Université de Montréal

Engendered Conversations:
Gender Subversion Through Fictional Dialogue in Lawrence, Hemingway and Forster

par
Allison Snelgrove

Département d'études anglaises
Faculté des arts et des sciences

Thèse présentée à la Faculté des études supérieures
en vue de l'obtention du grade de Philosophiæ Doctor (Ph.D.)
en études anglaises

Avril 2015

Résumé

Cette thèse examine le dialogue fictionnel genré dans les célèbres œuvres de D.H. Lawrence, Ernest Hemingway et E.M. Forster, incluant *Howards End* (1910), *The Sun Also Rises* (1926) et *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1928). J'applique la notion de masculinité féminine de Judith Halberstam au discours direct pour explorer l'apport des traits linguistiques à l'esthétique littéraire des modernistes. L'introduction inscrit cette analyse à la fois dans la sociolinguistique et dans la performativité selon Judith Butler, la théorie du langage de M.M. Bakhtine et les études de genre, et dans les auteurs expérimentales incluant James Joyce et Virginia Woolf. Le premier chapitre analyse l'utilisation des dialectes et des tabous linguistiques dans les œuvres de fiction de D.H. Lawrence. Le deuxième chapitre met en lumière la place cruciale qu'occupe la subversion du genre dans la stylistique des dialogues de Ernest Hemingway. Le troisième chapitre discuter l'usage du discours genré dans les expressions supprimées et soulignées. Finalement, ma conclusion tisse des liens entre vocabulaires subversifs et identité de genre dans la poésie de Dorothy Parker et de Baroness Elsa von Freytag Loringhoven, et le chapitre examine aussi comment le temps est genré.

Les personnages de New Woman tels que Lady Brett Ashley symbolisent un moment crucial du mouvement de libération des femmes. Ils ont non seulement subverti les stéréotypes de la féminité par leur façon de s'habiller et par leurs mœurs sexuelles plus libres, ils ont aussi adopté/adapté les expressions idiomatiques masculines pour choquer, se rebeller contre et défier la domination masculine. Différents actes de langage ont favorisé une vogue d'argot (*slang*), sont devenus des symboles de contestation politique ou ont inspiré la théorie psychanalytique. Les

fonctions fascinantes du langage masculin tel qu'employé par les femmes dans la fiction du début du vingtième siècle démontrent qu'il faut explorer davantage les liens entre genre et parole au sein des études littéraires.

Mots clés: D.H. Lawrence, Ernest Hemingway, E.M. Forster, Virginia Woolf, Radclyffe Hall, Elsa von Freytag Loringhoven, Dialogue littéraire, Modernisme (Littérature), Judith Halberstam, Sociolinguistique

Abstract

This dissertation examines gendered fictional dialogue in popular works by D.H. Lawrence, Ernest Hemingway and E.M. Forster, including *Howards End* (1910), *The Sun Also Rises* (1926) and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1928). I apply Judith Halberstam's notion of female masculinity to direct speech, to explore how speech traits inform modernist literary aesthetics. My introduction frames this discussion in sociolinguistics, Judith Butler's theory of performativity, M.M. Bakhtin's discourse theory, and gender studies. It provides an opportunity to establish experimental dialogue techniques, and the manipulation of gendered talk, in transgressive texts including James Joyce's *Ulysses* (1922), Virginia Woolf's *Orlando* (1928) and Radcyffe Hall's *The Well of Loneliness* (1928). The first chapter discusses taboos and dialect in D.H. Lawrence's fictional dialogue. The second chapter establishes gender subversion as a crucial element in Ernest Hemingway's dialogue style. The third chapter contrasts Forster's latently gendered speech with his techniques of dialect emphasis and dialect suppression. Finally, my conclusion discusses gender identity in the poetry of Dorothy Parker and Baroness Elsa von Freytag Loringhoven, and the temporality of gender in "Time Passes" from Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* (1927).

New Woman characters like Lady Brett Ashley typified a crucial moment in women's liberation. They not only subverted stereotypes of womanhood through their dress or sexual freedom, they also adopted/adapted masculine idiom to shock, to rebel against and challenge male dominance. Different speech acts incited fashionable slang, became a political protest symbol or inspired psychoanalytic theory. The intriguing

functions of women's masculine speech in early twentieth century fiction establishes the need to examine additional connections between gender and talk in literary studies.

