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Testimony of Trauma: Ernest Hemingway’s Narrative Progression in *Across the River and into the Trees*

Kathleen Robinson

ABSTRACT

Specifically, the study of the progression focuses on examining Hemingway’s *Across the River and into the Trees* for evidence of traumas’ effects on Hemingway’s development of narrative structure. Throughout his career, Hemingway pinpoints the importance of witnessing and experiencing war on a writer. I endeavor to demonstrate—in detail, achieved by close reading, and with solid evidence—how the imbrication of trauma in *Across the River and into the Trees* represents a vital moment in Hemingway’s progression as a writer. My assertion, a new calculus of subjectivity and objectivity appearing in the narrative structure via the protagonist, viably counters previous critical dismissal of this text and offers new horizons for studies of form and content in Hemingway’s writing.
Introduction: Hemingway’s Narrative Progression

Following Ernest Miller Hemingway’s death in 1961, many critics concentrate on making explicit what they see in his texts. However, few critics focus their critical eyes on the study of Hemingway’s *Across the River and into the Trees* (ARIT) (1950). Hemingway’s problematic text has languished in relative obscurity, most often cast simply as the novel that chronologically prefigures Hemingway’s *The Old Man and the Sea* (1952) and follows the successful reception of *The Sun Also Rises* (1926) and *A Farewell to Arms* (1929). However, the study of Hemingway’s ARIT, often avoided as it is one of the problematic texts in the Hemingway canon, can refine and engage the study of Hemingway’s fiction. In fact, critical study of ARIT reveals necessary and previously unexamined components of Hemingway’s work. The study of Hemingway’s ARIT exposes the merits of the text and illuminates issues important to understanding the narrative progression occurring in Hemingway’s fiction.

Hemingway’s ARIT (1950) illustrates a narrative progression in the work that references his desire, verbalized in 1933. Hemingway observes that his goal in writing fiction is to achieve success at “the hardest thing in the world”—“to
write straight honest prose on human beings” (Hemingway *By-Line* 183).\(^1\) As such, Hemingway’s development in ARIT reveals aspects of this progression, which appear in even in his early fiction. Hemingway’s writing progresses from his short story character Nick Adams (1925), who evolves into Jake Barnes in *The Sun Also Rises* (1926),\(^2\) which leads to the generation of Frederic Henry *Farewell to Arms* (1929). In the development of these three early figures, Hemingway reflects a progression in the narrative tension between the exterior world and the interior world showcased in the character’s narrative position. In Hemingway’s narratives, an exterior world of violence and uncertainty is juxtaposed with an interior world of struggle and desire for knowledge illustrated

\(^1\) I discovered Hemingway’s ARIT as I was completing my Ph.D. coursework and even though, I felt versed in Hemingway’s work, I was startled when I read the novel. As I had been exposed to multiple layers of literary theory and thought, I struggled to read the text and to see something theoretically meaningful in the text. Yet the text resisted my efforts to apply any one type of reading to it. Instead, the text seemed, much like Edmundson’s view, to make explicit what was implicit within the pages of the novel, both in regards to the protagonist Cantwell’s progression in the novel and Hemingway’s progression of thought in the text. As I examined the text, my thoughts were focused on how Hemingway constructed the protagonist, Richard Cantwell. The novel focuses on Cantwell coming to terms with the various events that he has experienced, most of these experiences have war and trauma as central tenets. Many intersections arise between Cantwell, the character, and Hemingway, the author. As I continued my exploration, I become more aware of how Cantwell achieves an understanding that is different than the awareness in the other Hemingway protagonists. Hemingway creates a different type of progression in Cantwell, a progression that focuses on reaching understanding by coming to terms with trauma. ARIT is, as Hemingway expressed, a novel that focuses not on the war and fighting, but instead exploring the areas beyond the actual scenes of violence. Returning to a position he had assumed in his first novel *The Sun Also Rises*, Hemingway sets forth to create a novel that placed the violence and fighting “offstage as in Shakespeare” (Baker *Hemingway: A Life Story* 476). With the action offstage, the novel focuses on Cantwell’s *remembrances* of war, trauma, and in essence, his life.

\(^2\) *The Torrents of Spring* i.e. technically Hemingway’s first novel, though *The Sun Also Rises* is his first major success. The novel relates the tale of the intersecting lives of World War I veteran Yogi Johnson and writer Scripps O’Neill, both of whom work at a pump factory. Both are searching for the perfect woman. O’Neill takes mescaline and hallucinates that he is President of Mexico. Johnson is cured of his impotence when, viewing a naked squaw, he is overcome by "a new feeling" which he immediately attributes to Mother Nature, and together he and the squaw "light out for the territories.” The hero of this novel suffers from impotence, while the hero of *The Sun Also Rises* suffered from an un-described war wound that prevented intercourse. Many of Hemingway’s short stories from this period (such as *God Rest Ye Merry Gentlemen*) also treat themes of sexual dysfunction.
by the protagonists of his fiction. For instance, the figures of Adams, Barnes, and Henry appear as characters oscillating between the search for epistemological order and the awareness of the lack of ontological certainty.

Scholars continue to value this dichotomy of narrative in the study of fiction. For example, analysts, including Thomas Strychacz in “In Our Time, Out of Season” suggest that Hemingway’s early figures and his narratives represent an anatomization of “war, bullfighting, and crime” in a narrative structure with “the tautness and compression of an imagist poem” (58). Under the lens of scholars including Strychacz, Hemingway’s early narrative structures encapsulate a progression of the tension between the uncertain exterior and the compressed interior. As such, the narrative structure in Hemingway’s early prose develops and presents a new and evolved narrative presence in his later fictions.

Many writers of the modern period (1910-1945), in which Hemingway is prolific, address the tension between a fragmented inner self and a menacing and often unknowable exterior world. Writers echo the psychic discrepancy in an incongruity in narrative style between the treatment of internal and external events evoked in their texts. The critic and reader of the period’s texts, including Hemingway’s works, confront a tension between narrative style and internal and external subject matter not present in the earlier fiction of the nineteenth century.

---

3 The designation of modern and modernism in literary studies is an oft-contested term, yet as Trudi Tate observes, the term(s), “remains a useful description of writings which were self-consciously avant-garde or attempting to extend the possibilities of literary form in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries” (2).
Tension between the presentation of subjectivity and objectivity in twentieth century narratives creates a dichotomy between thinking, feeling subjects and perceived objects of experience. The emphasis on narrative tension appears as modern authors attempt to speak from within and in observation of another person’s consciousness. This emphasis is the kind of tension that permeates and defines the modern literary canon. Modern authors knew that capturing this tension requires a move beyond dialogue or narrative summary. These authors sought a narrative style that captures the complexity of human relations and consciousness that arises in the tension between interiority and exteriority. The form for exploring the complexity in the narratives often involves a reference to the psychoanalytic as the dichotomy between subjectivity and objectivity is explored in the fiction.

Hemingway’s narrative style involves terse sentences, simple-sentenced phrases, and a dearth of adjectives and adverbs. His style is often understood by critics as implying that Hemingway privileges a focus on the concrete details conveyed in the narrative versus a more omniscient and omnipresent illustration of events and actions. However, accepting this limited focus dismisses Hemingway’s various attempts to capture, in his narratives, “the actual things [...] which produced the emotion that you experienced” (Hemingway Death in the Afternoon 2). Hemingway, echoing the desires of his peers appearing in narrative structures of texts by William Faulkner, James Joyce, and Virginia Woolf, wants to move beyond mere recordings of life in his narratives. For Hemingway and other authors of the period, the structure of the narrative
appears as a place for exploring the interiority and exteriority of experience without adhering to traditional didactic narrative representations of experience.

Hemingway appears to have an artistic, creative desire to create prose that reflects the inner reactions of his characters as they experience external objects of the world. Similarly, the individual’s confrontation of situations of extreme tension in the narratives of the time illustrates a crisis of the modern period. In Hemingway’s narrative embodiment of this confrontation, the external stimuli experienced, Hemingway’s “actual things,” are captured through his targeted prose style. Yet, his narrative structures still invoke a sense of interiority in the presentation of the tension. As such, Hemingway’s narratives inquire into the tension between the representation of the true “gen” and various correlating exterior events, objects, and actions. Hemingway’s narrative progression in his fiction illustrates his changing understanding of this inquiry.

**Interiority and Exteriority in Hemingway**

As Hemingway’s style evolves, his fiction begins to offer more insight into the manner in which characters perceive themselves. In this fashion, the narrative structures explore the interior landscape of his characters as they react to the experiences encountered. Later Hemingway characters such as Harry Morgan in (1937) *To Have and Have Not*, Robert Jordan in (1940) *For Whom the Bell Tolls*,

---

4 The changed landscape of modernity offers no reassuring sense of order nor firm models for society or the individual. Modernist writing references the disruption of order from the previous condition. Vincent Sherry suggests the writers of this time make claims of difference to the preceding conventions, to the way “things were” in their fiction (*Cambridge Companion to the Literature of World War I*) 6.
and (1950) Richard Cantwell in ARIT highlight an interiority of experience. In THHN, Hemingway portrays Harry Morgan in this fashion; “I was thinking to myself that this Johnson had fished for fifteen days, finally he hooks into a fish [...] he loses him, he loses my heavy tackle [...] and he sits there perfectly content” (22). On the narrative’s surface, Morgan’s thoughts reflect the experience of fishing, but Morgan’s thoughts also hint at an attempt to address the larger questions of his interior existence.

For Hemingway’s Morgan, fishing is not just an experience; it is the means by which he procures both his livelihood and his identity. In the narrative, Morgan cannot reconcile the lack of feeling or emotion in relation to the loss of the fish and the tackle. The questions of interiority posed by the later Hemingway figures of Jordan, Morgan, and Cantwell wrestle with larger concerns such as “what is the purpose,” “what have I accomplished,” and “what is happening to me” in reference to their interactions with the external world. The struggle in Hemingway’s later fiction illustrates a transition engaging both exteriority and interiority within Hemingway’s characters and his narrative structures. For the later figures, the wrestling between exteriority and interiority illustrates an opportunity, represented in the narrative structure, to reconcile the two positions.

Hemingway’s character evolution within his narrative chronology introduces a cautionary fascination with the expression of interior thought in his later literary figures. Interior expressions of thought and thinking in Hemingway’s early fiction are often viewed as both a source of worry for characters as well as
a source of remembrance. Robert Evans argues that recollection earlier memories/experiences in Hemingway is avoided in his early characters, as recollection presents characters engaging in “the recall of past and hence unalterable experience with its charge of unalterable pain” (Waldron Ernest Hemingway 118). As such, narrative representations of thought and thinking are severely limited in early Hemingway fictions. Hemingway’s later characters, however, wrestle with the narrative expression of interior recollections and questions, hoping to achieve awareness that life offers a sense of stability and totality. Throughout his fiction, Hemingway’s characters’ awareness is that life is a ceaseless flux of dissociated impressions, unwelcome memories, often-unsatisfied desires, and ultimately, fear and pain. However, the narrative treatment of this awareness evolves in Hemingway’s fiction. This evolution illustrates a different narrative approach to interiority and exteriority in his fiction.

Hemingway’s narrative structural realizations are not new—characters had faced trauma in narratives before Hemingway’s fiction and the modern period. Understanding of trauma in the late eighteen hundreds and early nineteen hundreds references the work of J.M Charcot, Pierre Janet, Alfred Binet, Morton Prince, Josef Breuer, and Sigmund Freud who suggest that trauma describes the wounding of the mind brought about by a sudden, unexpected emotional shock.\(^5\) This understanding of trauma, however, did not solely appear in the fiction of the time. In fact, trauma is a dominant figure in literature throughout the canonical

\(^5\) See Ruth Leys Trauma: A Genealogy “Introduction” for a historical perspective on the defining of the term.
and non-canonical literary continuum. However, the treatment of trauma in narrative form evolves in correlation to the study of trauma in the early twentieth century. Fiction writers use psychoanalytic explorations and ideas in their inquiry into representing modern life in narrative form.

Specifically, Hemingway’s narrative progressions reference that preexisting structures, which provide meaning to the world, are decayed in the various traumas of the modern ethos. Hemingway appears to craft this awareness in ARIT’s narrative presentation of Richard Cantwell. The narrative observes Cantwell’s interior thought process; “no one of his other wounds had ever done to him what the first big one did. I suppose it is just the loss of the immortality, he thought. Well, in a way, that is quite a lot to lose” (ARIT 39). In this passage, Hemingway’s narrative reflects on internal affects of an external experience on the figure of Cantwell. The narrative structure of ARIT explores the wounding of the mind and the concomitant causes of the various emotional shocks experienced by Cantwell. The narrative shares many such reflections throughout the narrative of ARIT. Throughout Hemingway’s novel, the structure of the narrative attempts to explore and to locate meaning in the flux of Cantwell’s experience—interior and exterior—of trauma.

In the modern external climate of war and trauma, where death and questions of immortality present the greatest mystery, all of Hemingway’s characters face this conundrum in a narrative state of isolation, confusion, and anxiety. In this state, the presentation of external factors contributes to establishing a sense of the present in the narrative. As such, the narratives deal
in the presentation of time as occurring correspondingly to the events in the texts. The narrative presentation of the experience of trauma, in these narratives, focuses on the event not on the effects of the wounding. In Hemingway’s narrative structure, the individual experience of these traumatic events engages character reactions, who are unable to construct a recognition of the effects of trauma on the individual character. The characters are presented as understanding the immediate experience of trauma, but the characters are not illustrated as being able to construct an understanding of the effects of trauma. However, in the narratives, a hope for the eventual recognition of the effects appears—this hope is intimated by Cantwell’s recognition of his loss in the prior passage. This hope, however, does not result in an end to alienation or an end to the fear for the characters in the narratives. Instead, this hope for the understanding of the effects of trauma illustrates the opportunity for the generation of meaning for the characters in Hemingway.⁶

Memory in Hemingway

The narrative presentation and treatment of memory represents an achievement for the characters in Hemingway’s later fiction. Prior to Hemingway’s second-to-last published novel ARIT, Hemingway’s protagonists do not engage with

---

⁶ In the moments of insight and flashes of meaning occurring in the narrative structure, Hemingway’s characters present a realization that something has been discovered in relation to the experience of trauma. This something is the understanding that the character can at least remember elements of the traumatic experience even if this remembrance cannot reconcile completely the effects of the experience. Elaine Scarry notes of trauma and memory that, “without memory, our awareness would be confined to an eternal present and our lives would be virtually devoid of meaning” (Memory, Brain, and Belief 1). In this context, Hemingway’s later narrative structures focus on the characters’ ability to experience remembrance. The narrative operates as a method for understanding one’s interior self in reference to the exterior world of experience.
memories as much as they participate in the actual experience. In the early 1920s, Hemingway’s Nick Adams experiences the pain of maturing in the face of family and national strife. The Nick Adams’ narratives eschew memory in the place of experience. In 1926, Jake Barnes encounters the experience of war, wounding, and emasculation. The narrative of The Sun Also Rises focuses on attempting to avoid remembering by active involvement with experience not memory. Hemingway’s focus on experience instead of memory also appears in The Sun Also Rises as Jake Barnes is constantly trying “not to think about it” (39, 103, 152-153). In 1928, Frederic Henry meets the experience of war wounding, survival, and loss. In A Farewell to Arms, Hemingway crafts Fredric Henry as a wounded ambulance driver who tries always to “say outside of [his] dreams” (88) and his memories. Hemingway’s early narratives involve characters who all experience with a limited focus on remembrance. In his early narrative structures, Hemingway’s character’s ability to remember illustrates a tension between the representation of exterior actions and internal understandings.

Hemingway’s early narratives and characters experience war and the subsequent traumas of war as an exterior event. In fact, E.R. Hagemann speaks of this thread in Hemingway’s fiction stating that, “The Great War and its aftermath were, collectively, the experience of his generation, the experience that dumped his peers and his elders into graves, shell-holes, hospitals, and onto gallows” (Benson New Critical Approaches 192). As such, Hemingway’s narratives imbue in his early characters a proximity to the war experience. However, Hemingway’s later narratives feature protagonists who still experience
war, but these narratives engage an additional focus on memories of prior war experiences.

Hemingway’s later figure of Robert Jordan in (1940) FWBT, while fighting with the guerillas in the Spanish hillside, remembers moments of past conflicts in conjunction with his current experiences. In the narrative, Hemingway intersperses memory with experience as Jordan, preparing for an attack, urges himself to, “remember” (336). Likewise, Hemingway’s Harry Morgan in THHN, running and rambling from the law and others, recollects on his past and his present—“Well I got something to think about now all right. Something to do and something to think about besides wondering what the hell’s going to happen” (107). Although memories of war are present in these later narratives, Hemingway’s Jordan and Morgan still maintain an immediate focus on experiences occurring in the chronology of the narrative.

By the time Hemingway in the late nineteen forties constructs the narrative of Richard Cantwell In Across the River and Into the Trees, the male protagonist remembers more than he experiences. In this late narrative, the figure of Cantwell appears in the text and observes that, “Remember your good friends and remember your deads. Remember plenty things and your best friends again and the finest people that you know” (34). This passage of the work illustrates a shift in the role of memory in the narrative structure of Hemingway’s fiction. Hemingway’s narrative structure in ARIT focuses on Cantwell’s telling and re-
telling of his experiences and less on the actual portrayal of these experiences in
the narrative.

In fact, Horst Oppel observes of the changed narrative structure in ARIT
that, “Cantwell tells of his war experiences. [...] Hemingway has here
transformed an experience into art” (Baker Hemingway and His Critics 221).
Hemingway’s narrative structure focusing on Cantwell’s recollections exposes
structural commonalities with Hemingway’s previous protagonists. Yet unlike
other Hemingway’s narrative protagonists, the figure of Cantwell appears
concerned with remembering more than experiencing in the structure of the
narrative. As such, the narrative presentation of Cantwell is much different than
then narrative presentation of earlier Hemingway heroes. Hemingway’s narrative
structure places Cantwell as no longer solely being a figure who privileges the
experience as the portal of hope in acquiring a certainty of knowledge. Instead,
Hemingway’s narrative places Cantwell as a character who illustrates the
understanding that in the modern narrative ethos (the philosophy and ideology of
a specific culture), recollection and memory operate as a narrative method for
presenting the understanding of the interior self in reference to the exterior world
of experiences in the fiction.

In the narrative structure of ARIT, Hemingway portrays Cantwell as a
figure coming to terms with a lifetime of memories of war experiences.
Hemingway constructs the figure of Cantwell as a narrative portrait of “three
men” who operates as the picture of “a highly intelligent fighting man deeply
embittered by experience” (Baker *Hemingway, the Writer as Artist* 475). In the narrative, the figure of Cantwell, as a military figure, is defined by both his experiences of war trauma and his memories of the trauma of war. In the narrative, Cantwell engages in the act of remembering his experiences. Cantwell’s remembering occurs in the present of the narrative. His memories are punctuated by the interaction with the remembrance of trauma. Hemingway creates a story and a character not solely defined by actions experienced but instead structured through memories and traumas re-experienced.

In the structure of the narrative, the figure of Cantwell appears as not experiencing events in the chronology of the narrative; instead, the figure operates through the act of remembering. For example during a conversation with another figure in the novel Contessa Renata, Cantwell speaks of his past experience of war. In the passage, the figure observes that, “First you fight to take a town that controls all the main roads […] then you have to open up the roads by taking other towns and villages” (ARIT 125-126). In this passage, the narrative structures showcase the figure of Cantwell through the narrative experiencing of the figure’s memories of war in a conversation that appears to occur in the present chronological framework of the novel. Hemingway’s narrative presentation in Cantwell illustrates a giving narrative voice and point of view to remembrances of experiences in war without solely focusing on the experiences. Through the act of remembrance, the figure of Cantwell attempts to come to terms with the trauma of war that defines him.
Hemingway’s narrative representations of memory and remembering in ARIT imbricate to create a point of view in the protagonist that differs from Hemingway’s prior points of view. For example, in the narrative, the figure of Cantwell remembers that, “That was the day before yesterday. Yesterday, he had driven down from Trieste to Venice along the old road […] he relaxed [and] looked out all this country he had known when he was a boy” (ARIT 21). The point of view established in the figure of Cantwell is not one that is simply concerned with the experience i.e. being in it nor merely concerned with thinking about the experience. This protagonist oscillates in this narrative structure between the two representations and, thus, creates the idea, as E.M. Halliday expresses, that external action is inadequate to internal meaning in the structure of the narration (174-175). In the narrative, the presentation of Cantwell’s memories and the understanding of the effects of war are more important then a textual preoccupation with exploring his actual experiences of war trauma. A Cantwell figure relies on the importance of memory to make sense of his world. Thus the narrative structure of ARIT presents a character type who appears as a post-war protagonist who has no choice but to assume a different level of narrative presence—objectivity and subjectivity engaging a third space—when making a priori meaning.

**Evolving Subjectivity in Hemingway**

In early Hemingway narrative structures appearing in the period roughly between 1920 and 1935, the protagonist is subjected to trauma. In fact in Hemingway’s earliest narratives, the dominant figure/voice of Nick Adams is the object of
other’s actions—his mother’s, his father’s, and his friends and lovers. In the structure of the early narratives, Hemingway constructs the Nick Adams figure/voice as being the object of trauma. In (1927) “Ten Indians,” Nick Adams is objectified by his father’s statement that Adam’s girlfriend Prudie has been in the woods “threshing around” with another boy. In response, Adams proclaims that, “my heart’s broken” (Hemingway *The Complete Short Stories* 256-257). Adams’ statement implies that some one else has broken his heart, and, thus, the figure of Adams is not in charge of his own subjectivity. Jake Barnes, in SAR, is the object of other’s actions—Brett’s, Cohn’s, and even Romero’s. Jake Barnes is presented as being at the whim of Lady Brett Ashley; Barnes opines that, “I never would have had any trouble if I hadn’t run into Brett when they shipped me to England” (SAR 39). Shortly after this thought, Barnes starts “to cry” (SAR 39). The narrative point of view in SAR showcases Barnes as being the object of other’s experiences. In AFTA, Frederic Henry is the object of other’s actions—the enemies’, Catherine’s, and even the Italian army. In the narrative of AFTA, Hemingway portrays members of the Italian army who are looking for dissenters. In the structure of the novel, these figures confront Frederic Henry; following this confrontation, the Italian soldiers proclaim in reference to dissenters like Henry that they will, “shoot him if he resists” (Hemingway *AFTA* 222). In this novel, the figure of Henry is presented in the narrative as being the object of the cruel, exterior world. Hemingway’s early figures—Adams, Barnes, and Henry—all experience trauma predominately as an object in the structure of the narrative.
As Hemingway journey as a writer of fiction progresses roughly during the period between 1935 and 1960, the protagonist of his narratives increasingly subjects others to trauma. Robert Jordan in FWBT objects others—his enemies and Maria—to trauma. Hemingway's Jordan observes that, “there was nothing to be gained by leaving them alone” (163). Subsequently, Jordan is compelled to impose himself upon the guerillas’ activities. The narrative point of view in FWBT concentrates on Jordan as operating as a subject who informs the experiences of others. In THHN, Harry Morgan objects—his mates, his wife, and others—to violence. Morgan’s wife, Marie, expresses the pain Morgan has caused stating that, “Everytime I see his goddamn face it makes me want to cry” (Hemingway 128). Morgan is presented in the narrative as a figure who has the ability to subject others to experiences of pain and suffering. In fact simply put,  

7 Hemingway’s ARIT references earlier characters and narratives. Alfred Kazin in a 1950 review of ARIT asserts, “The Colonel [Cantwell] is all the Hemingway prizefighters, hunters, drinkers, and soldiers in one” (Meyers Hemingway: The Critical Heritage 379). Understanding Cantwell and ARIT require a sense of memory and reference to the characters and narratives that have come before. Thus, like Hemingway’s portrayal of Cantwell in ARIT, the reader’s focus is on remembering. This focus showcases the necessity of closely examining the novel not from any one theoretical lens but instead focusing on conducting a Hemingway-esque read of Hemingway. Hemingway, notably upset by the poor reception of the ARIT, argues in a letter to Charles Scribner on Sept. 9, 1950, “a man without education nor culture, nor military experience naturally can’t understand the book nor the girl, nor the Colonel, nor Venice” (Baker Selected Letters 713). In this letter, Hemingway intimates the necessity of understanding his work in relation to implicit elements of education, culture, military, gender, and geography. Hemingway’s focus on understanding highlights the importance of explicating a text, and this text through one’s understanding not one understanding. Hemingway takes fault with those who dismissed ARIT because they felt it did not reflect on his abilities or on his previous texts. Writing to Robert Cantwell, Hemingway proclaims,  

Book is truly good. You pan it to hell if you don’t like it. That is your right and duty. But I have read it 206 times to try and make it better and to cut out any mistakes or injustices and on the last reading I loved it very much and it broke my fucking heart for the 206th time. This is only a personal reaction and should be dis-counted as such. But have been around quite a while reading and writing and can tell shit from the other things […] But pan it, ride it, or kill it if you should or if you can (Baker Selected Letters 711). Hemingway’s admonishments to Robert Cantwell reflect the intensity and precision he felt required not only in the writing and construction of this text but also in the reading and understanding of ARIT.
Hemingway’s later figures experience trauma as a subject—not as an object. As Hemingway’s character development progresses in correspondence with the evolution of his narrative structures, the protagonists shift from being objects experiencing trauma to being subjects creating trauma. Richard Cantwell, as one of the late Hemingway protagonists, engages these two aspects in the narrative. In ARIT, Cantwell is subjected to trauma, but he also objects others to trauma. Cantwell, as a protagonist, is compelled to fill both roles. Cantwell represents a progression for the Hemingway hero, as he is not only an object or subject of trauma in the structure of the narrative.

In ARIT, Hemingway’s Richard Cantwell is created in a play involving subjectivity and objectivity. The structure of the novel balances the objective, impressionistic exterior act of remembering with the subjective, expressionistic interior accessing of memory. Hemingway’s implementation of this balance and play engages what he calls a “narrative calculus.” His implementation calls attention to the narrative structure in relation to the structures of his prior fictions. The dialectic play between subjectivity and objectivity in the above balance is not created by a bifurcated equation. The balance is not simply the inner reconciliation of the outer experience appearing in the narrative structure. Instead, the balance occurs in the play involving the two: the inner and the outer, the experience and the thought, and the remembering and the memory. Thus, the narrative structure of ARIT creates a calculus of subjectivity and objectivity centering around the interrogation and integration of trauma in the work.

**Narrative Structure in Hemingway**
Ernest Hemingway is noted for his precision; his desire is to write a text that is crisp and compact while retaining power and presence. In fact, one of the most attributed Hemingway quotes reflects his desire for narrative precision. Hemingway states that his goal in creating structures of fiction is to—“Write the truest sentence that you know” (A Moveable Feast 12). However, Hemingway’s precision is often understood as a sparseness of emotion and feeling which Hemingway himself did not subscribe value to in his writing. In fact, while privileging a precision in the craft of writing, Hemingway also values the ability of prose to convey feelings. Hemingway observes that he is “trying in all my stories to get the feeling of the actual life across” (Baker Selected Letters 153).

Hemingway embodies in his fiction not overt emotionality but instead a precise portrayal of “the actual things which produced the emotion that you experienced” (DTA 2). In his narratives, Hemingway works to convey the emotion produced by the “actual things” diligently. He wants his texts to capture all sides of the experience portrayed and to transfer the emotion of the writer completely to the reader (Baker Selected Letters 778). To attain these mechanizations in his

---

8 Hemingway’s methodology of writing is also the method that he seeks to support as a tactic of reading. Hemingway proscribes a method of close reading and engagement with a text8. He looks for originality and fidelity to an experience as a marker of a good text, and Hemingway senses the ability of a text to convey emotion and life so powerfully that the text changes the reader (see A Moveable Feast 133-134). Hemingway’s notions of writing and reading take into account many understandings, but all focus on the intersection of precision and emotion in a text. Many scholars have focused on studying Hemingway’s precision, through his use of language, his application of rhetoric, his references to history, and his interrogation of his experiences, or studying his emotion, through the appearance of psychoanalytic markers, the reference of biographical experiences, and the presentation of gender and identity. However, many attempts to examine Hemingway’s work from these critical perspectives seek to proclaim—“here it is, I have discovered the key to understanding Hemingway.” While most of these perspectives illuminate a certain aspect or aspects of Hemingway’s work, they accomplish this through the extolling of one major perspective often at the denigration of other perspectives. Hemingway’s adherence to precision and to emotion encompasses a variety not a singularity, and as such, his
narratives, Hemingway engages an evolving methodology of precision and emotion.

ARIT differs from Hemingway’s other works, a conclusion noted by Hemingway. In a 1950 interview with Harvey Breit, Hemingway states in regards to the complexity of his new narrative structure that he has, “moved through arithmetic, through plane geometry and algebra, and now I am in calculus” (reprinted in Trogdon 274). Hemingway’s observations about ARIT focus on the progression that he feels this novel takes from his earlier works. In this quotation, Hemingway is not dismissing his previous texts, his previous narrative structures, or his previous protagonists. He is simply suggesting that this novel embodies a progression in the structure of his fiction. Similarly, James Meredith observes that, “the narrative effect of this literary alteration is a calculus of increasing subjectivity and expressionism, as evidenced by the inclusion of Hemingway’s own words” (War and Words 209). Subsequently, ARIT’s narrative structure embraces a style different from Hemingway’s prior narrative structures.

Calculus is the study of the change of space and time. Hemingway’s stance or position, appearing in his statement to Briet, that he “is now in calculus” method for reading and for writing when applied to the study of his texts focuses on close reading and appreciation of the structure and intense interrogation and involvement with the emotion conveyed in the text. He embodies both explicitness and implicitness. Hemingway’s work in ARIT requires this type of understanding. While it is easy enough to suggest that the work can be understood as a psychoanalytic study of a man in the last portion of a relatively violent and chaotic life, this implicit reading would be accomplishing only to push another of Hemingway’s works into the psychoanalytic box of thought. The importance of my work, thus, is not to simply suggest: here is Hemingway’s ARIT and here are the assumptions and methods for reading and categorizing the text within the Hemingway canon. This type of reading is the one that Hemingway resists with this text and his other texts. Hemingway’s work and methods instead advocate the need for precision, dedication and diligence on the part of the reader.
references the various treatments of space and time in his narrative structures. In the period between 1920-1935, Hemingway’s narrative “geometry” connects to his presentation of objects in space appearing in his earlier narratives. For example, in the (1925) “Chapter Five” interchapter of In Our Time, the narrative is structured in relation to the objects perceived in space. In this section of In Our Time, Hemingway writes that, “there were pools of water in the courtyard. There were wet dead leaves on the paving of the courtyard. It rained hard” (IOT 51). In this section, Hemingway captures the objective shapes of an experience in the narrative. The passage highlights the geometric structure of Hemingway’s early narrative structures in its adherence to perception of the various objects by the point of view provided by the narrator. Hemingway’s early fiction focuses on the perception of objects and space by an often objective yet distanced subjectivity in the narrative structure in order to construct an understanding.

Moreover, geometry, as a narrative structure, appears in Hemingway’s impressionistic early works as means to show a story rather than to tell a story. In geometry, the narrative focuses on the impressions of objects by the characters in the text. In a sense, the narrative structure unfolds as impressions of objects perceived. In SAR, Hemingway engages the impressions experienced by Jake Barnes to produce the narrative structure. Barnes observes that, “undressing, I looked at myself in the mirror of the big armoire beside the bed. That was a typically French way to furnish a room. Practical, too, I suppose. Of

---

9 See James Nagel’s “Literary Impressionism and In Our Time” from Hemingway Review 1987 for a detailed exploration of impressionism and Hemingway’s earlier works. Nagel connects Hemingway’s impressionism with Crane’s use of the method.
all the ways to be wounded” (Hemingway SAR 38). The impressions in this passage show the story of Barnes rather than tell the story of Barnes. The sights, sounds, and objects perceived by Barnes show and represent the elements of the narrative. The fleeting impression of the shapes perceived appears more significant than the desire to catalogue and to dictate the effect and specificity of the objects experienced on the figure of Barnes or on the structure of the narrative.

In later Hemingway texts created in the period between 1935-1960, the narrative structure expands to explore the effects of time. Hemingway’s narrative “algebra” plays with the experience of events and time in the fictions. In THHN, the narrative shifts perspectives and dislocates traditional notions of time and place. In particular, Chapter Twenty-Four of THHN is written from a birds-eye view. The narrative point of view in the text enters and exits the various boats in the harbor observing that, “abroad the other yachts lying at the finger piers there were other people with other problems” (THHN 233). The objects and items are experienced in a dislocated framework with leaps and movements occurring within the structure of the narrative. The passage from THHN highlights the algebraic structure of Hemingway’s later fiction in its transcendence of time and place in the narrative.

Algebra, as a narrative structure, remains, of course, in Hemingway’s later fiction as well. In the later fiction, Hemingway conveys internal impressions and moods without solely concentrating on representing external objects and
experiences. The expressionistic tone of the algebraic structure enables the objective outer world to be expressed through the impressions of the characters in the narratives. As example, in FWBT, Hemingway’s narrative communicates the internal impressions of Robert Jordan during his encampment with the Spanish guerillas. The narrative observes of Jordan that, “He looked at his watch. By now they should be over the lines, the first ones anyway. He pushed the knob that set the second hand […] and watched it […] No, perhaps not yet. By Now. Yes. Well over by now” (FWBT 76). In this section of the work, the structure of the narrative expresses Jordan’s world as it appears to him—at one specific time and for all time. Jordan’s impressions express, through the expression of his internal thoughts with the use of a free indirect style of narration, the tension experienced. In FWBT, Hemingway’s narrative conveys events accurately, but these events are not constructed representationally. Instead, the algebraically-influenced narrative structure of the work dislocates a traditional understanding of time and space.

In Hemingway’s later works, like ARIT, his narrative calculus implies the reader understand prior narrative structures—the geometry and algebra—used in his fiction. Hemingway’s narrative structure of calculus in ARIT at once embodies and transcends these prior structures. Thus, Hemingway presents in the narrative calculus of ARIT a study of not only space and time, but also, of change. The narrative treatment of Richard Cantwell’s memories of war and trauma illustrates Hemingway’s calculus in the novel. In ARIT, Hemingway writes that, “He [Gran Maestro] and the Colonel both remembered the men who
decided that they did not wish to die; not thinking that he who dies on Thursday
does not have to die on Friday” (ARIT 61). In this passage, the external
observations of the men coalesce with the internal impressions of the narrator.
The passage illustrates the narrative’s focus on interrogating changes of space
and time in conjunction with experiences of war trauma. The narrative calculus
unfolds as the novel’s point of view examines the effect of various alterations via
the figure of Colonel Richard Cantwell. The treatment and engagement with
trauma represents the variable that enables a narrative evolution in ARIT.
ARIT’s engagement and treatment of trauma alters the space and time of the
narrative structure, and thus, the novel offers a new narrative structure to the
Hemingway canon.

