. 65–82.

Pleck, Joseph H. "The Theory of Male Sex-Role Identity: Its Rise and Fall, 1936 to the Present." *The Making of Masculinities (Routledge Revivals)*, edited by Harry Brod, Routledge, 2015, pp. 21–38.

Potts, Annie. "'The Essence of the Hard On': Hegemonic Masculinity and the Cultural Construction of 'Erectile Dysfunction'." *Men and Masculinities*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2000, pp. 85–103.

Puckett, James A. "'Sex Explains It All': Male Performance, Evolution, and Sexual Selection in Ernest Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises*." *Studies in American Naturalism*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2013, pp. 125–149.

Rudat, Wolfgang E. H. "Hemingway's '*The Sun Also Rises*': Masculinity, Feminism, and Gender-Role Reversal." *American Imago*, vol. 47, no. 1, 1990, pp. 43–68.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. Columbia University Press, 1985.

Simon & Garfunkel. "Simon & Garfunkel - Mrs. Robinson (Audio)", *YouTube*, 16 April 2013, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9C1BCAgu2I8>.

Stephens, Gregory., and Janice Cools. "'Out Too Far': Half-Fish, Beaten Men, and the Tenor of Masculine Grace in *The Old Man and the Sea*." *The Hemingway Review*, vol. 32, no. 2, 2013, pp. 77–94.

Strychacz, Thomas. "Dramatizations of Manhood in Hemingway's *In Our Time* and *The Sun Also Rises*". *American Literature*, vol. 61, no. 2, 1989, pp. 245–260.

---. *Hemingway's Theaters of Masculinity*. Louisiana State University Press, 2003.

Thompson, Edward H. "Images of Old Men's Masculinity: Still a Man?" *Sex Roles*, vol. 55, 2006, pp. 633–648.

Vandello, Joseph A., and Jennifer K. Bosson. "Hard Won and Easily Lost: A Review and Synthesis of Theory and Research on Precarious Manhood." *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, vol. 14, no. 2, 2013, pp. 101–113.