Keywords: D.H. Lawrence, Ernest Hemingway, E.M. Forster, Virginia Woolf, Radclyffe Hall, Elsa von Freytag Loringhoven, Modernism (Literature), Dialogue in literature, Sociolinguistics, Judith Halberstam-Female masculinity

Contents

For Remy.
Tomorrow, the world.

Acknowledgements

My Sincerest Thanks:

-To my supervisors, Professor Jane Malcolm and Professor Michael Sinatra, for all their guidance, assistance and advice.

-To the Fonds de recherche du Québec – Société et culture (FQRSC), for their financial support of my project from Autumn 2011 until the Summer of 2013, and to the Faculté des études supérieures et postdoctorales for my grant during the 2013/2014 academic year.

-To my helpful, patient, inspiring husband, Remy, who is always by my side. Together, we work.

-To my loving family. I am forever grateful for lake house dinners in Ontario and Québec, for all that phone coaching, and for those punny, punny texts.

-To all my friends, including those on academic journeys alongside me. Without your assistance this endeavor would not have been possible. You demonstrated the value in dogged perseverance and urged me to voice my vision with confidence.

Introduction

Heteroglossic Talk: Gendered Language and Modernist Dialogue Technique

"You're a woman, Shel!" she cried. "You're a man, Orlando!" he cried. (174-5).

Virginia Woolf's *Orlando* (1928) is thick with transgressions of temporality, identity and "compulsory heterosexuality" (Gilbert xx). Yet despite that novel's iconic status in modernist studies, relatively little attention has been paid to the ways in which its dialogue is gendered.[1] On the surface, there is a distinct nominative juxtaposition in the passage above. The clash of the uttered noun against its opposite, paratextual, pronoun, of "woman" with "he," and "man" with "she," creates an amusing, though not wholly unexpected, disarrangement equal to the lover's sense of shock and surprise. The mirroring, crossing, composition of the two sentences presents a highly formalized challenge to the idea of gender fixity. Beneath the surface of this transgressively gendered exchange, however, where the narrative could easily employ masculine or feminine speech to accompany this inversion, or to inflect the "scene of protestation and demonstration" that follows, their speech remains primarily gender-neutral in tone (175). Shel calls himself a "fellow," and Orlando thinks of herself as a "woman," but those linguistic stereotypes of gender that might amplify these identities are absent. Significantly, the absence of genderlect forms the very substrate where Woolf's tale of gender subversion grows and flourishes.

Genderlect emerged as a sociolinguistic concept, in the nineteen-eighties, amongst early feminist linguists who wished to interrogate the perception of a "structural unity that systematically differentiates women's idiolects from men's" (McConnell-Ginet 13). Genderlect theory arose out of an effort to counteract the very stereotypes buttressing the system, including the "androcentric rule," where men

[1] The lack of attention to this topic is not limited to *Orlando* and, as Bronwen Thomas highlights in *Fictional Dialogue* (2012), it continues across different texts and genres (172).

"behave linguistically in a way that fits the writer's view of what is desirable or admirable; women on the other hand will be blamed for any linguistic state [that is] negative or reprehensible" (Coates 10). In the androcentric rule, when a man talks at length about an intellectual subject he is an authority, but when a woman does the same she is a verbose imitation. Conversations rely on shared beliefs to convey meaning. This ensures that prejudicial, erroneous stereotypes persist over time. The prejudice against those speech traits dubbed feminine reaches far back into linguistics as a discipline, and was being written into scholarly discourse beginning in the nineteen-twenties, precisely when Woolf was writing *Orlando*. The refusal to associate overemphasis solely with femininity, for example, and the decision to present dialogue speaking about the expectations of gender that is equally emphatic, exaggerated and aristocratic for both Shel and Orlando, argues against this androcentric rule.

In 1922, grammarian Otto Jespersen posited that men's speech was the gold-standard, the norm, and the sole source of innovative, strong and authoritative language (245). If it could be vulgar in certain cases, amongst young men for example, this was excused, expected on account of the precociousness of youth (Jespersen 245-9). In contrast, women's speech was ruled out as hyperbolic, paratactic, and completely averse to impropriety or impoliteness, favoring a more "delicate" vocabulary (248). Woolf could have easily heightened Orlando's femininity with frilly adjectives or unnecessary exclamations. Instead, she rejects this androcentrism at the basic structure of her fictional dialogue. Androgyny is the result of their neutral, matched speech style, where Shel asks "Are you positive you aren't a man?" Orlando echoes "Can it be possible you're not a woman?" (178, 179). Although Orlando switches gender,

Orlando remains, "in every other respect," the same, because "the change of sex, though it altered their future, did nothing whatever to alter their identity" (98). The neutral pronoun "their," along with a lack of genderlect, shows, proves, the deeper continuity of Orlando's personality.