**Trauma in Hemingway**

A study of change is presented in the narrative calculus of ARIT. The movement
is illustrated in the narrative structure’s focus on Cantwell’s remembrance and
memory of the war and trauma. The treatment and presentation of trauma
represents the variable that enables a change in the narrative represented in and
through the figure of Cantwell. Cantwell’s involvement with the memory of the
trauma alters his space and time. Similarly, Cathy Caruth in *Trauma: Explorations in Memory* observes that, “trauma, that is, does not simply serve as record of the past but precisely registers the force of an experience that is not yet fully owned” (151). Accordingly, when an individual experiences trauma, the individual lacks the ability to define subjectivity and objectivity: in that moment, the individual is often only concerned with his or her survival. At that moment,
there is not time to ask who (object) or what (subject) is doing this to me?\textsuperscript{10} The displacement of subjectivity and objectivity vis-a-vie trauma alters and confuses notions of space and time for an individual. Likewise, when a narrative engages trauma, the structure of the narrative references a displacement of traditional lines and positions of subjectivity, objectivity, and temporality. For example, one of the most telling lines that reference this displacement occurs at the end of the novel when the figure of Cantwell asserts that, “But we won’t think about that boy, lieutenant, captain, major, colonel, general sir. We will just lay it on the line once more and the hell with it, and with its ugly face that old Hieronymus Bosch really painted. But you can sheath your scythe, old brother death, if you have got a sheath for it. Or, he added, thinking of Hurtgen now, you can take your scythe and stick it up your ass” (ARIT 232). In this passage, the sense of the traumatic is embodied in the shifting narrative presentation that attempts to invoke the experience of war on all aspects of the protagonist.

Ernest Hemingway was intimately familiar with the confusion at the moment of physical trauma. Hemingway was wounded as an ambulance driver, injured by a self-inflicted gunshot wound (prior to the suicide), and incapacitated in numerous car, boating, and plane accidents. Hemingway’s various scars and markings represent the physical effects of his traumatic experiences on his person. In 1966, Phillip Young’s *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration* initiates

\textsuperscript{10} The term subject is taken to be one who knows and acts whereas object is taken to be one who is known and thus acted upon.
a set of theories tracing the wound in Hemingway’s fiction. Young’s focus concentrates physical wounding in Hemingway’s fiction as an analogue to his wounding in Italy. Young argues that Hemingway, in response to this wounding, creates a hero/man who is “a wounded man, wounded not only physically but as soon comes clear psychically as well” (41). Young develops the Hemingway “code” of “grace under pressure [...] the control of honor and courage in a life of tension and pain” (63). Young amalgamates Hemingway’s fictional characters’ and Hemingway’s experience of physical trauma into a code. Young privileges the wound’s physicality in Hemingway as representing a paratactic portrayal of trauma connected to Hemingway’s autobiography.

In the study of trauma, the traumatic experience is not only the physical wounding but also the witnessing and surviving of trauma. Hemingway’s journalistic experiences in both World Wars reference his roles as a spectator and survivor of trauma, as a wounded survivor in World War I and as embedded spectator in World War II. Hemingway, in his fiction, places special currency in witnessing and surviving the wounding and war experience. Hemingway views the suffering of and survival from a war wound as a credential. In AFTA, this attention is highlighted in the conversation between Frederic Henry and Ettore Moretti. In this early narrative, Henry and Moretti discuss wounds and service

---

11 It should be noted that Edmund Wilson also initiated a focus on the wound in Hemingway. Wilson’s focus is more on the psychic nature of Hemingway’s wound as being the element that constituted his art.

12 Mark Spilka, too, focuses on the wound in Hemingway, but instead of seeing the wound as a physical situation—a locatable knowledge, Spilka proposes that the wound is a marker of emotion—an instinctive and intuitive feeling, of androgyne.
with Moretti declaring that, “I’d rather have them [wounds or wound stripes that designate times wounded] than medals” (Hemingway AFTA 121). The conversation in AFTA illustrates the importance of the wound—both physical and mental, in Hemingway’s fiction and biography.

However, Hemingway’s attention to the wound in his fiction does not solely focus on the experience and effects of the physical or mental wound. Robert O. Stephens in Hemingway’s Non-Fiction: His Public Voice states that, “the real Hemingway at war was not so much an interpreter or even reporter of events and moods, but renderer of the sensations of war” (100). Stephens’ view captures an aspect of Hemingway’s biography that influences his fictional presentation of the war, wound and trauma—the sensations. Hemingway in his fiction renders the sensations of war and trauma as a physical feeling resulting from direct contact, as the capacity to have such feelings, and as an inexplicable awareness and impression. Hemingway’s tripartite expression of the sensation of war and trauma is captured in Hemingway’s short vignette “A Natural History of the Dead” appearing in Death in the Afternoon. In this story, Hemingway creates a naturalistic picture of the sensations of war. The point of view in the narrative relates that, “it was in this cave that a man whose head was broken as a flower-pot may be broken, although it was all held together by membranes and a skillfully applied bandage now soaked and hardened, with the structure of his brain […]” (Hemingway DTA 141). The observations of the man present the sensation of war trauma. The narrative captures the physical elements of trauma as the man’s head is held together. In addition, the narrative captures the
capacity to have such feelings as the head is a broken as a flower pot, and the
narrative captures the inexplicable awareness and impressions surrounding the
description of the bandage as it is described as being soaked and hardened.
Hemingway's narrative projects the sensations of trauma as wounded body, as
spectator, and as traumatized individual.

In relation to these various narrative positions, Hemingway declares that
war is the best subject for writers. He argues, in a letter to Ivan Kashkin, that not
only is war the best subject, but that capturing the events and traumas of war are
the most fruitful but also the most difficult for writers. Hemingway writes of
capturing war trauma in his narratives that, “it is very complicated and difficult to
write about truly” (Baker Selected Letters 480). Hemingway's concern with writing
“truly” about the war experiences illustrates the sense of confusion occurring
when trying to “write” trauma. Cathy Caruth, building on Sigmund Freud's
understanding of trauma, observes that trauma “is not simply … the literal
threatening of bodily life, but the fact that the threat is recognized as such by the
mind one moment too late” (Unclaimed Experience 62). Likewise, to capture
trauma in a narrative requires the structure to capture the literality of the threat
along with the corresponding textual presentation of the delayed recognition of
the threat of that traumatic event. Hemingway's proclamation and understanding
of the complexity and difficulty of writing truly about war trauma references the
difficulty of creating a narrative that captures the literality of the event along with
the delayed recognition of these threats.
Capturing the experience of trauma in a narrative involves creating a structure that represents a lack of time and recognition in the fiction. Hemingway references the difficulties in illustrating this sense of confusion and lack occurring in trauma in a letter to F. Scott Fitzgerald. Hemingway observes that, “it [war] groups the maximum of material and speeds up the action and brings out all sorts of stuff that normally you have to wait a lifetime to get” (Baker Selected Letters 176-77). Even though Hemingway places war as the best subject for writing, he concurrently remains prescient of truly capturing the shocks of war that disrupt action and understanding in a narrative. In *Men at War*, Hemingway recollects his wounding and survival in World War I. He observes in the introduction to this work that, “you are badly wounded the first time [and] you lose that illusion and you know it can happen to you” (xii). This experience of personal trauma draws attention to the illusory understanding and structure that is affected in the experience of trauma in war. Attempting to create a narrative that involves this experience requires the appropriate narrative calculus that engages and establishes a sense of shock with a sense of an awareness that changes all understanding that comes before and that will follow.

The traumatic loss of illusion, Caruth argues is, “the shock of the mind’s relation to the threat of death [...] not the direct experience of the threat, but precisely the missing of this experience, the fact that, not being experienced in time, it has not yet been fully known” (*Unclaimed Experience* 62). Narrative portrayals of this loss require a structure that embodies these qualities. For example, Hemingway captures both the absence and confusion of trauma in the
interchapter to “Chapter VII” in *In Our Time*. In this vignette, the narrative illustrates the protagonist praying during a bombardment. The section contains six lines of repetitive prayer, and then abruptly, the narrative shifts to the statement that, “We went to work on the trench and in the morning the sun came up” (Hemingway IOT 67). In the passage, a sense of loss is narrated in the face of trauma. In the story, the missing of the event and the missing of the experience create a sense of confusion and questioning. In the narrative, confusion continues to ensue as the protagonist does “not tell the girl” or “anybody” about his experiences (IOT 67). In this moment, the narrative references a sense of uncertainty in reaction to trauma in the protagonist. The protagonist’s “missing” of the experience illustrates the unknowability surrounding the experience trauma in the structure of the narrative.\(^{13}\)

**The Importance of Hemingway’s Narrative Progression**

Turbulence and confusion mark the early half of the twentieth century. Two traumatic concussions—World War I and World War II—punctuate and define the period. As a reaction to the turbulence and confusion in the shadow of the World Wars, certain stable notions of subjective and objective identity—gender, class, etc—become unhinged from previous stability in life and, thus, in fiction. The period embodies a condition of trying to make life bearable in the face of the  

\(^{13}\) After a trauma, an individual confronts a sense where “not having fully known the threat of death in the past, the survivor is forced, continually, to confront it over and over again” (Caruth 62). The survivor repeatedly confronts this “impossibility of grasping the threat to one’s own life [...] It is because the mind cannot confront the possibility of its death directly that survival becomes for the human being, paradoxically, an endless testimony to the impossibility of living” (Caruth *Unclaimed Experience* 62). The endless testimony is one of questioning and confusion, and the testimony of trauma is inscribed in the modern period, in general, and in Hemingway’s experiences and fiction, in particular.
unbearable and often times, inconceivable events of the time—of the traumas of war and wars. Hemingway’s narrative progression embodies the cultural evocation. For instance, in A Farewell to Arms, the narrative engages a sense of the condition of modern life witnessed as the protagonist of the work attempt to make sense of the effects of war trauma. In AFTA, Frederic Henry expresses his displeasure at the attempt to make the traumatic actions of war emblematic of patriotic glory and nationalistic sacredness. Henry thinks in reference to the trauma he has seen and experienced during war that, “I had seen nothing sacred, and the things that were glorious had no glory and the sacrifices were like the stockyards at Chicago if nothing was done with the meat except to bury it” (AFTA 185). The inconceivability of war trauma and the subsequent attempt to normalize this unbearable condition, captured in the narrative of FTA, illustrate the reaction to prior narrative constructions of the traumatic events of modernity.

Hemingway communicates in his narrative structures a sense of the role of trauma in crafting and creating understanding. In his works, it is as if history, suffering trauma like the individual, attempts to construct understanding in the face of surviving the ultimate threat of extinction. In fact, Paul Fussell in The Great War and Modern Memory argues that World War I, “detaches itself from its normal location in chronology and its accepted set of causes and effects to become Great in another sense—all-encompassing, all-pervading, both internal and external at once, the essential condition of consciousness in the twentieth century” (321). Similarly, Frederic Henry’s observation in Hemingway’s AFTA reflects this break in the normalcy of cause and effect. Moreover, Hemingway’s
narrative progression involving trauma appearing in AFTA references the sense of a modern consciousness stuck in the sense of an understanding occurring *one moment* too late. The ratiocinative impulse to reconcile this shock at missing the moment is indicative of the modern period and Hemingway’s evolving narrative structures.

In this historical context,\(^\text{14}\) the evolution of Hemingway’s modernist narratives of survival in the face of trauma presents a rich area for exploration. The progression of Hemingway’s narrative structures echoes the interrogation of the effects of trauma in his fiction. Hemingway states in a letter to Harvey Briet in 1956, referencing the tendency of critics to connect his writing to his personal experiences that, “It’s all trauma. Sure plenty trauma in 1918 but symptoms absent by 1928—none in Spain—37-38—none in China 40-41—None at sea, none in air, none in 155 days of combat” (Baker *Selected Letters* 867). Hemingway’s statement, “It’s all trauma,” captures the problematic essence of conducting this exploration. The traumatic experiences Hemingway encounters during World War I and II compound and contribute to shaping his aesthetic vision in his fiction. However, these biographical experiences represent not an

\(^{14}\) Modernism often is over-used to define the period between 1914 and 1945 in British and American Literature. Modern, from the Latin *modo* meaning now, just now, only and at one time, at another, is pressed into service in order to capture the period. Modernism, not to be confused with modernization (the application of technology and industrialization), centers on the art and literature appearing between roughly 1900 and 1945 that reflect the confusion and shifting ideas of the time. British modernism is much more a search and exploration of form and content; whereas, American modernism is more a search and exploration of content and structure. Due to the high percentage of Americans traveling in Europe during this time—both as ex-patriots and conscripted and voluntary soldiers—many of the ideas, forms, and critiques are shared between the two nations.
equation but instead a calculus of experience that informs his creation of narratives involving trauma.

The experience of trauma, like reading great fiction, positions one at the precipice between what is known and what is unknown. In fact, Hemingway’s narrator in *Green Hills of Africa* observes that,

[…] what a great advantage an experience of war was to a writer. It was one of the major subjects and certainly one of the hardest to write truly of and those writers who had not seen it were always very jealous and tried to make it seem unimportant, or abnormal, or a disease as a subject, while, really, it was just something quite irreplaceable that they had missed (70).

Like Hemingway’s observation from GHA, this exploration highlights the importance and influence of war and trauma on and in Hemingway’s narrative progression. Specifically, the study of the progression focuses on examining Hemingway’s *Across the River and into the Trees* for evidence of traumas’ effects on Hemingway’s development of narrative structure. Throughout his career, Hemingway pinpoints the importance of witnessing and experiencing war on a writer. I endeavor to demonstrate—in detail, achieved by close reading, and with solid evidence—how the imbrication of trauma in *Across the River and into the Trees* represents a vital moment in Hemingway’s progression as a writer. My assertion, a new calculus of subjectivity and objectivity appearing in the narrative structure via the protagonist, viably counters previous critical dismissal of this text and offers new horizons for studies of form and content in Hemingway’s writing.
The critical approach in this study is best described as a close reading of Hemingway’s *Across the River and into the Trees*. Although the study is formalistic in its adherence to the primary text, the dissertation focuses on a reading of the Hemingway’s lesser-praised ARIT as a means of understanding how his war experiences, in particular experiences of trauma, contribute to his creation of a text that is markedly different while sharing similarities with his other texts. Ultimately, the exploration demonstrates how ARIT showcases the progression in Hemingway’s writing in relation to his interrogation of trauma.

The hope is that this study in the conclusion will have highlighted the importance and influence of war and trauma on Hemingway’s progression as a writer through the exploration of Hemingway’s ARIT. This study reflects on the importance Hemingway placed on the witnessing and experiencing of war on a writer and thus, the texts created. Hemingway, himself, places a great caution on thinking “too much” about anything, but as Scott Donaldson expresses this warning “isn’t against rational thought. In Hemingway’s lexicon, to think means to worry, to suffer sorrow, to revisit in memory the site of trauma” (*By Force of Will: The Life and Art of Ernest Hemingway* xii). As my study concludes, I hope to illustrate that Hemingway’s *Across the River and into the Trees* showcases, as he reaches the end of his career and life, that Hemingway is finally able to truly think about trauma.
Chapter One: Hemingway, War, Trauma, and Texts

Ernest Miller Hemingway's birth in 1899 links his life with the chronological break between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. R.B. Kershner suggests in *The Twentieth Century Novel*, if we were simply to choose the year 1900 as a dividing line, we would discover some interesting items that hint at a large change. [...] Sigmund Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams* was published (an event symbolic of the widening importance of symbolism itself). The critic John Ruskin (Great art is the expression of epochs where people are united by a common faith and a common purpose, accept their laws, believe in their leaders, and take a serious view of human destiny) died aged and honored and Oscar Wilde died prematurely, disgraced and in exile. Stephen Crane died young and Friedrich Nietzsche died insane; both men would become far more identified with the century to come than the century in which they had lived and written. ... As for technology, the 'modern world' was rapidly taking shape. In 1900 the first zeppelin flew and the first wireless speech was sent ... a child born in 1900 would be 'born into a new world which would not be a unity but a multiple' (31-32).
Hemingway’s birth relates to Hemingway’s fiction’s relationship to the ethos of the culture. The culture, in which Hemingway participated in during his life, is rife with changes in ideology, epistemology, and ontology. Hemingway’s fiction engages the various evolutions occurring in the surrounding milieu. Entering the world at the turn of the century, Ernest Hemingway enters into a cultural consciousness resplendent with fluctuation and exploration.\(^{15}\)

During the early part of the 1900s, an accelerated degree of social and economic change occurs punctuated by two major global economic events: the depression of 1873 and the Great Depression of 1929 and two massive and global wars: World War I and II. Additionally during the first years of the new century, the focus on the individual versus the societal appears in the transition from agrarian to urban and from the universal to the individual. Ernest Hemingway, too, undergoes a transition as he longs to sacrifice his individuality for the war effort and leave the agrarian confines of Oak Park. In fact, Charles Fenton’s observations of the tension between Hemingway and his father echo the effects of societal change on the young Hemingway. As such, the imbrication of the transitory events engenders a profound evolution of the nineteenth

\(^{15}\) Consciousness, at the turn of the century, experiences a shift from faith in knowing an order to a doubting of the ability of knowing any type of true order or definition. Dennis Brown in *The Modernist Self in Twentieth-Century English Literature* observes that modernism in literature probes notions of selfhood while problematising the idea that the self could be expressed in text. Brown’s observations link with the epistemological concerns appearing in the culture. Modernism is characterized by the period’s questioning of epistemology. An individual born in this landscape, as Kershner suggests, inherits not a unity of vision but a plurality of vision in reference to understanding and locating his or her place in the world.
century’s various patterns and incidents of ethos for the culture and for Ernest Hemingway.

Ernest Hemingway’s youth captures a sense of evolutionary change as he watches as the horse-drawn buggies give way to automobiles, as the streets of Oak Park are paved and lit by electric lights, as the surrounding farms are parceled out into plots for wealthy Chicagoans to build homes, as crime infiltrates the small town born upon the nickel-fare commuter train from the city, as women achieve the right to vote and thus to participate in civic life, and as a war occurring thousands of miles away in Europe slowly encroaches into the minds of Oak Park youth, most notably into the mind and heart of the myopic Ernest Hemingway.\(^{16}\) The war in Europe bursts into the consciousness of the American public in 1917, as Woodrow Wilson, with great timidity, acquiesces to become involved in the conflict. Hemingway, expected to graduate and to attend the University of Illinois in 1917, instead senses the propitious potential for experience to aid in his desire to write, and he departs the small hamlet for the urban metropolis of Kansas City, Missouri.

In Kansas City in the fall of 1917, Hemingway writes for the *Kansas City Star* and initiates his apprenticeship in the trade of writing. The action of Kansas City only fulfills so many of Hemingway’s desires, and in the spring of 1918, Hemingway and a few others from the *Kansas City Star* staff sign on as volunteer

---

\(^{16}\) For a complete discussion of Hemingway’s early childhood see Michael Reynolds *The Young Hemingway* “Introduction: Time Was.”
ambulance drivers with the Italian Army.\textsuperscript{17} Hemingway’s desire to experience the war, in any capacity, references a generational impetus to get involved in the war effort. Hemingway’s desire reflects the growing national fervor behind the war effort. John Keegan in \textit{The First World War} observes that, “once committed to hostilities, America’s extraordinary capacity for industrial production and human organization took possession of the nation’s energies” (373). World War I, with its totalitarian global presence, represents a tragic demarcation between the experiences and ideologies of the two centuries. Hemingway’s exposure and experiences at the warfront serve to further coalesce his life and, thus, his fiction with the period.

World War I appears in the chronological landscape of both Hemingway and the culture-at-large as an event that captures a sense of revolutionary change in a bombastic fashion. Vincent Sherry in “The Great War and Literary Modernism in England” observes of World War I that, “Global in scope, shattering in its impact on national traditions as well as class structures and gender identities, this first world war scored a profound disruption into prevailing standards of value and so opened the space in cultural time in which radical artistic experimentation would be fostered” (\textit{The Cambridge Companion to the Literature of the First World War} 113). As Sherry notes and others agree, World War I initiates a profound shift in thought and action on individuals and cultures.

\textsuperscript{17} For a detailed discussion of Hemingway’s time in Kansas City see Charles Fenton’s \textit{The Apprenticeship of Ernest Hemingway}. 37
The disruption of World War I effects a profound change for the individual and the culture.

**Hemingway and the Trauma of the Early Twentieth Century**

Ernest Hemingway, in writing his fiction, engages the psychic, personal, and social trauma\(^{18}\) initiated with World War I, transacted during the Great Depression, and mobilized by World War II.\(^{19}\) Hemingway and his texts function as a barometer to the trauma experienced in the early twentieth century. His experiences, captured in prose and journalism, mirror the proliferation of war and trauma occurring in the early twentieth century at large. The traumas of war coincide and contribute to molding Hemingway’s narrative style, a style that in many ways contributes to defining the period.

The violent events and aftermath of the twentieth century beginning with WWI explode in the collective population and psyche. World War I affects the culture as it heralds a changing society with cultural conventions being subverted by death, trauma, and fear. Cathy Caruth in *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative and History*, asserts that trauma is experienced and witnessed through a "response to an unexpected or overwhelming violent event or events that are not fully grasped as they occur, but return later in repeated flashbacks,

---

\(^{18}\) "In war and peace, Hemingway was racked by disease and suffered hundred of wounds—skull fractures, concussions, internal injuries. But, as he said, ‘My luck, she is running very good.’ He survived them all, all except the last, self-inflicted wound" (Waldhorn *Reader’s Guide* 4).

\(^{19}\) "The exhaustion Hemingway feels after such ordeals is the same as he felt when he was writing fiction; in fact, it is the ‘same damn business as writing really.’ Underneath that observation lay the disturbing truth that Hemingway was never completely at ease with the idea of fiction. Like most of his contemporaries, he was raised to tell the truth, and punished for telling lies. Fiction, by definition, was telling a story not factually true; any story not true was a lie. The syllogism might be logically flawed, but emotionally it carried its weight" (Reynolds *Hemingway: 1930’s* 149).
nightmares, or other repetitive phenomena” (91). The experience of WWI, as Caruth’s definition of trauma suggests, births a tremendous response to the violence of war that is not culturally grasped as it occurs, but instead returns and effects the stories and fictions generated in its passing.

The traumatic responses of cultures to war appearing in the period’s fictions explore fundamental changes in human epistemologies and ontologies resulting from the effects of the traumas of the Great War. Celia Malone Kingsbury observes in *The Peculiar Sanity of War: Hysteria in the Literature of World War I* that, “war literature…reflects a deep pathos that grows out of the acknowledgement of human frailty and impotence in the face of communal disaster” (xx-xxi). Similarly, the epistemological frailty and ontological impotence resulting from war trauma can be seen as aftershocks in the narrative structures of Hemingway’s fiction. Hemingway’s narrative aftershocks create and establish a backdrop of war for the characters and the narratives of his work. In addition, Hemingway’s texts express, in an evolving narrative form, a response to unexpected or overwhelming violent events that are not fully grasped as they occur, but return later in repeated flashbacks, nightmares, or other repetitive phenomena in the texts. His narrative expressions embody the lack of epistemological and ontological certainty occurring in the passing of war and trauma.20

20 See Ronald Berman’s *The Loss of Certainty* for an in-depth exploration of this issue in Hemingway’s fiction.
The capturing of trauma in fiction requires that the writer attempt to engage an event or series of events that is enacted in a liminal state, outside of the bounds of traditional human understanding and experience. In this transitory state, the subject is radically ungrounded. Likewise in fictional depictions of trauma, subjectivity, objectivity, and the structure of narratives appear ungrounded. Correspondingly, Kali Tal in *Worlds of Hurt: Reading the Literature of Trauma* asserts that textual representations of trauma are “written from the need to tell and retell the story of the traumatic experience, to make it ‘real’ both to the victim and to the community” (21). For instance, Hemingway, in one of his early stories, (1925) “On the Quai at Smyrna,” reflects the effects of trauma on the narrative when the narrator speaks of the fear and death surrounding the protagonist. The story attempts to capture the story of the effects of trauma by observing in the narrative that, “the strange thing was, he said, how they screamed every night at midnight. I do not know why they scream at that time” (Hemingway *In Our Time* 11). As evidenced in this portion of the narrative, Hemingway’s early short story captures a sense of the unbearable nature of witnessing and the difficulties of telling the story of trauma. Moreover, the passage expresses an inability in understanding the screams. In addition, the screams heard by the protagonist in “On the Quai at Smyrna,” establish a sense of repetition in the face of violence, unknowable yet crushingly present.

Many of the writers of the twentieth century, like Hemingway, create texts that articulate as cultural witnesses to the traumatic events of war. In fact, Trudi Tate’s *Modernism, History, and the First World War* proposes that the fiction
created following the World War I, “attempted to bear witness to the trauma of
the war and its consequences” (1). Tate’s notion of “bearing witness” enforces
the idea that the writers who experienced the war, either as soldiers or as
witnesses, reiterated their observations and experiences of the traumatic events.
In this fashion, Hemingway’s characters, in his narrative structures, often function
as both a witness to and victim of events involving traumas. Moreover,
Hemingway’s texts construct and reconstruct a narrative landscape that is
fragmented and punctuated by violence and fear. Correspondingly, John T.
Matthews in “American Writing of the Great War” observes that, “Hemingway’s
innovative structure creates the sensation of a psychological palimpsest, in which
the barely suppressed trauma of the war deforms the conscious mind of the
survivor” (Sherry The Cambridge Companion to Literature of the First World War 234). Therefore, Hemingway’s narrative structure engages traumas and bears
witness to the atrocities of war. The structure of his narratives captures the
traumas of war while referencing the difficulties of capturing the unexpected and
overwhelming events of the trauma of war of the early twentieth century.

The beginning of the twentieth century heralds an era of crisis and change. The era resounds with moments of cultural cataclysm: economic disparity and
depression, gender shifts and upheavals, labor and class struggles, and national
and international wars and conflicts. In reference to the cataclysmic milieu of
the early twentieth century, Walter Benjamin asserts in “The Story-Teller” in 1936

Michael Levenson asserts the twentieth century holds “inescapable forces of turbulent social
modernization” that “were not simply looming on the outside as the destabilizing context of
cultural Modernism; they penetrated the interior of artistic invention” (4).
For never has experience been contradicted more thoroughly than strategic experience by tactical warfare, economic experience by inflation, bodily experience by mechanical warfare, moral experience by those in power. A generation that had gone to school on a horse-drawn streetcar now stood under the open sky in a countryside in which nothing remained unchanged but the clouds, and beneath these clouds, in a field of force of destructive torrents and explosions, was the tiny, fragile human body” (page 2 pdf). Benjamin’s “tiny fragile body” appears integrally within the evolving literary landscape. In the evolving literature of the early twentieth century, narrative structures, devices, and figures are changed and affected by the traumatic surroundings cultural experiences. In fact, the opening half of the century, as Benjamin observes, is resplendent with the overwhelming experience of trauma and war that profoundly alters the structures of literature and life.

The fiction engaging the trauma of the Great War not only references and creates from the various “bodies broken in war” but in addition, these narratives reflect the anxiety emboldened in the radical changes brought on as a result and occurring contemporaneously to the War. Michael Levenson asserts that the events of the early 1900s, “gave subjects to writers and painters, and they also gave forms, forms suggested by industrial machinery, or by the chuffing of cars, or even, most horribly, the bodies broken in war” (The Cambridge Companion to Modernism 4). As such, the concentration in modern fiction on “bodies broken in war,” observed by scholars such as Levenson, illustrates a cultural co-
contamination of war and trauma on a culture and literature already lacking stability.

The Great War of 1914-1918 encapsulates the various evolutions and anxieties occurring in culture.\footnote{World War I appears as one of the most resonant punctuation marks to the ruptures and evolutions appearing in culture. Marianne Dekoven declares the artists and writers creating during the period see, “art as the only remaining avenue to truth, meaning, value, and transcendence in the otherwise bankrupt twentieth century” (Levenson The Cambridge Companion to Modern Literature 188). Prior to World War I and following the War, a sense of unrest with and disintegration of old values are prominent in the fiction of the time. The fiction of the time embraces a search for vitality and movement towards change. The search and movement exposes a “linguistic turn” in the fiction (Bell “The Metaphysics of Modernity” 16). Michael Bell proposes that during the early twentieth century the understanding of language shifts from the predominate view of the nineteenth century realists and naturalists where language describes or reflects the world to a more modern view where language in fiction could also form the world (16). Bell’s notion of the linguistic turn in fiction positions language’s ability to reflect and to create a cultural understanding of the modern period. The word “modern” hails from the Latin word modo that means of “of one time,” “at one time,” and “at another time” (Oxford English Dictionary). The period’s designation as modern references the linguistic turn that marks fiction’s strong and conscious break with tradition as the fiction attempts to reflect “of one time” and to create “at one time.” The linguistic turn operating in the fiction also references the specific time and the historical events occurring which reflects a preoccupation with “another time.” Modern fiction, thus, both creates and reflects the time and the culture. Modern belief, bolstered by existentialist philosophy, presupposes that the world is created in the act of perception. Inherent in the modern ethos is a rejection of the narratives of realism and naturalism of the prior periods, as the modern writers reject historical and traditional values and assumptions in their fiction. The elevation of the individual and the interior landscape over the social and the exterior landscape positions narrative power with the author in constructing a text that both captures the novelty of the “time” and creates a novel understanding of the “time.”} In fact Dennis Brown observes that during the War, Western notions of selfhood transition into self-fragmentation. Brown’s observation is that this type of fragmentation and crisis of the self is reflected in the metaphors, words, and linguistic structures operating in narratives that are used to describe the effects of war. The linking of language and trauma in an unsymbiotic relationship intimates the tension between external events and internal understanding appearing in the surrounding narratives. Correspondingly, Paul Fussell in The Great War and Modern Memory argues that one of the cruxes of
war is the collusion between events and the language used to describe—albeit inadequately—the force of these events.23 As such, notions of language’s inability to capture the trauma of war emerge as a rejection of earlier realistic structures and devices appearing in pre-World War fiction.24

Narrative structures, like Hemingway’s, are overlain, like a palimpsest, on the actual occurrences of trauma during the period. For instance, Ernest Hemingway observes in AFTA that, “the world breaks everyone and afterwards many are stronger at the broken places” (249). This observation illustrates a sense of awareness of the effects of trauma that operates in Hemingway’s fiction. Hemingway’s tendency to explore these broken spots references a sense of fictional nostalgia in the aftermath of trauma in his fiction.25 In fact,

23 Paul Fussell, additionally asserts that it “was less a problem of ‘linguistics’ than of rhetoric” (The Great War and Modern Memory 170).

24 Richard Poirier in The Renewal of Literature: Emersonian Reflections asserts that, “literary modernism is the systematic pressing of a claim—made in writing and therefore in a requisite discipline of reading—that many of the anxieties which Western culture has often associated with the human condition have been immensely intensified by contemporary life. These anxieties, it is implied, were once manageable within habitual discourse; they could, as it were, be ‘talked over’ without anyone’s having to change the terms or tones by which ordinary social exchanges made sense. But under modern conditions, the argument runs, such talk has become increasingly meaningless, even to a point…where the audience finds in dialogue, at once plaintive and comic, evidences that human communication consists merely of the constantly induced desire to communicate something, anything” (97).

25 In the period, the language of fiction creates the opportunity for cultural reflection and creation. This technology of language is an act that requires a concentration on perception. Hemingway creates fiction that captures and reflects the action “of one time.” Hemingway reflects a concern with reflection and creation based on perception. In DTA, Hemingway expresses his goal as a writer is to encapsulate, “what really happened in action […] the sequence of motion and fact which made the emotion and which would be as valid in a year or in ten years or, with luck and if you stated in purely enough, always […]” (2). In this passage, his narrative reflects the sequence of motion and fact “at one time.” In addition, Hemingway creates a fictional representation that also projects “another time” in the novel.

The focus on time in Hemingway’s narrative reflects a preoccupation with the interactions between language and time. Vincent Sherry in “Liberal Measures: Language, Modernism, and the Great War” argues that war draws a line through time as projected in fiction. For Sherry, the war places the confines of the prior time and language into a suspended position. In SAR,
Hemingway’s narrator evokes this sense of the nostalgic traumatic reaction in his (1925) “The End of Something.” The narrator of the story states that, “Ten years later there was nothing left of the mill except the broken white limestone of its foundations showing through the swampy second growth as Nick and Marjorie rowed along the shore” (Hemingway In Our Time 31). The sepulchral desiccation of the mill and the surrounding landscape, in the narrative, echo the destruction of an economy, an identity, and a set of values that exist no more. In the structure of the story, the aftermath of trauma is projected onto and into Nick and Marjorie’s experiences, like a palimpsest, in and on the landscape in the story.

R.B. Kershner observes the traumatic effects of World War I on and in the fiction of the time. Kershner saliently speaks of the cultural turbidity in national and personal identity following the aftermath of the Great War. Additionally, Kershner emphasizes the fiction of the period surrounding World War I as representing a “massive disenchantment with sentimental patriotism [which] generalized itself in a feeling of rejection of the older generation’s entire set of values.”

---

Hemingway embodies this motion in Jake Barnes who does “not care what it was all about” (152). Barnes simply wants to know “how to live in it” (152). In Barnes’ edicts, a sense of reflection appears in the language. Sherry, additionally, sees the war as offering an opportunity for a tonal conceit, a new voice, and one that accounts for a verse of turning, of difference, of literary modernism (Thormahlen Rethinking Modernism 19). This voice and turn requires a creative movement. Linguistic creation also is illustrated in Hemingway’s narrative as Barnes continues, “maybe if you found how to live in it you learned from that what it was all about” (152). Hemingway, in Barnes’ perceptions, reflects and creates a sense of the aftermath of war. Hemingway’s fiction, in the sense of modern fiction, reflects and creates from the culture of the early 1900s.
values” (The Twentieth-Century Novel: An Introduction 38). The narrative structures appearing at this time, like Hemingway’s works, reference a sense of dejection with the older traditional narrative devices. This disenchantment is illustrated in the manner in which the fictions present identity as a shifting position that lacks a firm definition. In fact, Hemingway’s “The End of Something” captures a sense of the turbid notions of identity in his portrayal of Nick Adams and Marjorie.

Nick and Marjorie, who are presented as a romantic couple, argue and separate. In their arguments, the traditional roles of gender appear in question with Marjorie speaking of her knowledge—“I know it”—and acting independent of Nick—“I’m going to take the boat, Marjorie called to him. You can walk back to the point” (Hemingway In Our Time 35). The prior models of gendered behavior, like the denigrated property of the mill, proffered by the older generation no longer exist for Nick and Marjorie in Hemingway’s story. Instead, these models appear as the ideological ruins of a former time and pattern of thought that was brought low by the cultural upheaval of the period. Even without the direct mention of war and trauma, Hemingway in the narrative

---

26 See George Santayana’s Winds of Doctrine published in 1913 for a contemporary overview of these sentiments.

27 Similarly, Tiffany Joseph, who researches links between trauma and Modern Literature, in “Non-Combatant Shell-Shock: Trauma and Gender in F. Scott Fitzgerald’s Tender is the Night,” explains that for the Moderns, “trauma is not just personal, but social, and often those social roots are gendered” (79). Thus, World War I and World War II and the related trauma expose a societal structure of gender, which like the culture of the time, is undergoing reactionary ruptures and evolutions. No location illustrates these ruptures as clearly and succinctly as the shift in language and literature.
structure of the story references a sense of the effects of existing on the precipice of traumatic change and crisis.

**Perception, Subjectivity, and Trauma in Hemingway's Fiction**

Hemingway’s narrative calculus involves both reflection and creation and is balanced through perception and memory. For instance, Hemingway’s early narratives feature characters that focus primarily on the actual perception and engagement with objects and events. In Hemingway’s early short story (1927) “The Killers,” Hemingway’s Nick Adams perceives the events of Ole Anderson’s assassins. In the story, the narrator observes that, “two fellows came in and tied me and the cook, and they said they were going to kill you” (*Men Without Women* 64). As this passage in “The Killers” demonstrates, attention is paid to the exterior perception of events in the structure of the narrative. This perception does not reflect a concentration on the interior remembrance of the affects of the experiences or events in the narrative.

