This essay re-evaluates the character of Jake Barnes from a disability studies perspective. Previous interpretations that treat Barnes's trauma realistically still tend to reinforce traditional stereotypes about disabled men, including the notion that Jake may "turn" gay because of his injury. However, the text suggests Hemingway's awareness that cultural narratives make disability more than a personal problem; one of the biggest obstacles to Jake's rehabilitation is a "medical model" of disability that pathologizes any impairment and compels disabled people to continually "prove" they are "normal."

******

AS MICHAEL S. REYNOLDS and others have noted, the intense campaign of persona-building that Hemingway engaged in after being wounded in World War I makes it difficult to assess his level of anxiety over degeneration through disability. Even so, the cultural research of Joanna Bourke and Betsy L. Nies suggests that this fear would have been more than "in the air" for a wounded man returning from Europe. Bourke, for instance, notes that an increase of pension claims sensitized Britain to the literal costs of war-related disability and helped to re-energize debates over which veterans "deserved" charity and which did not (63-75). Nies, in turn, describes how similar financial concerns and the popularization of eugenic theories in the United States combined to make the war-wounded body a site for particularly intense fears about "degeneration." (1)

In addition to this body-obsessed cultural milieu, a seemingly minor incident during Hemingway's recuperation in Italy may have helped cement connections between disability and moral/physical breakdown in his mind. Quoting from the writer's correspondence, biographer James Mellow reports that not long after Hemingway's arrival at the hospital in Milan, "one of [his] newly-acquired friends proved to be a problem" (70). The friend was the wealthy Mr. Englefield, "an Englishman in his fifties, brother to one of the Lords of the Admiralty":

Mr. Englefield, who had been "younger sonning it in Italy for about twenty years," had adopted him, visited him often, made a practice of bringing him gifts—everything from eau de cologne to the London papers and bottles of Marsala. Later in life, however, Hemingway would remember Mr. Englefield in an acid sketch in a letter to a friend. On his visits to the hospital, Mr. Englefield, it seems, "got wet about wanting to see my wounds dressed. At the time I didn't know well-brought-up people were like that. I thought it was only tramps. I explained to him that I was not that way and that he couldn't come to the hospital anymore and that I couldn't take his Marsala" (Mellow 70)

This incident has been interpreted as contributing in a general way to Hemingway's awareness of sexual behaviors not acknowledged by his Midwestern home town (Vernon 39). Critics such as Eby and Elliot concur that such an incident would heighten Hemingway's interest in the idea of erotic variations and help to move him past thinking about sexual desire in binary terms. Yet while they recognize this subsequent interest in sexual variety, these readings do not stray far beyond binarism themselves, ultimately situating Hemingway's fascination within a familiar spectrum of either homosexual or heterosexual behavior signified through a socially constructed gender. (This is arguably true even in Eby's case, where Hemingway's hair fetish is tied to his fascination with "effeminate" men and "boyish" women).

If, however, Englefield's lapse of sexual decorum was indeed triggered by arguments over seeing Hemingway's "wounds dressed" it also serves as the young writer's introduction to a wider range of beliefs specifically tied to sexuality and disability. Mr. Englefield could, for instance, have been what disability researchers call a "devotee"--a species of fetishist whose erotic desires are triggered by the sight of people with disabilities. There exists today, for instance, a large community of devotees who seek out partners with amputations; others, however, are aroused by simply associating with disabled people (Bruno 1-10). The rapidly expanding field of disability studies has done much to create a fuller understanding of this kind of fetishism, as part of its wider research on the ways cultural stereotypes intersect with the realms of myth, psychology, pseudoscience, and medicine to impact the daily lives of people with physical and mental impairments.

The Sun Also Rises articulates ideas currently debated within the field of disability studies, especially those related to the concept of the "disabled identity" (Linton 8-32). An examination of these new concepts, in turn, allows a re-evaluation of Hemingway's attitudes toward wounds and masculinity. Specifically, the experiences of emasculated war hero Jake Barnes reflect Hemingway's awareness of what researchers call a "medical model" of disability--a worldview that equates disability with pathology and that forces disabled people continually to "prove" to the world at large that they are completely "cured" and therefore "normal." (2) The novel's downbeat ending suggests that a philosophy that continually denies bodily realities can be
as physically and mentally destructive as a literal wound. In the end, Jake will never achieve the psychological stability he
craves because he finally accepts prevailing social and medical philosophies about his injury—and these ideas, in turn, will
always leave him vulnerable to the fear that he will “degenerate” into an invalid or a “pervert.” The encounter with Englefield
may have alerted Hemingway to the fact that merely having a disability made one vulnerable to a new range of sexual
types and cultural assumptions—and especially to the idea that disability “turns” men into homosexuals or childlike,
asexual beings (Shakespeare 10, 63-65).