In an acute negotiation of the subtleties of idiom, words that might be feminine for less wealthy interlocutors instead contribute to the neutrality of Orlando and Shel's upper class idiom. They each exclaim endearments such as "darling" and dearest" (175, 176). Aristocratic speakers benefit from the belief in their authority such that "upper-class British men" can deploy words from the "women's column" of speech without threat to their masculinity (Lakoff 13). Consider that, in D.H. Lawrence's salt-of-the-earth gamekeeper figures, such as Annable from *The White Peacock* (1911) or Mellors from *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1928), "dearest" would be an aberrant noun, not a typical feature of their working class, masculine Derby dialect. Wealthy subjects are afforded the leisure to transgress gender in a way that their lower class counterparts cannot, and this is clear in the social perception of their speech patterns. Orlando's lofty position eases his/her gender shift in a way that would be much more difficult for a less entitled individual.

Dialogue *shows* how Orlando remains the same by refraining from feminizing her speech; from plainly elevating the timbre of her voice or making her commentary more stereotypically hyperbolic. The technical benefits of this absence for Orlando's characterization is made all the more overt by the way that her fashionable idiom, Orlando's slang, otherwise alters. It changes over the centuries like a temporal litmus stick, absorbing cultural catchwords over Orlando's preternaturally long lived

existence. Renaissance Orlando stylishly ruminates on mortality like a Shakespearean soliloquist:

> "Whose hand was it?" he went on to ask. "The right or the left? The hand of man or woman, of age or youth? Had it urged the war-horse, or plied the needle? Had it plucked the rose, or grasped cold steel? Had it—" (51)

The monologue rhetorically examines finger bones much like Hamlet studies the skull of poor Yorick. Yet, centuries onwards, by the dawn of the Jazz age, this philosophical, archaic and lofty diction has given way to a far less serious tone. In her motor-car, Orlando again muses on the nature of identity, this time her own, and uses an au courant, malaprop contraction, replacing "doesn't" with "don't": "Oh, but that don't count" (214). Orlando's manner of speaking achieves an air of historical progression and change, but refrains from gendered speech to invest aspects of continuity into Orlando's fundamental self.

Modernist dialogue insists that common aspects of speech, such as gender or dialect, are negotiated and morphed, covertly and overtly, in texts that defy easy explanation. The defining aspects of modernism are both "qualitative" and "chronological," but because contradiction and resistance are its constants, the category is continually being re-evaluated and recharged through a focus on its instruments of change and innovation (Mao and Walkowitz 2). This is not to claim that all works from the modernist period, from the turn of the twentieth century through World War II, employ a "persistent orthodoxy" (6). Instead, there are multiple ways in which such texts aspire towards innovation. Modernism's/modernisms commitment to aesthetic experimentation, rebellion, innovation, subversion and shock ensures that, when a

character speaks it often displays aspects of self-contradiction or ambivalence.[2] For example, in Lawrence's *The Plumed Serpent* (1922), a novel exploring spiritual dimensions of sexual fulfillment, Kate Leslie identifies verbal deference with femininity, proclaiming that she "ought to want to be limited" (457). However, paradoxically her strength "can barely be crushed" (Storch 117). Modernist dialogue presents purportedly polarized concepts, including genders, aesthetics and literary traditions, and renders these increasingly difficult, troubled and spectral. Gendered speech troubles the fixity of social roles across economic and cultural divides, and while Orlando's speech is neutrally gendered, gendered by the absence of stress on masculine or feminine traits, not all modernist characters deploy the same mannerisms. In addition, aesthetic techniques in representing dialogue can change within the same work of literature, just as a character's idiolect might display distinctly gendered styles with the same conversation.