In his early narrative structures, Hemingway establishes characters that reflect and create an awareness of their surroundings and a perception of the world, but these characters are presented as having little focus on memory and recollection. In fact as Hemingway concludes “The Killers,” attention in the narrative shifts to avoid memory and recollection. As such, the narrative juxtaposes the exterior and the interior in an act of reflection and creation. In the story, Adams states that, “I can’t stand to think about him waiting in the room and knowing he’s going to get it” (67). To which, George, another character in the story, responds that, “you better not think about it” (67). As demonstrated in “The
Killers,” Hemingway’s early fiction concentrates on the exterior perception of trauma as survival and the interior recollection of trauma as an acknowledgement of death.

Hemingway’s fiction illustrates a narrative shift as he moves through the denial of the trauma, in his early fictions, to the recollection of trauma, in his later fictions. Correspondingly, Judith Lewis Herman, M.D. in *Trauma and Recovery* presupposes that, “the ordinary response to atrocities is to banish them from consciousness” (1). Herman observes the conflict between denial of the trauma and the desire to recollect the trauma as being the central dialectic in trauma. Herman’s observations correspond to the appearance and treatment of trauma and the effects of trauma occurring in early Hemingway narratives. In addition, Herman’s dialectic is key to Hemingway’s narrative ethos, as he moves from reflection, which captures the experiences of trauma, to creation that coruscates his memories of trauma in his narrative structure.

This dialectic appears in Hemingway’s later fictions from the period of 1935-1960, in general, and particularly in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* with the figure of Robert Jordan. In the narrative of this novel, Jordan is presenting as thinking that, “He would write a book when he got through with this. But only about the things he know, truly, and about what he knew. But I will have to be a much better writer than I am now to handle them, he thought. The things he had come to know in this war were not so simple” (248). The narrative presentation in FWBT illustrates the narrative tension between writing the events of trauma
versus engaging the memories of trauma in the narrative. Hemingway’s narrative focused on his later character Jordan, unlike the earlier presentation appearing in Adams in “The Killers,” concentrates on the experience and the recollection of trauma in the structure of the fiction.

In the various narratives, Hemingway characters progress from simply dealing with the experience of trauma to dealing with experiencing the memory of trauma. In particular, Hemingway’s Richard Cantwell from *Across the River and into the Trees* illustrates this progression. In the novel, the figure of Cantwell projects an epistemology that in the modern ethos his dialectic engagement with his memories of trauma is the only method for creating understanding. Cantwell, as he accesses his memories of war, is described by the narrator as looking “up at the light on the ceiling and he was completely desperate at the remembrance of his loss of his battalions, and of individual people” (222). Cantwell’s engagement with his memories of trauma and of one’s interior self references a reflection offered by the exterior world of experiences for the protagonist. As the passage from above concludes, the exterior world of trauma is imbricated on the interior world in the figure of Cantwell. Cantwell’s observations continue in the narrative. He observes that, “and all the wounded were wounded for life” (222). As such, the idea that an individual is wounded for life coalesces the experience of trauma with the memory and the recollection of trauma in the narrative structure of Hemingway’s ARIT.
Hemingway’s dialectic between the memory and remembering of trauma in the narrative structure of ARIT establishes a protagonist that is not simply concerned with being and reacting to the experience of trauma like earlier protagonists. Hemingway’s early protagonists maintain a focus on being in and reacting to the experience of trauma. Subsequently in these early narratives, the protagonists are shown as avoiding thinking or remembering moments of trauma. Instead, these early figures are shown as being aware of the experience but not aware of the effects of the experience. In fact, these early figures all experience trauma predominately as objects; they are subjected to trauma by other people and entities. For example in Hemingway’s (1927) “A Simple Enquiry,” the protagonist, a major, is blistered and beaten by his experiences. The major is described as a man that, “the rest of his face had been burned and then tanned and then burned through the tan” (Men Without Women 107). In the story, the battle-worn major questions his orderly, Pinin. In this questioning, the major attempts and fails to create a subject of Pinin. In the narrative, the major repeatedly confronts Pinin stating that, “and you don’t really want [...] that your great desire isn’t really—“ (Hemingway Men Without Women 109). However, Pinin will not transition to being an object. Pinin departs leaving the major “lying on his bunk” and wondering if Pinin “lied to” him (110). As such, the figure of the major is left as an object of the experience with Pinin. In this narrative,

---

28 For a detailed exploration of this story, see Gerry Breener’s selection “A Semiotic Inquiry into “A Simple Enquiry” in Susan Beegal’s Hemingway’s Neglected Short Fiction.
Hemingway constructs a figure in the major who is the object of trauma—both of the war and of the exchange between him and Pinin.

The major in “A Simple Enquiry” exists outside the normal bounds. In Hemingway’s “A Simple Enquiry,” the major’s status in the structure of the narrative reflects on his position in relation to the effects of the trauma of war. Kali Tal in Worlds of Hurt: Reading the Literatures of Trauma asserts that, “trauma is enacted in a liminal state, outside of the bounds of normal human experience, and the subject is radically ungrounded” (15). Subsequently, the major, as one of Hemingway’s earlier figures suffering from the effects of trauma, is not able to subject others to trauma. However as Hemingway’s interrogation and integration of the effects of trauma progresses in his fiction, the protagonists experience a narrative shift where the figures are no longer the objects of trauma, but instead, these protagonists become subjects who object others traumatically. In this narrative character progression, notions of protagonist subjectivity become ungrounded from traditional narrative structures and performances demonstrating the effects of the trauma of war.

In this subjective state appearing in the narrative, Hemingway’s protagonists resemble a victim of trauma who has moved to, what Jonathan Shay in Achilles in Vietnam: Combat Trauma and the Undoing of Character calls, the “berserk” stage of trauma interrogation and integration (77). Shay asserts that the berserk stage appears when an individual experiences “a special state of mind, body and social disconnection at the time of his memorable deeds” (77).
These deeds, according to Shay, are related to the experience with trauma on the battlefield. The characteristics of the state are that the individual feels “beastlike, godlike, socially disconnected, crazy, mad, insane, enraged, cruel—without restraint or discrimination, insatiable, devoid of fear, inattentive to own safety, distractible, indiscriminate, reckless—feeling invulnerable, exalted, intoxicated, frenzied, cold, indifferent, insensible to pain, and suspicious of friends” (Shay 82). During this stage, the individual shifts from being the object of trauma to operating as a subject in relation to trauma. Hemingway’s construction of his later protagonists resembles Shay’s criteria for the berserk stage as the figures shift from being objects of to subjectors of trauma.

With Harry Morgan’s actions in (1937) To Have and Have Not, Hemingway creates a figure that is subjecting others to trauma instead of being the object of trauma. Morgan, unlike the major in Hemingway’s early short story “A Simple Enquiry,” reacts without restraint in a frenzied fashion. Harry Morgan is one of the later figures making this shift from object to subject in relation to trauma and the events of trauma. In the narrative, Morgan is described as attacking Mr. Sing: “I got his arm behind him and came up on it but I brought it too far because I felt it go. When it went he made a funny little noise […] But I got him forward onto his knees and had both thumbs well in behind his talk-box, and I bent the whole thing back until she cracked. Don’t think you can’t hear it crack, either” (53-54). The figure of Morgan acts outside of normal boundaries of

29 While these adjectives have all been used to describe Hemingway before, it is interesting to note that the trajectory of trauma fits with Hemingway’s trajectory as a writer.
human experience, and as such, he occupies a space in the structure of the narrative that illustrates Hemingway’s evolving subjectivity in reference to trauma.

Hemingway’s early and later protagonists experience trauma from the subject and the object role; however Richard Cantwell, one of Hemingway’s later protagonists, engages the dialectic space between the memory and remembering of trauma and subjectivity and objectivity. Thus, Cantwell operates as a different type of protagonist in a different type of narrative structure. In fact, Cantwell is a protagonist that is not simply concerned with being and reacting to the experience of trauma like his early protagonists nor is he simply motivated to engage and create the experience of trauma on others. The figure of Cantwell appears in the narrative structure of ARIT as a figure who engages the space, previously silent between subject and object.

**Returning Remembering Home and Trauma in Hemingway’s Fiction**

Robert Hemmings in *Modern Nostalgia: Siegfried Sassoon, Trauma, and the Second World War* argues the relationship between trauma and nostalgia operates from the same liminal space as memory and forgetting in narratives. These impulses represented in narratives of trauma, according to Hemmings, are often rooted in the experience of war, and more particularly, the experience of surviving war (3). Hemmings’ exploration focuses on nostalgia as the combination of the Greek word nostos—to return home, and algos—pain (6). The sense of memory as a painful return home illustrates aspects of the relationship between memory and experience in Ernest Hemingway’s narrative
structures. In a basic sense, all of Hemingway’s narratives are concerned with and confront the pain of returning home from the arena of trauma.

Hemingway explores the tension between the pain of returning home and the pain of remembering home and self before the experience and the subsequent trauma. For instance, this tension appears in Hemingway’s (1933) “Fathers and Sons” as an older and presumably more experienced Nick Adams peripatetically wonders the country following his father’s death. The narrative structure of the story embodies the tension between the two aspects of nostalgia and memory. In the story, the figure of Adams observes that his father was “sentimental, and, like most sentimental people, he was both cruel and abused” (The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway 370). Adam’s designation of his father as “cruel” echoes a sense of present action whereas “abused” evokes a sense of memory. Nick Adams, as figure of fiction and point of voice of the narrative, comments on the connection between experience and memory in this story appearing as the last story in Hemingway’s Winner Take Nothing in 1933. In the construction of the narrative, Adams is seen as being aware of the subjective present, but he is also represented as being cognizant of the objective past.

The stories in Winner Take Nothing, as well as In Our Time and Men Without Women, are all written upon Hemingway’s return from World War I. Hemingway’s Winner Take Nothing occurs chronologically between his
experiences in World War I and World War II. Hemingway’s fictions in these collections all intimate a sense of the trauma of war measured out against the memory of this trauma. In (1927) “Now I Lay Me,” the Adams figure/voice ponders the effect of war trauma on his memories and his ability to “remember” observing in his insomniac mind that, “I tried to remember everything that had ever happened to me, starting with just before I went to the war and remembering back from one thing to another. I found I could only remember back to that attic in my grandfather’s house. Then I would start there and remember this way again, until I reached the war” (Hemingway The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway 277). The passage’s focus illuminates the importance of “remembering” in relation to Hemingway’s narratives. The remembering operating in the structure of this story serves as a means to both engage and to avoid the pain of returning home and the pain of remembering home and self before the experience and the subsequent trauma.  

30 Ernest Hemingway reflects and creates capturing the surrounding milieu and ethos. His experiences in World War I as an ambulance driver serve greatly in his early fiction. James Nagel in Hemingway in Love and War asserts Hemingway’s Italian journey was a source of material for him, and that Hemingway used nearly every aspect of the experience from the beginning of his career to the last (264). Nagel’s perspective on the pervasiveness of his experience in Italy during WWI is apparent in Hemingway’s fiction ranging from Nick Adams to Jake Barnes to Fredric Henry.

31 Psychoanalytic theorist Angelika Rauch in “Post-Traumatic Hermeneutics: Melancholia in the Wake of Trauma” posits, “trauma is less significant as an event that can be fixed at a prior date then in its posterior resubjectifications and the restructuring of the subject that is the consequence” (113).
Hemingway creates narratives that engage the psychic, personal, and social trauma\textsuperscript{32} initiated with World War I, transacted during the Great Depression, and mobilized by World War II. The evolving structure of Hemingway’s narrative structures appears as a barometer to the effects of trauma experienced in the early twentieth century. His actual experiences with trauma, captured in prose and journalism, mirror the proliferation of war and trauma occurring in the early twentieth century at large. However, the fictional adaptation of these traumatic experiences in his narratives operate to create narrative structures that reflect the experience of trauma and the effects of trauma on point of view in fiction. The traumas of war coincide and contribute to molding Hemingway’s narrative style of calculus, a style that in many ways contributes to defining the period. For example, one of the most often quoted phrases, in relation to trauma and narrative appearing in his fiction occurs in \textit{A Farewell to Arms}. In this passage, Frederic Henry appears in the narrative observing that, “I was always embarrassed by the words sacred, glorious, and sacrifice and the expression of vain” (184). This passage illustrates the burgeoning narrative calculus while functioning to define the sardonic yet honest exploration of the effects of war trauma on linguistic and narrative structures that represents the period’s literary engagement with war.

Hemingway’s narrative calculus involves both reflection and creation and is balanced through perception and memory. For instance, Hemingway’s early

\textsuperscript{32}“In war and peace, Hemingway was racked by disease and suffered hundred of wounds—skull fractures, concussions, internal injuries. But, as he said, ‘My luck, she is running very good.’ He survived them all, all except the last, self-inflicted wound” (Waldhorn Reader’s Guide 4).
narratives appearing in the period of 1920-1935 explore characters that focus primarily on the actual perception and engagement with objects and events. In these early narratives, attention is focused on the exterior perception of events in the structure of the narrative. In AFTA, the narrative predominantly focuses on the exterior, as demonstrated in the opening to chapter fifteen that states, “That night a bat flew into the room through the open door that led onto the balcony and through which we watched the night over the roofs of the town” (101). This perception, in the early narratives like AFTA, does not reflect nor privilege a concentration on the interior remembrance of the affects of the traumatic experiences or events in the narrative.

In his early narrative structures, Hemingway establishes characters that inquire into the awareness of their surroundings and a perception of the world, but these characters are presented as having little focus on memory and recollection in this inquiry. In the earlier narratives, attention in the narrative shifts to avoid memory and recollection. These earlier narratives juxtapose the present experiences through the representation of the exterior and the interior world and traumas of the characters in an act of reflection and creation. Hemingway’s early fiction concentrates on the exterior perception of trauma as survival and the interior recollection of trauma as an acknowledgement of death. Therefore, the narrative structures of his early fiction appear to privilege the survival with limited focus on acknowledging the effects.
In Hemingway’s later fictions from the period of 1935-1960, the narrative structure evolves and illustrates the narrative tension between writing events of trauma versus engaging memories of trauma in a narrative. Hemingway’s later narratives, unlike the earlier narrative presentations, concentrate on the representation of both the experience and the recollection of trauma in the structure of the fiction. In the progression demonstrated in Hemingway’s various narratives, characters progress from simply dealing with the experience of trauma to dealing with experiencing the memory of trauma in the narrative. In particular, Hemingway’s Richard Cantwell from *Across the River and into the Trees* illustrates this progression. Cantwell is shown as looking up at “a light on the ceiling” and being “completely desperate at the remembrance of his loss of his battalions, and of individual people” (ARIT 222). For Cantwell and for ARIT, the focus is on the experience of the memory of trauma.

Hemingway’s dialectic between the memory and remembering of trauma in the narrative structure of ARIT establishes a protagonist that is not simply concerned with being and reacting to the experience of trauma like earlier protagonists. Hemingway’s early protagonists maintain a focus on being in and reacting to the experience of trauma. Subsequently in these early narratives, the protagonists are shown as avoiding thinking or remembering moments of trauma. Instead, these early figures are shown as being aware of the experience but not aware of the effects of the experience. In fact, these early figures all experience trauma predominately as objects; they are subjected to trauma by other people and entities.
Chapter Two: Style, Structure, and Trauma in Hemingway's Fiction

Twentieth century understanding of trauma related to war grows out of the pre and post World War I studies of Sigmund Freud, Sandor Ferenczi, Karl Abraham, Ernst Simmel, Ernest Jones, W.H.R Rivers, Charles Myers, Elmer Southard, and Frederick Mott. While Freud is the mono-mythic figure of trauma studies, the other individuals working and studying the effects of war trauma contribute greatly to understanding the definition of war trauma during the early twentieth century. These individuals seek to explore the effects of modern war on the individual, and they appear to embody Elmer Southard’s 1919 edict to discover “out of Shell-shock” how that, “Man may get to know his own mind a little better, how under stress and strain the mind lags, blocks, twists, shrinks, and even splits, but on the whole is afterwards made good again” (“Preface” 3).

---

33 Studies of the effect of war on individuals have been noted as occurring throughout all major conflicts. In fact, Edgar Jones and Simon Wessley observe that in the seventeenth century, various Swiss and Spanish accounts of the effects of war on conscripted troops produced a nostalgia. Jones and Wessley continue by expressing that in French and German accounts in the 18th century, this type of effect is often described as melancholia. Nostalgia, as a form of war suffering, according to Jones and Wessley, came to prominence during the “American Civil War when rates of 2.3 per thousand and 3.3 per thousand were recorded among Northern troops in 1861 and 1862” (see Shell Shock to PTSD 2-3).
Dr. Charles S. Myers\textsuperscript{34} is the first to employ the term “shell-shock” in his 1915 three-case study of World War I veterans titled “A Contribution to the Study of Shell-Shock. Being An Account of Three Cases of Loss of Memory, Vision, Smell, and Taste.” Myers’ study focuses on the connections between experiencing shelling and the subsequent loss of memory, vision, smell, and taste in World War I veterans. For Myers, the close relation of these experiences to “hysteria” is fairly certain in the soldiers (\textit{The Lancet} 320). Early studies of war veterans of World War I reflect a certain congress between the battlefield traumas—either experienced or witnessed—and the embodiment of external symptoms such as insomnia, alcoholism, and body tremors with internal symptoms such as muteness, loss of memory, and fatigue.\textsuperscript{35} In addition, Dr. David Forsyth in 1915 in \textit{The Lancet} observes that the rising instances of disorders in veterans results in the increasing study and research of afforded by the traumatized soldiers.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{34} Myers’ study, in line with William Aldren Turner and Frederick Mott, attempts to generate a manner of understanding and thus treating “shell shock.” However, as Edgar Jones and Simon Wessley clarify, these early doctors and studies suffer from a lack of definition as a result of the wide range of unexplained symptoms and disabilities experienced by the soldiers (23).

\textsuperscript{35} Myers’ linking of trauma with the loss of memory and sensation appears in Hemingway’s early fiction. In Hemingway’s 1925 “A Very Short Story,” Hemingway constructs Nick Adams as a soldier in a hospital. Hemingway writes of the Adams figure that, “he went under the anesthetic holding tight to himself so he would not blab about anything during the silly, talky time” (\textit{In Our Time} 65). In this story, Adams’ concern is with the withholding of memories—“not blabbing about anything”—related to his trauma.

\textsuperscript{36} “By 1915, Sir Alfred Keogh director-general of army medical services had become concerned by the rising number of servicemen admitted with cardiac symptoms…Disordered Action of the Heart (DAH) had been a major cause of invalidity during the Boer War and had the potential to denude valuable manpower from the armed forces. Soldiers complained of fatigue, breathlessness on exercise, and pain over the region of the heart. (Dr. James) Mackenzie concluded that the condition was one of general exhaustion and the circulatory symptoms were “but parts of a general manifestation” (Mackenzie, 1916, p. 118) (As qtd in Johns and Wessley 39-40).
Freud, who undoubtedly is one of the key figures in trauma studies, does not always seek to directly correlate his study of trauma neuroses with a study of trauma neuroses and war trauma. In fact, Freud addresses the effect of war and death in cultural terms not solely on the individual terms of a soldier in his “Thoughts for the Times on War and Death” in 1915. Correspondingly, Ann Banfield highlights Freud’s reticence and belatedness in relation to his exploration of trauma and war. Banfield asserts that, “Freud often implicitly (if not explicitly) relates his patient’s symptoms to the larger cultural (implicitly ideological) thinking that these general essays reveal” (Trauma Culture 28). As such, Freud’s studies of war trauma neuroses evolve as he continues his research and study of hysteria. Of course, the backdrop of World War I and World War II significantly affects his research and his findings, as it does the surrounding psychoanalytic community.

Ferenczi, Abraham, Simmel, and Jones, with Sigmund Freud\(^\text{37}\) work to establish an understanding of war trauma during a symposium at Fifth International Psycho-Analytical Congress in 1918.\(^\text{38}\) During this symposium, Abraham, Simmel, and Jones present the connections between experiencing

\(^{37}\) Freud took great fault with the individuals who sought to divorce gender from war neurosis in his introduction to this volume.

\(^{38}\) The dominant theme of these proceedings is the linking of sexuality and trauma. Dr. Karl Abraham observes, “the recurrence of certain definite symptoms in war neurotics, which were familiar to me not only in the traumatic neuroses of peace time, but also in the non-traumatic cases, seems to me worth noting. I refer particularly to the complex of symptoms that we could so often observe during the war in the anxiety cases with trembling, such as trembling, agitation, irritability, sensitiveness, sleeplessness, headaches, anxiety, depression of spirits and feelings of incompetency. Two neurotic types with the same symptoms—although these do not appear so prominently as in the war—would be the impotent man and the frigid woman. A similarity which is so marked in external phenomena leads one to expect a similarity also in internal processes” (23).
trauma in war and the psychological effects of such events on the mental state of individuals. Likewise, Dr. Ernst Simmel observes that, “the most frequent war psycho-neurotic symptoms represents what after all is comprehensible without anything further, loss of memory. It may extend over a limited period of the war or over the whole of it or even into pre-war times. The whole memory is blotted out in order that definite things should not be brought to mind” (40). Simmel et al focus on extending the connection of trauma to the loss of memory and sensations in the traumatized soldier and individual.40

Freud continues to develop his thoughts and theories on war neuroses, and in Beyond the Pleasure Principle, his treatise explores the manner in which the mind distinguishes between the pressures of internal unsatisfied instincts and displeasure from an external perception recognized by the mental apparatus as a danger (see Banfield 31, and Freud Beyond 28). Subsequently, Freud's Moses and Moebesism creates his ultimate reading and exploration of trauma and latency. Ann Banfield suggests that, “central to … Freudian theory of trauma is a

39 In the period between World War I ending and World War II beginning, Freud and other psychoanalytic researchers such as Joseph Breuer focus on various angles and perspectives in the study, prevention, and treatment of individuals experience war trauma. Freud carefully includes a focus on the effects of gender on the experience of trauma. In fact, Freud’s early work on women’s hysteria involves memories of sexual abuse. This work demonstrates a correspondence between women’s hysteria and the traumatic experience of soldiers. In relation to these connections, according to Ann Banfield, the soldiers like the traumatized women suffered from memories of an overwhelming event that they had been unable to cognitively register at the time it happened (Trauma Culture 30). As such, studying the experience of trauma reflects a desire to correlate the unknowable nature of trauma to a knowable understanding of how trauma functions.

40 Echoing Simmel et al’s views, Hemingway’s old man in the 1926 short story “A Clean, Well-Lighted Place” questions, “what did he fear? It was not fear or dread. It was a nothing that he knew too well” (The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway 291). The “nothing” mentioned by the old man becomes a demagogue to “a nothing” in the story. Hemingway’s “a nothing” corresponds to a loss or the loss of one of the most important aspect of thought, one’s memory.
motivated unconscious…the traumatic event my trigger early traumatic happenings…there may be, in the case of battle trauma, unconscious guilt at surviving the attack; or events in battle may unconsciously recall childhood violence" (32). Similarly, Freud’s continuing explorations of trauma and the effects of trauma center on the congress of internal and external elements occurring in relation to the experience of trauma.

Modern warfare and war trauma exercises a significant influence on the evolution of psychiatry in the twentieth century. In fact, the study of war trauma and hence a psychoanalytic focus on predominantly masculine subjects, according to Elaine Showalter, finally made doctors accept that males, as distinct from ‘hysterical’ females, also had a psychic dimension (Johns and Wessley 49). As World War I ends, the population continues to be haunted by the traumas of war. For instance, Captain William Brown, in 1939, argues that for these witnesses to war and trauma, the “memory of an unacceptable or terrifying event had been repressed at the expense of some aspect of physical functioning. Hence it was necessary to persuade the soldier to recollect the frightening event so that it could be mastered and incorporated” 41(as qtd. in Johns and Wessley 29). As such, Brown’s notions of traumatic storytelling and acceptance reflect a changing dynamic in war trauma studies. Correspondingly, the dynamic seeks to understand not only the symptoms of trauma neurosis but also the causes.

41 M.H Rivers believed that “the symptoms of shell shock resulted when an adaptive form of repression failed to operate efficiently. Because most troops were not regulars but had volunteered or had been conscripted into the army and trained in great haste, they had not had time to build up an effective mechanism to deal with strong emotions” (as qtd in Johns and Wessley 33
Opinions were sharply divided over causes of war trauma in soldiers. Johns and Wessley argue that, "psychologically minded doctors believed that in some cases shell shock was the inevitable result of the sustained and intense stress of combat. Rivers, for example, argued that shell shock was a hysterical defense against intolerable fear and when treated could often leave a residual anxiety neurosis" (53). Various war trauma theorists and medical professionals, such as Rivers, were conversant with Freudian ideas before the outbreak of war. Rivers concluded that it was an inability to repress the conflict between the soldier's sense of fear and duty that lay at the heart of war-related psychological disorders" (Johns and Wessley 55). However, as World War II explodes onto the world arena, the focus on the mental health of soldiers appears as an oft-dismissed concern as the various militaries and countries seek to defend and to protect the citizens and nations from outside forces.

Early work and studies on trauma arrive at a similar understanding as contemporary trauma theorists, with some difference of opinion on treatment and diagnosis. In fact, Cathy Caruth posits that, "trauma is described as the response to an unexpected or overwhelming violent event or events that are not fully grasped as they occur, but return later in repeated flashbacks, nightmares, and other repetitive phenomena" (Unclaimed Experience 91). Caruth’s observation connects with Myers’ early view of the symptoms of trauma—loss of memory and sensation—as operating as an unconscious expression of a

---

42 PIE (Proximity, immediacy and expectancy) methods introduced into US and Allied military during World War II. "The principal aim of PIE treatments was to return men to duty rather than address their mental state" (Johns and Wessley 87).
repressed trauma. Caruth’s generalization echoes Freud et al’s 1915 discussion from the symposium in its attention to the loss of memory represented by the non-acceptance of trauma at the time by the individual. The difference, in many ways, between historical and contemporary understandings of trauma often relate to the contradictory idea of disassociation in trauma.

The effects of the trauma of World War I and World War II present an arena of study that contributes to the burgeoning field of psychoanalytic study. As the wars ended and became part of the culture’s understanding and experiences, many authors of the period sought to engage the war and the trauma of war in their fictions. The effect of war trauma on the literature of the period is profound. Scholars Paul Fussell, Eric Leeds, Trudi Tate, and Margaret Higonnet—to name a select few—endeavor to further the connection of war and literature in their work. The burgeoning field of trauma psychology throughout the twentieth century is embraced by a variety of literary scholars. The trauma of war becomes an area that is rich for the study of the functions of the literary text.

**War Trauma and Literature in the Twentieth Century**

The first half of the twentieth century heralds many changes for the population, as well as the literature of the time. Literary creators and subsequently, literary critics, react by adopting the voices and timbre of war and trauma in the eras

---

43 See Edgar Jones and Simon Wessely’s *Shell Shock to PTSD: Military Psychiatry from 1900 to the Gulf War* pages 23-24 for a detailed discussion of Myers’ study.

44 Moreover, Caruth, Myers, and Freud et al’s connection of trauma with the loss of memory connects with Hemingway’s experiences related to his war experiences in World War I and World War II.

45 “If the Greeks invented tragedy, the Romans the epistle and the Renaissance the sonnet,’ the Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel has written famously, ‘Our generation invented a new literature, that of testimony’ (as qtd in Stonebridge 202).
surrounding the World Wars. In like fashion, Margaret R. Higonnet asserts that trauma, in general, and PTSD, in particular, offers “literary critics a vocabulary to describe the symptoms of soldiers’ mental disturbances that may figure in memoirs and other autobiographical accounts: nonsequential memory, flashbacks, nightmares, and mutism or fragmented language” (“Authenticity and Art in Trauma Narratives of World War I” 92). Additionally, Higonnet observes that, “those symptoms bear a suggestive resemblance to certain features of modernist experiment: decentering of the subject, montage, ellipses or gaps in narrative, and startlingly vivid images. This similarity—or, some would argue,

---

46 Ann Banfield observes that, Dori Laub’s and Shoshana Felman’s Testimony in 1992, “together with Cathy Caruth’s earlier Unclaimed Experience (1986) and her edited volume, Trauma: Explorations in Memory (1995) initiated what has become a growing field in the humanities. Books by Geoffrey Hartman (1994, 1996), Dominick La Capra (1994, 1998), and Michael Rothburg (2000) have proved influential in deepening and furthering humanities Holocaust research” (33). Banfield observes that, “trauma theory extended beyond Holocaust studies in the humanities, especially in the wake of increasing revelations about child abuse in the 1990s” (33). Banfield asserts that, “Understandably, not being psychologists, humanists turned to the official definition of trauma that could be found in the American Psychiatric Association’s Diagnostic Manual. This manual, especially in the 1994 revised edition, stressed the phenomenon of disassociation in trauma, already discussed years earlier by Pierre Janet, Josef Bruer, and Freud. Bessel o. van der Kolk stressed Disassociation in his 1987 Psychological Trauma, and he repeatedly wrote about it in many subsequent articles…Such theories apparently influenced Cathy Caruth, whose acceptance of dissociation as central in trauma is evident in her now famous definition of trauma as, ‘a response, sometimes delayed, to an overwhelming event or set of events, which takes the form of repeated, intrusive hallucinations, dreams, thoughts, or behaviors stemming from the event.’ The pathology, she notes, consists ‘solely in the structure of the experience or reception: the event is not assimilated or experienced fully at the time, but only belatedly in this repeated possession of the one who experiences it’” (34). Banfield observes that, “the narrow focus on dissociation, together with what seemed increasingly like a ‘faddish’ aspect to humanities trauma research soon produced strong objections from some literary and film scholars in the late 1990’s. As Michael Roth first argued in an essay ‘Why Trauma Now’ (1999), it is significant that it was Paul de Man’s students at Yale who first turned to trauma. Deconstruction scholars focus on language as primary, and accept Lacan’s concept of affect and the unconscious split off from linguistic signifiers, which obscures emotion.” (34). Banfield observes that, “addressing the phenomena of trauma must have seemed one way for critics to begin to link high theory with specific material events that were both personal and which implicated history, memory and culture generally. To this extent, the turn was productive; suggesting reasons for it should not detract for the importance of intervention. Giving reasons for the turn says more about the state of theory before trauma became of interest than offering a critique of the turn” (35).
connection—between a set of medical symptoms among veterans and a set of stylistic features in narrative has fostered a masculine canon of modernism” (92). As such, Higonnet’s observations expose a necessary and expressive link between the experiences of war and the literature surrounding the trauma of war and the battlefield.47

The relationship of the literary with the psychoanalytic study of trauma is inherently linked in the modern ethos. In fact, Lyndsey Stonebridge observes the relationship between trauma and literature in “Theories of Trauma.” Stonebridge asserts that,

for psychoanalysis, trauma is what happens when thinking fails or can no longer take place. It is modern, because the experience of modernity makes thinking about and experiencing the world harder even as technology has supposedly made things easier. Modern war, the marriage of technology with barbarism as it was thought of by many in the middle of the twentieth century, has become the highly charged emblem of a moral, psychological, and existential paralysis of thought (“Theories of Trauma” 194).

As the modern period exhibits a crisis of and in epistemology, Stonebridge and others such as Higonnet, Eric Leeds, and Paul Fussell connect this crisis to the pervasive influence of war trauma—as a result of the World Wars—on the

47 Higonnet like Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar carefully fashion a space in the study of war and trauma for gender explorations.
population and, most importantly for this study, on the literature.\textsuperscript{48} The manner in which literature operates in concert with the traumas of war is reflected in the various narrative adaptations appearing in the fiction of the time.

Sigmund Freud’s work on trauma, in particular, and on the psychoanalytic workings of the mind, in general, present an interesting amalgam for literary studies in the early portion of the twentieth century. Similarly, M.H. Abrams observes that Freud’s form of psychology initially operates as a means of analysis and therapy for neuroses, but that Freud’s work soon expands to account for developments in society such as warfare, mythology, and religion, as well as literature and the other arts (\textit{A Glossary of Literary Terms} 248). The marriage of psychoanalytic thought and literary creation and critique contributes greatly to the literary milieu in the twentieth century.

Freud and Joseph Breuer’s (1895) \textit{Hysteria} argue that trauma is a wound in the psyche. Freud and Breuer argue that the individual cannot speak directly to this wound, but nonetheless, the individual experiences a fixation on this event through the imperfect memories, fictions, repetitions, and compulsions associated and surrounding the experience. In this fashion, an individual who

\footnotesize{\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{48} The loss of epistemological certainty in relation to war trauma affects the manner in which narrative is created and produced. Stonebridge observes that, “the Second World War, perhaps more than any war before it, raises the question of how war can be held in the mind when the mind itself is under siege; of what it means to experience a trauma so unrelentingly forceful, that it cannot be grasped consciously” (194). The events of World War II, a war that by all accounts affected the collective global community, unrelentingly dominate the culture of the time. It is hard to imagine in this day of where war is staged geographically and ideologically removed from everyday life to imagine the climate experienced by the individuals during World War II. The shear magnitude of the war effort—from rationing to conscripting—pressed every citizen into a constant and sustained participation in the war effort. And while texts have sought to glamorize this period of civic and national duty and pride, the fact is that the individuals lived under the constant specter of war and trauma.
\end{quote}}
experiences trauma may not have a memory of the event, but he or she will attach a variety of experiences to attempting to understand the event. The attachment of peripheral experiences in the attempt to understand the experienced trauma generates fictions surrounding the event. Thus, the event of trauma, itself, becomes a fictional narrative generated in order to attempt understanding of an event or sequence of events that defies and demands understanding.

The notion that trauma is both experienced and forgotten is key to theories of trauma in relation to literary critique and study. Trauma divides the mind from itself and from the understanding and structure of time. In relation to trauma’s effect and presence in literature, Lyndsey Stonebridge observes that, “there’s a lag, a snatch, in the experience of the traumatized that pulls them out of linear chronology” (195). Subsequently, the experience of trauma effects understanding of the event, the self, and time. In fact, Freud reflects on this portion of the experience of trauma in *Moses and Monotheism* stating that, “We give the name of *traumas* to those impressions, experienced early and later forgotten, to which we attach such importance in the aetiology of the neurosis” (349). The division of the mind, in relation to trauma, affects the understanding of one’s position in space and time. Thus, narratives that attempt to embody or tell the story of a trauma or traumas often utilize disjointed narratives that involve memory and loss of memory in an effort to capture trauma and the effects of trauma in a narrative structure.

---

Freud’s prescient observation that effects his understanding and theory of trauma is his salient contention that traumatic experiences effect the mind and the conception of human subjectivity. Correspondingly, Stonebridge argues in relation to literary creation and study that,

Trace the development of the concept of trauma through Freud’s thought and, on the one hand, it looks as if while Freud first conceptualized trauma in terms of sexuality, gradually his thinking became overshadowed by a second theory of trauma, this time modeled on the neurosis to which the war-ravaged foot soldiers of the first war, with their vacant gazes, tremors, paralyses, and Charlie Chaplin gaits, bore painful witness. With an eloquent narrative simplicity, the self-shattering of the subject of bourgeois hypocrisy gives way to the traumas of an increasingly atrocious century—as if the latter’s consuming violence was the apotheosis of the former’s alienation from itself. But it was also always clear to Freud that external events derive their traumatic force precisely because they activate fantasies and provoke the drives into actions and reactions. So, for the Freud of 1915, if not for others working with this new category of fatefuly historicized hysteria, the shell-shocked veterans of the first war were not simply driven mad by the war; they were traumatized because the trauma of war had undone their deepest fantasies of themselves as peacetime masculine subjects (197).