The specters of the eunuch and the “queer” haunt Jake Barnes and drive his search for a viable identity. In the novel, Jake’s
struggle to define himself as a disabled man plays out in what Thomas Strynchacz calls “theatrical representations,” in which he
exists on a continuum of behavior “between” male characters (8, 74-80). These are men whose behavior and physical
characteristics seem like exaggerated aspects of Jake’s own, at least potentially. Specifically, Jake occupies a psychological
middle-ground between the disabled characters Count Mippipopolous and the bullfighter Belmonte—and as he accepts or
rejects these characters, we are meant to understand that he is embracing or discarding the stereotypes of able-bodiedness or
disability they represent.

Generally speaking, critics have glossed over the complexity of the relationship between Jake’s identity and the stereotypes
linking wounds, physical power, and masculine degeneration. This oversight is due largely to the influence of Freudian thinking
even within more “modern” readings of the novel that move away from the older, bluntly “heroic” and masculinist
interpretations of Philip Young, Carlos Baker, and Jeffrey Meyers. (3) And so while recent interpretations have established
Hemingway’s awareness of gender construction and varieties of erotic desire, they consider disability primarily as a catalyst
alerting Jake in a general way to the existence of a “polymorphous” sexuality. The Freudian school either aligns Jake with the
stereotypical figure of the disabled man who receives a compensatory “gift” of artistic or emotional sensitivity because of his
impairment, or uncritically accepts the notion that he is “turning” gay because of his injuries.

Wolfgang Rudat’s essay on the Count deserves a second look at this point. Rudat identifies Mippipopolous as the only
psychologically healthy disabled man in the novel, situating him within an “inspirational” discourse crafted to show how a man
with injuries arguably similar to Jake’s might achieve a greater sense of mental stability. Rudat explains that Brett Ashley
introduces the Count as a pawn in her quasi-sadomasochistic relationship with Jake, as yet another substitute for Jake himself,
and as a target for her repressed frustration:

{When} Brett turns to Jake to assure him that the Count is one of them, that is, that the Count is also wounded, and
then makes a show of telling the Count that she loves him—and that he is a “darling,” she is telling Jake that the Count
too is sexually “wounded”.... The Count, whom according to her own statement Brett has told that she was in love with
Jake ... knows ... that Brett has now communicated to Jake that he, the Count, is sexually disabled. Not only does the
Count take in stride the communication to another man of his own sexual status, but he actually confirms it in order to
be able to explain to the other man his philosophy of life, that is, that he “can enjoy everything so well” including
relations with women. (Rudat 7)

This is a persuasive analysis of the sadomasochistic elements in Brett and Jake’s relationship, but because it assumes without
question that the Count is literally the best-adjusted disabled man in the novel, Rudat’s reading gives a distorted picture of the
disability experience that Hemingway wants to articulate.

Rudat does not recognize, for instance, that the strategies for psychic healing suggested by the Count’s performance—the
“subduing” of sexual desire and the transference of erotic energy into “symbolic gratification” (7)—amount to little more than a
passive acceptance of the asexual status that non-disabled society considers proper for the disabled. Jake knows that the
Count’s solution amounts to a renunciation of his sexuality. He is familiar with this kind of “cure,” and he has declared it
useless; alone in his hotel room, he remembers that “the Catholic Church had an awfully good way of handling [his disability.]
Good advice, anyway. Not to think about it. Oh, it was swell advice. Try and take it” (SAR 39).

Contrary to Rudat’s reading, wherein Jake realizes the larger significance of the Count’s advice only gradually, Jake is instantly
aware that the Count is being presented to him as a “role” model, and he resents it for reasons that would be clear to a man
like Hemingway, who had had a real brush with catastrophe. Jake’s almost complete silence during this playful interlude
between Brett and the Count may indicate his anger over having the Count paraded in front of him as a version of what
Leonard Kriegel calls “the charity cripple”—a figurehead whose injuries are assumed by the non-disabled to represent the
disability they represent.