In this dissertation I explore different, sometimes contrasting, examples of gender subversion in modernist dialogue to better understand how genderlect aids in characterization, how it is employed across texts, and to outline its social and political influence beyond the borders of the page. I trace the ways in which Lawrence and Hemingway stress and exaggerate conversational manliness to heighten the agency of individual characters, while E.M. Forster treats dialect and genderlect as hindrances to his principle of individual human connection. I spotlight one genderlect in particular, one perceptively transgressive speech style, that of female masculinity, to flesh out the

[2] While modernism is a genre, modernisms, in the plural, is a concept connected to the varying methods and aesthetics with which its creative works capture atmospheres of personal and political conflict and dissidence (Mao and Walkowitz 2).

portrayal of peripheral figures in patriarchal Britain, including the New Woman and the working class rural male.[3] My discussion covers a great deal of ground, encountering poetry and prose with very distinct aesthetic styles, to illuminate the subversive heart of modernism's most engendered conversations.

Talking Techniques

The modernists' quest for newness, authenticity and a rejection of propriety necessitated a troubling, not just of gender or sex-based categories, but also of the very processes of quotation and speech representation. In this vein, some modernists effectively jettison the distinction between narrator and character to amplify a sense of unmitigation, divorcing realism from its traditional modes of grammatical artifice. In Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* (1927), "figural narration" blurs the narrator and Mrs. Ramsay together, weaving in and out of the first and third person (Herman 76). In section twelve of "The Window," Mr. and Mrs. Ramsay begin a conversation in quotation marks, but as the narrative style circles inwards, becoming interior and insular, the marks are left off, and three perspectives, that of the narrator, the husband and the wife, blend: "He would like a little solitude. Yes, she said. It annoyed him that she did not protest. She knew that he would never do it" (57). Quotation marks become self-conscious obstructions in achieving this fusion of perspectives, and so "yes" is without grammatical quarantine.

---

[3] In *The Rise of the New Woman* (2003), Jean Matthews characterizes and historicizes the New Woman figure: "By the turn of the century, magazines and newspapers were filled with discussions of a new type of female personality: the 'New Woman.' The actual term seems to have been coined around 1894, but the type was instantly recognizable and the name immediately caught on. As a type, the New Woman was young, well-educated, probably a college graduate, independent of spirit, highly competent, and physically strong and fearless" (13).

The voice of the narrator and the titular hero/ine also frequently blur in *Orlando*, but in that narrative the effect is different, generating a more broken up, staccato, less mellifluous tone. Orlando's exclamations or thoughts are sometimes mitigated by narrative interjections. Parentheses create a paradox, generating a self-reflexiveness that suggests authenticity but revels in its ability to qualify and control the processes of composition: "But (here another self came in) a duffer, a fumbler. More clumsy I couldn't be. And – and – (here she hesitated for a word and if we suggest 'Love' we may be wrong" (214).

James Joyce's *Ulysses* (1922) similarly rebels against the conventional demarcations of speech. Molly Bloom's interior monologue from "Penelope" is almost entirely bereft of grammatical cues.[4] This demands a high level of readerly participation in order to discern meaning. In "Penelope" the masculine pronoun "him" repeats, and at certain points it is wholly unclear whom it references: Mr. Riordan, his wife's dog, or Leopold Bloom:

> Mr Riordan here and Mr Riordan there I suppose he was glad to get shut of her and her dog smelling my fur and always edging to get up under my petticoats especially then still I like that in him polite to old women like that and waiters and beggars too hes not proud out of nothing….have him staying there till they throw him out or a nun maybe like the smutty photo he has (872).

This represents only a small part of her rails against the unified "he," and the three blend together here, the dog and the men are all equally inferior males in Molly's estimation. Without grammar or quotes other pronouns also become fluid: "on

[4] There is debate over whether any part of this monologue is spoken aloud and, as Declan Kiberd highlights in his Introduction to the Penguin edition, its experimental form challenges the limits of speech and thought (xliv). "You" appears over and over in the section. It sometimes seems colloquial and at other times indicates an audience. So "Penelope" presents Molly's reflections in a soliloquist's style.

Christmas if you please O no thank you not in my house" could be a comment and response from two different people in her memory, or, her own colloquialisms and imagination entirely (873). Because verisimilar dialogue relies on an aura of lived speech, of authenticity, grammar, an obvious symbol of artificiality, therefore becomes an impediment that Joyce and Woolf at times reject.[5] Consistent with this rejection of old modes, conventions are reimagined such that, as with the neutral aristocratic genderlect in *Orlando*, absence is presence. However, the lack of constraints is illusory; the removal of old ramparts only creates new borders.