50 In similar fashion, Stonebridge observes that, “Freud’s originality was to insist that trauma not only had an effect on the mind, but that it constituted what we think of as human subjectivity itself, which is why, at the same time…” (196).
Stonebridge’s claims that Freud’s reading of the war-ravaged veteran as an individual who is driven mad not simply because of the trauma, but because of the effects of the trauma on the individual’s subjectivity. Stonebridge’s observations reflect on the effect of trauma in the generation of narrative structures that engage the trauma of war.51

Fictions that attempt to capture war trauma endeavor to give form to an experience that affects understanding of the experience and of the self. The narratives of war trauma represent a means of organizing the experience of trauma—both as an experience that is happening and as an experience that has happened. The narratives of trauma register an effort presenting a changed literary form that addresses an experience that throws structures out of time and out of conscious experience. Echoing this change in narrative form in relation to trauma, Walter Benjamin observes in “The Storyteller” that in the modern culture information replaces narration and sensation operates as the norm in the structure of fiction. According to Benjamin, it is no longer possible to present lived experience in a traditional narrative framework of time. The literary presentation of trauma in narratives is affected by the displacement of time occurring as a result of trauma. The question thus appearing central to this exploration is where does the experience go to when it can no longer be understand in a traditional framework or form.

51 To encounter trauma for Freud, then, is also to encounter an alien part of ourselves; a ‘foreign body,’ as the rhetoric of his first studies on hysteria frequently has it, or as Freud finally describes it in Moses, with a loudly reverberating historical echo, “a State within a State, an inaccessible party; which co-operation is impossible, but which may succeed in overcoming what is the normal party and forcing it into its service” (Stonebridge197).
Theories of trauma applied to the study of narrative form reflect an effort to understand how the experience of trauma affects the presentation of traditional literary elements in the twentieth century. The crux of the explorations of trauma in literature reflects as individuals like, Cathy Caruth, Anne Whitehead, Margaret Higonnet, and Lyndsey Stonebridge contend, the study of how the representations of trauma and the individual operate in narrative. Stonebridge suggests that, “Each writer (Benjamin, Freud, and Woolf) asks us to think about what it really means for the mind to be possessed by an experience it cannot represent to itself. Each understand what it means to be inhabited by a lost past. And for all three, this conflict in the mind finds its most acute representation and realization in modern war” (200). For literary scholars, the study of how trauma operates and functions in literary forms and structures offers an intersection to view the effect of trauma on the narrative in the twentieth century.

Freud’s understanding of latency reflects on the manner in which trauma functions structurally in a narrative. For Freud, trauma affects the understanding of history as a structure capable of capturing the event of trauma and

52 Whitehead argues that, Caruth’s “Work suggests that if trauma is at all susceptible to narrative formulation, then it requires a literary form which departs form conventional linear sequence. The irruption of one time into another is figured by Caruth as a form of possession or haunting” (6).
53 Anne Whitehead observes that, “the ethical questions raised by testimony are inherently literary.
54 Contemporary trauma theory focuses on the crisis of knowledge surrounding traumatic experiences, such as war. Cathy Caruth’s congress of trauma theory and literary interpretation explores epistemological uncertainty in the wake of the trauma. For Caruth, ideas of the literal in relation to trauma and literature are the most important. Caruth argues that Freud’s exploration and understanding of the nightmare-stricken soldiers from Beyond the Pleasure Principle focus on the insistent return of the ‘literal’ in the soldier’s dreams. For Caruth, the return of the literal, “constitutes trauma and points to its enigmatic core; the delay or incompletion in knowing, or even seeing, an overwhelming occurrence that then remains, in its insistent return, absolutely true to the event” (5).
surrounding trauma. In this movement, the traumatic event is missed in its occurrence, and, thus, the traumatic experience happens out of time and in a sense of belatedness. In relation to literary structures, Caruth observes that narratives of war trauma display and explore the inaccessibility of historical structures and narratives. As such, the presentation of narrative plays with language and structure in relation to trauma so that the force of the trauma and the imperative for a new form of historical witnessing operates in the narrative. Caruth, ultimately, suggests that “trauma opens up and challenges us to a new kind of listening, the witnessing, precisely, of impossibility” (Unclaimed Experience 10). Trauma operates as both an opportunity and a challenge for literary and narrative form.

The exploration of trauma and literature showcases an interconnection between the symptoms experienced in trauma and the various forms and contents using in literature surrounding the trauma. In fact, Susan Stanford Friedman writes in her study of H. D. that, “Art produced after the First World War recorded the emotional aspect of this crisis; despair, hopelessness, paralysis, angst, and a sense of meaninglessness, . . . chaos, and fragmentation of material reality” (97). Friedman’s work focuses on the idea that modernist writing highlights the “agency of language” as a means and a vehicle to produce meaning in the traumatic landscape. In addition, Freidman’s observations reflect on the congress of trauma and its concomitant effects on literature written in the period during and following war. The study of trauma’s effects on literary form and content contributes a necessary component to understanding the evolution
of literary narrative structures in the twentieth century.

Dori Laub and Shoshana Felman in *Testimony* question, “the relation between narrative and history, between art and memory, between speech and survival?” (xiii). The complexity of this relationship illustrates the effects of the massive war traumas of World War I and World War II on the literature created at this time. In fact, Geoffrey Hartman⁵⁵ observes that literary trauma theorists are trying to find a “way of receiving the story, of listening to it, of drawing it into an interpretative conversation” (536). For Caruth, Friedman, Laub, Felman, and Hartman, literature that attempts to tell the story of trauma places different obligations and requirements on the narrative form and thus on the generation of the narrative structure.

Geoffrey Hartman suggests that there are two aspects of trauma—the event (content) and the symptomatic response to the event (form). These two traumatic aspects, for Hartman, often operate in literary terms. Hartman asserts that, “on the level of poetics, literal and figurative may correspond to these two types of cognition” (536). Hartman’s observations focus on the narrative exploration and representation of trauma in congress with the reading and interpretation of the text. Hartman explores the literature of trauma by exploring the text for evidence of both the literality of a specific event and the text’s figurative evocation of the symptomatic response to trauma through formal and

---

⁵⁵ In the interpretation of literature, the act of generating textual understanding often is seen as a binary process between the reader—an active subject and the text—a passive object. Using ideas from trauma theory changes the relationship between the subjective reader and the objective text, so that the act of reading is re-storied and made ethical. Hartman argues that a text involving the story of trauma or stories of trauma address the reader as a “responsive, vulnerable, even unpredictable being” (Hartman 536).
stylistic innovation in the narrative.

In all of the various treatments and exploration of trauma and literature, the focus centers on the narrative structure and modes of subjectivity. Literature functions as a created realm that attempts to embody the imagination while simultaneously capturing a verisimilitude of experience. The impulse to capture the experience of trauma and the surrounding effects of trauma in literary form is, indeed, a difficult proposition. Often, the literature fails in this attempt. In this light, the literary aspects are often denigrated in the pursuit of capturing both the imaginative quality and the verisimilitude in the narrative. However, when trauma is captured and represented and when the experience does operate in the narrative, the opportunity for understanding the effects of trauma on the narrative form appears.

**Trauma and the Narrative in Hemingway’s Fiction**

Hemingway’s fiction embodies a sense of precision and emotion. Hemingway desires to convey the emotion produced by the actual experience. In a letter to Russian critic Ivan Kashkin in 1939, Hemingway observes that, “[…] in stories about the war I try to show all the different sides of it, taking it slowly and honestly and examining it from many ways” (23). War, as Hemingway intimates, marks a culture into a dualistic prism of subjectivity and objectivity:

56 Hemingway’s emphasis as noted in Phillips *Ernest Hemingway on Writing*.
57 Debra Moddelmog asserts Hemingway’s text and the perspective evidenced in his correspondence to Kashkin, presents the “different sides” of war in the text’s “actions, appearance, and desire […] that spill over the ‘normal’ boundaries of identity and identification so that categories become destabilized” (162). Moddelmog continues and argues that this destabilization merges the gendered identities into one another; however, her amalgamation of identity and gender in *The Sun Also Rises* presupposes a locatable position for gender. Gender cannot be so firmly merged into one understanding and location.
solider/civilian, friend/enemy, security/danger, and masculine/feminine. Hemingway’s narrative structures coruscate this dualistic prism containing “all the different sides” of war. Hemingway appears to capture war and trauma in narrative form from a multiplicity of angles rather than from a unified perspective. This narrative representation reflects and echoes the experience of trauma. Hemingway’s application is demonstrated in the various representations and implementations of war trauma in his works. For instance, the Nick Adams figure/voice in the (1925) “Big Two-Hearted River”(BTHR) stories reflects and refracts the experience of war in a subtle and nuanced fashion, while remaining aware of the varied sides to the experience of war.

Philip Young’s Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration introduces a similar critique of “Big Two-Hearted River.” Young observes the stories as engaging and interrogating symptoms of the protagonist’s past experiences from a varied

58 Hemingway’s work contributes to a reflection and creation of gender in the war period and the post-war period. Gender during the war and post-war periods reflects its inability to clearly be defined due to what war-trauma and gender specialist Susan M. Gilbert asserts is the paradox of World War I which examines Modern notions of gender from the position of the War as representing a “masculine apocalypse” and a “feminine apotheosis” (424). Gilbert's observation in “Soldier’s Heart: Literary Men, Literary Women, and the Great War” points to the shifting roles available for women during the War years as these women took the place of the missing men in the factory, the home, and the hospital. Psychoanalytic Hemingway scholar Carl Eby, in Hemingway’s Fetishism: Psychoanalysis and the Mirror of Manhood, observes in relation to the evidence of trauma, the post-war period, and gender in The Sun Also Rises that, Jake’s wound speaks of a general cultural malaise associated with the post-war period—an anxiety about the ‘sterility’ of cultural life, about personal alienation in the modern world, about the rising sexual and social power of women, about a world of sexuality no longer governed by the dictates of procreation (56). As Eby connects Jake Barnes’ wound with the shifting roles of women, an examination of Hemingway’s texts connects the effects and affects of trauma on the presentation or reflection and re-presentation or creation of gender in the Modern period, in general, and in Hemingway's writing, in particular.

59 Eric Leed in No-Man’s Land: Combat and Identity in World War I observes that for the soldier and participant of war, the war and the front operates as a place that “dissolved the clear distinction between life and death. Death, customarily the ‘slash’ between life/not-life, became for many in the war a ‘dash,’ a continuum of experience the end of which was the cessation of any possibility of experience” (21).
perspective, all referencing the traumatic experiences’ responsibility as the origin for the protagonist’s identity and the subsequent problems with that identity. Young asserts of the protagonist and narrator of the short story that, “the blows which he has suffered—physical, psychical, moral, spiritual, and emotional—have damaged him. He has been complicated and wounded by what he has seen, done, and been through” (47). Correspondingly, Hemingway’s construction of characters like the Adams figure and voice in the “Big Two-Hearted River” stories reflects and creates a response to the human condition in the modern world following World War I and prior to World War II. Archibald MacLeish observes of Hemingway that,

He ‘whittled a style for his time.’ It is a conspicuously American style, stressing naturalness of language, syntax that fragments rather than unifies his predominantly simple sentences, and a persistent use of repetition to force the parts into a coherent whole […] Hemingway’s success owes in part to his genius as a consciously disciplined stylist. Nearly as much owes to his vision of man as a creature at bay, haunted by the bogey of violence and the specter of destruction. To delineate such a man, a leisurely, contemplative prose would have been inappropriate. Pressing hard, one upon the other, Hemingway’s conjunction-bound simple sentences declare flux and crisis. The static luxury of reflective or

---

60 John T. Matthews in “American Writing of the Great War” observes the combination of Hemingway’s eerie surface simplicity and profound insight into the human condition evokes a sense of homelessness as “many who had experienced their most meaningful, soul-searching moments abroad, and who returned to places and routines that no longer seemed much like home at all” (*The Cambridge Companion to the Literature of the First World War* 236).
introspective discourse would seem an intolerable extravagance when reality demands mobility. [...] Thinking is minimal, limited to an ironic comment about ‘beautiful detachment’ (Waldhorn Reader’s Guide 32).

MacLeish and multiple critics have long observed that the combination of Hemingway’s style and subject matter is indicative of the modern ethos.\textsuperscript{61} Hemingway’s narrative structure, beginning with the Nick Adam’s stories and vignettes and continuing through the trajectory of his long fiction and journalistic dispatches, captures a progression balanced between a precision of style and emotion of subject.

\textsuperscript{61} Ernest Hemingway experiences trauma in battle and war as both spectator, World War II, and participant, World War I and car, plane, boat, and hunting/fishing accidents. Much work, starting with Philip Young and continuing through the trajectory of Hemingway studies, focuses on the physical wound or trauma. Yet the physicality of wounds experienced by Hemingway represents only one portion of his trauma testimony. Jay Winter in Remembering War asserts, in reference to battle trauma, that, “it (trauma) goes on in the minds of many of those who returned intact, or apparently unscathed, and in the suffering of those whose memories are embodied, enacted, repeated, performed” (61). In myriad manners, Hemingway embodies, enacts, repeats, and performs the internal function of his memories of trauma in his fiction. In his 1933 short story “A Way You’ll Never Be,” Hemingway addresses the embodiment, enactment, repetition, and performance of the mental effects in his protagonist, a Nick Adams figure. In the story, a certified “nutty” American arrives at the Italian front where is he promptly told to lay down (“A Way You’ll Never Be” The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway 310). As the Nick Adams figure rests, he revisits his experiences of war and trauma. Hemingway’s Adams, while in a state of confusion, observes, If it didn’t get so damned missed up he could follow it all right. That was why he noticed everything in such detail to keep it all straight so he would know just where he was, but suddenly it confused without reason as now, he lying in a bunk at battalion headquarters, with Para commanding a battalion and he in a bloody American uniform (311).

In the story, the Adams figure embodies the memories of war in his uniform—“I am supposed to move around and let them see the uniform” (308), enacts the memories of war in his command to the young second lieutenant to “put your gun away, (307), repeats the memories of war trauma as he attempts to rest—“it was all lower, as it was at Portogrande, where they had seen them come wallowing across the flooded ground holding the rifles high” (311), and performs the memories of war trauma by wearing a spurious American military uniform—“The uniform is not very correct […] but it gives you the idea. There will be several million Americans here shortly” (311). In this story, Hemingway presents the sensations of war through the experiences and memories of Nick Adams.
Hemingway carefully captures the arithmetic—the subjects and objects, the geometry—shapes and senses—and the algebra—equations and consequences—of the traumatic experiences in his fiction. In a 1922 journalistic dispatch for *The Toronto Star*, Hemingway urges the veterans of the war to avoid returning to the battlefields. For Hemingway, the subjects and objects represented by the shapes, senses and consequences of the past in the text are changed in the generation of creating and engaging the memories of war trauma. Hemingway observes in this dispatch that veterans should not,

> go back to your own front, because the change in everything and the supreme, deadly lonely dullness [...] of the fields once torn up with shell-holes and slashed with trenches and wire will combine against you and make you believe that the places and happenings that had been the really great events to you were only fever dreams or lies you had told to yourself (*Hemingway on War* 248).

In this piece, Hemingway centers on the change following the war on the land, but the awareness of this change also references awareness and a mimetic representation of the change on the individual as a result of the trauma of war. The individual, like the land, has been the object of trauma. The land, like the individual, physically progresses from the trauma; the scar-like trenches and the wound-like shell-holes heal on the land and the body. In this view, the exterior physical shapes and consequences of war disappear from view leaving the interior memories adrift in space and time without physical markers.
In this 1922 dispatch, Hemingway observes a transition of the exterior to the interior. In his assertion in the text, the complexity of dealing with war and the interior landscape of war trauma relates to the structuring of his narrative construction. Hemingway’s narrative structure, like the scarred yet healed land of the front, evolves and changes as he continues his career. The structure, at the beginning of his career, focuses on the physical scars. As such, the narrative structures of this early period in his writing focus on the presentation of objective experience. As Hemingway’s fiction evolves, the structure begins to explore notions of the effects of the experiences that created the physical reminders of war and trauma. Similarly, his fiction uses narrative structures that represent and illustrate the subjective elements of an experience. The structure of Hemingway’s narratives evolves as he continues to involve various perspectives of war and trauma in his fiction. This continued evolution ultimately contributes to his narrative structure in his ARIT, his second-to-last novel.

Hemingway asserts, in a 1956 interview with Harvey Breit concerning the narrative construction of ARIT, that, “I have moved through arithmetic, through plane geometry and algebra, and now I am in calculus” (reprinted in Trogdon 273). In this quote, Hemingway intimates ideas from his 1922 dispatch in relation to the construction of his narrative. Moreover, Hemingway’s focus on crafting a text using a narrative calculus is not just about treating or representing an inner reconciliation to the outer experience. Instead, the emphasis is on the play between the inner and the outer in the narrative. As calculus is the study of change, of space, and of time, Hemingway draws attention to the manner in
which change is represented in the structure of a narrative. Hemingway’s writing no longer just focuses on presenting the arithmetic—the subjects and objects of his stories, the geometry—shapes and senses evoked by his stories—and the algebra—equations and consequences apparent in the themes of his stories. Instead, Hemingway seeks to capture the illusive element of change, space, and time in his narrative construction.

The arithmetic, geometry, and geology of war appear in his early narrative works. These elements still retain a place of prominence in his later work. However, as Hemingway’s narrative style evolves, calculus, as the study of change and space, is the narrative method he attempts to deploy. The study of change, which Hemingway presents in the narrative calculus in ARIT, is illustrated through his character’s, Cantwell’s, remembrance and memory of war and trauma. In fact, trauma operates as the variable enabling a change in the narrative structure of the work; trauma, both the acts and memory of the acts, alter understanding of space and time in the narrative. In like fashion, Samuel Hynes observes in Soldier’s Tale of the effect of war trauma on the construction of narratives. Hynes observes that,

there are the inflicted sufferings of war—the wounds, the fears, the hardships” and “there is something else that is done to men by wars: no man goes through a war without being changed by it … and though that process will not be explicit in every narrative—not all men are self-conscious or reflective enough for that—it will be there. Change—inner
change—is the other motive for war stories: not only what happened, but what happened to me (3).

As such, Hemingway’s ARIT utilizes a narrative calculus as Hemingway represents how the experience of war and trauma operate and affect in the narrative through the figure of the subject Cantwell. Moreover, exploring Hemingway’s widely-panned novel using the juncture of trauma and narrative represents an opportunity to examine how this narrative calculus contributes to understanding Hemingway’s narrative progression in his fiction.

During Hemingway’s time as a World War II correspondent, he spent eighteen days embedded in front lines of the Hurtgen Forest during a battle that cost 33,000 American soldiers their lives (Whiting Battle of Hurtgen Forest, pp.xi–xiv, 271–274). The Hurtgen Forest battle, lasting six months and existing as the single longest American battle of World War II, is known as one of the bloodiest. Hemingway is noted as never writing about this battle, save for his Across the River and into the Trees. It is not a stretch to suggest that the events Hemingway experiences during his two-week time at the front exposed him to many traumatic events. Perhaps, it is most telling that he never writes of these events in his capacity as a non-fiction correspondent. Instead, Hemingway chooses to use ARIT to respond to the unexpected or overwhelming violent events witnessed and experienced yet not fully grasped as they occurred in the battle. Hemingway’s narrative structure in ARIT uses the figure of Cantwell’s remembrance of these events as they return later in repeated flashbacks,
nightmares, and other repetitive phenomena to create a narrative structure that illustrates and engages the effects of trauma.⁶²

⁶² Hemingway's desire to write war truly reflects “the profound dislocation of combat, the confusion of perpetrator and victim, power and powerlessness” (Tal Worlds of Hurt: Reading the Literatures of Trauma 114). Ernest Hemingway observes in many letters and bits of writing that war is the best subject for writers. His concern in writing about war relates to his ability to capture the experiences of war, which so often create confusion for the participant and spectator. Kali Tal suggests this dislocation and confusion creates “in the survivors of war a duality of perception characteristic of trauma survivors. Their choice—to close their eyes to the horror of the past and deny their own experience, or to attempt to integrate the traumatic experience into the banality of everyday life—is always difficult” (114). Tal’s viewpoints in conjunction with Caruth, Freud, Myers, and other psychoanalytic theorists place Hemingway’s writing as jostled between the experience of trauma and the memory of this experience. Thus, the experience of trauma and the memory of trauma affect the manner in which Hemingway constructs his narrative structure.
Trauma often is illustrated in fiction as not simply the threatening of life but the recognition of the threat occurring as a recognition that occurs, “one moment too late” (Caruth Unclaimed Narrative 62). To explore this type of recognition, authors utilize a narrative structure that involves aspects of trauma; these aspects appear in narratives in the form of disjointed narrative sequences involving repetition and the displacement of subjectivity. In the structuring of the narratives, the necessity and impossibility of truly grasping the threat to life is repeatedly confronted by both the act of survival and the traumatic experience itself (Caruth 62). Fiction, thus, represents an arena to play out the traumas of cultural experience of the twentieth century. Ernest Hemingway interrogates and integrates trauma in his fiction, and the subsequent evolutions appearing in his narrative structures reflect the experiences and effects of trauma. In Hemingway’s fiction, the narrative structure offers an opportunity to capture and to explore the witnessing of the experience and effects of trauma. Hemingway’s narrative evolution uses elements of trauma to reflect while creating a fiction that captures the external and internal experience of coming to terms with the trauma of war.
In Hemingway’s hortatory introduction to his collection of war stories *Men at War*, he states that,

This book has been edited in order that those three boys [his sons], as they grow to an age where they can appreciate it and use it and will need it, can have a book that will contain truth about war as near as we can come by it, which was lacking to me when I needed it most. It will not replace experience. But it can prepare for and supplement experience. It can serve as a corrective after experience (xxiii).

Hemingway’s introduction highlights a narrative gap between the experience of war trauma and the fictional representation of war trauma. Hemingway places great importance on the collection of fictional stories in *Men At War* as a palliative for others, including himself, who experience war and the traumas of war. In addition, Hemingway encourages the ability of fiction to present narratives of war trauma that capture the “truth about war” and trauma.

Hemingway suggests in his introduction to *Men at War* that one should attempt to engage trauma both as an experience i.e. one going to war and as a missed experience i.e. reading or writing the fictions of war. For Hemingway, trauma functions between the areas of reflection and creation. Thus the narrative structure of his fiction seeks to reflect on the experience of war trauma while attempting to create the experience of war trauma in the fiction. Caruth suggests that the experience of trauma reflects the mind’s inability to, “confront the possibility of its death directly” (62). Hemingway’s edict to capture the
confrontation of death in his fiction illustrates this inability. In addition, Caruth suggests that post-trauma places survival as becoming, “paradoxically, an endless testimony to the impossibility of living” (62). As such, Hemingway’s persistent explorations of survival in the face of trauma in his fiction represent a continued paradox of this impossibility. Hemingway’s focus on the traumas of war and experience reflects and creates in the narrative the testimony of questioning and confusion related to the trauma of war during the period. For Hemingway, the narrative presentation of the traumas of war embodies knowledge of the incomprehensibility of the traumatic experience. Thus, as he constructs his structures of fiction, Hemingway oscillates between reflecting a testimony based on experience of trauma and creating a fiction drawn from the impossibility of understanding the experience of trauma.

**Subjectivity, Semantics, Temporality, Trauma, and Hemingway**

As a result of the climate of war trauma, certain stable notions of subjective and objective identity appear unhinged from their previous stability with notions of first and second person subjective identity of “us” and third person notions of objective identity of “them” being blurred in reality and fiction. Further, the period evokes a condition of trying to treat and to handle the various paradigm shifts occurring during the early 1900s unbearable and, often, inconceivable traumas. The traditional heroic paradigms, which had supported the various ideas surrounding war in the earlier periods, are disrupted during the period of the Great War (1914-1918) and Second World War (1939-1945). Prior to the world wars, the treatment of trauma in heroic paradigmatic structures focused on using
a very subjective position and structure. For instance, in Walt Whitman’s “The Wound-Dresser” the position and structure of the work reflects on notions of sacrifice and duty to the cause. In this fiction and other fictions of the time, the subjective and the objective appear to operate with a sense of stability. However upon the advent of the World Wars, fiction, mirroring reality, begins to reference changing notions of subjectivity and objectivity in reference to war trauma and positionality. In this fashion, the fiction of the period reflects and creates drawing from the various paradigmatic shifts occurring in the culture of the time.

In light of the shifting paradigms of the early twentieth century, James Dawes in The Language of War argues that, “the experience of violence puts tremendous pressure on nations, persons, ideas, and language […] foundational epistemological borders—like the borders between care and harm, cause and effect, or the morally permitted and the morally prohibited—are revealed by war to be fragile social fictions” (131). Dawes continues and observes that, “war thus initiates a semantic crisis, a crisis of meaning premised upon disbelief in language’s ability effectively to refer to and intervene in the material world” (131). According to Dawes, the semantic break operates in Hemingway’s fiction. This break in Hemingway, however, also illustrates a thematic break, one that is linked to Hemingway’s semantics in his narratives. The semantic and thematic break in Hemingway’s narratives profoundly references an engagement with the inconceivability of war and trauma in his fiction. In addition, Hemingway’s narrative breaks reflect his subsequent attempt to create a narrative structure
that captures the unbearable condition of war and the unknowable experience that occurs as a result of trauma.

As an example in ARIT, Hemingway places his character Colonel Richard Cantwell in a narrative structure steeped not in direct experience but instead filtered through memory. In the narrative, Cantwell, who appears deep in his memories of war, recollects his experience and memories of war trauma. Cantwell observes that, “that was the first time I ever saw a German dog eating a roasted German kraut. Later on I saw a cat working on him too” (235). In this passage in the narrative, Hemingway captures the visceral experience of trauma. In fact, the inconceivability of cats and dogs eating the flesh of humans is a jolting image that captures a sense of tension occurring between the foundations of humanity. Following this description, Hemingway’s Cantwell ponders, “how many could you tell like that? Plenty, and what good would they do? You could tell a thousand and they would not prevent war” (235). In the narrative, the passage presents a semantic crisis—“how may could you tell. The narrative questions the possibility of using narrative devices and structures to capture and to present the trauma of war. The passage also references a thematic crisis; in this section, Hemingway is not adhering to a glorious story of war but instead the text focuses on the atrocities of war exemplified by the cat and dog’s eating of the German soldier’s corpse. Hemingway’s thematic crisis, involving his semantics, most definitely, reflects and creates a view of the tenuous period of paradigmatic upheavals. Hemingway captures in the narrative a sense of the period, suffering similarly like the individual, attempting to construct an
epistemology through semantics and an ontology through thematics in the face of surviving the ultimate threat of physical and mental exhaustion and extinction vis-a-vie the trauma of war.

Narrative tension between external and internal perspectives in modern and contemporary American fiction may effectively correspond to the effect and influence of trauma of war—World War I and World War II. The question surrounding the narrative tension arises in how does a body of literature deal with subjects who are speaking from an abject position of trauma. Trauma, as viewed by Sigmund Freud, is an experience that is not fully assimilated as the experience occurs. The experience of trauma operates as a complex play between knowing and not knowing that occurs in reaction to a breach in the mind’s experience of time, self, and the world. The awareness experienced in relation to trauma is abject; it operates from without and within and sometimes from another space. Abject references a disruption in identity, systems and order. As such, narratives that attempt to embody the trauma and traumatic experiences of war treat an experience that does not occur within normal subjective or objective narrative understandings; therefore, the narratives engage a structure that differs from previous structures of more stable subjectivity and objectivity.

World War I, described by H.G. Wells as the “war to end all wars,” appears initially in the American landscape almost as an afterthought. President

63 See Cathy Caruth’s exploration of Freud’s treatment of trauma appearing in Unclaimed Experience page 4-5.
Woodrow Wilson’s reluctance to engage America in the European conflict contributes to the initial American sense of distance with the conflict. However as America enters the war in April of 1917, an era of conscription and service weaves through the American consciousness.64 Moreover, notions of subjectivity and objectivity appearing in the narrative structures of the time reflect the dualities of us/them and enemy/friend brought forth as a result of the American entry into battle. However, these notions of stability established in the act of war are confronted by the abject experience of war. In fact, the conscripted masses of American soldiers faced a war-torn landscape unlike any experienced before in war, resplendent with men fighting from muddy trenches, attacking from armored tanks, bombing from war planes, and gassing from canons.

The horror of modern warfare surrounding the newly minted American soldiers introduces a different type of mental chaos into the psyches of the men. Jennifer Keene, however, asserts that few combatants directly confront the irrationality of the war landscape upon their introduction to the field of battle; instead, Keene argues, these men remain adamant in believing in order that could be discerned in the chaos of frontline life (49). Correspondingly, the narratives of the period reference this attempt at projecting stable identity and order in the chaotic trauma of war. However, the notion appearing in the narratives of the Great War and following after reflect an increasing desire to witness some semblance of order within in the chaos. Yet, American narratives

64 Ernest Hemingway, like many of his fellow young men, seeks to become involved in the war; however, due to his myopic vision, he is deemed unsuitable for military service.
surrounding the Great War reflect an increasing awareness of trauma and the abject nature of the experience of war, while still representing the possibility of ordering the traumatic chaos of war into a traditional narrative that preserves the accepted understanding of subjectivity and objectivity.

In Ernest Hemingway’s first novel *The Sun Also Rises* (1926), the awareness of the abject nature of war trauma arises; however, this awareness is abetted and is tempered by the desire for the possibility of creating an order out of the chaos of war trauma. In the novel, Jake Barnes appears as a wounded veteran of World War I who is struggling with the physical and mental effects of war trauma on his subjectivity and objectivity. The narrative structure oscillates between approaching an awareness of the abject and embodying a need for order. The narrative, at many points, captures aspects of the abject quality of trauma. For instance, Barnes reflects in the narrative that, “there is no reason why because it is dark you should look at things differently from when it is light. The hell there isn’t” (151). This portion of the narrative captures a sense of the abject, the dark and hidden knowledge of trauma, which is predominantly accessible to Barnes only in snippets and fragments appearing in the ordered narrative structure.

The point of view in the early Hemingway narrative does not solely inhabit a space or a voice of abjection. The narrative still seeks solace in the generation of an ordering of the trauma in traditional subjective and objective lines. For example in the passage following the above lines, the narrative voice of Barnes
declares that, "I did not care what it was all about. All I wanted to know was how to live in it. Maybe if you found out how to live in it you learned from that what it was all about (152). The passage illustrates a tension arising in narratives following World War I as it focuses on the impulse to attempt to subjectively order and make objective the abject chaos of war trauma in the narrative. With this, the complete passage illustrates a desire to maintain traditional subject and object positioning. The predominant voice in the narrative structure of SAR still adheres to traditional subjectivity and objectivity; however, a limited use of a voice of abjectivity appears in the structure of the early Hemingway narrative.

Little doubt pervades in relation to the effects of the trauma experienced by the participants and witnesses of World War I. Scenes of trench warfare populated by dead and decomposing bodies, blind stares of the veterans marching out of battle, and bombed-out ruins of buildings are so imprinted in the fabric of the culture and serve as a collective image of the effects of the trauma of war. Narratives such as Richard Aldington’s *Death of a Hero* and Erich Maria Remarque’s *All Quiet on the Western Front* attempt to capture the churned and shattered landscapes—mental, physical, and geographical—of the war. These narratives, resembling Hemingway’s SAR, focus on the subjective representation of the abjective traumas of war while still privileging an attempt at objective ordering of the experience of war through the implementation of traditional elements of narration.
The narratives written following the First World War are torn between the traditional impulse of repression and the psychoanalytic credo of repetition. David Craig and Michael Egan suggest that World War I is best described by the phrase—the “obliteration of humanity” (12). Craig and Egan’s “obliteration of humanity” appears as a predominant preoccupation in the literature of the time. In addition, Craig and Egan observe that, the “filth, terror and injuries of war had, since prehistoric times, been glorified out of recognition by the chroniclers and bards, because of the psycho-social need to repress traumas and keep morale well-tempered” (13). Therefore, the narratives presage a structuring of the chaos of war in an effort to maintain and to represent order in the face of the abject experience of war.

In A Farewell to Arms (1929), the filth and terror of war previously glorified prior to the war effort is presented in a fashion that calls attention to the cultural impetus of repression surrounding times of war. The narrative focuses on the experiences and memories of Fredric Henry. In the novel, Henry is a wounded ambulance driver who falls in love with his nurse, Catherine Barkley. At one point in the narrative, Henry attempts to flee from the battlefield. During this retreat, Henry reflects on information that he has heard concerning the enemy. He reflects that, “last night on the retreat we heard that there had been many Germans in Italian uniforms mixing with the retreat in the north. I did not believe it. That was one of those things you always heard in the war” (216). This passage illustrates the impulse to repress and to restructure understandings of war and trauma. As the passage continues, Henry asserts that, “I did not believe
the Germans did it. I did not believe they had to. There was no need to confuse our retreat. The size of the army and the fewness of the roads did that” (216).

The first portion of the narrative attempts to repress—to make objective—the experience. In this, the portion of the narrative embodies a degree of objectivity. In the second portion of the passage, the focus begins with a subjective “I. However, this “I” subjectivity is confused as the passage continues. The passage, like the majority of the narrative in AFTA, demonstrates an increasing evolution of subjectivity and objectivity in the presence of the abject traumatic experience.

War fiction following World War I illustrates a tension between the repression of the objective experience and repetition of the subjective effect of war trauma. This tension corresponds to the newly emerging study of the effects of trauma on veterans and witnesses of war. Sigmund Freud’s theories and explorations of trauma and “shell-shock” appear in the period surrounding World War I. Freud, along with other psychoanalytic researchers and doctors such as Charles Meyers, W.H.R. Rivers, and Elmer E. Southard—to name only a few—, begin to explore the lingering mental effects of war trauma on individuals.

Correspondingly, F. Scott Fitzgerald’s Tender is the Night and Virginia Woolf’s Mrs. Dalloway echo psychoanalytic ideas in their narrative explorations of shell-shock and the effects of war trauma. These narratives, like Hemingway’s AFTA, focus on capturing the effects of the trauma of war. In addition, these narratives illustrate the ineffability of traditional narrative elements and structures in capturing and representing the experience and effects of war trauma.
The narratives following World War I reference subjects who display a preoccupation with the interior affects of an exterior experience of trauma. In fact, James H. Meredith observes that these subjects mourn a loss of the traditional meaning of loss. The expression of this loss appears in the narratives following World War I in a discontinuity of plot, character, and narrative structure. Correspondingly, Sharon Oudit suggests that, in narratives following World War I, Freudian ideas are alluded to as a “means of representing a world fragmented and disjointed in which narrative progression is frequently disrupted by stories that compete with it for attention” ("Myths, Memories…” 255). As such, the disruption of narrative unity vis-a-vie the playing of subjectivity in post-WWI fiction references a shift in narrative structure appearing as a correlative to the experience and effects of the traumas of the war.

In For Whom the Bell Tolls, the world surrounding Robert Jordan is fragmented and disrupted not only by the events of the Spanish Civil War but also by the various memories and stories that compete with plot in the narrative. In many ways, the narrative surrounding and encompassing Jordan is structured elegiacally. For instance, the narrative moves from third person to second person to first person and highlights and calls attention to the disruptions in the point of view appearing in the narrative. As Robert Jordan moves through the Spanish countryside with a pack of guerillas, he is presented as thinking and recollecting

---

65 The rapid and decisive destruction of villages, homes, peoples, and ways of life in the modern warfare of World War I, according to Meredith, illustrates a rapid acceleration of time. This acceleration operates as the spiritual enemy of mankind, and accordingly, for Meredith, places time as a major preoccupation of the modern literary and artistic sensibility. See James H. Meredith’s “Fitzgerald and War” in Kirk Curnett’s A Historical Guide to F. Scott Fitzgerald.
various stories from his past; the appearance of these stories in the narrative disrupt the traditional narrative structure. In one passage, Jordan is captured in the narrative as, “He grinned back with the front of his face and selected four more grenades and put them in his pockets” (386). The presence of the third person narration establishes the plot operating in this passage, and simultaneously, it also marks the passing of this predominantly objective structure of narration.