Jake is silent when Brett forces the Count to undress and expose his wounds, and when she declares, “I told you [he] was one
of us” (SAR 67). Jake recognizes her condensation toward both the Count and himself. He knows that what Brett really wants
to say is, “Look, the Count is like you” because he has suffered severe injury and survived; by implication, the Count’s
boundless ebullience is something Brett hopes Jake will adopt as well, simply because she cannot stand to be around
depressing or gloomy people.

The Count, in turn, is also aware of what Brett is doing, and embraces the role of “supercrip” she has offered him. He parrots
the inspirational drivel she wants to hear: “You see, Mr. Barnes, it is because I have lived very much that now I can enjoy
everything so well. Don’t you find it is like that?” To this utopian assessment of post-disability living, Jake responds curtly, “Yes.
Absolutely” (SAR 67). Anger and embarrassment clip his sentences, and the affect is flat and mechanical because Jake wants
to limit his participation in what is essentially Brett’s own private freak show.

The banter ends with a significant exchange between Brett and the Count. During a discussion of the Count’s values, Brett
declares, “You haven’t any values. You’re dead, that’s all.” To which the Count responds, “No, my dear. You’re not right. I’m not
dead at all” (SAR 67-68). The concept of death here is more than a metaphor for fin de siecle malaise and ennui among the
wealthy (Gaggin 95-99): it serves to expose the liminal nature of existence for the disabled male in this society. On the one hand, the fact that Brett can so glibly declare the Count dead shows how close her thinking is to the eugenic/Social Darwinist stereotypes of the period. The Count's insistent and unequivocal response, in turn, gives the lie to his studied joviality and shows his own awareness of his marginalized status, revealing how desperately a disabled man must prove to others and himself that he is worthy to live. Hemingway's sensitivity to stereotypes of disability, rather than Jake's inability to interpret the Count's advice correctly, helps explain why the novel quickly casts such a positive role model into obscurity.

The next model of disability lake encounters is the bullfighter Belmonte. This figure underscores the novel's ambivalence toward a worldview that valorizes traditional forms of masculine performance as cures for disability. The Belmonte character has been overshadowed, however, by the critical fascination with the relationship between lake and the damned good-looking young matador Pedro Romero (SAR 170).

The tantalizing homosocial tension between Pedro and lake diverts attention away from the dialectic that Hemingway creates though the aging matador Belmonte--a dialectic that exposes the interplay between the wounded body and public/private constructions of honor masculinility and disability. The general view of lake's bullfighting adventures assumes that Hemingway wants the reader to identify most with the implicitly able-bodied spectators who clamor to see the new young bullfighter. This perspective reduces Belmonte to a foil for Pedro Romero, and the graphic details of the older man's corruption and decline simply underscore the beauty and potential for greatness embodied by the younger artist.

Through Belmonte, however, readers are again forced to consider the physical and psychological costs of supercripism and normality-at-any-price. The matador is described as a paradox, someone who has managed to live on past his real life: Fifteen years ago they said if you wanted to see Belmonte you should go quickly, while he was still alive. Since then he has killed more than a thousand bulls (SAR 218). Driven to perform even though he is sick with a fistula (218), Belmonte is kin to the jovial, wounded, and dead Count Mippipopolous. The tone of these passages is significant: they spare Belmonte the kind of quiet disgust reserved for other macho failures, such as Robert Cohn. By reminding the reader that Belmonte cannot reach his former heights of greatness simply because he is no longer well enough (219), Hemingway acknowledges the burden of social expectations on disabled men, and discards yet another faulty role model, a matador who has crafted an identity based on negation--an attempt to purge the self of any trait associated with invalid.

How then might Jake Barnes achieve happiness in a world shaped by the limitations of his sexually mutilated body and by cultural narratives that stigmatize deformity? The novel suggests, at least initially, that Jake might achieve a sense of wholeness if he can correctly interpret the veiled truths conveyed by Brett Ashley and Bill Gorton. These are characters who, by virtue of their unconventional worldviews, serve not so much as role models but rather as guides to show Jake how he might thrive in his otherwise oppressive and limited environment.