In contrast with Molly Bloom's interior monologue, her talk with herself, in Joyce's *Ulysses*, Ernest Hemingway's dialogue craft proves that traditional grammatical cues can also heighten a sense of unmitigation. Hemingway uses omission to capture the ambiguity inherent in lived speech, and to command attention while adding intrigue. His "effacement of the narrator" draws the reader into the character's perspective and experiences (Lamb 175). In this technique, quotation marks are emphasized as a vital writerly constraint because other narrative cues are intentionally excluded. Hemingway rejects paralinguistic report, such as "she said" or "he said," because these situate the quotation firmly in the past. Their absence stresses the presence and immediacy of the utterance, particularly in first person narratives where the atmosphere of recollection, of the report of memory, necessitates a rear view perspective. Alternation, idiolect and subject matter turn into the primary means to attribute snippets of talk to a particular character. Like Woolf's figural narration,

---

[5] Norman Page, in his study of traditional dialogue craft from 1973, and Raymond Chapman in his discussion of victorian speech in literature, stress the necessity of an air of authenticity to the suspension of disbelief (3,1).

though *To the Lighthouse* and *Ulysses* could not be more stylistically distinct from Hemingway, each technique confronts the reader with the active need to attribute the speech and to decide what it means.

It is almost impossible to generalize dialogue technique across all modernist authors and texts, but the reader's interpretive force is often intensified to magnify an authentic sense of ambiguity. For example, in *The Sun Also Rises* (1926), after multiple lines without narrative cues, Hemingway's characters volley shots back and forth:

> "Anything. Absolutely."
> "Good night, darling."
> "Don't be sentimental."
> "You make me ill." (41-2).

The effacement of the first person narrator means the reader must focus on the order in which these interlocutors converse to remember who says what.[6] Brett Ashley's use of "darling" is gendered feminine by necessity, despite her upper class, often gentlemanly, personage. Jake Barnes, a laconic American male, would not use darling as a typical endearment, whereas Brett would, to insert a demonstrative confidence into their parting. "Darling" is not gender-neutral here although, as an upper-class Briton, one could allow for this. Instead, the word mitigates the impolite tongue-lashing of "you make me ill" with an affectedly feminine laissez-faire. Paradoxically, narrative effacement both requires sustained consideration and conveys the immediacy of the utterance to show nuances in the character's emotional state. The narrator provides no guidance, leaving "you make me ill" ambiguously glib, angry and dismissive, or none of these things. Does Brett intend this as a joke, a cruel jab, or both?

---

[6] Narrative effacement arose out of Hemingway's short stories, where "a high degree of suggestiveness and implication" was required because of that "genre's demand for radical compression" (Lamb 175).

Grammar is an implement, rather than an impediment to the reader's participative force. Woolf, Joyce and Hemingway construct dialogue styles that push back against the prescriptive delimitations of more commonplace prosaics. Whether conventional, innovative or experimental in form, fictional dialogue is, at its sociolinguistic root, a technique in characterization that is also a means of politicization. In *Ulysses*, Molly Bloom's iterations of "him," where non-specific male pronouns recur over nine hundred times, fuse her lovers together into a sort of faceless, cyclopean antagonist. Rarely, Molly uses "they" to affect a criticism of men: "they treat you like dirt I dont care what anybody says itd be much better for the world to be governed by the women in it you wouldnt see women going and killing one another….yes because a woman whatever she does she knows where to stop" (926).

The lack of grammar *is* characterization and a means to interrogate gender roles: "if he comes out Ill read and study all I can find or learn a bit off by heart if I knew who he likes so he wont think me stupid" (923). Molly thinks quickly, on her feet, and without pause. The abundance of "he" and "him" interjects dissatisfaction and disapproval into her emotional state, indicating her mixed feelings of desire and repulsion towards those men who seek to control her. The sudden appearance of "they" and "women" amongst all the male pronouns adds a weight to this argument for women's liberation. Her monologue is an insight into her history, her perspective, and an aesthetic argument for the verisimilitude to be had in disorder. By comparing styles

and texts, dialogue analysis presents a rarely opened but very bright window into the way modernists and modernisms "make it new," intersecting practice and principle.[7]