Abruptly, the narrative shifts to first person in FWBT. The narrative observes that, “I could unscrew the detonators and just use them, he thought. But I don’t think the fragmentation will have any bad effect” (386). This shift disrupts the narrative structure and calls attention to the passing evolution of narrative objectivity and subjectivity. Moreover, as the passage continues, the narrative shifts once again to second person. The narrative states that, “And you, last night, thinking about how you and your grandfather were so terrific and your father was a coward. Show yourself a little confidence now” (386). The completely odd shift to second person narration in this passage completely disrupts the traditional narrative of war trauma, by inserting a different space/voice into the narrative structure—the voice of the abject. Thus, the appearance of second person in the narrative engages a voice of abjectivity, and thus presents a voice and a space which references and engages a previously silenced experience of trauma operating in the abject.
The scope of World War II generates an almost unfathomable pervasive dominance of thought and experience in the narratives surrounding the war experience. World War II, described by Studs Terkel as the “Good War,” exceeds all the prior boundaries and expectations of war. In fact, James Dawes observes that artists reflect on the oppressive pervasiveness of World War II through a literary style concomitant to the task of witnessing the unbounded and unprecedented events of World War II (157). As such, the fiction appearing during World War II and in the post-war period (less than five years following the Armistice of 1945) engages in attempting to address and represent—in narrative form—the atrocious events of World War II.

The aftermath of the trauma of World War II—the mass genocide of the Holocaust combined with the mass decimation of Nagasaki and Hiroshima with the atom bomb—introduces a set of tragic circumstances into the cultural narrative fabric. The trauma of World War II operates on a scale that encompasses an unimaginable subjectivity—war simply pervades all perceptions of experiences—there is no outside war and there is no inside war; there simply is war. The question then arises as how do writers create narrative subjects in this period of total trauma and war?66 This question draws attention to the inability of traditional narrative structures and elements to adequately convey the perversity of the trauma of the Second World War.

66 This question differs from Fredric Jameson’s view of narratives as socially symbolic acts in his *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as Socially Symbolic Act* in that the question of narrative subjectivity is focused on the manner in which trauma impinges on the narrative of the text. However, the question still reflects Jameson’s desire to link narrative evolution with social change in the culture.
Thus, the question—posed earlier in this chapter—as to how a body of literature deal with subjects who speak from and occupy the abject position of trauma corresponds to the above question. The experience of trauma operates as a complex play and juncture between knowing and not knowing that occurs in reaction to a breach in the mind’s experience of time, self, and the world. This experience defies and demands attention. As such, the awareness experienced in relation to trauma is often deemed abject. Modern and contemporary narratives embody the trauma and traumatic experiences of war through the treatment of an experience that does not occur within normal subjective or objective narrative understandings; that is, in fact, occurring in a third space that is abject. Thus, the narratives engage a structure that differs from previous structures of subjectivity and objectivity. In this engagement, the narratives draw on the previously silenced and abjected voice of trauma to generate a different presence in the fiction following war.

The fiction surrounding trauma and war involves the placing of narrative authority in a voice of trauma.67 In giving voice to the trauma of war in the narratives, the narrative structures of the fictions engage a previously silenced portion that reconstructs an interior experience of trauma and reveals a necessary component of war. In this reconstruction, the war narratives of trauma create a necessary voice of critique to the hegemonic war narratives68 that Paul

---

67 The placement occurs in American war fiction beginning with Stephen Crane’s The Red Badge of Courage Private Fleming.
68 Notions of traumatic war remembrance in Ernest Hemingway’s Across the River and into the Trees offer a component and link to the influence of the trauma of war on modern fiction. Elaine
Fussell in *Wartime Understanding and Behavior in the Second World War* argues have turned the experiences of trauma in World War II into sanitized, Norman Rockwell-ized narratives of war (267). The appearance of the voice of the abject in the narratives in relation to trauma allows for the previously silenced experience of trauma to gain audience and to counteract the hegemonic narratives of traditional war stories.

In the narrative structure of ARIT, Hemingway’s post-World War II work draws on the previously silenced and abjected voice of trauma to generate a changed point of view and presence in this narrative. The fiction of war created in this Hemingway text places narrative authority in a voice of trauma. In giving voice to the trauma of war in the narrative, Hemingway engages a previously silenced portion that reconstructs an interior experience of trauma and reveals a necessary countermand to traditional narratives of war. Hemingway captures this “giving voice over to the abject” in many passages in ARIT; however, one particular passage highlights the transition.

A portion of the narrative in ARIT demonstrates the shift to the voice of the traumatic abject. The narrative states that, “He looked up at the ceiling and he was completely desperate at the remembrance of his loss of his battalions, and

Scarry notes that, “without memory, our awareness would be confined to an eternal present and our lives would be virtually devoid of meaning” (*Memory, Brain, and Belief* 1). In this context, Hemingway’s later characters’ like Cantwell experience remembrance in a different fashion than the earlier characters in American fiction. The act of remembrance operates as a method for attempting to understand the interior self in reference to the exterior world. The memory of World War I operates similarly as it lies like a palimpsest beneath the surface of modern American fiction. The desire to locate meaning through an attempted recollection of past traumas echoes from the first international trauma, World War I. The post-World War I literature seeks to explore understanding through the remembrance of an exterior world fraught with trauma.
of individual people. He could never hope to have such a regiment, ever. He
had not built it. He had inherited it. But, for a time, it had been his great joy”
(222). Like the stories of war, Hemingway and others had inherited, the figure of
Cantwell too realizes the loss felt as a result the trauma of listening and engaging
those prior narratives of war. The passage continues observing that, “Now every
second man in it was dead and the others nearly all were wounded. In the belly,
the head, the feet or the hands, the neck, the back, the lucky buttocks, the
unfortunate chest and the other places. Tree burst wounds hit men where they
would never be wounded in open country. And all the wounded were wounded
for life” (222). This passage engages the space and a voice of the abject—the
voice butting up against the inherited traditional narratives; the tension arises and
effects the narrative structure when the oppressive war narratives of the past are
overturned by the giving voice to the previously silenced experience of trauma
caused by both the oppression created by the prior stories of trauma and by the
experience and effects of war trauma.

The narratives of war trauma not only operate in a different semantic and
thematic fashion, but they also inhabit and engage a different sense of
temporality. Jay Winter in Remembering War suggests in similar fashion that the
“traumatic memory” of individuals who experience war and trauma creates a
disruption of the heroic narrative structures of war. For Winter, these memories
challenge conventional interpretations of meaning (75). Winter asserts that
“traumatic time,” which is created by engaging in the experience and effects of
war trauma, is,
circular or fixed rather than linear. Here the clock doesn’t move in a familiar way; at times its hands are set at a particular moment in wartime, a moment which may fade away, or may return, unintentionally triggered by a seemingly innocuous set of circumstances. When that happens, a past identity hijacks or obliterates present identity; and the war resumes again (75).

Resembling Winter’s observations, Hemingway’s presentation of traumas in his narrative structures operates similarly to Winter’s notion of “traumatic time.” Hemingway’s early characters appearing in the period of 1920-1940 and beginning with Nick Adams, Jake Barnes, and Fredric Henry operate in a traditional narrative structure. The proto-traditional characters and structures of Hemingway’s early fiction transition to the later and less traditional characters appearing in his later period occurring between 1940-1960 with Harry Morgan and Robert Jordan appearing in a modified narrative structure. The transition from early to later characters and structures in Hemingway reflect a break in the normalcy and temporality of cause and effect as presented in the narratives. All of Hemingway’s characters reference the sense of a modern consciousness stuck in the sense of understanding the trauma of war and experience that occurs one moment too late. However, the difference in the character and structures appears in the construction of the narrative in reference to the treatment and appearance of trauma in the position of point of view.
In fact, the character of Richard Cantwell in *Across the River and Into the Trees* illustrates aspects of Hemingway’s narrative progression in the representations and expressions of trauma in the narrative. In this text, Hemingway captures the corresponding calculus occurring as a result of trauma that involves crafting a narrative that involves reflection and creation, perception and memory, experiencing and remembering, and changed objectivity and subjectivity deployed through the use of the previously silenced voice of abjectivity. Hemingway, like the modern ethos immersed in the trauma of war, moves the reflection of trauma as experience—evident as Nick Adams reflects in the early 1925 short story that, “He had been hit in the spine. His face was dirty and sweaty” (*In Our Time* 63)—to the creation of an understanding of trauma as memory—appearing as Richard Cantwell, in the later 1950 ARIT, recollects that, “It boils down, or distills, to the fact you stay in until you are hit badly or killed or go crazy and get section-eighted” (ARIT 229). In addition, Hemingway transitions the perception of events of trauma—operating in the early 1929 narrative of AFTA as Fredric Henry watches, “the sudden round puffs of shrapnel smoke in the sky above a broken farmhouse near where the line was” (AFTA 185)—to the accessing of the memory of trauma—illustrated in the later ARIT as Richard Cantwell recalls, “and I can remember just how he [the dead G.I. in the middle of the road] felt, lifting him, and how he had been flattened and the strangeness of his flatness” (ARIT 234). Moreover, Hemingway shifts the experience of trauma—appearing in the 1937 middle narrative of THHN as Harry Morgan experiences death and states that, “A man […] ain’t got no hasn’t got any
can’t really isn’t any way out” (THHN 224)—to the remembering of trauma—operating as Richard Cantwell reminiscences that, “He remembered how, by some miracle of chance in a war, he had been with his best friend for a moment in action in the Ardennes and they were pursuing” (ARIT 268). Hemingway’s ARIT illustrates the narrative calculus of trauma which presents Hemingway’s narrative progression as a result of trauma.

The progression of Hemingway’s characters and narrative structures through the interpolation of trauma captures a modern impulse to reconcile the paradigm shifts that displace ideological structures such as narratives, time, and identity. In this movement, Hemingway embodies, enacts, repeats and performs the modern impulse both to reconcile the shock of trauma and to assume one’s survival as one’s own, both as an individual and as a member of a community. In this embodiment, enactment, repetition, and performance, Hemingway’s narrative calculus gives voice to a silenced and abjected experience of war trauma in his fiction. Thus, the narrative counters and critiques the dominant war narratives of the time. In fact, with this use of narrative calculus, Hemingway additionally offers a critique to his earlier works and structures.

**Hemingway’s Progression: Texts and Trauma**

Walter Ong, in *Orality and Literacy* asserts that, “the evolution of consciousness through human history is marked by growth in articulate attention to the interior of the individual person as distanced—though not necessarily separated—from the communal structures in which each person is necessarily enveloped” (174). Ong’s sense of evolution, like Hemingway’s narrative calculus, concentrates on
the emergence of the interior rather than a mere preoccupation with the exterior. The move from the exterior or explicit to the interior or implicit is made necessary and available through the experience of trauma in the narrative. Trauma provides the impetus to engage a calculus of reflection and creation, perception and memory, experiencing and remembering, and objectivity, subjectivity, and abjectivity. Thus, the focus on the explicit combines and engages a focus on the implicit. Thus, Hemingway’s narrative calculus appearing in ARIT captures and engages a different voice and structure that appears to privilege movement involving exteriority and interiority.

Ernest Hemingway writes in a letter to Harvey Brie in 1956 that, “it’s all trauma” (“Talk with Mr. Hemingway” reprinted in Trogdon Hemingway: A Literary Reference 274). This observation appears as Hemingway attempts to denigrate critics who solely focus on the various explicit moments of traumas in his life without truly engaging the implicitness of these events in order to read and understand his fiction (Baker Selected Letters 867). Trauma, in Hemingway, is an event that offers the opportunity to engage the implicit through the witnessing of the explicit. It is not “all” the experience of trauma; it is the totality of the effect of the traumatic in and on Hemingway. Hemingway’s Across the River and into the Trees offers a manner of seeing and listening to Hemingway from the site and with the voice of traumas that opens the possibility of witnessing a transition of Hemingway’s narrative structures through his use and treatment of trauma.69

69 See Cathy Caruth’s Unclaimed Narrative’s discussion of Hiroshima, Mon Amour for a similar discussion.
Exploring the narrative structure of Hemingway’s ARIT highlights the importance of trauma on and in the progression of Hemingway’s structures. The exploration echoes the importance that Hemingway places on witnessing and experiencing war and trauma on the writer and the reader. Knowledge of war trauma is key in Hemingway’s ethos; he observes in *Green Hills of Africa* that, “what a great advantage an experience of war was to a writer” (70). As such, Hemingway’s privileging of war and trauma showcases the evolution from the exterior to the interior and the explicit to the implicit that occurs in his narrative structure. However make no mistake, the evolution is one that requires both sides of the conversation to create a successful narrative of war and trauma.

*Across the River and into the Trees* demonstrates the effects of experiencing war trauma in concert with toll of carrying the memory of war. In fact, Hemingway writes in *Death in the Afternoon* that, “there are some things which cannot be learned quickly and time, which is all we have, must be paid heavily for their acquiring. They are the very simplest things and because it takes a man’s life to know them the little new that each man gets from life is very costly and the only heritage he has to leave” (192). Hemingway’s 1950 ARIT expresses through a voice of someone who paid heavily for the acquiring of the “things” needed. Hemingway’s ARIT exemplifies through the lens he proposes most apt, war and trauma, the explicit and implicit value of the toll paid on the development of narrative structure and point of view.
Chapter Four: Hemingway’s Hermeneutics: Trauma and *Across the River*

Ernest Miller Hemingway’s (1950) *Across the River and into the Trees* receives little critical analysis or exploration.\(^{70}\) In fact upon its release and for the years following, the novel is dismissed from the canon of Hemingway’s work. Joseph Warren Beach’s views in 1951 deeming the novel—“a pathetic *liebstod*”\(^{71}\) of a certain Colonel Cantwell”—permeate the novel’s contemporary reception and subsequent critical evaluation of Hemingway’s ARIT (*Hemingway and His Critics: An International Anthology* 228). Many Hemingway aficionados, scholars, and critics simply dismiss the novel from serious study and critical analysis.

Their dismissal focuses on the novel’s protagonist’s, Colonel Richard Cantwell’s, brusque manner of recollecting his war stories.\(^{72}\) The critics also take

---

\(^{70}\) Hemingway addresses the critical dismissal of ARIT in a 1950 reaction, “Success, It’s Wonderful.” He counters the critical reception of the novel by stating that, “Many critics do not understand a work when a writer tries for something he has not attempted before” (*New York Times: Book Review* 58). Hemingway observes the critics’ lack of understanding in relation to the viewing of the book as autobiography. Thus, the critics not only attack the book, but also attack Hemingway, the person. Hemingway continues his defense and suggests a shift in literary criticism, “when books are read and criticized, rather than personalities attacked” (58). Perhaps, Hemingway’s statement is to be understood as a man facing harsh criticisms when he previously had been lauded, but at the kernel of Hemingway’s censure to critics appears the desire for ARIT to one, be recognized as his development as a writer and two, be understood from the vantage point of Hemingway writing, not solely Hemingway biography.

\(^{71}\) Literally German for “dear death” but in this application, Beach is suggesting the novel is in the genre of a progression of death, in inverse to a *buildingsroman*, which is German for a novel of the progression of growth.

\(^{72}\) Conducting a basic reading of ARIT using the approach illustrates the mechanics and validity of
fault with the story of the improbable love between a doomed cardionecrostic Cantwell and the nineteen-year-old Italian menstruant Contessa Renata.

Overall, scholars and readers\(^{73}\) pan the style of Hemingway’s writing in the novel, the method. The exploration begins investigating ARIT for “things that have happened” understanding how the text functions as story. Hemingway’s ARIT is the story of the last four days of Colonel Richard Cantwell and his memories of war as told to Contessa Renata. Charles M. Oliver observes the plot focuses on a man struggling “heroically to control the terms of his own impending death” (“Study of Impending Death” 144). Understanding the focus of the plot leads to examining the text for “things as they exist” with an exploration of themes. The major themes in Hemingway’s ARIT are war, trauma, and love. These themes are supported by a textual focus on Cantwell’s recalling of war stories, revisiting the moments of trauma, and proclaiming his love for Renata. Building on thematic knowledge of the text transitions to the “things that you know” through a close inspection of the structures of the text.

The narrative structure of the text is disjunctive with the Colonel’s story beginning on Day 4 (The duck shoot i.e. “tomorrow of the text”), returning in memory to Day 1 (the medical examination i.e. “day before yesterday”), then Day 2 (drive to Trieste and memories of World War I, arrival in Venice, evening and gondola ride with Renata i.e. “yesterday”), then Day 3 (morning and lunch with Renata with memories of World War II and departure for hunting grounds i.e. “today”), with the conclusion returning to Day 4 (the duckshoot and death i.e. “tomorrow”)\(^{72}\). ARIT’s structure differs from the majority of Hemingway’s fiction in its lack of linearity. The structure of ARIT leads to an exploration of the text for elements “you cannot know.” A concentration on elements, aspects, and portions of the text is aided by the inclusion of an investigation of historical and biographical information. The story of Cantwell parallels events involving trauma which Hemingway experienced and witnessed in World War I and World War II. Using the four levels of art’s function as expressed by Hemingway illustrates the centrality of war and trauma in interpreting ARIT. The overview of Hemingway’s ARIT illuminates the importance of memory and remembering war and trauma in the interpretation of the text.

\[^{73}\] Hemingway studies resonates from the aftermath of his suicide, with Irving Howe (1961) stating that, “Now that he is dead and nothing remains but a few books and the problem of his dying, perhaps we should ask the simplest, most radical of questions, what was there in Hemingway’s writing that enabled him to command the loyalty of a generation?” (Meyers 430-433). Howe’s question reverberates through Hemingway studies. Exploring the question, what is there in the writing contained in ARIT, illustrates an important angle for Hemingway study.

The greatest difficulty in approaching a text like ARIT is the impulse for the critic to try and save the text, to restore the text from its depths of disapproval to its rightful position in the Hemingway canon. Instead, approaching ARIT necessitates extensive exploration. The text needs to be first understood as a story followed by a close thematic examination. The examination should closely inspect the structures of the text with a concentration on elements, aspects, and portions of the narrative. Lastly, the investigation should address historical and biographical information contained in the text. The thrust of this type of reading is not to heroically save or to merely extol the text, ARIT; instead, the impulse is to disperse the critical pother preventing these types of approaches and interpretations of ARIT in the first place.

Ernest Hemingway presents his view of fiction in many interviews, essays, and treatises. In response to George Plimpton’s (1958) question concerning the function of art, Hemingway proclaims that art arises, “From things that have happened and from things as they exist and from all things that you know and all those you cannot know” (The Paris Review Spring 1958; reprinted in Trogdon Ernest Hemingway: A Literary Reference 310). Hemingway continues explaining his methods used to create art. He states that, “you make something through your invention that is not a representation but a whole new thing truer than anything true and alive, and you make it
which Morton D. Zabel (1950) suggests is “poor with a feebleness of invention, a dullness of language, and a self-parodying style and theme” (Meyers Hemingway: The Critical Heritage 377). 74

Role of Trauma in Interpreting Hemingway’s ARIT

Hemingway’s Across the River and into the Trees 75 is a very different novel then his previous works of fiction in its structure, tone, and characterization of trauma and war. The work illustrates a progression in Hemingway’s narrative structure referencing aspects and elements of Hemingway’s prior texts. Hemingway, in an (1959) introduction unpublished until 1981, examines the progression of his alive, and if you make it well enough, you give it immortality” (The Paris Review Spring 1958; reprinted in Trogdon Ernest Hemingway: A Literary Reference 310). Hemingway’s observations on the function and method of creating art reflect on the skills necessary to read and interpret his fiction.

Reading and interpreting ARIT, in this fashion, involves examining the text from Hemingway’s perspectives: things that have happened, things as they exist, things that you know, and those you cannot know. Exploring Howe’s question, what is there in the writing contained in ARIT, involves really examining the there of Hemingway’s novel. The exploration involves investigating ARIT for “things that have happened” through the understanding of how the text functions first as story, “things as they exist” through an examination of the themes in the text, “things that you know” through a close inspection of the structures of the text, and “those you cannot know” through a concentration on elements, aspects, and portions of the text aided by the inclusion of an investigation of historical and biographical information contained in ARIT. 74


75 9:00 PM Saturday, May 2nd, 1863 Jackson was wounded at the battle of Chancellorsville. He was shot through the left upper arm just beneath the shoulder. The humerus was fractured— the radial artery was injured. He bled profusely. A second bullet entered the lateral left upper forearm and exited diagonally from the medial lower third of the forearm. A third bullet struck his right hand fracturing the second and third metacarpal bones and lodged beneath the skin on the back of his hand. These wounds would lead to his left arm being amputated, and his living for eight days. On the following Sunday, at 1:30 PM, Dr. McGuire noted momentary consciousness and told him he had but two hours to live. Jackson whispered, “Very good. it's all right.” He declined brandy and water and said, “I will only delay my departure and do no good. I want to preserve my mind to the last.” Dr. McGuire states his mind began to fail and wander. He talked as if giving commands on the battlefield— then he was at the mess table talking to his staff— now with his wife and child— now at prayers with his military family. A few moments before he died he ordered A.P. Hill to prepare for action. “Pass the infantry to the front rapidly. Tell Major Hawks” -- then stopped. Presently he smiled and said with apparent relief, “Let us cross over the river and rest under the shade of the trees” and then seemingly in peace he died.” (taken from http://www.lostgeneration.com/hemfaq.htm)
narrative structure throughout his writing career. In this essay written two years before his suicide, he emphasizes the importance of trauma in relation to his narrative evolution as a writer. Towards the end of the passage meant for a collection of Hemingway’s short fiction, Hemingway observes that,

> It is very bad for writers to be hit on the head too much. Sometimes you lose months when you should have and perhaps would have worked well but sometimes a long time after the memory of the sensory distortions of these woundings will produce a story which, while not justifying the temporary cerebral damage, will palliate it. “A Way You’ll Never Be” was written at Key West, Florida, some fifteen years after the damage it depicts, both to a man, a village, and a countryside, had occurred. No questions? I understand. I understand completely. However, do not be alarmed. We are not going to call for a moment of silence. Nor for the man in the white suit. Nor for the net. (The Paris Review reprinted in Trogdon Hemingway: A Literary Reference 318).76

In this passage, Hemingway appears to explore the progression of his narrative structure in relation to the trauma he experienced. The various “woundings” Hemingway experiences of trauma contribute “after the damage” depicted. The affects of his experiences with trauma are reflected in the evolution of his narrative structures, including the oft-dismissed ARIT. Hemingway’s narratives

76 The quote continues observing that, “Now gentlemen, and I notice a sprinkling of ladies who have drifted in attracted I hope by the sprinkling of applause. Thank you. Just what stories do you yourselves care for? I must not impose on you exclusively those that find favor with their author. Do you too care for any of them?” Hemingway’s questioning of a hypothetical audience of mixed gender is interesting in light of the trajectory of change that his characters have taken in his fiction in reaction to traumas in the text.
interrogate and utilize a sense of the effects of trauma experienced and remembered by Hemingway.

*Across the River and into the Trees* reflects the unhinging and play of certain thought-to-be-stable notions of narrative subjectivity and objectivity. Too often, the evolution of Hemingway as a writer is viewed as a result of the trauma experienced and how these experiences biographically correlate and appear in his fiction. However, Hemingway’s narrative progression appears more keenly related to the manner in which the various experiences he witnessed affected the form of his narrative. In other words, the construction of the narratives and not only the contents of his narratives reference the experience of trauma. The evolution of Hemingway as a writer is not solely because of the experiences he had. The progression of Hemingway, evidenced in his narrative structures, can be seen instead as treating the pervasive quality of the memories of these experiences that affect the narrative structuring in Hemingway’s fiction. Hemingway observes that, “but sometimes a long time after the memory of the sensory distortions of these woundings will produce a story which, while not justifying the temporary cerebral damage, will palliate it.” Correspondingly, Hemingway’s *Across the River and Into the Trees* interrogates and integrates the effects of his memories of trauma within the novel’s narrative structure.77

77 The memory and active remembering of trauma and war appears in Hemingway’s focus in ARIT. Hemingway’s views the function of art—as exploring things that happened, things as they exist, things that you know, and things that you cannot know. Hemingway’s function of art is to craft not a representation but a new thing truer and more alive that achieves immortality. Hemingway’s ARIT’s “things” all focus on aspects of the experience of trauma. In the 1958 interview with George Plimpton in which he outlined the function of art, Hemingway responds to the question “how detached must you be from an experience before you can write about it in fictional terms?” stating, “It depends on the experience. One part of you sees it with complete
Hemingway explores the effects of trauma on the writer in a 1958 interview with George Plimpton. Hemingway observes that, “Certainly it is valuable to a trained writer to crash in an aircraft which burns. He learns several important things very quickly. Whether they will be of use to him is conditioned by survival” (The Paris Review Spring 1958; reprinted in Trogdon Ernest Hemingway: A Literary Reference 309). In this observation, Hemingway’s privileging of trauma concentrates on the knowledge gained not only from the event, but, additionally, the focus is on the effects of surviving the trauma. Hemingway asserts the importance of this survival,

Survival, with honor, is as difficult as ever and as all important to a writer. Those who do not last are always more beloved since no one has to see them in their long, dull, unrelenting, no quarter given and no quarter received, fights that they make to do something as they believe it should be done before they die. Those who die or quit early and easy and with every good reason are preferred because they are understandable and human. Failure and well-disguised cowardice are more human and more beloved (The Paris Review Spring 1958; reprinted in Trogdon Ernest Hemingway: A Literary Reference 309).

Inherent in Hemingway’s response to Plimpton is the relationship between the

_________________________
detachment from the start. Another part is very involved. I think there is no rule about how soon one should write about it. It would depend on how well adjusted the individual was and on his or her recuperative powers” (The Paris Review Spring 1958; reprinted in Trogdon Ernest Hemingway: A Literary Reference 309). For Hemingway, trauma is an integral "thing" explored in his fiction.
traumatic survivals to writing. Equally important in his response is the focus on

Hemingway’s response to Plimpton concerns the detachment in the experience of trauma. He also presents a preoccupation on survival in relation to trauma. Hemingway places emphasis on the survival of the traumatic experience. He buttresses this emphasis with a connection between two modes: one, the survival of the trauma and two, the survival of the author. Hemingway observes that the relationship between the experience of trauma and writing about the experience is related to ability and success of surviving. Hemingway observes of the usefulness of trauma to the writer stating, “whether they will be of use to him is conditioned by survival.” Hemingway’s survival of trauma consequently is linked to the survival of the author.

Robert Jay Lifton, in an interview with Cathy Caruth, explores survival in relation to trauma. Lifton proposes that the survivor of trauma “moves forward into a situation that one has little capacity to image; and that’s why it shatters whatever one had that was prospective or experiential in the past” (Caruth Trauma: Explorations in Memory 137). Lifton asserts that this shattering creates a second self, as “one’s sense of self is radically altered” (137). Lifton’s views of the shattering occurring within in the individual experiencing trauma is echoed in Hemingway sense of simultaneous detachment and involvement in the traumatic event and survival of the trauma. Hemingway’s understanding of the traumatic experience embodies Lifton’s idea of the second self, a self that is not “a totally new self” but a self that is “what one brought into the trauma as affected significantly and painfully, confusedly, but in a very primal way, by that trauma” (137).

Hemingway’s imbrication of traumatic involvement and detachment positions survival as both involving the individual and creating the author. In Hemingway’s “On Writing,” appearing in Philip Young’s (1972) The Nick Adams Stories, the Nick Adams figure/voice projects this bifurcated identity of individual and author. In the story, a stream-of-consciousness narrative ensues conflating Nick Adams and Hemingway. Hemingway writes, “Like talking about something good. That was what had made the war unreal. Too much talking. Talking about anything was bad. Talking about anything actual was bad. It always killed it. The only writing that was any good was what you made up, what you imagined. That made everything true” (237). The Adams figure captures a sense of detachment from Hemingway and from the experiences of trauma with the observation “that was what had made the war unreal.” Additionally, the narrative engages a sense of involvement with Hemingway and the experiences of trauma with the statement “too much talking.”

Hemingway’s portrays in Adams the reaction of the individual to the survival of trauma. In this portrayal, revisiting the actual experience of trauma is to be avoided. In the story, Adams proclaims that, “Talking about anything actual was bad.” Hemingway also captures a sense of the experience related to the survival of the author. The experience and survival of trauma exposes the unknowable, or as Hemingway calls it, things “you cannot know.” In this breach, fictions are created in the attempt to explain the traumatic event. Therefore, authors, like Hemingway, are generated in the impulse to explain the unexplainable. Hemingway echoes this notion in “On Writing” when Adams asserts that, “the only writing that was any good was what you made up, what you imagined.”

In Hemingway’s “On Writing,” aspects of Hemingway, the individual, and Hemingway, the author are imposed and projected in the figure of Adams. The work captures the double-sided nature of a trauma survivor as both individual and creator. Lawrence Broer observes essential differences in Hemingway’s development of Nick Adams. Broer notes that, “the wounded ex-soldier in “Big Two-Hearted River” can let out his mental line only so far before the strain becomes unbearable and he becomes sick and shaky (226). Whereas, Broer highlights Hemingway’s development of Adams as “the aspiring writer in “On Writing” who has acquired the courage to confront the traumatic past experience and the necessary knowledge of self and craft to transmute such experience into art and thus create a more stable and durable identity” (Beegel Hemingway’s Neglected Short Fiction 138). In “On Writing,” Hemingway’s Nick Adams brings repressed experience to consciousness through the recollection of both the experience and the survival of
the amount of time between the experiencing of the trauma and the accessing of
the memory of the event in relation to the construction of narratives structures
that attempt to illustrate and to engage the effects of trauma in the fiction.

Hemingway’s observes of experiencing trauma that, “One part of you sees
it with complete detachment from the start. Another part is very involved. I think
there is no rule about how soon one should write about it” (The Paris Review
In this passage, Hemingway saliently exposes gaps between the traumatic
experiences, the knowledge of the experiences, the involvement with the

trauma. Broer’s observation of the duality in “On Writing” references the survival of the individual
involved in the traumatic experience and the generation of the author as a detached double
created in that survival.
Hemingway’s Nick Adams figure in “On Writing” experiences two contradictory impulses. The
first impulse is the desire to capture the reality of the situation, and the second focuses on the
need to create writing that “made everything come true” (Young The Nick Adams Stories 237).
Hemingway’s portrayal of doubling in the story mirrors the experience of trauma. Doubling like
this occurs in the survival of trauma establishing a duality where “elements” are at odds in the two
impulses, “including ethical contradictions” (Lifton 137). Hemingway’s writing embodies the
contradiction between capturing life and creating fiction from moments of trauma. His narratives
generate a dialogue between involvement and detachment with trauma.
Contradictory impulses in Hemingway appear in his desire to write prose that captures aspects of
trauma, creates engaging fiction, involves his traumatic experiences, and offers him the
opportunity to detach from these experiences. Hemingway is capturer of life and trauma in his
prose. He asserts that, “but when you get the damned hurt use it—don’t cheat with it. Be as
faithful to it as a scientist […]”(Hemingway Baker Selected Letters 408). And, he is a creator of
fiction, “find what gave you the emotion; what the action was that gave you the excitement. Then
write it down making it clear so the reader will see it too and have the same feeling that you had”
(Hemingway By-Line 219). His fiction involves his experience of trauma. Hemingway’s
experience of war trauma in Italy is captured by his observation, “when there is a direct hit your
pals get spattered all over you” (Hemingway letter reprinted in Nagel’s Hemingway in Love and
War 176). This experience is mirrored in AFTA as Fredric Henry is splattered with the blood of a
soldier. Hemingway writes, “I felt something dripping […] I tried to move sideways so that it did
not fall on me” (AFTA 61). And, his fiction engages the detachment he felt at the moment of
trauma. Hemingway’s detachment in relation to his wounding in Italy is expressed in a letter
where he writes that, “the 227 wounds I got from the trench mortar didn’t hurt a bit at the time,
only my feet felt like I had rubber boots full of water on” (176). This detachment is echoed in
FWBT as Robert Jordan surveys the damage to his leg. Hemingway’s Jordan observes, “the big
nerve must have been truly smashed when that damned horse rolled on it, he thought. It truly
doesn’t hurt at all” (Hemingway FWBT 468). Hemingway’s observations about trauma, all
gleaned from his non-fiction, reference the duality in his fiction. Hemingway’s traumatic duality in
his fiction interpolates the tension between the survivor as individual and the survivor as author.
experiences, and the later accessing of the experiences in the writing of a text. The gaps in understanding, exposed by Hemingway, connect to Hemingway’s specific experience with trauma operating in his fiction. For example in ARIT, Hemingway appears to intimate his view of experiencing of trauma when Cantwell observes of people who write of war. In the narrative, Cantwell observes that, “Boys who were sensitive and cracked and kept all their valid first impressions of their day of battle, or their three days, or even their four, write books. They are good books but can be dull if you have been there” (129). In addition, Hemingway’s observations appearing in *The Paris Review* and in ARIT connect the experience of trauma to one’s progression as a writer, which also explores the role of trauma in interpreting his texts.

Hemingway’s observations in his 1958 interview with George Plimpton reflect on the general epistemology of trauma in relation to Hemingway’s narrative generation. Hemingway’s observation on experiencing trauma connects to elements of trauma theory. This connection is not to say that Hemingway refers specifically to the psychoanalytic understanding of trauma in direct mention, as he notes a distrust of the impulse to read his literature in relation to “discards from Freud and Jung” (Letter to Wallace Meyer 1952 reprinted in Baker *Selected Letters* 751). Instead, elements of Hemingway’s observations correlate to historical and contemporary psychoanalytic and cognitive understandings of textual representation and treatment of trauma appearing in literary works. For instance, in THHN, Richard Gordon is observed
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79 See Caruth and Freud for the sense of belatedness that arises in the experience of trauma.
by Professor MacWalsey as,

on the other hand, a surgeon cannot desist while operating for fear of hurting the patient. But why must all the operations in life be performed without an anesthetic? If I had been a better man I would have let him beat me up. It would have been better…I am ashamed and disgusted with myself and I hate what I have done…but I must not think about that. I will now return to the anesthetic I have used for seventeen years and will not need much longer (222).

In this passage, Hemingway’s narrative references the historical treatment of trauma in a text in relation to the distance and proximity a character experiences during trauma or following traumatic experiences.

The first correlation appearing between Hemingway’s observations and psychoanalytic theories echoes Sigmund Freud’s notion of how trauma relates to memory. Freud in his 1939 *Moses and Monotheism* observes that, “someone gets away, apparently unharmed, from the spot where he has suffered a shocking accident, for instance a train collusion. In the course of the following weeks, however, he develops a series of grave psychical and motor symptoms which can be ascribed only to his shock or whatever else happened at the time of the accident” (84). Echoing Freud’s observation of the belatedness of the traumatic experience on the individual, Hemingway, too, intimates a delayed connection between the experience and the return of the experience in memory, and, thus, in the generated fiction. Hemingway focuses on the experience of trauma in relation to the amount of time between the event and the accessing of
the event. For both Freud and Hemingway, trauma is an experience that returns to the individual as a condition of survival. For example, in FWBT Robert Jordan observes of his experience of war and trauma that,

in all that, in the fear that dries your mouth and your throat, in the smashed plaster dust and the sudden panic of a wall falling, collapsing in the flash and roar of a shell-burst, clearing the gun, dragging those away who had been serving it, lying face downward and covered with rubble, your head behind the shield working on a stoppage, getting the broken case out, straightening the belt again, you now lying straight behind the shield, the gun searching the roadside again; you did the thing there was to do and knew that you were right. You learned the dry-mouthed, fear-purged, purging ecstasy of battle and you fought that summer and that fall for all the poor in the world, against all tyranny, for all the things that you believed and for the new world you had been educated into. You learned that fall, he thought, how to endure and how to ignore suffering…But it was still there and all that you went through only served to validate it” (236).