For her part, Brett Ashley suggests what Jake might do in the realm of the physical. She recognizes intuitively what recent work on the sexual development of disabled men and couples has confirmed, that it is possible for severely disabled people to achieve sexual satisfaction by re-training their bodies to feel erotic pleasure in different ways, through different erogenous zones (Callahan 77-78, Brown 37-38, Milam 40-43). (4)

Critics have barely considered the idea that Jake could achieve sexual satisfaction in nontraditional ways. While Debra Moddelmog's analysis of lovemaking between mutilated heroes and their normal lovers in Across the River and into the Trees and To Have and Have Not acknowledges that Hemingway was willing to consider the possibility of such sexual behavior (Reading 122-123), Chaman Nahal's indignation over moments of perverted sexual satisfaction qtd. in Rudat, Sexual Dilemmas 2 between Jake and Brett Ashley constitutes the only critical recognition that Hemingway perhaps wanted to include the emasculated Jake in his pantheon of wounded but sexually active heroes.

However, the key moment that foreshadows the course of Jake's psychosexual development occurs not in the hotel room (as Nahal would have it), but rather in a Paris taxi when he finally gets a moment alone with Brett. Here we see how truly suitable Brett would be as a lover for Jake, because she is willing to entertain the possibility of a nontraditional erotic relationship. The meeting does not start well. Don't touch me, she says. Please don't touch me (SAR 33). This reaction suggests a woman who knows about the nature of Jake's injury and is disgusted by thoughts of sex with man whose penis has been mutilated. But the scene does not end there. Despite her protests, Brett finally admits that she [turns] all to jelly at Jake's touch. Thus she affirms a capacity to experience intense physical sensation from simple stimulation--which may translate into an ability to derive satisfaction from nontraditional sex. Descriptions of her eyes also provide a kind of silent response to Jake's question about what they can do as lovers: Brett has been a wartime nurse (46); she has proven her ability to withstand the sight of horrific wounds--to look on and on after everyone else's eyes in the world would have stopped looking (34). She would not be afraid to have sex with a deformed man, even though she was afraid of so many things (34).

Through this scene, Hemingway hints at what Jake must do in order to achieve happiness and psychological stability: he must re-evaluate the effects of his wound for himself, discarding former notions about damaged masculinity based on cultural stereotypes. He must, in other words, rid his consciousness of the idea that sexual mutilation can only trigger mental and physical degeneration into homosexuality or invalidism--an idea elegantly condensed in the words of the Italian colonel who tells Jake in the hospital that he has given more than [his] life (SAR 39). But such is the power of these cultural stereotypes that there can be no epiphanic moment when Jake suddenly sees the truth and decides to drastically change his life. Instead, he must grope his way toward solving the riddle of his new identity, trying the best he can to interpret the random hints he is given.

Some of these hints come from Bill Gorton, who emerges as a mentor for Jake during an odd shopping trip in Paris. During this
interlude, Bill's eccentric banter makes connections between dead bodies and ethics in ways designed to establish that Bill, like Brett, is someone comfortable with nonstandard bodies and perhaps able to help Jake on his journey toward psychological wholeness. When Bill and Jake are out walking in Paris, Bill stops by a taxidermist's shop and becomes strangely insistent that Jake buy something, "Want to buy anything?" he asks. "Nice stuffed dog?" (SAR 78)

Jake declines, but Bill will not relent. "Mean everything in the world to you after you bought it" he says. "Simple exchange of values .... Road to hell paved with unboUGHT stuffed dogs" (SAR 78). This odd joking appeals to Jake, who remembers it later when he introduces Bill to Brett as a "taxidermist." To which Bill replies, "That was in another country. And besides all the animals were dead" (81). Bill's words have struck a chord with Jake, as well they might--by linking the notions of compromised (or 'exchanged') values with "dead" bodies from "another country" Bill resurrects memories of the affable "supercrip" Count Mippipopolous and draws attention yet again to the question of how one can "overcome" or adapt to a catastrophic physical injury.

Bill's praise of out-of-place, nonstandard bodies and his certainty about their value seem to constitute a metaphorical expression of the same open-mindedness that led him to rescue a black Viennese boxer from a lynching mob earlier in the novel--a scene which Bill describes in similarly nonchalent, playful terms in order to downplay the mob's potential for violence (SAR 76--78). Taken together, these scenes establish Bill's importance to Jake's quest for wholeness as a disabled man. Specifically, these incidents show that Bill Gorton, like Brett Ashley, is committed to a nontraditional code of behavior allowing him to see value in bodies that the larger society would declare worthless or "dead" He seems eminently suitable as a friend for Jake: as a self-styled philosopher about what makes life worth living, Bill may be able to help Jake formulate his own principles for survival as a wounded man.