Fictional dialogue is, like gender, at its very core an "improvisation within a scene of constraint," where what is known, or experienced, informs performance (Butler 1). In *Undoing Gender* (2004), Judith Butler lays out how individuation, through the social processes of identity formation, forms the crux of gender performance theory. In that volume Butler succinctly amalgamates the assertions of her previous texts including *Gender Trouble* (1990) and *Bodies That Matter* (1993):

> If gender is a kind of doing, an incessant activity performed, in part, without one's knowing and without one's willing, it is not for that reason automatic or mechanical. On the contrary, it is a practice of improvisation within a scene of constraint. Moreover, one does not "do" one's gender alone. One is always "doing" with or for another, even if the other is only imaginary. What I call my "own" gender appears perhaps at times as something that I author or, indeed, own. But the terms that make up one's own gender are, from the start, outside oneself, beyond oneself in a sociality that has no single author (and that radically contests the notion of authorship itself). (1)

The process of generating, of engendering, gender is also wholly crucial to sociolinguistic practice and the analysis of fictional dialogue. "Doing" gender relies on those forces outside the performer that social processes generate and alter. Constraints may not ever be universally verifiable, but the perception of certain traits insists that aspects of gender are both within, and outside of, the performer's control. Gender, a construct so intimate to grammar, to pronouns, to professions and given names, relies on the negotiation and manipulation of systems already in place to elicit meaning.

In the sociolinguistic theory known as the dynamic approach, as in Butler, "gender identity is seen as a social construct rather than as a 'given' social category,"

[7] Ezra Pound, Hemingway's friend and mentor, emblazoned his favorite motto, "make it new" on a scarf and bore the emblem proudly across 1920s Paris (Wagner-Martin 5).

allowing for the "co-variation of language and gender" (Coates 6, 5). The subject continually informs their milieu and vice-versa. Woolf constructed Orlando's lordly dialogue out of her experience of Vita Sackville-West, her "privileged" muse (Gilbert xxv). Text is bound by context, and this is reminiscent of Mikhail Bakhtin's principle of heteroglossia and understanding of discourse.[8] In Bakhtin's "Discourse in the Novel" (1934), discourse is identified as exchanges and connections of meaning, which exist, in fiction, between the "direct intention of the character who is speaking," and the "refracted intention of the author" (*The Dialogic Imagination* 324). While each is integral to the composition of the work, at different junctures one or the other may appear dominant through shifts in emphasis. When the narrator tells of "The Great Frost" in *Orlando*, the protagonist's perspective is laid aside, and the annotated Penguin edition provides this note: "Woolf knew of [The Great Frost] from Thomas Dekker's pamphlet," and took details from it (24, 236). The "two different intentions" of character and author are "dialogically interrelated" and participating in a mutual exchange of knowledge (*The Dialogic Imagination* 324). When communicating Orlando's thoughts, the narrator frequently uses "for" as a conjunction to join and interrelate their perspectives: "'I knew it!' she said, for there was something romantic and chivalrous, passionate, melancholy, yet determined about him" (174).

Heteroglossia obscures and refracts, but also exposes the influential workings of the text's exterior forces. This is because a matrix of influences form meaning, identity and intention in the narrative. In this regard, a transgressive gender identity, for

[8] Bakhtin's dialogical principle supports the "importance of approaching conversational interaction [in fiction] as a microcosmic social system in which the distribution of power may be uneven" (Thomas 36). Power relies on the dynamic negotiation of class, education, gender and circumstance in fictional dialogue.

example, can be expressed, promoted, even when its persistence runs contrary to both authorial intent and the greater narrative philosophy. In *Lady Chatterley's Lover* the titular character's use of expletives explodes, unseats, the author's frequently expressed desire to dominate and subjugate "these clever women." In the 1911 poem of that title, Lawrence rails against his opinionated counterpart, demanding her deferent silence: "Now stop carping at me!/ Do you want me to hate you?" (*Complete Poems* 83).

Unlike Joyce or Woolf, Lawrence and E.M. Forster's fictional dialogue adheres to the traditional conventions of direct speech. Each character's verbalizations are quarantined from narration by quotation marks and paralinguistic details in a consistent format. Although free indirect discourse does occur, this primarily captures thoughts and not speech. It is important to stress that language can be just as indicative of "talk" in narration or in dialogue, whether it deploys experimental or typical stylistics. In his study of "dialogue in a discourse context," David Herman uses the term "talk" when discussing *To The Lighthouse*, because the flexibility of "talk" echoes the fluidity of perspectives in the text (76). "Talk" can be oral or textual, fictional or lived, but for my purposes it occurs wherever thoughts or meanings are expressed in a manner indicative of speech or the processes of quotation.