In this passage that echoes Freudian understandings of trauma, Hemingway appears to intimate the connection between the experience of trauma and the return of the experience in memory, and, thus, in the generated fiction.

Hemingway, like Freud and Caruth, insists on a problematic tension between the experience, the understanding, and the recollection of trauma. Sigmund Freud focuses on the haunting qualities resulting from trauma on the
individual’s identity and consciousness. His ideas about the effects of trauma appear central to contemporary trauma theorist Cathy Caruth. For Caruth, the experience of trauma creates a tension that operates in fiction that treats trauma as a sense of belatedness. When this tension appears in narratives, traditional notions of linearity in time, dialogue, plot, and character appear disrupted. For example, Hemingway’s THHN opens in a manner that reflects this narrative tension surrounding tales of trauma. The first passage of the work observes that, “You know how it is there early in the morning in Havana with the bums still asleep against the walls of the buildings; before even the ice wagons come by with ice for the bars” (1). Correspondingly, representations involving trauma mirror the experience of trauma. This mirroring operates in the structure of a narrative through a representation of a strain in the recollection of the experience. For example, in THHN following the opening, a shoot out occurs. The narrative shifts from the action of the shoot out to the discussion of the experience by the characters. In the narrative, the characters reference a strain in relation to the traumatic experience just witnessed. Eddy, a character in the work, relates to Mr. Johnson that, “‘don’t talk about it, Mr. Johnson,’…’It makes me sick to even think about it’” (THHN 9). This strain in THHN and other works appears in narratives as a disruption of traditional modes of narrative structure and subjectivity and objectivity in reaction to the experience of trauma.

The tension in narratives of trauma, according to Anne Whitehead, challenges the notion of a straightforward textual referentiality due to the belatedness related to the experienced trauma. Whitehead connects the
representations of trauma in texts to a repositioning of self in the modern world. The modern experience of world wars generates a history that is no “longer available as a completed knowledge, but must be reconceived as that which perpetually escapes or eludes our understanding” (Whitehead *Trauma Fiction* 13). This notion of history, according to Whitehead, “implicitly repositions the relation between language and the world, so that the text shifts from a reflective mode—based on a position of self-awareness and self-understanding—to a performative act, in which the text becomes imbricated in our attempts to receive and understand the world around us” (*Trauma Fiction* 13). As such, the fictional representation of trauma involves a calculus between an awareness of self and a performance of self. Therefore, the fictional treatment and representation of trauma experienced contributes to narratives steeped with strain, detachment, and disjuncture. For instance in Hemingway’s SAR, Jake Barnes recollects his experience of trauma, and in the narrative strain appears in his memory. Barnes observes that, “I lay awake thinking and my mind jumping around. Then I couldn’t keep away from it, and I started to think about Brett and all the rest of it went away” (39). In this passage the representation of trauma witnessed through Barnes’ narration reflects a sense of strain and disjuncture in the structure of the narrative.

Hemingway’s observations of trauma’s relation to writing reflect Caruth’s and Whitehead’s notions that during the experience of trauma an individual sees the experience with detachment. Moreover, Hemingway’s understanding connects with Whitehead’s notion of the incompleteness of knowing the
experience of trauma. This understanding also echoes Hemingway's ideas about the function of art arising from his observation that fiction should involve “things that have happened and from things as they exist and from all the things that you know and all those you cannot know.” Hemingway’s aesthetic concentration illustrates a narrative reflection of the experience based on self-awareness. Hemingway's focus is additionally tempered by the understanding that this awareness is incomplete and must be reconceived as a knowledge that perpetually escapes and eludes conventional notions of understanding due to the nature of trauma.

Unconventional nature of knowledge of trauma is expressed in the attempt to portray trauma in a narrative. In fact, Hemingway attempts to capture the reality or “the things” of trauma in his narratives. For instance in (1936) “The Snows of Kilimanjaro,” Hemingway constructs a protagonist who suffers from the effect of a trauma involving a thorn puncture. Harry, the protagonist and sometimes narrator of the story, is shown using a *vers libre* or free indirect narrative structure. Harry is shown as reflecting that, “since the gangrene started in his right leg he had no pain and with the pain the horror had gone and all he felt now was a great tiredness and anger that this was the end of it” (Hemingway *The Complete Short Stories* 41). In this passage, the things that have happened—“since the gangrene started in his right leg”—, the things that have existed—“he had no pain and with the pain the horror had gone”—, and the things that you know—“with the pain the horror had gone” all operate to present
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80 See Plimpton Interview reprinted in Trogdon’s *Ernest Hemingway: A Literary Reference*
Harry’s experience and memories of that experience of the effects of trauma. Likewise as Whitehead suggests, the experience and memory of trauma is not just about presenting, in the narrative, the accurate reflection of the experience. The function of art, for Hemingway, is not just about creating a narrative that captures the things you “know” but also, it is about creating a narrative that embodies “all those you cannot know.”

Hemingway’s narrative movements of “all those [things] you cannot know” appear as a concern of performance in his narratives in relation to the writing about the experience of trauma. A component of trauma is the performance of understanding that occurs after the experience of trauma. The performative act following the experience of trauma attempts to give voice to the perceptions and knowledge generated by the experience. Since there is an element of the unknowable surrounding the experience of trauma, the performative also intimates the ability to construct understanding of the unknowable. For example, Hemingway in “The Snows of Kilimanjaro” creates this type of performance as Harry, directly following the prior quoted passage, issues the statement that, “For this, that now was coming, he had very little curiosity. For years it had obsessed him; but now it meant nothing in itself. It was strange how easy being tired made it. Now he would never write the things that he had saved to write until he knew enough to write them well” (The Complete Short Stories 41). In this passage, Harry’s obsession with unknowability that he will never write gives voice to the unknowable portion related to the experience of trauma. In a similar fashion in ARIT, Hemingway echoes these sentiments in relation to trauma. The narrative
surrounding Cantwell reflects that,

Death is a lot of shit, he thought. It comes to you in small fragments that hardly show where it has entered. It comes to you in small fragments that hardly show where it has entered. It comes, sometimes, atrociously. It can come from unboiled water; an un-pulled-up mosquito boot, or it can come with the great, white-hot, clanging roar we have lived with....I have seen it come...But what can I tell this girl now on this cold, windy morning in the Gritti Palace Hotel?” (202).

In both “The Snows of Kilimanjaro” and ARIT, the performative act of telling the story of death and trauma following the experience of trauma attempts to give voice to the perceptions and knowledge generated by the experience in the narratives. The element of the unknowable surrounds the experience of trauma in the narratives, and as such, the performative act of telling the story of trauma also intimates the ability to construct understanding of the unknowable experience of trauma.

In the passage in “The Snows of Kilimanjaro,” Hemingway places in Harry a preoccupation on performance, as being drawn from a lack of knowledge—“very little curiosity.” The narrative also intimates a concentration on the performance itself—“he would never write the things he had saved to write.” As such, Harry’s “little curiosity” and his inability to write about “the things he had saved” reference the unknowable and abject nature of the effects of prior experiences and traumas. In fact, Hemingway’s in the Plimpton interview suggest that with the experience of trauma that “one part of you sees it with
complete detachment from the start” while “another part is very involved.”

Hemingway’s observations are embodied in figure of Harry from “The Snows of Kilimanjaro.” The narrator of the story illustrates the tension between reflection and performance of the treatment of traumatic experiences in Hemingway’s narrative. The narrative, both reflects a verisimilitude of the experience of trauma while creating a narrative that explores aspects of the unknowable related to the effects of the experience.

Hemingway writes to his friend Buck Lanham in 1949 that *Across the River* recapitulates themes used throughout his career, adding that he believed this novel was his best to date” (reprinted in Waldron *A Readers to Ernest Hemingway* 187). On one hand, *Across the River and into the Trees*, as recapitulation of Hemingway’s experiences and memories of war and trauma, engages Hemingway’s time spent as an ambulance driver in Italy in World War I and as a war correspondent during World War II. In fact, Hemingway, in (1944) “Battle for Paris,” remarks of his time in World War II-torn Paris that, “the main highlights of this period that I remember, outside of being scared a number of times, are not publishable at this time. Sometime I would like to be able to write an account of the actions of the colonel both by day and by night. But you cannot write it yet” (Collier’s September 30, 1944 reprinted in *By-Line* 371). Hemingway’s observation that, “I would like to be able to write an account of the actions of the colonel both by day and by night,” illustrates his desire to reflect
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81 Quoted in Trogdon *Ernest Hemingway: A Literary Example* page 297.
82 Most critics panned the novel; Carlos Baker asserts “in spite of Ernest’s high hopes and preliminary vauntings, *Across the River* was received in September with boredom and dismay” (486). As such, the novel has languished in obscurity, for the most part, since its publication.
and create from his traumatic experiences—the un-publishable moments of “being scared.” Hemingway fulfills this desire in writing ARIT. ARIT uses and establishes themes and structures used by Hemingway in his earlier narratives.

In relation to Hemingway’s ARIT, Carlos Baker observes that, “the [novel’s] atmosphere was darkened by a strange psychological malaise, as if Ernest were using the pages of his novel as the equivalent of a psychiatrist’s couch” (477). Baker’s critical observation centers on the novel as connecting solely to the biographical without focusing on the textual qualities of the narrative. Baker and multiple other critics address only one side of the there of interpreting Hemingway’s writing in ARIT. Baker, like most of the contemporary critics of the novel, focus their critiques on the autobiographical nature of Hemingway’s ARIT. In fact, Alfred Kazin in (1950) New Yorker review opines that, “the book [ARIT] reads as if it had been written as a premature summary of Hemingway’s own life and work” (reprinted in Meyers Hemingway: The Critical Heritage 378). The observations of Hemingway’s second-to-last novel all concentrate on crafting a criticism of the work from biographical perspectives which limits the full exploration of the narrative.

The critics’ preoccupation with the connections between Hemingway and his fiction in ARIT are addressed by Hemingway’s observation (1950) where he asserts that critical observations should focus on texts not solely on the personalities of the author. Yet, reading Hemingway’s ARIT does involve understanding how Hemingway’s experiences, in general, and his traumatic experiences, in particular, affect his narrative constructions. To really engage
Irving Howe’s question, “what was there in Hemingway’s writing that enabled him to command the loyalty of a generation,” most certainly requires a responsibility to the interpretation of the writing (the text), the author, the story of survival in the text, the survival of the author, and the effect of trauma recollected and experienced in relation to the structuring of his narratives (reprinted in Jeffery Meyers Hemingway: The Critical Heritage 430-433).

Hemingway speaks to the dichotomy and responsibility of capturing war and trauma in writing. In a Collier’s dispatch on November 18, 1944, where he interjects into Captain Howard’s recounting of combat, Hemingway states that, “there is a great difference in combat between the way it is supposed to be and the way it is—as great as the difference in how life is supposed to be and how it is” (“War in the Siegfried Line” reprinted in By-Line 394). Similarly, Michael Herr, in Dispatches writing as a war correspondent in a very different war—Vietnam yet capturing the sense of trauma, similarly argues “I went there behind the crude but serious belief that you had to be able to look at anything, serious because I acted on it and went, crude, because I didn’t know, it took the war to teach it, that you were responsible for everything you saw as you were for everything you did” (20). Hemingway, like Herr, understands that writing war requires an oscillation between the reflection and creation.\(^83\) The question this brings to the surface is

\(^83\) Reading Hemingway’s ARIT involves a focus on the there of the text through engagement with the reflection of Hemingway’s life—“the way it is” and the creation of Hemingway’s text—“they way it is supposed to be.” Herr’s statement focuses on the responsibility of the reflection i.e. “seeing” in concert with the “doing” i.e. creation of war trauma. Likewise, Hemingway’s observations focus on the responsibility of the author to see the war, as a reflection of what “it is” and to represent the war, as a creation of the “supposed to be.” In this manner, Hemingway’s ARIT serves as both reflection and creation of his experience of war and trauma.
how does one create a narrative structure that can embody the trauma while maintaining responsibility.

Solely focusing on Hemingway’s ARIT as a reflection of Hemingway’s experiences discounts the text as Hemingway’s narrative creation. This is the stance that the majority of critics did and have continued to do with ARIT. The struggle in ARIT is not to interpret the work as mere Hemingway autobiography. In fact, the interpretation of the text involves a hermeneutics that addresses Hemingway’s reflections of traumatic experiences, while focusing on his creation and use of a narrative calculus relating to these traumatic experiences. The interpretation of Howe’s there in Hemingway’s ARIT involves reading the text for the experiences—“the way it is”—and memories—“the way it was supposed to be”—of war and trauma. In this fashion, reading the work proposes a move beyond reading the work for evidence of Hemingway’s experience with trauma, and instead, the act of reading the work focuses on examining the text for evidence of trauma’s effects on Hemingway’s narrative structure in the novel.

Hemingway, in all of his fiction, references and uses his life experiences as textual fodder. Additionally, Hemingway’s experiences engage a culture subjected and objected to war trauma during the period of 1914 to 1945. Hemingway in a 1946 “Foreword to Treasury for the Free World” observes that,
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84 Hemingway, in “Battle for Paris,” observes, “during this epoch I was addressed as ‘Captain.’ This is a very low rank to have at the age of forty-five years, and so, in the presence of strangers, they would address me, usually, as ‘Colonel.’ But they were a little upset and worried by my low rank, […] The main highlights of this period that I remember, outside of being scared a number of times, are not publishable at this time. Sometime I would like to be able to write an account of the actions of the colonel both by day and by night. But you cannot write it yet” (Collier’s reprinted in Byline 370-371).
“now that the wars are over and the dead are dead and we have brought whatever it is we have it is a good time to publish books like this” (reprinted in Trogdon Hemingway: A Literary Reference 261). Subsequently, Hemingway’s endorsement of the post-World Wars work that engages the trauma of the past wars is mirrored in his desire to create new narrative structures that capture trauma accurately yet in an evolved form. Hemingway appears to explore the use of the experience of war in his narratives, not only in the shifting content of his works, but in addition, in the evolving narrative structures that he uses in his fiction.

In all his writing, Hemingway desires to capture a veracity to the experience and feelings surrounding those experiences. He desires to write of “the simplest things [...] the most fundamental is violent death” (DTA 2). In fact in Death in the Afternoon, a text that is as much concerned with capturing the trauma of writing and trauma as the preferred subject of writing as it is in capturing the violent beauty of bullfighting, Hemingway observes that,

   I had read many books in which, when the author tried to convey it, he only produced a blur, and I decided that this was because either the author had never seen it clearly or at the moment of it, he had physically or mentally shut his eyes, as one might do if he saw a child that he could not possible reach or aid, about to be struck by a train. In such a case I suppose he would probably be justified in shutting his eyes as the mere fact of the child being about to be struck by the train was all that he could convey, the actual striking would be anti-climax, so that the moment
before striking might be as far as he could represent. [...] I had seen
certain things, certain simple things of this sort that I remembered, but
through taking part in them, or, in other cases, having to write of them
immediately after and consequently noticing the things I needed for instant
recording, I had never been able to study them as a man might, for
instance, study the death of his father or the hanging of some one [...] DTA 2-3).

Evident in this passage, Hemingway views the witnessing of violent death as the
most valid subject for literature, yet he is keenly aware of the difficulty of
conveying this subject in fiction. Hemingway’s intimations of the difficulty of truly
capturing, in writing, the moment of trauma involves close study of the traumatic
experience by the writer, as one oscillates between not knowing—“physically or
mentally” shutting one’s eyes” and knowing—of not only seeing but also of
remembering—the ability of studying the moment through recollection. In many
fashions, this observation illustrates the tension that Hemingway attempts to
capture in his narrative structures in his stories of trauma.

In ARIT, Hemingway’s narrative structure vacillates between the “not
knowing” and “knowing” that corresponds to the experience and effects of
trauma. In the narrative, Hemingway captures the unknowablity that occurs in
the actual seeing and experiencing of the traumatic events. This lack of certainty
is due to the nature of trauma as an event that defies knowledge as it happens.
In the narrative, Hemingway also intimates and creates the knowable that occurs
during the traumatic event. This “knowing” connects to the remembering and
recollecting of the traumatic events. As an individual is revisited and haunted by the memory of trauma, the events and effects of trauma continue to possess the subject with insistent repetitions and returns of both the knowable and unknowable elements of the experience. In fact, Cathy Caruth asserts that, “literature, like psychoanalysis, is interested in the complex relation between knowing and not knowing. And it is at the specific point at which knowing and not knowing intersect that the language of literature and the psychoanalytic theory of traumatic experience meet” (3). In the structure of ARIT, the complex relationship between knowing and not knowing in relation to trauma creates a narrative calculus that showcases Hemingway’s narrative progression. Hemingway’s narrative is structured through an exploration of the space and time of trauma, which involves the tension between knowing and not knowing that occurs in the experience of trauma.

In the narrative, Hemingway’s Colonel Richard Cantwell appears consumed in the movement from the knowing and not knowing of trauma. Correspondingly, James Meredith’s observations about ARIT echo the prevalence of traumatic haunting in the work. Meredith observes that, “like Cantwell Hemingway also thinks about ‘that’ too much, “that being this World War II battle that was fought so hard that it broke the heart of its combatants,

85 For a discussion of the hauntedness of trauma see Anne Whitehead’s Trauma Fiction “Chapter 1 The Past as revenant: trauma and haunting in Pat Barker’s Another World” pages 12-29.
86 It is interesting to note that at the end of the summer of 1929, Hemingway was signing his letters, “E. Cantwork Hemingstein” reflected a connection to Cantwell in ARIT (Reynolds Hemingway: 1930’s 33).
including the real Hemingway and the fictional Cantwell” (207). While Cantwell is not Hemingway, the figure coruscates elements of Hemingway’s perceptions of trauma. Other figures and protagonists in Hemingway’s fiction serve a similar purpose; however, Cantwell and ARIT represent an evolution in his fiction in the reflection and creation of trauma. Hemingway’s work always interrogates the effects of trauma on both the writer and the text, yet ARIT appears to handle a different type of subjectivity and objectivity in relation to the interrogation and representation of trauma in Hemingway’s fiction.

**Interpreting Hemingway’s ARIT: The Evolution of Subjectivity via Trauma**

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the psychoanalytic model of Sigmund Freud challenges the ideal of the unified subject in literature. As a result, the modernist literary subject often is halved between the conscious and unconscious, elements that are often in conflict in the structure of the modernist narrative. Instead of defining the subject only against external others—enemies, non-believers, foreigners, etc—, modernists argue that the subject also contains its own other within the unconscious. At this time, a fascination with human

---

87 “A writer, he [Hemingway] tells himself, does not need to live in the country of his fiction, for if he is a writer who deals with the human heart, with the human mind and with the presence of [or] absence of the human soul then if he can make a heart break for you, or even beat, make the mind function, and show you what passes for the soul then you may be sure he does not have to stay in Wessex for fear that he will lose it” (Reynolds Hemingway: 1930’s 67).

88 Philosophers from Rene Descartes to G.W.F. Hegel conceived of the subject as stable and unified, wholly knowable and fully self-conscious. Although presumed to be universal, and compelling even now, the ideal of the unified subject was grounded in its historical period: defining their own selves, the male Enlightenment thinkers of Western Europe also defined in contrast a host of female, racial, and ethnic others as lesser beings, neither subjects nor selves in any philosophical or political sense. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, a new modernist model challenged the Enlightenment ideal of the unified subject. As articulated most famously by Sigmund Freud, the modernist subject was divided between conscious and unconscious parts, often in conflict with one another. Instead of defining the subject only against
subjectivity arises in the literature of the period. This perspective focuses on the view that what is tantamount is not solely the nature of the external physical or social world but the manner in which the impressions of these worlds register in the consciousness of individuals. In spite of the rejection of the previous subjective sentimentality of the fiction of the late 1900s, a concern for form, tone, and an objective style in fiction jostles with an emergent desire to explore the interior landscape of individuals by means of external imagery.

Subsequently, most Hemingway scholars view his fiction as being presented in a straightforward fashion and epitomizing objectivity—the precise presentation of “the things that happened” by means of external images. E.M. Halliday observes of Hemingway’s subjectivity and objectivity a clearly defined space where the subjective (the labyrinth of the hero’s mind) ends and the objective (the presentation of the material world) commences (Critiques of Four Novels 177). E.M. Halliday’s and other scholars’ beliefs about Hemingway’s subjectivity and objectivity therefore are flummoxed when presented with the narrative structures of Hemingway’s later fiction. In his later works such as ARIT, Hemingway’s presentation of subjectivity and objectivity is not defined cleanly between the mind and thoughts of the protagonist and the presentation of the external elements of the material world surrounding the figure in the narrative.

external others, modernists argued that the subject also contained its own other within the unconscious. (xxv-xxvi Paula Geyh, Fred G Leebron, and Andrew Levy in Postmodern American Fiction)

89 See Irving Howe’s discussion of modern life in relation to Fydor Dostoevsky’s “Notes from the Underground” in Classics of Modern Fiction pages 3-12.

Interpreting Hemingway’s Calculus: Subjectivity, Trauma and ARIT

In ARIT, Hemingway accesses a narrative structure, a calculus, for presenting and representing the interior and the exterior of his protagonist that calls attention to the evolution of subjectivity and objectivity in his narrative structure. Hemingway asserts, in relation to understanding this narrative evolution in ARIT, that, “in writing I have moved through arithmetic, through plane geometry and algebra, and now I am in calculus. If they don’t understand that, to hell with them. I won’t be sad and I will not read what they say. They say? Who do they say? Let them say” (Briet “Talk with Mr. Hemingway” reprinted in Trogdon Hemingway: A Literary Reference 274). In this observation, Hemingway’s attention on his evolution references the transition occurring in his writing. Hemingway begins his career writing from the objective presentation of experiences through the images of the external world—the arithmetic and plane geometry of his experiences. As his writing progresses, he generates narratives that focus on the subjective exploration of the impressions of the interior landscape of the mind—the algebra involving his experiences. With ARIT, Hemingway writes from a narrative realm where subjectivity and objectivity in the narrative is comprised of multiple dimensions involving the exterior and the interior—the calculus of a change in the space and time of experiences. Therefore, Hemingway’s narrative structure evolves from objective arithmetic and plane geometry to a more subjective algebra.

Hemingway’s transition to a narrative calculus echoes the modernist climate affected by the theories of Freud. In addition, his progression also
references the effects of war on subjective (interior) and objective (exterior) identity in society. In fact, Eric J. Leed understands the Great War as a “modernizing experience” as it “fundamentally altered traditional sources of identity, age-old images of war and men of war” (193). Leed continues his exploration of the disruption of identity resulting from World War I stating that, “Total war” was nothing but the assertion that there was no such thing as two realities, two sets of rules, two levels upon which life might be lived and experienced (194). Leed’s view of the war’s disruption of traditional reality, rules, and levels of life highlight the change in narrative structures and point of view occurring in fiction. Mirroring the disrupted culture, subjectivity and objectivity are also no longer merely seen in narratives as distinct but instead are seen as imbricated and engaged through the use of the voice of the abject.

Hemingway’s narrative focus, as displayed in ARIT, is not just about a subjective reconciliation with an objective experience. Instead, his emphasis is a play between the subjective and the objective that uses the previously silenced voice of the abject—the experience and effects of trauma—to give a voice to a modern sensibility. This play appears in Hemingway’s calculus between the subjective presentation, remembering the trauma, and the objective representation, the memory of the trauma, in ARIT. As such, trauma operates as the impetus to imbricate objectivity and subjectivity in the narrative structure. The voices and structures of Hemingway’s ARIT present subjectivity and objectivity in a different fashion then his earlier works. The study of the novel from this perspective opens the possibility of witnessing and remarking on a
progression in Hemingway’s writing that has not been engaged before in scholarship. Additionally, the exploration of the narrative exposes an answer to the question of what does it mean to have a narrative structure voiced through a previously silenced experience such as trauma.
Michael Reynolds suggests that Ernest Hemingway *Across the River and into the Trees*, “looked for ways to speak of the war without refighting it” (203). Hemingway’s narrative desire reflected by Reynolds’s observation that Hemingway wanted to “speak of the war without refighting it” illustrates his progression to narrative calculus. Hemingway’s fiction showcases a transition in his narratives from focusing on protagonists in war—some of the Nick Adams vignettes and stories, *A Farewell to Arms, For Whom the Bell Tolls*, and *The Fifth Column* to his narratives of protagonists who attempt to escape their experiences and memories of war—selections from the Nick Adams vignettes, *The Sun Also Rises, To Have and Have Not, Green Hills of Africa*, and *Death in The Afternoon*. In the evolution of his narrative structures, Hemingway progresses to a different type of narrative and protagonist. This evolving narrative still references the heritage of Hemingway’s previous structures, yet the changes showcase a transition in his style and presentation as a result of his narrative treatment and interrogation of war, in general, and trauma, in particular.

One of the narrative’s main focuses is the recollection of his memories of
World War I and World War II. In ARIT, Colonel Richard Cantwell\(^91\) travels to Venice\(^92\) in ill health to spend time with his last love, Contessa Renata and to go duck-hunting with his friends. Cantwell is spurred on by Renata’s desire for Cantwell to tell her the stories of his war experiences. At many times in the narrative, the figure of Renata urges Cantwell to, “tell me anything about the war?” (Hemingway ARIT 118). As the narrative unfolds, Cantwell concentrates on the interior and personal recollection of his experiences and memories of war. For example, the narrative presents Cantwell as a figure who, “remembered how the attack had taken off from Monastier, gone through Fornace, and on this winter day he remembered how it had been that summer” (ARIT 26). In the structure of the novel, Hemingway captures war trauma from the perspective offered by the distance—of time and space—using the act of remembering and memory. As the brief sentence above showcases, Cantwell is not experiencing the attack—he is not in war—, nor is he escaping the memory or war; instead, the narrative focuses on Cantwell remembering the trauma of the war and exploring how these experiences and memories shape and change the narrative and point of view.

---

\(^91\) In Carlos Baker’s *Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story*, Baker observes, “He (Hemingway) said that his hero Cantwell was a composite portrait of three men: Charlie Sweeny, the former soldier of fortune; Lanham, the hard-driving West-Pointer; and most of all himself as he might have been if he had turned to soldiering instead of writing. The background, as always, was love and death” (475).

\(^92\) John Paul Russo asserts in “To Die is Not Enough,” “the swamp is the real origin of Venice—the novel begins and ends there, and nowhere do we long forget the presence of water” (154). As such, the novel appears to transform the Hemingway protagonist who first appears reluctant to enter the swamp, or the memories and the fear of war trauma in the Nick Adam’s story “Big Two Hearted River: Part Two” into a figure who wades into the swamp of awareness.
Hemingway appears to construct the narrative of and surrounding the figure of Cantwell in such a way that the structure focuses on remembering more than it focuses on experiencing. In this novel, Hemingway constructs Cantwell’s act of recollection as a narrative implementation and engagement reminiscent of calculus; the narrative structure involves a play of space and time of memory. Hemingway’s narrative calculus concentrates on the function and role of memory. Exploring the function and role memory, Endel Tulving and Martin Lepage in “Where in the Brain is the Awareness of One’s Past” observe and explore the calculus of memory. Dividing memory into different spaces and times, Tulving and Lepage observe the temporal relations in the act of remembering as displayed in Figure 1. In their exploration, Tulving and Lepage assert that, “the influence of Time 1 at Time 2 expresses itself in a mental return to the past: the individual has a conscious awareness of reexperiencing here and now something of the experience of the earlier time. Because this type of memory allows an individual to mentally visit and ‘see’ the past, this type of episodic memory is referred to as ‘palinscopic’ (backward-looking) memory. [...] Moreover, Tulving and Lepage observe that, “the looping
arrow of episodic memory can loop once more at remembered Time 1 forward to
imagined Time 3, which will follow Time 2. Episodic experiences of our personal
past become a foundation for expectations about our personal future, and we can
speak of individuals remembering the future” (Schacter and Scarry 212). In this
exploration of the calculus of memory, Tulving and Lepage’s notions of memory
and the act of remembering references a changed narrative structure of memory.
This changed narrative structure of memory resembles the movement occurring
in the narrative structure of Hemingway’s ARIT. For instance in ARIT, the
narrative of Cantwell focuses on his memories and remembering, as he is
presented in the narrative as wanting “to tell it true” and to “let it hurt who it hurts”
(207).

The proscopic elements in ARIT refer to the time and space of the events
in the narrative. For example, Cantwell’s journey to Venice, his visit with the
doctor, his rendezvous with Renata, and his hunting trip all feature procopically
in the narrative structure of ARIT. The palinscopic elements in ARIT refer to the
time and space of the memories in the narrative. For instance, Cantwell’s
memories of WWI, WWII, his wives, his meeting of Renata, and his youth all
operate palinscopically in the structure of the narrative. The imbrication of these
elements of memory in the narrative structure illustrates a calculus of space and
time in relation to memory in the narrative. Hemingway’s structure of narrative
calculus in the novel is best understood by examining the following chart. The chart outlines the narrative structure of the work in relation to the actions and experiences expressed in the story. The juxtaposition of Cantwell’s time and the narrative time in the novel expresses the tension operating in the narrative structure of the work as a result of the effects of trauma.

93 John Paul Russo’s chart provides the majority of this information except for some slight deviations in relation to Cantwell’s time (“To Die is Not Enough: Hemingway’s Venetian Novel”176).
The two graphic figures attempt to visually demonstrate the complexity of Hemingway’s structure in ARIT. Understanding Hemingway’s narrative calculus.
in ARIT requires looking beyond the words on the page, at times, to see and to understand the play and interplay of space and time of memory in the text that creates a narrative structure much different yet sharing similarities with his prior structures. Memory and remembering in ARIT appear imbricated in the structure of the narrative creating a presence and protagonist different from earlier Hemingway figures in that he is not simply in “it” nor is he merely concerned with thinking about “it.” Cantwell, instead, oscillates between these representations in a narrative calculus. The impetus that allows this narrative imbrication and movement is the evolved interrogation and interpolation of trauma that alters the narrative structure of ARIT.

**Hemingway’s Iceberg of Memory: Narrative Frame Vehicle**

ARIT opens with a pastoral scene of duck hunting in winter—“They started two hours before daylight, and at first, it was not necessary to break the ice across the canal as other boats had gone on ahead” (11). The focus, in the early portion of the narrative, shifts from the contents of the boats—“a poler,” “shooter,” “lunch,” “shells,” “guns,” “decoys,” “live mallard hens,” and “dogs”—to the actions of a specific boat, the “sixth boat” (12). The sixth boat forges “south into a shallow lagoon” where “there was no broken water” (12). As the narrative opens, the focus settles on the ice—“new-frozen during the sudden, windless cold of the night” (12)—and on the breaking of the ice—“the ice broke like sheets of plate glass as the boat drove into it, and onto it” (13). The opening of the narrative creates and references prior Hemingway narratives in both content and in structure, which illustrates a use of the arithmetic and geometry of his prior
narrative structures.

Hemingway’s opening of ARIT concentrates on breaking the ice—literally and metaphorically. Ice, in Hemingway parlance, is not just frozen water; ice represents, in many ways, a narrative methodology that Hemingway proposed for his writing and expressed as the “ice-berg” theory. As early as 1932, Hemingway in *Death in the Afternoon* expounds on his idea that

> if a writer of prose knows enough about what he is writing about he may omit things that he knows and the reader, if the writer is writing truly enough, will have a feeling of those things as strongly as though the writer had stated them. The dignity of movement of an ice-berg is due to only one-eighth of it being above water (192).

His thoughts are later crystallized in a 1958 interview when he asserts that, “I always try to write on the principle of the iceberg. There is seven-eights of it underwater for every part that shows. Anything you know you can eliminate and it only strengthens your iceberg. It is the part that doesn’t show” (Plimpton “The Art of Fiction” reprinted in Trogdon *Hemingway: A Literary Reference* 307).

Thus, the focus on ice and the breaking of the ice in the opening of ARIT creates a connection between action expressed in the narrative and the content suppressed in the narrative, and thus, this narrative equation explores aspects of Hemingway’s ice-berg principle.

As the novel begins, the breaking of the ice operates to one, facilitate movement for the boatman and the shooter and to secondly, transition the
narrative structure from external action to the interior landscape of the shooter, Cantwell. In the opening of the novel, Hemingway prepares the reader for a different type of ice-berg in this narrative; instead of the focus on the one-eighth showing, this narrative structure concentrates on the seven-eighths previously hidden in Hemingway’s writing. In relation to this changed focus in ARIT’s narrative, Charles M. Oliver posits that,

the duck-hunting trip is the frame-vehicle through which Hemingway creates a character whose recent life moves before his memory as he awaits, with sure knowledge, the next heart attack and death. Cantwell is not at all a caricature or authorial wish-fulfillment, but a fully drawn persona 50 years old, selecting very carefully both the things he does on his last weekend and the things he remembers about it during the Sunday duck-hunt” (Hemingway in Italy 144).

In similar fashion, Oliver’s observation connects with Hemingway’s deployment of the principle of the ice-berg in ARIT in a two-fold fashion: first, Hemingway creates a “a frame-vehicle” in the duck-hunting story which operates as the one-eighth of the ice-berg, and second, Hemingway’s construction of Cantwell’s remembering—the predominant focus of the narrative—operates as the seven-eighths of the ice-berg, traditionally not shown in Hemingway’s writing. A clue to

94 The shift in the novel perhaps explains the critics and scholars’ dismissal of the text, yet even while the critics and scholars acknowledge a difference in ARIT’s style, structure, and narrative, almost all of them dismiss the text on the basis of aspects of Hemingway’s autobiography. Hemingway’s shift in the text is, as Deb Wylder in a 1951 review of ARIT observes, “a more complicated and more subtle development” achieved “through repetition and concentration on unimportant detail rather than through a corresponding complexity of style” (reprinted in Meyers Hemingway: The Critical Heritage 399).
this two-fold operation is the placement of the shooter, Cantwell, in the partially
submerged duck-hunting blind—“the oaken staved hogshead sunk in the bottom
of the lagoon” (ARIT 13) for ostensibly the majority of the narrative. Cantwell, for
all intents and purposes, is the ice-berg in and of the narrative structure of the
work.95

The opening passages in chapter one of ARIT establish a narrative
structure that moves from the portrayal of objective exterior action to the more
subjective presentation of the “shooter’s” nee Cantwell’s interior monologues of
his previously abjective thought and remembrance of war trauma. In fact, Peter
Lisca observes after the opening duck hunting scene that, “the intervening two
hundred and seventy-eight pages make up an uninterrupted interior monologue
during which the shooter [Cantwell] recreates in his mind not only the actual
events of the last two days, Friday and Saturday, […] but also the particular
memories which had concerned him during those two days” (291).96 Likewise,
the narrative structure and focus in Cantwell’s memory-laden confession-of sorts
focuses on “particular memories” of traumas experienced in World War I and II.97

95 Or Island. Hemingway had a sense of the “no man is an island” ideology. Note that For Whom
the Bell Tolls title is from the Donne Mediation.
96 “Like so many modernists—Joyce, Pound, Stein, Yeats—Hemingway is consciously creating a
handbook for his readers, explaining how to read his texts. He is also creating a prose more
complicated than any of his earlier writing, a prose that stops time, twists time, escapes outside of
time. If Einstein could imagine more dimensions than three, just maybe a writer can work through
the fourth dimension of time and into a timeless fifth dimension: a continuous present tense both
now and then, here and elsewhere simultaneously” [in reference to Hemingway’s writing in 1934]
(Reynolds Hemingway: 1930s 181).
97 In addition, the narrative also references the military indoctrination of the Colonel, as military
discourse and communication relies on exterior orders being accepted, without discourse or
question, by the individual soldier, much like traditional third-person omniscient narration requires
the submission of the characters’ mindset to the narrator. The novel’s narrative structure
Cantwell’s confessional focus, presented in the majority of the narrative, references Anne Whitehead’s interpretation that “trauma does not lie in the possession of the individual, to be recounted at will, but rather acts as a haunting or possessive influence which not only insistently and intrusively returns but is, moreover, experienced for the first time only in its belated repetition” (5). Thus, the narrative structure of ARIT moves from the objective one-eighths of the iceberg to the subjective seven-eighths below the iceberg engaging the haunting and possessive influence of the previously abjected memories of traumas to generate a calculus of narration that creates a changed narrative movement for Hemingway.