To see how Bill is only partially successful in healing Jake's psychic wounds, we must re-evaluate the quasi-erotic interlude between Bill and Jake that occurs during the Basque fishing trip in Chapter Twelve. As David Blackmore has elegantly explained, Jake's outdoor experiences foster an unexpected freedom of expression between the two men, to the extent that homoerotic desires rise "so near to the surface of Jake's personality as not to be latent" (59). Even so, I think Blackmore misses the mark when he concludes that the trip represents a victory for Hemingway's homophobia, as Jake finally falls back into "the trap of male homosexual panic" (65). Like Blackmore, I believe Hemingway recognizes here that traditional concepts of masculinity--and especially Freudian concepts of masculinity--are too emotionally restrictive and in need of change. However, because the text links these norms and the same concepts of "normality" that stigmatize Jake's disability, I question whether the scene finally promotes the re-establishment of 19th century gender boundaries as Blackmore suggests (66).

To see the full range of ideas Hemingway presents here, it is necessary to reevaluate the psychoanalytical play that occurs between Jake and Bill in the woods. Analyses of Gorton's highly symbolic banter by both Blackmore and Buckley confirm, in essence, that Bill copies the tactics of a skilled psychotherapist, verbally creating a "safe" space for Jake to express hidden or taboo feelings without fear of censure. Thus, Bill's graphic admission that his "fond[ness]" for Jake would make him a "faggot" in New York (SAR 121) is an invitation for Jake to express similar feelings as part of the "talking cure" being constructed here.

What such analyses of this psychoanalytical session fail to see, however, is that Jake's same-sex desires may not be the only cause of his problems. For instance, the war-centered double entendres that initiate Bill's well-known repartee suggest the plight of disabled veterans. Even the famous scene where Bill teases Jake with the idea of "[getting it] up for fun" (Blackmore 60) is peppered with loaded questions that echo the standard phrases of a military recruiter: "Been working for the common good?" "Work for the good of all." (SAR 118). Thus the text introduces a narrative thread about military service/disability that parallels the homoerotic subtext and intensifies as the joking continues between the two men.

Bill's persistent invocation of "irony and pity" further enhances this disability subtext: the phrase is a poetic crystallization of the attitudes and experiences that shaped the lives of disabled veterans during this era. Joanna Bourke, for instance, describes an "early sentimentalization" of the war-wounded that lasted until the 1920s (56). She explains that the most bathetic public responses were reserved for men with obvious deformities and amputations: in this early period, "public rhetoric judged soldiers' mutilations to be 'badges of their courage, the hall-mark of their glorious service, their proof of patriotism'" (56). According to the popular mythology of the times, a severe wound inspired more than just intense patriotism: women were supposed to be especially attracted to men with obvious injuries; these men, in turn, "were not beneath bargaining pity for love" (Bourke 56). For a time, a distinction was made between men wounded in war and those born with birth defects: the former were 'broken warriors,' and poems singing their praises "adopted the ironic, passive tone of the newly-styled, modern poetry" (Bourke 57).

The decline of national fascination with the war-wounded was foreshadowed by the concurrent stigmatization of veterans like Jake, whose disabilities were invisible to the public eye. Bourke reports: "The absent parts of men's bodies came to exert a special patriotic power. In the struggle for status and resources, absence could be more powerful than presence. The less visible or invisible diseases that disabled many servicemen... could not compete with limblessness" (59). This bias in favor of amputees translated into a pervasive resentment against men who were "merely" diseased or invisibly injured: such men were often considered to be of inferior stock, or literally less "important" than men with obvious wounds (Bourke 59-60). During the postwar years, as the novelty of wounded men wore off and disabled veterans began to compete for resources with the civilian unemployed, this kind of resentment would even be directed against "heroic" amputees (Bourke 63-75.)