Talk can occur in a poetic or narrative form. Bronwen Thomas laments the "absence of any critique of the forms of talk discussed and the ways in which they may disseminate and perpetuate certain values and norms" in fictional dialogue (Thomas 37) It is crucial to add that talk does not only disseminate or perpetuate norms, that it also can subvert expected modes of expression. It is therefore important to discover the relationship between how "characters speak inside of novels and the way that people

speak outside of them" to better understand fiction's role in the dynamic co-variation of language and gender in particular (Coleman 54).

Talking Genderlects

Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises* popularized "a clipped form of masculine speech," a hardboiled genderlect, that would "assume its most trendy incarnation in the film noir dialogue of the 1940s" (Moddelmog and Del Gizzo xxiii). Detective novelist "Raymond Chandler frankly acknowledged that the entire 'hardboiled' school of detective fiction….exaggerates" and was influenced by this manly slang (Cohen 116). Hardboiled speech, typified by laconicism, bravado, cynicism and an acute command of fashionable slang words, made its way into common parlance as Hemingway's Jake Barnes and Chandler's Philip Marlowe rose to iconic status, and came to masculinize an entire genre of crime writing. This goes beyond these male protagonists, however, and some of the most significantly masculine speech in *The Sun Also Rises* comes from its heroine, not its hero.

Brett Ashley swears and calls herself a "chap" (29). When the novel appeared female college students immediately began to model "their dress or speech" after her (Moddelmog and Del Gizzo xxiii). Young "ingénues abandoned the flapper motif" in favor of all things Brett (Nagel 87). Her masculine manner and sultry looks prefigure the "pretty dames" Marlowe abuses in *The Big Sleep* (1939) over a decade later (Chandler 44). Again and again, strong women combine good looks and a "fine-drawn face" with speech as terse as Chandler's shadiest crooks: " 'I don't know. What is it?' She had a smoothly husky voice" (28). The voice is low, husky, and its masculinity

tantalizes men, communicating sexualization through a tacit disconnect with feminine virtuousness.

This is characteristic of female masculinity, a gender identity that, Judith Halberstam contends, allows masculinity to achieve its most highly developed, legible incarnation "where and when it leaves the white male middle-class body" (2). While Halberstam focuses on visual examples, on manners of dress and physical bearing, Brett Ashley and Chandler's dames demonstrate that female masculinity has definite aural dimensions as well. As Chandler's narratives prove, masculine genderlect does represent sexualization and another means of objectification of women, and yet for some modernist women it also presents a very effective means of rebellion against the perceived regulation of their sexuality. It adapts those beliefs within the system that signal masculinity, including strength, authority, a deep voice, expletive use or laconism, to develop a hybrid of femaleness and manliness that claims a version of independence and self-governance away from patriarchal control. Speaking like a "chap" affords the freedoms of that position. I discuss the deeper contradictions inherent in this genderlect, and its implications for Brett, in my Hemingway chapter.

A non-standard gender identity like female masculinity suggests the underpinnings of the production of gender norms in social discourse. It is important to stress that a belief about a certain trait may not be how language actually operates in lived speech: a "particular problem with sex difference research [in linguistics] is the lack of consensus about exactly what aspects of cognition and behavior differentiate between men and women" (Weatherall 53). While in the early nineteen-twenties, Otto Jespersen was certain about what aspects of speech were feminine or masculine,

contemporary sociolinguists understand that "socially constructed difference is a reason why satisfactory resolutions" about such difference, about what traits define particular genderlects, remain elusive (53). If conversational participants believe that gentlemen can use otherwise womanly adjectives, then they can without threat to their masculinity, even if this is an ingrained assumption and not a verifiably widespread practice.