As the novel begins, however, the narrative does not specifically refer to the past experiences of trauma; instead, the haunting and possessive influence of Cantwell’s prior experiences of trauma linger on the metaphoric edge of the literal pre-dawn marsh he is hunting. Similarly, the scene constructed in ARIT is reminiscent of the swamp that Hemingway’s early Nick Adams figure/voice, recently returned from war, “did not want to go in” (“Big Two-Hearted River” IOT 155). Thus, the opening chapter’s setting in ARIT recalls the haunted qualities of the earlier narrative structures of the short stories of Hemingway involving another sufferer and survivor of war trauma, Nick Adams. In fact, Hemingway in “The Art of the Short Story” proposes that “Big Two-Hearted River” is about a boy coming home beat to the wide from a war. Beat to the wide was an

______________________________
additionally can be seen as the debate between the military structure of communication and the personal, interior communication.
earlier and possibly more severe from of beat, since those who had it were unable to comment on this condition [...] so the war, all mention of the war, anything about the war, is omitted. [...] The change of name was made purposely, not from ignorance nor carelessness but because Big Two-Hearted River is poetry, and because there were many Indians in the story, just as the war was in the story, and none of the Indians nor the war appeared. As you see, it is very simple and easy to explain (reprinted in Trogdon Hemingway: A Literary Reference 312).

As such, Hemingway’s critical analysis of his early short story presents narrative aspects of the ice-berg theory, and his analysis supports the readings focusing on the connection of war and “Big Two-Hearted River” made by Edmund Wilson98, Phillip Young, and a continuum of Hemingway scholars.99

The first chapter of ARIT resembles “Big Two-Hearted River” in its concentrated portrayal of external elements; however as the narrative structure in ARIT progresses, Hemingway’s protagonist, unlike the Adams figure/voice in “BTHR,” will not only mention the traumas of war, but the figure/voice will address aspects that heretofore have not appeared in Hemingway’s fiction. The narrative inclusion of these aspects expresses a confrontation with past acts and traumas in way that is markedly different from other Hemingway protagonists and

---

98 Hemingway’s observation of the connection of the brutality of war with other elements in his writing is not new; in 1947, Edmund Wilson observes Hemingway’s ability to coalesce the brutality of life in concert with “the joys of the most innocent surface” in resolution and makes “the beauty of Hemingway’s stories” (The Wound and the Bow 214-216).
99 However, it should be mentioned that there was a notable shift in criticism with Kenneth Lynn and Mark Spilka arguing that the war was not the trauma or the wound not mentioned in the short story. Lynn et al argue that the unspoken relates to gender issues centered on Hemingway’s relationship with his mother, Grace.
narrative structures appearing before the 1950 publication of ARIT.

Hemingway’s “boy” who was “beat to the wide” in his previous incarnations of Nick Adams and unable to “comment” on his condition transitions into an older and near-death Colonel in ARIT who recollects and attempts to capture the “true gen”\(^{100}\) of a man dealing with issues related to “bitterness, soldiering, honor, love, and death” (Hemingway reprinted in Baker *Collected Letters* 692).

Cantwell becomes quite upset with the inaptitude of the guide during the duck-hunting scene in the first chapter, stating that, “what’s the matter with him? I offered to put the dekes out with him. The hell with him” (ARIT 15). Continuing, Cantwell commands himself to “keep your temper, boy” (16). In this passage, Cantwell’s interior commandment references the scene of explosive anger in “Fathers and Sons” when the young Nick Adams in the memories of the older Nick Adams reacts to wearing his father’s underwear. In Hemingway’s earlier narrative, the protagonist expresses anger stating that, “I can blow him to hell. I can kill him” (*Hemingway The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway* 375). Unlike the earlier Adams, who “felt his anger go out of him” (375) yet still bears the frustration—“all the others he avoided all contact with” (375), the later Cantwell controls his anger and therefore his reaction, reminding himself in the first lines of the following chapter, “but he was not a boy. He was fifty and a Colonel of Infantry in the Army of the United States” (17). The narrative expression of anger differs in the later ARIT from the earlier “Fathers and Sons.”

\(^{100}\) Suzanne del Gizzo asserts, “In both his writing and his life, he seemed dedicated to capturing authentic action and emotion—the “true gen,” as he called it—and was very wary of any false emotion. This pronounced preoccupation with authenticity has filtered into critical perceptions of Hemingway and his work as well” (“Going Home” *Modern Fiction Studies* 504).
This changed narrative treatment illustrates an evolution in Hemingway’s narrative structuring of the experience of trauma.

The figure/voice of the young Nick Adams in “Fathers and Sons” does not assume a position of subjectivity; instead in the early narrative structure, he is subjected to experiences by his father and the external world. In this early narrative, Nick Adams’ external and internal world is controlled by his father. Adams creates an understanding based on his father’s objectification of external factors, as these are the controlling elements bearing down on his understanding. The vignette containing the young Nick Adam’s observations is embedded in the memories of an older Nick Adams. In this early layering of experience and memory, hints of Hemingway’s narrative calculus of memory operate in the structuring of the narrative. In fact, Richard McCann observes of Hemingway’s “Fathers and Sons” that, “Nick’s entrance into town at the beginning of the story signals his entry into the interior of memory and self, just as Hemingway’s recurring use of the second-person singular and long heavy sentences creates for Nick an interior voice, contemplative” (Benson Critical Approaches to Hemingway’s Short Stories 267). As such, the older Nick Adams recalls moments when he was angry at the lack of control and subjectivity that he had as a boy in the narrative.

In “Fathers and Sons,” Hemingway creates a narrative situated between the past and the future in concert with the present, a narrative style that becomes more refined and developed in ARIT. In many ways, Hemingway’s narrative structure echoes Martin Heidegger’s concept of time. Heidegger’s conception of
time focuses on the past as facticity (the no-longer), the future as projection (the not-yet), and the present as falleness (the lost-yet). In the narrative structure of the short story, Hemingway embodies a voice situated between Heidegger’s no-longer, the not-yet, and the lost-yet. Likewise, Hemingway’s application of Heidegger’s philosophy of time is evidenced in the plea of Nick Adams nameless son’s intimation that, “I hope we won’t live somewhere so that I can never go to pray at your tomb when you are dead” (“Fathers and Sons” Complete Short Stories 376). In this passage, the triad representation of time references the effects of a sense of trauma in its structure. Subsequently, the notion of the present is represented in the narrative as being tenuous in its state of falling. This state of falling corresponds to the various traumas intimated and deployed in this early Hemingway narrative.

Psychologically and in Heidegger’s sense, to fall evokes a split between emotion and intellect and the loss of the ability to become whole. This act of falling produces a sense of anger and disorientation, and when evoked in narratives, it contributes to a disjointed structure and subjective in the structure of the story. The disorientated anger recollected by the older Nick Adams figure and the nameless figure of the son in Hemingway’s “Fathers and Sons,” in the present of the narrative, speaks of the no-longer and the not-yet through the perspective of the lost-yet—the falleness of the present. Therefore, Heidegger’s concept of falleness (the lost-yet) refers to a tendency to become lost in present concerns, a consequence where alienation from self and actions of the self appears. In this move, the self externally appears to lack the ability to make
choices, and instead, it is subsumed by circumstantial minutia. Likewise, Heidegger’s falleness illustrates aspects of the effects of trauma in the idea that trauma is an occurrence where one is alienated from self and actions for the preservation of the self.

Trauma is a falling away from one’s external self caught between notions of the no-longer (the way one was) and the not-yet (the way one would be). The paradoxical falling away in trauma imbues a certain frustration and anger at the idea that the most direct seeing of a violent event may occur as an absolute inability to know it. The narrative treatment of this paradox necessitates the generation of a narrative structure that uses the traditional structures and points of view along with the use and privileging of the changed structure made accessible through the abject. Likewise in ARIT, the sense of abject anger and frustration is mirrored in the anger of the shooter, Cantwell, at his boatman.

While Nick Adams in the short stories remembers his anger at his father and the thoughts he had had of killing him, in ARIT, the shooter—Cantwell—experiences his anger and thoughts of killing the boatman. In the earlier short story, Nick Adams’ focus is on thinking about his father and the control exerted by his father’s presence. However, Cantwell’s surface focus is on not letting the boatman “spoil” the experience for him. The narrative observes that, “you don’t know how many more times you will shoot duck and do not let anything spoil it for you” (15). In this intimation, Cantwell attempts to focus on the present

external task at hand—shooting ducks, but the abjected interior, the combination of the no-longer, not-yet, and lost-yet keeps bubbling to the surface. Like the older figure of Nick Adams in “Fathers and Sons,” the figure of Cantwell enters into an interior narrative structure of memory and self, where he assumes a narrative presence informed by his memories (the no-longer), experiences (no-longer and not yet), and thoughts (lost-yet) of self.

**Memory and War: Function of Trauma in Hemingway’s Calculus of ARIT**

As the second chapter opens, the shooter, Cantwell, intimates a shift to memory from the action of chapter one. The figure observes that, “but he was not a boy. He was fifty and Colonel of Infantry in the Army of the United States and to pass a physical examination that he and to take the day before he came town to Venice for this shoot—he had taken enough mannitol hexanitrate to, well he did not quite know what to—to pass, he said to himself” (ARIT 17). As the chapter commences, the narrative structure places the shooter Cantwell as shifting from experiencing the duck-hunt to remembering his medical examination three days prior. The first memory which Cantwell experiences takes place in a hospital where the physical toll of Cantwell’s service in the military and battle is assessed—“your cardiograph was wonderful […] how many times have you been hit in the head?” (18). Entering chapter two of ARIT begins the entry into Cantwell’s memories of the past.

The shift in the narrative from duck-hunting to the hospital illustrates a focus on the physical effects of trauma in relation to the mental effects of trauma. In fact, James Dawes in *The Language of War* asserts that, “Hemingway
believed that special knowledge could be found at the front, on the battlefield, and in the liminal spaces at the fringes of an emergency (the encampment, the hospital, the temporary hotel retreats)” (93). As such, Hemingway’s placement of Cantwell’s first memory as being at a military hospital echoes a sense of distinct and focused knowledge shared between Cantwell and the Doctor. The two share a camaraderie over Cantwell’s physical wounds—“I have known you a long time, Colonel. Or maybe it just seems like a long time” (ARIT 17). The special knowledge of the physical self, represented by the assessment of the physical wounds references the objectived trauma that occurs on Cantwell’s body in battle representing the site of violence. At this point in the narrative, the traditional points of view of subjectivity and objectivity jostle for predominance in the narrative structure.

This special knowledge is also positioned in relation to the hospital as the objects of study, Cantwell’s injuries, are measured. The measurement of the physical effects of Cantwell’s traumatic experiences are the first memory engaged in the narrative. Hemingway situates the narrative structure on the transition from the exploring the physical measuring of trauma to the examining

---

102 Hemingway’s father, a medical doctor, is thought to have influenced Hemingway’s perspective on medicine and treatment of wounds. Reynolds in Hemingway: 1930’s suggests, “being a doctor’s son, he [Hemingway] always exaggerates his illnesses and is quick to project the worst possible scenario—traits which sometimes lead those who know him well to underestimate the seriousness of his condition [in relation to the November 1 1930 car accident]” (57).

103 “Hemingway’s characters are in a world of natural and human violence, struggling to survive and to assert the integrity of self. The conflict is intense, the rules of battle merciless and strictly enforced. Love, war, and sports (usually bloody ones) are the games his heroes play and, in conventional terms, lose. From the earliest stories to the latest, the hero ends as victim. “All stories, if continued far enough, end in death,’ Hemingway writes it Death in the Afternoon […]” (Waldhorn Reader’s Guide 5).
of the mental measuring of trauma.\textsuperscript{104} In the narrative during the physical, the surgeon estimates that the Colonel’s cardiograph “could have been that of a man of twenty-five. It might have been that of a boy of nineteen” (18). As such, the surgeon’s observations convey a sense of timelessness and timeliness in the narrative and a sense of Heidegger’s no longer, the not yet, and the lost yet in the structuring of this work. The narrative presents an awareness that the Colonel is old and has suffered many “concussions”\textsuperscript{(18)}, but at the same time, the structure of the narrative establishes a sense of pained foreboding for the youth Cantwell once was, of a body that will experience much physical pain and trauma.\textsuperscript{105} The triad interplay of subjectivity, objectivity, and abjectivity establishes a narrative that gives voice to the effects of the pain of trauma.

The surgeon’s proclamation “You poor old Son of Bitch”\textsuperscript{(18)} references the figure of Cantwell’s litany of “concussions” and bodily injury experienced. Cantwell’s examination in ARIT recalls the earlier medical examination of Frederic Henry in Hemingway’s early narrative structure of \textit{A Farewell to Arms} following his trench mortar shell wounding.\textsuperscript{106} In Hemingway’s second major

\textsuperscript{104} The focus on the measurement and assessment of the physical effects of trauma appearing in chapter two present the one-eighth of the ice-berg of trauma explored in the novel. The novel situates the present action—the frame-vehicle of Cantwell duck-hunting—as the one-eighth of the iceberg with Cantwell’s memories being showcased as the seven-eighths.

\textsuperscript{105} “When he was the Doctor’s son, young Hemingway learned that injuries and sickness brought him attention; at twenty-nine, he buried his father, who from worry, fear, and deep melancholy put a bullet through his brain. Now, the Doctor’s son does not seek injury out, but it finds him as if it were his brother. When he hurts, those about him are the first to know” (Reynolds Hemingway: 1930’s 25).

\textsuperscript{106} On July 8, 1918, beside the muddy Piave River on the Venetian plain, a night mortar shell ruined his right knee, filled his legs with shrapnel, and left him with a concussion; after less than a month at the front lines, Hemingway spent the remainder of the war recuperating in a Milan hospital, where he fell in love with a nurse eight years his senior. Ten years after the experience, he has created a war more real than any he had known. He gives his war wound and his nurse
novel, the figure of Henry is examined in the field hospital. In the narrative, the medical captain, examining the damage inflicted on Henry’s body, probes his legs and head. The medical captain, prefiguring the surgeon in ARIT, interrogates Henry stating that, “What were you trying to do? Commit suicide?” (AFTA 5) and “Does that sting? Good, that’s nothing to how it will feel later. The pain hasn’t started yet. Bring him a glass of brandy. The shock dulls the pain; but this is all right, you have nothing to worry about if it doesn’t infect and it rarely does now. How is your head?” (AFTA 60). Hemingway presents a similar medical treatment as the surgeon in ARIT questions Cantwell, “How many times have you been hit on the head?” (18). However, unlike the earlier Henry’s reaction to the medical captain’s questions—a repeating of the phrase “Good Christ,” the later construction of Cantwell is leery of the surgeon’s questioning, and he responds with, “you asking for the army or as my physician?” (ARIT 18).

Cantwell’s response to the surgeon in the narrative structure of ARIT reflects a creative imperative in relation to the experience of trauma, whereas the

---

107 Scholars reference Frederic Henry’s wounding in AFTA as evidence of the impact Hemingway’s own traumatic experiences of wounding during World War I. Alec Vernon observes, “the instant of Hemingway’s wounding taught him at a young age the lesson of his own mortality, of the accidental rather than the providential nature of suffering and death, of humankind’s ultimate passivity and helplessness” (Soldier’s Once and Still 68). The lesson learned by Hemingway, however, does not directly correlate to the experiences of Henry and Cantwell. In trauma in the breach occurring in response to the unexpected and overwhelming event of violence that is not grasped as it occurs, an imperative for the creation of a story, of a narrative to attempt to understand or at least to reconcile appears. Thus, Hemingway’s reflection and creation of war trauma in his fiction arrives not as a strict autobiographical reflection but instead as a creation enacted as a consequence of the traumatic experience and the subsequent desire to understand, to know, the experience.
earlier response from Henry operates more as a reflection of the traumatic experience. Corresponding to this narrative evolution, Elaine Scarry in *The Body in Pain* asserts that when a body is injured, “the normal relation between body and voice is deconstructed and replaced by one in which the extremes of the hurt body and unanchored verbal assertions are laid edge to edge. In each, a fiction is produced, a fiction that is a projected image of the body” (143). As such, the disconnect, observed by Scarry, occurring between body and voice in the narratives of SAR and ARIT in relation to trauma produces a narrative space involving and creating fiction. In the narrative space of trauma, presence and temporality depart from conventional understanding illustrated in the structure of Hemingway’s ARIT. This narrative departure arises in the structure of the narrative as memory. In Hemingway’s narrative structure in ARIT, Cantwell’s memories of trauma create an understanding of his experiences, wounds and traumas emboldened by a narrative calculus of trauma.

Moreover, Henry’s and Cantwell’s medical examinations of their bodies reflect the structuring of stories of traumas that do not fit into the conventional structure of narratives. In stories of war trauma, fictions are produced that correspond and draw from the physical deconstruction of the body in the narrative. Stories of trauma elude conventional narrative temporalities and points of view. Thus, the eluding of narrative conventions illustrates Sigmund Freud’s conception of *natraglichkeit* or deferred action/afterwardsness that occurs with the experience of trauma. Freud’s notion involves a transition in the understanding of causality and temporality in relation to memory as a result of
trauma. For Freud, the traumatic incident is not fully acknowledged at the time that it occurs; the individual, instead, reflects a fiction of his or her understanding of the event first in the body, and then later in the mind.

Trauma eludes the presentation of the containment offered by traditional structures in narratives. In fact, Jay Winter observes in relation to the veterans of the first World War that, “the bodies of these soldiers hold traces of memory; … here stories become flesh … these images, feelings, and memories didn’t fit; they could not be interpolated in a story of before and after” (57). Like the body experiencing the trauma, the fiction created holds traces of memories that cannot be placed into a conventional narrative structure. Thus, the use of wounded bodies in narratives offers the opportunity to create a different type of narrative structure. These narrative structures showcase a transition occurring in the physical and through the mental. The opportunity for trauma, the abject, arises to be introduced into the narrative structures, and thus to more accurately illustrate the effects of the experience of trauma, the abject, appears in the structures of the narrative.

As a result of the trauma of war, the physical deconstruction of bodies becomes represented through the traumatic destruction of the landscape of the battlefield. Similarly, World War I tactics transition the events of war from occurring only on the land to events both in and above the land with the inclusion of trench warfare and aerial attack. Correspondingly, Eric J. Leed asserts that, “the silence, darkness, disorientation, and almost unbelievable psychic tension suffered by mining soldiers was an intensification of the experience of trench
warfare. In mining, entrenchment—a defensive tactic that immobilized the war—became an offensive act” (No Man’s Land 138). During the trauma of war, the land, like the body of the soldier, operates in a distorted temporality and spatiality. This distortion, occurring in the trauma of war, appears in narrative structures in the disruption of traditional narrative structures and presentations of point of view. For Hemingway, the narrative treatment of the landscapes of trauma, like his characters, embodies the narrative contradiction in temporality and spatiality as a result of the effects of trauma.

This movement is inchoately intimated in the early 1925 short story “The Three-Day Blow.” In the story, Hemingway creates a dystopian, fallen landscape that surrounds the narration. The story describes the landscape as, “the fruit had been picked and the fall wind blew through the bare trees” (CSS 85). The passage in the short story corresponds to the hopeless, collapsed mental terrain of the Nick Adams figure/voice who states that, “‘All of a sudden everything was over,’ Nick said. ‘I don’t know why it was. I couldn’t help it. Just like when the three-day blows come now and rip all the leaves off the trees’” (Hemingway Complete Short Stories 91). The bareness of Nick Adams figure/voice is in concord with the bareness of the landscape in the narrative. Ann Putnam sees Hemingway’s treatment of landscape in his narratives, and in particular in relation to GHA, as capturing,

images of both unspeakable beauty and appalling destruction, images which depict the divided heart of the narrator himself and his two, equally held and opposing attitudes toward nature—a reverential sense of nature
where beholding is sufficient and the sense of nature as an Other to be possessed at all cost. What is most loved must finally be slain, for in the end the pastoral impulse to merge with nature is silenced by the tragic impulse to destroy it” (Fleming *Hemingway and the Natural World* 100).

Putnam’s observations reference a move in Hemingway’s fiction that captures the divided nature of the survivor of trauma. The dualistic tendencies of the individual are in concert with the surrounding landscape. Memory operates as a vehicle to display the bifurcation in early Hemingway, in general, and in later Hemingway’s ARIT, in particular. The landscape functions as a component in the earlier Hemingway narratives to grant access to the interior mental terrain of the protagonists. However in the later Hemingway narratives, the landscape functions not only to give access to the interior thoughts but also as a narrative element that uses memory as a device to interrogate and integrate the effects of trauma into the narrative structure.

As chapter three of ARIT begins, the text shifts back to the opening scene with the figure of Cantwell immersed in the duck-hunting barrel. The narrative’s opening lines to the chapter—“that was the day before yesterday—establish the role and tone of memory in the narrative (ARIT 21). A connection between memory and landscape appears as the third person omniscient narrator observes of Cantwell—“he […] looked out at all this country he had known when he was a boy” (ARIT 20). The narrative continues with a notable shift in the structure and style in the text. The shift involves a slipping between the third-person and the first-person point of view. This shift occurs in the passage that
observes that, “it looks quite differently now, he thought. I suppose it is because the distances are all changed” (ARIT 21). Hemingway’s structure of narration, beginning in this chapter, differs from the use of a traditional third-person style that occurs in his earlier narrative structures. Hemingway’s shift is indicative of free indirect style. Free indirect style, vers libre, or free indirect discourse involves a shifting presentation of point of view in the narrative structure. This shift captures, psycholinguistically, a predicament of a divided self evident in and projected on the narrative structure surrounding the figure of Cantwell in the narrative.

The landscape witnessed in this portion of the narrative reflects the division occurring in the figure of Cantwell. The narrative observes that, “they were past the ruined villa now and onto the straight road with the willows growing by the ditches still dark with winter, and the fields full of mulberry trees” (ARIT 22). Resembling the division of the landscape in this passage, Cantwell’s divided self is mirrored and captured in the narrative description of the landscape. Hemingway’s passage reflects both Cantwell’s physical and mental journey on the landscape. In the narrative, Cantwell moves from the memory of his exam illustrated by a correlated focus on his body as “ruined villa” to the act of recollection. This act of recollection appears as the narrative focuses on the movement from linear investigation i.e. “the straight road” to non-linear engagement i.e. “willows growing by the ditches still dark with winter.” In the

---

108 A concept developed by narrative theorists, free indirect discourse refers to those moment in a narrative that blur the difference between, as Brian McHale puts it, “the representations of an action (diegesis) [and] the repetition of a character’s words (mimesis).” See Joseph Childers and Gary Hentzi’s definition in The Columbia Dictionary of Modern Literary and Cultural Criticism.
narrative, memories of trauma are represented by “the willows” located in the
dark “winter.” These memories are intersected by a desire for reconciliation of
self, as represented by “the fields full of mulberry trees” (22). The congress of
interior and exterior appears in the use of free indirect style in the structure of the
narrative.

The increasing appearance of free indirect style in the narrative imbricates
the Colonel’s body and his voice onto and into aspects of the landscape. In a
passage, the connection appears in the description that observes that, “They
were on a straight stretch of road now and were making time so that one farm
blended, almost blurred, into another farm and you could only see what was far
ahead and moving toward you [...] I’m not sure I like speed” (23). This passage’s
use of free indirect style illustrates a point of view that involves non-traditional
parameters of narrative discourse structure. According to Ann Banfield, free
indirect discourse is a narrative presentation allowing a narrator to recount what
a character has said while retaining the idiomatic qualities of the speaker’s
words. Likewise in the above passage, the third person narration deviates into a
combination of Cantwell’s direct speech—“I’m not sure I like speed”—and
narratorial observation—“they were on a straight stretch.” The use of free
indirect discourse creates the effect of heightened feelings, intensifying or
dramatizing the character’s words. This narrative device is unlike direct speech
where the words of the speaker stand on their own without narrator involvement,
exposing the speaker directly. In the evolution of Hemingway’s narrative structure, his increasing reliance and transition from a direct, objective point of view operating in his earlier narratives to a different, more subjective, point of view in his later narratives illustrate a demarcation in his presentation of point of view in the narrative. In addition, his evolution presents his move to the use of narrative calculus in the structuring of his fiction.

The narrative capturing of Cantwell’s perceptions of the landscape from the perspective of memory illustrates a difference appearing and operating in Hemingway’s narrative structure. In fact, Barbara K Olson observes that the early Hemingway selectively gives inside views of his characters tempered by a reluctance to share their voice without tonal dissonance. Olson views Hemingway’s early omniscient narration as treating his readers and characters in comparable ways: from a position of power and distance. Moreover, Olson clarifies that, “For his readers, he limited the indications of his presence and the disclosure of significant information. For his characters, he limited life to disillusionment and pain and kept himself aloof from their inner turmoil” (Authorial Divinity in the Twentieth Century 45). However, the distance, which Olson highlights occurring in Hemingway’s early fiction, disappears in Hemingway’s ARIT. As such as Hemingway creates the narrative structure involving the figure of Cantwell, Hemingway appears to be no longer concerned with keeping the narration nor the characters “aloof” from the disillusionment and pain of trauma.

109 For a comprehensive discussion of the free indirect style concept, see Ann Banfield’s “Narrative Style and the Grammar of Direct and Indirect Speech.” Foundations of Language 10 (1973).
Instead, Hemingway establishes invitations in the narrative for engagement with the trauma and memories of trauma. In one particular passage, the narrative expresses that, “I'll show you a place down there where we used to fight when I was a kid” (25). Similarly, Hemingway’s transition and use of free indirect style in ARIT calls attention to the protagonist’s Cantwell’s memories of trauma, and this transition presents an altered narrative structure. The deployment of a narrative calculus of the recollection of traumatic memories operate as a framework within which understanding about war and trauma is conducted through and by a voice of trauma—Cantwell—whose narrative voice and point of view is defined by the trauma witnessed on the landscapes of battle.

During the early portion of the novel, Hemingway constructs a scene where Cantwell revisits, in both narrative memory and in narrative act, the landscape of his wounding. The narration states that, “a few weeks ago he had gone through Fossalta and had gone out along the sunken road to find the place where he had been hit” (26). Correspondingly, the narrative in chapter three focuses on Cantwell’s remembrance of his war trauma in relation to the landscape surrounding the memory of this experience. The landscape captured in the narrative like Cantwell’s body bears the long-healed yet apparent scars of

---

110 Jay Winter observes witnesses to war and the traumas of the war, in particular WWI and WWI, desire “to tell the story they knew without sugarcoating it with moral uplift or romance” (*Remembering War* 244). The witness to these wars and traumas, instead, is more apt to recollect the narrative of war and trauma in a framework that eschews a distanced re-telling, and instead, the narrative of the witness requires specular engagement with the memory of trauma—“I never saw it before it was smacked, he thought. They shelled it badly before the big fifteenth of June offensive in eighteen. Then we shelled it really badly before we retook it. He remembered how the attack had taken off from Monastier, gone through Fornace, and on this winter day he remembered how it had been summer” (25).
war—“it was easy to find [...] the crater was smoothly grassed” (26). In a passage that Arthur Waldhorn and others unimaginatively dismiss as evidence of Hemingway’s “self-indulgent nonsense”(181), Cantwell constructs a physical memorial to his war trauma. In this portion of the work, the figure of Cantwell is depicted as creating a monument to his war trauma and memories of the trauma by defecating in the spot he remembers as the place of his wounding. The scene produces an interesting narrative commentary on the pain of trauma and the mechanisms for dealing with the trauma used by the Colonel in the novel. The passage reinforces Elaine Scarry’s observation that the relation between body and voice shifts in trauma to a relationship between the hurt body’s verbal assertions of that traumatized body and the fictions reflected and created by the injury.

By the end of Chapter three, Cantwell recalls his return, a few weeks prior, to the place of his wounding. In the narrative, Cantwell remembers his return to “the exact place” that “he had been badly wounded thirty years before” (26). The narrative focuses on Cantwell squatting and relieving himself in that “exact” spot of his wounding. Subsequently, the narrative observes that, “‘Now I’ll complete the monument,’ he said to no one but the dead” (26). Cantwell completes the action of building his monument to the memory of his trauma by including money and his medal “the Silver Star” (27) into the hole in the earth. In the narrative actions—both mental and physical, the figure of Cantwell engages his abject experience of trauma. In the retrospection captured in the narrative, he participates in an act that marks his status as witness and spectator to the
trauma of war.\textsuperscript{111}

As Cantwell constructs his monument and recalls the trauma of his past, he, in essence, makes a monument of his memories—the fictions produced in the act of trauma—of the wounding of his body.\textsuperscript{112} In this passage, the structure of the narrative plays between presenting the experience and representing the memory of trauma. In Cantwell’s reflections and creations connected to his memorialization of his first wounding, a shift in point of view in relation to objectification and subjectification appears in the narrative structure that engages the previously silenced narrative voice of the abject. Hemingway creates in Cantwell an externalized reaction to internalized memories. The monument to

\textsuperscript{111} Martin Harries in \textit{Forgetting Lot’s Wife} deems acts of traumatic retrospection, like Cantwell’s monumental movement, as moments embodying “destructive spectatorship.” Harries’ argument is that acts of memory in modern and contemporary art and literature engage the actions and representations of the biblical figure of Lot’s wife. Harries views Lot’s wife as representing, “a vivid emblem of the twentieth century problem of self-destructive historical spectatorship […] she figures the coincidence of dangerous individual memory with catastrophic historical damage” (16). In ARIT, Cantwell, too, operates as an embodiment of the precarious coincidence of individual memory and collective damage in the moment and memory of trauma. Hemingway creates in Cantwell a figure similar to Lot’s wife in the mingling of the effects of war and the memory of trauma on Cantwell. Cantwell is not frozen, literally, by his witnessing of trauma; however, Cantwell is frozen, mentally, by the memories of his witnessing and experiencing of trauma. Hemingway wants to have Cantwell reflect the events that happened on the side of the river, but these events no longer exist in the space or time of the narrative. Unlike Lot’s wife, there are no physical images to freeze Cantwell as a monument to the destruction of war—“he stood up and looked around. There was not one in sight” (26). Thus, the monument that serves to mark the memory of Cantwell’s trauma is \textit{a creation not a reflection}. Cantwell creates a monument not to his wounding, but to the memories of his wounding. In the narrative, Cantwell references that the monument has “merde, money, blood […] Gino’s leg, both of Randolfo’s legs, and my right kneecap” (27).

\textsuperscript{112} In May of 1922, Ernest took Hadley to revisit the site of his wounding at Fossalta. Carlos Baker recollects, “When Ernest had seen it last, it had been a heap of rubble. Now he could not recognize a single landmark. ‘All that shattered, tragic dignity of the wrecked town was gone,’ he wrote […]When they drove out to the bank of the river, all the old trenches and dugouts had vanished without a trace. Ernest climbed the grassy slope above the sunken road. The Piave was clean and blue […]he found a rusty shell fragment, the only surviving sign of the front where he had once bled and thousands had died […] He had tried and failed to recreate a former actuality for his wife’s benefit and perhaps for his own. But the past, he concluded, was as dead as a smashed Victrola record. ‘Chasing yesterdays,’ said he, ‘is a bum show, and if you have to prove it, go back to your old front’” (\textit{Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story} 94).
this reaction, consisting of “merde, money, blood” becomes a memorial to Cantwell’s memory as much as it serves as a memorial of a specific event—his first wounding (ARIT 27). In fact, Martin Harries suggests the recollection of “certain powerful sights force[s] the body to become a too-solid memorial to what the spectator has seen” (Forgetting Lot’s Wife 17). The body’s transition illustrates a move from objectivity to subjectivity occurring in the remembrance of trauma. Cantwell, in the narrative, assumes responsibility for subjectivity in his creation of the monument not for the benefit of others but for the benefit of himself. Cantwell’s creation of his monument illustrates a progression of Hemingway’s writing in regards to point of view.

This section represents the highly problematic nature of the structure of the novel. In this section of the narrative, the narrative structure and point of view engages an abject position. In this move, the narrative uses the “merde” monument to evoke and to position the abject in the structure of the narrative. Julia Kristeva’s work on the abject and abjection reflect on the difficulty of understanding the function and role of the abject in consciousness and literature. According to Kristeva, the abject is a voice and a point of view occurring in a narrative that references a displacement of traditional understandings and structures. For Kristeva, the abject represents a threat that, “seems to emanate from an exorbitant outside or inside, ejected beyond the scope of the possible, the tolerable, the thinkable” (229). The experience of trauma functions in a similar fashion in the narrative as experience that exists outside of normal narrative structures and points of view. For instance in ARIT, the narrative of
Cantwell observes that, “Death is a lot of shit, he thought. It comes to you in small fragments that hardly show where it has entered” (202). In this passage, Kristeva’s notion of the abject’s displacement of traditional understanding appears in Cantwell’s observation that death is an “it” that “comes” yet “hardly show (s).”

Moreover for Kristeva, the abject illustrates a space where trauma resides. In this experience of trauma, the abject is formed. When the experience of trauma occurs, the effects of the experience often arise in and through a sense of abjected knowledge. According to Kristeva, the abject is represented in structure of narratives by the refuse and corpses that are thrust aside or outside the narrative—in deed or in structure. These representations of the abject—the destructed bodies, the “body fluids, this defilement, this shit”—illustrate in the narratives the border of the condition of life and death (231). If these elements of the abject are presented inside or embedded in a narrative—in deed or structure, then the work engages a movement that acknowledges a sense of perpetual danger, attempting to mirror the abject experience of trauma.

In relation to Kristeva’s view of the abject in the structure of the narrative, the engagement of the abject as a point of view in a structure brings forth a different and changed perspective in the work. This changed perspective evolves the location of point of view from traditional subjective or objective lines. As such, the appearance of the abject as point of view in a narrative gives voice to a silenced presence in the fiction. This silenced presence intimates a sense of the aside or outside of traditional points of view involving subjectivity or
objectivity. Moreover, the silenced presence involves a voice created in the abject experience occurring at the border of life and death. The border of life and death that generates this voice is the experience of trauma. As such, Hemingway’s narrative calculus in the structure of ARIT involves an abjectivity, in order to create a narrative structure beyond yet within traditional narrative points of view represented by traditional presentations of subjectivity and objectivity.