Given this historical context, there is a double irony at work in the novel. According to the new rules of this modern world, Jake could "pass" as one of the most heroic of heroes. He has suffered the all-important amputation of a "part"--one which most men would probably consider the most vital "limb" of all. And yet the injury cannot be paraded in front of the public for acclaim.
Because his wound must remain hidden and unknown, it must also remain "shameful."

The other resonant moment of irony and pity occurs at the point where Bill's humorous play falters. The way Bill's lighthearted tone is broken intensifies the novel's focus on disability, revealing that Freudian therapy is ill-equipped to deal with the many problems associated with a physical impairment. In the midst of "defining" Jake, Bill explains,

You're an expatriate. You've lost touch with the soil. You get precious. Fake European standards have ruined you. You drink yourself to death. You become obsessed by sex; you spend all your time talking, not working. You're an expatriate, see? You hang around cafes. You don't work. One group claims women support you. Another group claims you're impotent. (SAR 120)

On one level, this charge reinforces the novel's well-known destabilization of sexual stereotypes by lampooning the traditionally gay or bisexual figure of the Wildean "Decadent." However, if we employ the psychoanalytical perspective established by Blackmore, Rudat, and Buckley, this babble becomes "empty speech"--the Freudian term for symbolic discourse designed to mask unpleasant truths. Seen in this light, it becomes apparent that what Bill is desperately trying--and trying not--to talk about is Jake's wound.

Consider first how the passage develops the character of the expatriate. He or she is defined, ultimately, as someone who is "impotent." This seems like an odd conclusion if one adheres to the literal definition of an expatriate as someone who has left his or her homeland. However, the characterization makes sense if one scratches the surface of the word to reveal the homonym beneath--"ex-patriot," a euphemism for a discharged soldier. This hidden concept exposes the wound-related anxiety here, because Jake's mutilated penis is the reason he has become an "ex-patriot" and an impotent expatriate. All the flaws ascribed to this decadent character--alcoholism, laziness, unemployment, sexual obsessiveness, and dependence on women--are also weaknesses stereotypically ascribed to wounded men whose injuries have supposedly destroyed all positive aspects of their former personalities (Pernick 49-52). (5)

Jake's response to Bill's prompting is simple, yet significant: countering the charge of impotence, he says, "No ... I just had an accident" (SAR 120). The matter-of-fact tone here suggests that Jake may finally be able to accept his disability. He is on the verge of catharsis, of "coming out" as a disabled man (Shakespeare 50-55). Any potential recovery is thwarted, however, by Bill's response: "Never mention that ... That's the sort of thing that can't be spoken of. That's what you ought to work up into a mystery. Like Henry's bicycle" (SAR 120). The joking is only half-hearted: to some degree, Bill really doesn't want Jake to talk about his wound explicitly because his amateur therapy session (and by extension, Freudian theory in general) cannot address the range of problems associated with physical impairment. Thus Bill, the advocate of irony and pity, becomes an ironic figure--a therapist asking his patient to repress inconvenient problems.

For his part, Jake intuits the opportunity for healing presented to him here, and wants to exploit it. He notes that Bill "had been going splendidly;" and wants to "start him again" on a more in-depth discussion of Jake's wound (SAR 120). But the task is too daunting for Bill. After a brief discussion of the nature of Henry's wound, Bill declares, "Let's lay off that" (SAR 121), and the conversation turns to repressed homosexuality--a more familiar (and less threatening) realm for amateur psychoanalysts.

Interpreting The Sun Also Rises from a disability perspective leads to a dark view of human existence, but not for the reasons most critics have discussed. Jake's struggles to find a place for himself in the postwar world help Hemingway to show that a range of disabled figures become "typical." Henry, twenty-two-year-old amputee, has lost his right leg at the age of fifteen. He drinks himself to death andアルフレックス is there to comfort him. Jake has finally accepted the life society has mapped out for him as a disabled man. Jake will join Count Mippipopolous as a "paraplegic" and insistently to make disability into a "master trope for human disqualification" (Mitchell and Snyder 3). A disability reading of these characters also fits them into the stereotype of the expatriate, ascribed to this decadent character--alcoholism, laziness, unemployment, sexual obsessiveness, and dependence on women--are also weaknesses stereotypically ascribed to wounded men whose injuries have supposedly destroyed all positive aspects of their former personalities (Pernick 49-52). (5)

The final, terrible irony of the novel is that it supports the idea that Brett and Jake can end their torment and be together in all senses of the word: sex is not impossible between them. However, neither Jake nor any of his well-meaning friends can rid themselves of their ingrained prejudices about disability, and these social constraints become the real obstacles to Jake's rehabilitation. The furtive sexual pleasures that Brett gives Jake are few and far between, and expressed in the classic Hemingway modes of elision, understatement, and silence indicative of guilt; for his part, Jake has internalized the stereotype of the sexually mutilated man who would be better off dead--he finally believes that "there's not a damn thing [he can] do" (SAR 34).