In Hemingway’s early (1925) short story “Soldier’s Home,” Hemingway creates a narrative focusing on the figure of Krebs, who like Cantwell, embodies a responsibility to what he has witnessed in war. In the early story, Krebs is observed as falling “into the easy pose of an old soldier among other soldiers: that he had been badly, sickeningly frightened all the time” (IOT 70). Likewise, Hemingway’s narrative structure in “Soldier’s Home” externalizes the experience of trauma. In the structure, Krebs is not a subjective participant in his memories of war and trauma. Instead, he appears an object of the trauma. This objectification corresponds to the pictures explored in the beginning of the story. In Hemingway’s early narrative, Krebs’ monument, the photos, operates in a different, more objective, fashion than Cantwell’s personalized construction of abjection. In the narrative structure of ARIT, Cantwell, as the witness and the participant in the war atrocities, takes ownership, “a poor effort […] but my own” (26) for what he has seen and consequently, for what he remembers. Hemingway’s earlier protagonists, like Krebs, do not construct this type of awareness, and as such, they operate as objects of their experiences and memories—“he did not want any consequences” (IOT 71). As such, the narrative
structures in ARIT and in “Soldier’s Home” use an act of abjection to highlight the shift occurring in the traditional narrative placement of point of view.

In the narrative structure of ARIT, varying degrees of subjectivity, objectivity, and abjectivity are echoed in the constant play in narration from third person omniscient to first person to free indirect style. Peter Lisca in “The Structure of Hemingway’s Across the River and into the Trees” observes that, “the result is that we know the Colonel only as he knows himself, but with the authority and effects which accrue to the interior monologue by virtue of its disguise as omniscient third person narration” (291). Unlike earlier Hemingway narratives such as the one operating in “Soldier’s Home,” the structure of ARIT embodies a sense of the relationship appearance of the abject in the between subjectivity and trauma. In fact, the Colonel’s observations and recollections as he creates his monument to trauma mediate the subjectivity and objectivity of his memory of the war and the trauma experienced with the responsibility and impetus to demonstrate the culpability of the abject witnessing of trauma.

In the point of view in the structure of ARIT, Cantwell’s desire to build a monument reflects a subjective need to create an object that can address the abject and thus imperfect nature of memory, much as Hemingway does in his narrative construction of the novel. Correspondingly, Sharon Ouditt in “Myths, Memories, and Monuments: Reimaging the Great War” observes that, “it is part

---

113 Peter Lisca continues, “an understanding of the narrative structure makes it obvious that the lack of difference between the sensibility of the Colonel and the narrator (for most critics a prime objection to the novel) does not indicate that the author (i.e. Hemingway personally) identifies himself with Colonel Cantwell, but only that the author is Colonel Cantwell” (291)
of the duty of remembrance to retell these stories...furthermore, it is about the shortcomings of memory, the lack of knowledge, the imperfect nature of interpretation and the need to build monuments, literal or literary, as an objective correlative for loss" (246). Likewise as Cantwell creates a monument to the abject memory of his pain, the narrative illustrates in the figure of Cantwell a subjectivity which operates as an objective correlative to the presentation of his previously silenced abject memory of war and trauma in the novel.114

In the narrative calculus of ARIT, Colonel Cantwell’s journey of memory travels through the reborn war-torn landscape of his youth and his recollections of the past. One of particular note to the text is the memory of the two crossings of the Paive River: one in memory of World War I and one in the memory of Cantwell’s recollections occurring in the narrative. As an aged Cantwell remembers when he crossed over the river that he previously had fought near, he recalls that, “he could see the old positions […] there had been a great killing at the last of the offensive and someone, […] had ordered the dead thrown into the canals” (28). Moreover, crossing bridges, in Hemingway’s structures of narration often operate as a metaphor both for growth and for reconciliation. In

114 “The constants in Hemingway’s style function, then, to express a vision of experience and also to control his hero’s emotional response (as well as his own) to that experience. If as critics have observed, Hemingway’s prose is lyric rather than dramatic, it is a reticent, not confessional lyricism. Even when he narrates from the perspective of the first person, we are privy to what the hero sees and does, rarely to a direct statement of what he feels. In ‘Big Two-Hearted River,’ Nick’s experience while fishing near the swamp evokes terror. What Hemingway describes, however, is not an emotion—terror is never mentioned—but is objective correlatives as Nick and the reader see them: ‘In the swamp the banks were bare, the big ceders came together overhead, the sun did not come through, except in patches; in the fast deep water, in the half light, the fishing would be tragic. In the swamp fishing was a tragic adventure’ (329). Objective, external, the description relies for its impact upon the controlled release of Nick’s response to pure visual stimuli. Not until the mysterious word tragic does emotion implode upon Nick’s and the reader’s consciousness” (Waldhorn Reader’s Guide 33).
faction, Robert Gajdusek observes the bridge in ARIT as operating to capture the essence of the novel, a desire to cross over and rest on the other side.\(^{115}\) Cantwell’s crossing of the bridge, in his memory and in his recent past, illustrates an attempt at reconciliation between his prior objectification in war and his current subjectification of his memories of war. Moreover, the bridge provides a symbolic representation of the abject. The bridge and the crossing of the bridge illustrate the remembrance of the previously silenced and abjected experience of trauma in the structure of the narrative.

In addition, the bridge passage in ARIT echoes a narrative presence similar to the voice in Hemingway’s 1938 short story, “Old Man at the Bridge.” In both ARIT and the short story, Hemingway embodies a sense of the haunting abject memory of trauma as figures attempt, or are forced, to cross into the unknown. In “Old Man at the Bridge,” Hemingway creates what William Braaslich Watson calls “a powerful drama whose resolution we fearfully anticipate, […]! [as] tight and coherent [with] much of its power com[ing] from a veiled danger we feel but never quite see” (Benson *Critical Approaches* 133). The veiled danger correlates to the presence of the abject in the narrative. In the narrative structure of the short story, an old man is sitting by a bridge after being told to leave his duty as shepherd to a menagerie of animals in San Carlos. The narrator observes that, “He looked at me very blankly and tiredly, then said, having to share his worry with some one, ‘the cat will be all right” (CSS 58). The

\(^{115}\) For more information on bridges in Hemingway, see Robert Gajdusak’s “Bridges: Their Creation and Destruction in the Works of Ernest Hemingway” appearing in *Hemingway in his Own Country*.  
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protagonist in the story finally convinces the old man to cross the bridge, but the old man gets up only to “sat down backwards in the dust” (CSS 58). Watson observes a notable shift in perspective in the narrative’s conclusion. He observes, “after paragraphs of intimate dialogue the story suddenly shifts to an objective, impersonal perspective. The lack of sentiment at the end and the coldness with which the narrator makes his decision cloak the emotions and the confusion we can image he must have felt” (Benson *Critical Approaches* 132). The shift at the end of the story highlights the affect of the abject on and in the structure of the narrative.

In the section of ARIT, Hemingway constructs a certain impersonal objectivity in Cantwell’s recollections as a result of the giving of voice to the abject in the narrative. In the section, Cantwell recalls his time spent at the bridge during WWI stating that, “so there was little movement to the water, and the dead had stayed there a long time” (28). The sense of objectivity in Hemingway’s narrative structure belies the danger of crossing the bridge of abjection, literally—in war and metaphorically—in memory in both ARIT and “Old Man at the Bridge.” In fact, James Meredith observes that, “to cross a river into the middle of the enemy’s defenses has always been an army’s most dangerous combat maneuver” (“The Rapido…” 60). Moreover, Meredith’s observations focus on the myriad textual allusions to crossing bridges that appear in the novel. These moments occurring in the narrative offer a clue to the use and appearance of the voice of the abject. As such in the narrative, Cantwell crosses over the physical and mental bridges. With these crossings, Cantwell enters the
previously silenced abject dangerous territory of his past. He enters a land filled
with self-narrated defenses to his recollection of his traumas, and thus, the
narrative gives voice to the abject—a voice of trauma.

In ARIT, Hemingway’s creation of a narrative presence tinged with
subjectivity, objectivity, and abjectivity conveys a sense of the lingering effects of
trauma, physical and mental, of war. As the river of the past is filled with the
dead, so too is the landscape of Cantwell’s memories filled with the previously
silenced voices of the dead. He observes in retrospection that, “the dead had
stayed there for a long time, floating and bloating face up and face down
regardless of nationality” (28). Correspondingly, Elaine Scarry argues that the
injured bodies of war do not present any claim to nationality or victory.116 In fact
Scarry states that, “injuring has no relation to the contested issues; […] as in
World War II there would not be anything in the three bodies of a wounded
Russian soldier, a Jewish prisoner from a concentration camp, a civilian who had
been on the street in Hiroshima, to differentiate the character of the issues on the
Allied or the Axis sides. But neither would the injuries make visible who had won
and who had lost” (115-116). Subsequently, Scarry’s views are reflected in the
narrative structure of ARIT in both the objective observation of the war dead in

116 In war as Scarry intimates and Hemingway observes in ARIT and his September 1935 Esquire
dispatch “Notes on the Next War: A Serious Topical Letter,” there is no differentiating grades or
categories of soldiers. The trauma of war explodes any notion of stable identification. Likewise,
the memory of trauma explodes any notion of stable narrative identity in relation to the
presentation of subjectivity. As such, Hemingway’s salient observations in “Notes on the Next
War” operate as manifestation in Cantwell’s recollected creation of the figure of Jackson,
Cantwell’s driver. The echo of Hemingway’s opinions of war, soldiers, trauma, and death
appearing in the mind of Cantwell as he remembers and the figure of Jackson illustrate a major
concern of the narrative and the novel, the potential danger of and desire for the remembrance of trauma
the river and in Cantwell’s following subjective observation when he states that, “He knew how boring any man’s war is to any other man, and he stopped talking about it. No one is interested in it, abstractly, except soldiers and there are not many soldiers” (29). The difference in this narrative structure of trauma is the inclusion and privileging of the abject in the evolved structure of ARIT.

The Structure of Remembering Trauma in Hemingway’s ARIT

As the structure of the novel progresses, the narrative focusing on the figure of Cantwell shifts from the proscopical memory of the events of his drive to Venice to the palinscopic remembering and cataloging of the great and feckless war participants he knew in the past. In the narrative, Cantwell is shown as subjectively observing that, “Remember your good friend and remember your dead. Remember plenty things and your best friends again and the finest people you know. Don’t be a bitter nor a stupid. And what has that to do with soldiering as a trade? Cut it out, he told himself” (34). In this passage, Cantwell’s intimations to “remember” contract proscopical and palinscopic memory in the narrative. Additionally, these intimations also disrupt the structure and construction of the narrative engage a sense of the abject. Moreover, episodes like this contraction and disruption appear in other Hemingway war narratives.

117 In fact, Hemingway deals objectively with the sentiment of this passage previously in his non fiction. Hemingway asserts, “but those who want to go to war, the elite, are killed off in the first months and the rest of the war is fought by men who are enslaved into the bearing of arms and are taught to be more afraid of sure death from their officers if they run than possible death if they stay in the line or attack” (Byline 210). These enslaved men, according to Hemingway’s observation that shifts from reserved objection of the elite to engrossed subjection of the enslaved, do not represent the ideals that initiate the war nor will their deaths serve as monuments to some just cause. In ARIT, Cantwell reflects and creates this understanding observing, “there was no sense boring this boy, who, for all his combat infantryman badge, his Purple Heart and the other things he work, was in no sense a soldier but only a man placed, against his will, in uniform, who had elected to remain in the army for his own ends” (30).
and convey similar movement within the created structure of the narrative.

In the structure of Hemingway’s later (written following WWII) short story “Black Ass at the Crossroads,” a story of battle, death, and trauma during World War II, Hemingway’s narrative contracts prooscopic and palinscopic memory as the protagonist remembers laying in the grass that “smelled of true summer” watching “the big blue flies” and “butterflies around the edges of the blood on the black-surfaced road” while recollecting a Wyoming hunting trip that had occurred in a distance “September” (CSS 583). The narrative structure in this short story, additionally, is disrupted in its presentation of subjectivity and objectivity with portions of the story being subjective—“I watched the road to the west beyond the estaminet while the cleaning up was going on. I never watched the cleaning up unless I had to take part in it myself. Watching the cleaning up is bad for you” (CSS 581)—and then abruptly shifting to objectivity—“it was the first man he had killed that day and he was very pleased” (CSS 579). The inchoate shifts in subjectivity and objectivity in “Black Ass at Cross Roads” appear in the recollected narrative of the text but are not fully realized in the story. These shifts in Hemingway’s narrative structure and style preface the evolution of subjectivity and objectivity in conjunction with the presence of abjectivity operating in the narrative in ARIT.

The narrative of ARIT focuses on Cantwell’s exterior physical and interior mental movement through the landscape, and the structure of the narrative operates as an ambulatory event involving abjection. This event offers him the opportunity to begin to access his previously silenced abjected memories of his
first traumas experienced in the war. In fact, Rudolf Bernet in “The Traumatized
Subject” observes that, “the traumatizing event is thus the shock of the encounter
with something so strange and inconceivable that it neutralizes the subject […].”
Bernet continues and observes that, “the combination of another, second event is
required to draws the subject out of its torpor and to allow the trace of the first
event to take up a place within the history of the subject” (162-163). As such in
ARIT, Bernet’s idea of the necessity of a secondary event operating as an
impetus for the accessing of the memory of the initial traumatizing event appears
as the narrative of Cantwell imbricates proscopic and palinscopic memory in the
narrative through the use of the abject as a voice and presence in the narrative.

In a passage in ARIT, Cantwell asks his driver, Jackson, to stop so he can
view Torcello, a location that exists both in the proscopic narrative and the
palinscopic narrative of the novel’s structure. In the narrative, Cantwell observes
that, “This is where you can see how it all happened. But nobody ever looks at it
from here” (ARIT 36). The notion of retrospection and subjectivity is at the
forefront of this portion of the narrative. Hemingway creates in Cantwell a
contraction of subjectivity and objectivity, as Cantwell is observed in the
narrative—“but he continued to look at it and it was all wonderful to him” (ARIT
37). Cantwell, expressed in a mixture of third person omniscient and free indirect
style embodying a tone of objectification, recalls his time during the battles on the
landscape. He remembers the enemy and his troops’ initiations into battle
observing that, “but he never hated them [the enemies]; nor could have any
feeling about them […] he taught his people to shoot, really, which is a rare ability
in continental troops, and to be able to look at the enemy when they came” (ARIT 38). This section of the narrative uses a presence of abjection to both connect and separate traditional points of view—subjectivity and objectivity—in the structure of the narrative.

Hemingway’s narrative focuses on the accessing of the memory of his first wounding in battle in chapter five of ARIT. Cantwell’s objective reaction to and subjective experience of trauma and wounding in battle is presented in the narrative. The narrator observes that,

He has hit three times that winter, but they were all gift wounds; small wounds in the flesh of the body without breaking bone, and he had become quite confident of his personal immortality since he knew he should have been killed in the heavy artillery bombardment that always preceded the attacks. Finally he did get hit properly and for good. No one of his other wounds had ever done to him what the first big one did. I suppose it is just the loss of immortality, he thought. Well in a way, that is quite a lot to lose (ARIT 39).

Cantwell’s objective and subjective remembrance of his realization of his “loss of

---

118 Cantwell’s objective remembrance of his subjective guidance to his initiate troops shifts from the objective and impersonal display to the personal and subjective display of knowledge and initiation that he experienced during the battles, “you always had to count and count fast after the bombardment to know how many shooters you would have” (ARIT 39). The objective and historical accuracy of Cantwell’s observation echoes Jennifer D. Keene’s Doughboys, the Great War, and the Remaking of America where she observes, that the objective education WWI soldiers differed greatly from the subjective “in-the-field education” of the battlefield. Keene argues that the subjective “in-the-field education” was often more substantial than anything citizen-soldiers received in the training camps” (44). Keene also asserts that the subjective education holds more validity “for late-arriving troops,” as “combat veterans became the primary source of information about how to conduct themselves in the front lines” (48).
immortality” as being “quite a lot to lose” connects to Eric J. Leed’s exploration of
mortality and death in World War I. Leed asserts that, “the front is a place that
dissolved the clear distinction between life and death. Death, customarily the
’slash’ between life/not-life, became for many in the war a ‘dash,’ a continuum of
experience the end of which was the cessation of any possibility of experience”
(No Man’s Land: Combat and Identity in World War I 21). Leed’s observation
references the abject. As such, the Colonel’s remembrance of his experience on
the frontlines presents a recognition of the continuum of life ending in death as a
result of wounding, and this recognition operates in reference to the abject.119

Cantwell’s recognition that initiation in the trauma of war and battle leads
to an awareness of the abject understanding of personal mortality and death
appears as a central theme to the text and specifically, this portion of the novel.

119 In Hemingway’s first novel The Sun Also Rises, Jake Barnes’ narrative evokes the connection
of his wounding in relation to Leed’s continuum, “I was all bandaged up. […] he [liaison colonel]
made that wonderful speech: ‘You, a foreigner, an Englishman (any foreigner was an
Englishman) ‘have given more than your life” (SAR 39). In the portion of SAR containing Barnes’
memories, the text appears consciously subjective as Barnes attempts to avoid and to escape the
memory of not only his injury but the lingering effects of both the physical effects of trauma and
his memories of war. Robert O. Stephens asserts, “the pattern of rejection, avoidance, and quest
is a repeated one when seen along the whole range of Hemingway’s writing. Numerous critics
have noted that the novelist’s heroes embody a continuum of experience, so that later heroes
incorporate the experience of others” (Bloom Modern Critical Interpretations of SAR 57).
Stephens continues, “Colonel Robert [sic] Cantwell of ARIT (1950) most clearly exemplifies this
pattern. At fifty, he had lived through his initiation by wounding as have Nick Adams and Frederic
Henry, sampled the expatriate life known to Jake Barnes, and witnessed the loss of Spain as has
Robert Jordan” (57). In Hemingway’s narrative in SAR, Barnes traumatic removal from
‘experience,’ specifically represented by his inability to connect sexually with Brett, connects to
Cantwell’s remembrance of his traumatic acceptance of the loss of his immortality as a soldier in
battle. Barnes remembers a wound that is commonly viewed as a castration. Barnes references
Leed’s and Stephens’ conceptions of the traumatic “continuum of experience.” Barnes truly
experiences, as a result of his wound, a subjective sense of Leed’s “the cessation of any
possibility of experience” (21) in that he is castrated, at most, or rendered impotent, at least. As
the result of the memory of his wound, Barnes achieves an objective sense of Stephens’ “liv[ing]
through an initiation by wounding as […]have Nick Adams […]and] samp[ling] the expatriate life”
(57) in that he is focused on experiencing not on remembering.
The recognition is not of the death of a specific person or ideal. Instead, the recognition is the understanding and awareness in the memory of the loss of mortality, an awareness that is abject by definition. In the narrative, Cantwell’s recollected recognition of his death prompts him to think of his internment observing that, “for a long time he had been thinking about all the fine places he would like to be buried [...] the stinking, putrefying part doesn’t last very, long, really, he thought, and anyway you are just a sort of mulch” (ARIT 40). The pragmatic yet poetic view of death and of the effects on the body engages the abject reality and effects of death. Correspondingly, Margot Norris observes that, “dead bodies make the issues and outcomes of war real (35). Similarly, Cantwell’s preoccupation with the burial of his lifeless body—the abject— makes his recollection of physical and mental war traumas experienced and remembered—the subjective and objective by Cantwell paired with his inability to ‘get well’ to reconcile the objective and the subjective through an awareness of the abject— the locus of the text.
Conclusion: Trauma’s Effects in Hemingway’s Narrative Progression

Ernest Hemingway’s narrative style involves terse sentences, simple-sentenced phrases, and a dearth of adjectives and adverbs. His style is often understood by critics as implying that Hemingway privileges a focus on the concrete details conveyed in the narrative versus a more omniscient and omnipresent illustration of events and actions. However, accepting this limited focus dismisses Hemingway’s various attempts to capture, in his narratives, “the actual things […] which produced the emotion that you experienced” (Hemingway Death in the Afternoon 2). Hemingway, echoing the desires of his peers appearing in narrative structures of texts by William Faulkner, James Joyce, and Virginia Woolf, wants to move beyond mere recordings of life in his narratives. For Hemingway and other authors of the period, the structure of the narrative appears as a place for exploring the interiority and exteriority of experience without adhering to traditional didactic narrative representations of experience.

Hemingway appears to have an artistic, creative desire to create prose that reflects the inner reactions of his characters as they experience external objects of the world. Similarly, the individual’s confrontation of situations of extreme tension in the narratives of the time illustrates a crisis of the modern period. In Hemingway’s narrative embodiment of this confrontation, the external
stimuli experienced, Hemingway’s “actual things,” are captured through his targeted prose style. Yet, his narrative structures still invoke a sense of interiority in the presentation of the tension. As such, Hemingway’s narratives inquire into the tension between the representation of the true “gen” and various correlating exterior events, objects, and actions. Hemingway’s narrative progression in his fiction illustrates his changing understanding of this inquiry.

Ernest Hemingway, in writing his fiction, engages the psychic, personal, and social trauma initiated with World War I, transacted during the Great Depression, and mobilized by World War II. Hemingway and his texts function as a barometer to the trauma experienced in the early twentieth century. His experiences, captured in prose and journalism, mirror the proliferation of war and trauma occurring in the early twentieth century at large. The traumas of war coincide and contribute to molding Hemingway’s narrative style, a style that in many ways contributes to defining the period.

The violent events and aftermath of the twentieth century beginning with WWI explode in the collective population and psyche. World War I affects the culture as it heralds a changing society with cultural conventions being subverted by death, trauma, and fear. Cathy Caruth in *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative and History*, asserts that trauma is experienced and witnessed through a "response to an unexpected or overwhelming violent event or events that are not fully grasped as they occur, but return later in repeated flashbacks, nightmares, or other repetitive phenomena" (91). The experience of WWI, as
Caruth’s definition of trauma suggests, births a tremendous response to the violence of war that is not culturally grasped as it occurs, but instead returns and effects the stories and fictions generated in its passing.

The traumatic response of the culture to war appearing in the period’s fiction explores a fundamental change in human epistemology and ontology resulting from the effects of the traumas of the Great War. Celia Malone Kingsbury observes in *The Peculiar Sanity of War: Hysteria in the Literature of World War I* that, “war literature…reflects a deep pathos that grows out of the acknowledgement of human frailty and impotence in the face of communal disaster” (xx-xxi). Similarly, the epistemological frailty and ontological impotence resulting from war trauma can be seen as aftershocks in the narrative structures of Hemingway’s fiction. Hemingway’s narrative aftershocks create and establish a backdrop of war for the characters and the narratives of his work. In addition, Hemingway’s texts express, in an evolving narrative form, a response to unexpected or overwhelming violent events that are not fully grasped as they occur, but return later in repeated flashbacks, nightmares, or other repetitive phenomena in the texts. His narrative expressions embody the lack of epistemological and ontological certainty occurring in the passing of war and trauma.

The capturing of trauma in fiction requires that the writer attempt to engage an event or series of events that is enacted in a liminal state, outside of the bounds of traditional human understanding and experience. In this liminal
state, the subject is radically ungrounded. In fictional depictions of trauma, subjectivity, objectivity, and the structure of narratives appear ungrounded. Correspondingly, Kali Tal in *Worlds of Hurt: Reading the Literature of Trauma* asserts that textual representations of trauma are “written from the need to tell and retell the story of the traumatic experience, to make it ‘real’ both to the victim and to the community” (21).

The first half of the twentieth century heralds many changes for the population, as well as the literature of the time. Literary creators and subsequently, literary critics, react by adopting the voices and timbre of war and trauma in the eras surrounding the World Wars. In like fashion, Margaret R. Higonnet asserts that trauma, in general, and PTSD, in particular, offers “literary critics a vocabulary to describe the symptoms of soldiers’ mental disturbances that may figure in memoirs and other autobiographical accounts: nonsequential memory, flashbacks, nightmares, and mutism or fragmented language” (“Authenticity and Art in Trauma Narratives of World War I” 92). Additionally, Higonnet observes that, “those symptoms bear a suggestive resemblance to certain features of modernist experiment: decentering of the subject, montage, ellipses or gaps in narrative, and startlingly vivid images. This similarity—or, some would argue, connection—between a set of medical symptoms among veterans and a set of stylistic features in narrative has fostered a masculine canon of modernism” (92). Higonnet ‘s observations expose a necessary and expressive link between the experiences of war and the literature surrounding the trauma of war and the battlefield.
Hemingway’s focus on crafting a text using a narrative calculus is not just about treating or representing an inner reconciliation of the outer experience. Hemingway asserts, in a 1956 interview with Harvey Breit concerning the narrative construction of ARIT, that, “I have moved through arithmetic, through plane geometry and algebra, and now I am in calculus” (Briet “Talk with Mr. Hemingway” reprinted in Trogdon Hemingway: A Literary Reference 274). In this quote, Hemingway intimates ideas from his 1922 dispatch in relation to the construction of his narrative. The emphasis in his 1956 and 1922 interviews are on the play between the inner and the outer in the narrative. As calculus is the study of change, of space, and of time, Hemingway draws attention to the manner in which change is represented in the structure of a narrative. Hemingway’s writing no longer just focuses on presenting the arithmetic—the subjects and objects of his stories, the geometry—shapes and senses evoked by his stories—and the algebra—equations and consequences apparent in the themes of his stories. Instead, Hemingway seeks to capture the illusive element of change, space, and time in his narrative construction.

The arithmetic, geometry, and geology of war appear in his early narrative works. Moreover, these elements still retain a place of prominence in his later work. However, as Hemingway’s narrative style evolves, calculus, as the study of change and space, is the narrative method he attempts to deploy. The study of change, which Hemingway presents in the narrative calculus in ARIT, is illustrated through his character’s, Cantwell’s, remembrance and memory of war and trauma. In fact, trauma operates as the variable enabling a change in the
narrative structure of the work; trauma, both the acts and memory of the acts, alter understanding of space and time in the narrative. In like fashion, Samuel Hynes observes in *Soldier’s Tale* of the effect of war trauma on the construction of narratives. Hynes observes that,

> there are the inflicted sufferings of war—the wounds, the fears, the hardships” and “there is something else that is done to men by wars: no man goes through a war without being changed by it … and though that process will not be explicit in every narrative—not all men are self-conscious or reflective enough for that—it will be there. Change—*inner* change—is the other motive for war stories: not only what happened, but what happened to me (3).

As such, Hemingway’s ARIT utilizes a narrative calculus as Hemingway represents how the experience of war and trauma operate and affect in the narrative through the figure of Cantwell. Moreover, exploring Hemingway’s widely-panned novel using the juncture of trauma and narrative represents an opportunity to examine how this narrative calculus contributes to understanding Hemingway’s narrative progression in his fiction.

During Hemingway’s time as a World War II correspondent, he spent eighteen days embedded in front lines of the Hurtgen Forest during a battle that cost 33,000 American soldiers their lives (Whiting *Battle of Hurtgen Forest*, pp.xi–xiv, 271–274). The Hurtgen Forest battle, lasting 6 months and existing as the single longest American battle of World War II, is known as one of the bloodiest.
Hemingway is noted as never writing about this battle, save for his *Across the River and into the Trees*. It is not a stretch to suggest that the events Hemingway experiences during his two-week time at the front exposed him to many traumatic events. Perhaps, it is most telling that he never writes of these events in his capacity as a non-fiction correspondent. Instead, Hemingway chooses to use ARIT to respond to the unexpected or overwhelming violent events witnessed and experienced yet not fully grasped as they occurred in the battle. Hemingway’s narrative structure in ARIT uses the figure of Cantwell’s remembrance of these events as they return later in repeated flashbacks, nightmares, and other repetitive phenomena to create a narrative structure that illustrates and engages the effects of trauma.

In light of the shifting paradigms of the early twentieth century, James Dawes in *The Language of War* argues that, “the experience of violence puts tremendous pressure on nations, persons, ideas, and language […] foundational epistemological borders—like the borders between care and harm, cause and effect, or the morally permitted and the morally prohibited—are revealed by war to be fragile social fictions” (131). Dawes continues and observes that, “war thus initiates a semantic crisis, a crisis of meaning premised upon disbelief in language’s ability effectively to refer to and intervene in the material world” (131). According to Dawes, the semantic break operates in Hemingway’s fiction. This break in Hemingway, however, also illustrates a thematic break, one that is linked to Hemingway’s semantics in his narratives. The semantic and thematic break in Hemingway’s narratives profoundly references an engagement with the
inconceivability of war and trauma in his fiction. In addition, Hemingway’s narrative breaks reflect his subsequent attempt to create a narrative structure that captures the unbearable condition of war and the unknowable experience that occurs as a result of trauma.

Ernest Hemingway in *Across the River and into the Trees* reflects the unhinging and play of certain thought-to-be-stable notions of narrative subjectivity and objectivity. To often, the evolution of Hemingway as a writer is viewed as a result of the trauma experienced and how these experiences biographically correlate and appear in his fiction. However, Hemingway’s narrative progression appears more keenly related to the manner in which the various experiences he witnessed affected the form of his narrative i.e. the construction of the narrative and not the content of his narrative. The evolution of Hemingway as a writer is not solely because of the experiences he had. The progression of Hemingway, evidenced in his narrative structures, can be seen instead as treating the pervasive quality of the memories of these experiences that affect the narrative structuring in Hemingway’s fiction. In fact, Hemingway observes that, “but sometimes a long time after the memory of the sensory distortions of these woundings will produce a story which, while not justifying the temporary cerebral damage, will palliate it.” Correspondingly, Hemingway’s *Across the River and Into the Trees* interrogates and integrates the effects of his memories of trauma within the novel’s narrative structure.

Hemingway accesses in ARIT a narrative structure, a calculus, for presenting and representing the interior and the exterior of his protagonist that
calls attention to the evolution of subjectivity and objectivity in his narrative structure. Hemingway asserts, in relation to understanding this narrative evolution in ARIT, that, “in writing I have moved through arithmetic, through plane geometry and algebra, and now I am in calculus. If they don’t understand that, to hell with them. I won’t be sad and I will not read what they say. They say? Who do they say? Let them say” (Briet “Talk with Mr. Hemingway” reprinted in Trogdon *Hemingway: A Literary Reference* 274). In this observation, Hemingway’s attention on his evolution references the transition occurring in his writing. Hemingway begins his career writing from the objective presentation of experiences through the images of the external world—the arithmetic and plane geometry of his experiences. As his writing progresses, he generates narratives that focus on the subjective exploration of the impressions of the interior landscape of the mind—the algebra involving his experiences. With ARIT, Hemingway writes from a narrative realm where subjectivity and objectivity in the narrative is comprised of multiple dimensions involving the exterior and the interior—the calculus of a change in the space and time of experiences. Therefore, Hemingway’s narrative structure evolves from objective arithmetic and plane geometry to a more subjective algebra.

Hemingway’s transition to a narrative calculus echoes the modernist climate affected by the theories of Freud. In addition, his progression also references the effects of war on subjective (interior) and objective (exterior) identity in society. In fact, Eric J. Leed understands the Great War as a “modernizing experience” as it “fundamentally altered traditional sources of
identity, age-old images of war and men of war” (193). Leed continues his exploration of the disruption of identity resulting from World War I stating that, “Total war” was nothing but the assertion that there was no such thing as two realities, two sets of rules, two levels upon which life might be lived and experienced (194). Leed’s view of the war’s disruption of traditional reality, rules, and levels of life highlight the change in narrative structures and point of view occurring in fiction. Mirroring the disrupted culture, subjectivity and objectivity are also no longer merely seen in narratives as distinct but instead are seen as imbricated and engaged through the use of the voice of the abject.

Hemingway’s narrative focus, as displayed in ARIT, is not just about a subjective reconciliation with an objective experience. Instead, his emphasis is a play between the subjective and the objective that uses the previously silenced voice of the abject—the experience and effects of trauma—to give a voice to a modern sensibility. This play appears in Hemingway’s calculus between the subjective presentation, remembering the trauma, and the objective representation, the memory of the trauma, in ARIT. As such, trauma operates as the impetus to imbricate objectivity and subjectivity in the narrative structure. The voices and structures of Hemingway’s ARIT present subjectivity and objectivity in a different fashion then his earlier works. The study of the novel from this perspective opens the possibility of witnessing and remarking on a progression in Hemingway’s writing that has not been engaged before in scholarship. Additionally, the exploration of the narrative exposes an answer to
the question of what does it mean to have a narrative structure voiced through a previously silenced experience such as trauma.

Trauma is a falling away from one's external self caught between notions of the no-longer (the way one was) and the not-yet (the way one would be). The paradoxical falling away in trauma imbues a certain frustration and anger at the idea that the most direct seeing of a violent event may occur as an absolute inability to know it. The narrative treatment of this paradox necessitates the generation of a narrative structure that uses the traditional structures and points of view along with the use and privileging of the changed structure made accessible through the abject. Likewise in ARIT, the sense of abject anger and frustration is mirrored in the anger of the shooter, Cantwell, at his boatman. While Nick Adams in the short stories remembers his anger at his father and the thoughts he had had of killing him, in ARIT, the shooter—Cantwell—experiences his anger and thoughts of killing the boatman. In the earlier short story, Nick Adams’ focus is on thinking about his father and the control exerted by his father’s presence. However, Cantwell’s surface focus is on not letting the boatman “spoil” the experience for him. The narrative observes that, “you don’t know how many more times you will shoot duck and do not let anything spoil it for you” (15). In this intimation, Cantwell attempts to focus on the present external task at hand—shooting ducks, but the abjected interior, the combination of the no-longer, not-yet, and lost-yet keeps bubbling to the surface. Like the older figure of Nick Adams in “Fathers and Sons,” the figure of Cantwell enters into an interior narrative structure of memory and self, where he assumes a
narrative presence informed by his memories (the no-longer), experiences (no-longer and not yet), and thoughts (lost-yet) of self.

The changed narrative perspective operating in Hemingway’s narrative structure evolves the location of point of view from traditional subjective or objective lines to a more abjective position. Julia Kristeva explores the notion of the abject in the structure of narratives, and she observes the engagement of the abject as a point of view in a structure that brings forth a different and changed perspective in the work. As such, the appearance of the abject as point of view in a narrative gives voice to a silenced presence in the fiction. This silenced presence intimates a sense of the aside or outside of traditional points of view involving subjectivity or objectivity. Moreover, the silenced presence involves a voice created in the abject experience occurring at the border of life and death. The border of life and death that generates this voice is the experience of trauma. As such, Hemingway’s narrative calculus in the structure of ARIT involves an abjectivity, in order to create a narrative structure beyond yet within traditional narrative points of view represented by traditional presentations of subjectivity and objectivity.

In ARIT, Cantwell’s recognition that initiation in the trauma of war and battle leads to an awareness of the abject understanding of personal mortality and death appears as a central theme to the text and specifically, this portion of the novel. The recognition is not of the death of a specific person or ideal. Instead, the recognition is the understanding and awareness in the memory of the loss of mortality, an awareness that is abject by definition. In the narrative,
Cantwell’s recollected recognition of his death prompts him to think of his internment observing that, “for a long time he had been thinking about all the fine places he would like to be buried [...] the stinking, putrefying part doesn’t last very, long, really, he thought, and anyway you are just a sort of mulch” (ARIT 40). The pragmatic yet poetic view of death and of the effects on the body engages the abject reality and effects of death. Correspondingly, Margot Norris observes that, “dead bodies make the issues and outcomes of war real (35). Similarly, Cantwell’s preoccupation with the burial of his lifeless body—the abject—makes his recollection of physical and mental war traumas experienced and remembered—the subjective and objective—by Cantwell paired with his inability to ‘get well’—to reconcile the objective and the subjective through an awareness of the abject— the locus of the text.

Ending this study at this point in the exploration is difficult, as the continuing close study of the text exposes many avenues for the lens presented in the preceding pages. However, the hope is for this study to be continued, albeit in another form, and that in that form, to address the effect of the presence of trauma as a point of view on Ernest Hemingway’s narrative structure in Across the River and into the Trees. The remaining, unexamined portions, of the novel illustrate the various movements and transitions Hemingway uses to engage and to create his narrative calculus of trauma in the novel.
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