Thus, at the novel's conclusion, when Brett declares "Oh, Jake ... we could have such a damned good time together;" he can only respond, "Yes ... Isn't it pretty to think so?" (SAR 251). Although the use of "pretty" here is a "feminine" affectation, it is hardly, as Rudat has suggested (in "Hemingway on Sexual Otherness" and "Sexual Dilemmas"), the sign of Jake's life-affirming liberation from heterosexist prejudice. Rather, it is a sign that--despite occasional glimpses of his sexual potential--Jake has finally accepted the life society has mapped out for him as a disabled man. Jake will join Count Mippipopolous as a caricature of life and a toy for Brett's amusement, like one of the "pretty nice stuffed dogs" that stare at Bill Gorton from the window of a Paris taxidermy shop (SAR 78).
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NOTES

(1.) Discussing how racist stereotypes from the 19th century carried over into the 20th, Nies describes how the growing presence of wounded veterans in postwar America engendered a paradoxical glorification of the "fighting Nordic male" even as it fostered a widespread "collapse in the belief in the sanctity of physical borders of white soldiers" (23). According to tile
Lamarckian logic behind this worldview, a wounded soldier had the potential to weaken the "national health" by transmitting his "defects" into the gene pool.

(2.) Simi Linton defines the "medical model" as a worldview that "casts human variation as deviance from the norm, as pathological condition, as deficit, and, significantly, as an individual burden and personal tragedy." This philosophy allows non-disabled people to ignore "the social processes and policies that constrict disabled people's lives" (11).

(3.) Young arguably provides the most sustained examination of disabled men in Hemingway's works, as well as the most influential material for defining the nature of disability issues in The Sun Also Rises. Young's analysis goes beyond subsequent critics in its clarification of the disability experience, insofar as it resists the temptation to view Jake's mutilated penis as a metaphor for societal malaise. He recognizes that physical disabilities are never completely "overcome," and that they force individuals to view the world in different ways for a lifetime. Yet even Young falls back into the absolutist thinking that characterizes much Freudian thought regarding disability, suggesting that the disabled can never adapt to physical impairment that cannot be completely cured. Rather, disability becomes a totalizing flaw that causes the "primitivization" of personality (169), the core of an idee fixe that fuels a never-ending sense of "dis-grace" (41) and a dangerous "ambivalence" toward life.

(4.) In Don't Worry, He Won't Get Far on Foot, paraplegic author John Callahan describes achieving sexual satisfaction, from a neck massage (77-78); in "Movie Stars and Sensuous Scars," Steven E Brown relates the story of a disabled woman who trains herself to reach orgasm by rubbing her elbow (37-38); and in The Cripple Liberation Front Marching Band Blues, Lorenzo Milam describes a boyhood experience when he felt pleasure of sexual intensity simply by having a visitor lie next to him in a hospital bed (40-43).

(5.) Martin S. Pernick explains the basis for this totalizing view of disability in his analysis of eugenics and euthanasia. Specifically, he discusses the widespread belief in core genetic material known as "germ plasm" which, according to the science of the time, could be altered by environmental factors encountered after birth, such as poisons, illness, psychological shock, and wounds. Damaged germ plasm could drive a previously healthy organism into a state of physiological degeneration or "atavism" and transmit a variety of dangerous personality traits through a family bloodline (Pernick 49-52).

(6.) Tom Shakespeare (1996) eloquently summarizes the most common stereotypes of disabled sexuality:

Stereotypes of disability often focus on asexuality, or lack of sexual potential or potency. Disabled people are subject to infantilization, especially disabled people who are perceived as being 'dependent.' Just as children are assumed to have no sexuality, so disabled people are similarly denied the capacity for sexual feeling. Where disabled people are seen as sexual, this is in terms of deviant sexuality, for example, inappropriate sexual display or masturbation. (10)
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