This helps to illuminate why old proverbs and aphorisms about women's speech are as contradictory as they are sexist (Coates 9). A literary author may be aware of the prejudices beneath sayings such as "a woman's tongue wags like a lamb's tail" (England) or "maidens should be mild and meek — quick to hear, and slow to speak" (Scotland) and exploit these for characterization (9). Sexism in conversational practice is complex because social conventions can promote its tenets. Women's politeness was demanded, expected, by Victorian and Edwardian society, and so an "instinctive shrinking from coarse and gross expressions…among the things women object to in language must be specially mentioned anything that smacks of swearing" was treated as a biological instinct instead of an external imperative (Jespersen 246). When linguist Robin Lakoff identified such stereotypical speech traits in *Language and Women's Place* (1975), and plainly stated their role as generalizations, subsequent studies were not able to verify these as widespread aspects of women's speech patterns, however expected or well-known (McConnell-Ginet 18).

The offshoot of this discussion of gender mores in speech is that fictional dialogue infers gender by manipulating these beliefs, sometimes to question their validity, and at other times to evoke verity. In this way, literary dialogue becomes a

kind of cultural artifact, necessitating a treatment of the surrounding site, of the temporal, social and situational conditions under which it was produced, for context.[9] I have so far outlined how quotation marks are a form of artifice, a signal to quarantine speech from narration. What they also imply, however, in their very name, is the processes of quotation in lived speech, transcripts, biographies or histories. Like a musical note, quotation marks symbolize the sense of the sound.

As an artifact bounded by evolving perspective, textual narrative permits a kind of continuous moment, a process, informed by, but separate from reality. The repercussion is that such discourse is unfinalizable. Bakhtin argues for unfinalizability, where discourse is never closed, but "extends into the boundless past and boundless future" (*Speech Genres* 170). It would seem impossible to treat fiction as an unaltered exemplar of reality. Yet, the urge to ignore verisimilitude persists. In Jespersen's study of gendered speech, titled *Language, Its Nature, Development and Origin* (1922), he uses William Makepeace Thackeray's *Vanity Fair* (1848) and Compton Mackenzie's *Poor Relations* (1919) amongst other novels to "exemplify…the frequency with which women thus leave their exclamatory sentences half-finished" (251).

His study was progenitive, because "sex differences in the speech of Europeans were [not] considered" until the twentieth century, but his "uncritical acceptance of sexist assumptions about male/female differences in language" is as flawed as his work is indicative of the practices during that period (Weatherall 32; Coates 12). Decades after Jespersen, despite the impact that Eric Auerbach's *Mimesis* (1953) had on

---

[9] This conception grew out of F.W. Bateson's "The Literary Artifact," a 1963 article. Bateson stresses the "space" and "aurality" of a fictional text (81). Real speech, and the composition of dialogue, both occur in the dimension of time, whereas written dialogue maintains a degree of aurality that occurs in the dimension of space. The idea of the artifact helps in keeping this distinction ever present (81).

theories of representation, in *The Art of Conversation* (1993) Peter Burke uses Shakespeare, Jane Austen and others to illustrate his history of speech in the English language. He also treats fiction as an unquestionable model of lived attitudes and expressions of the day (3-4). For example, he reads Rosamond Vincy's insistence in *Middlemarch* (1874) that "the pick of them" was a "rather vulgar expression" as a typical of the speech of Victorian women (3). The implication is that the aversion to, and detection of, vulgarity is generalizable amongst that group.

Discussion of this sort of misprision stresses that dimensions of characterization, fictionality and perspective are integral to the creation and analysis of fictional forms of talk. If we consider that George Eliot is painting Rosamond as a somewhat loveable, if flippant and inexperienced, prig, and not using her to represent a trend amongst her entire gender, Rosamond's belief is an affect of her individual judgmental attitude and not the politeness trend. Fiction *does*, must, reference lived speech conventions, prejudices, pronunciations, slang forms and dialect traits to achieve an effect bound by artifice and intentionality. However, the denial of verisimilitude is important to counter because it threatens to obfuscate the presence of parody or irony.[10] Rosamond's snobbery is parodied, implicitly more offensive than the inane expression to which she ascribes such vulgarity. Brett Ashley's speech is similar to Rosamond's in that it demonstrates the deficiencies in her character. Her masculine genderlect is liberating, imitable, but it also facilitates her romantic inconstancy, and her fiduciary reliance on men.

[10] In *Orlando*, Woolf embraces the capability of irony to both highlight and indict "the limits of your representation in the same gesture" (Eagleton "Porkchops and Pineapples").

Masculine women, and female masculinity as a genderlect, are not limited to modernist fiction. Though modernism is my primary focus, its dialogue begs comparison with that of other genres. In Charles Dickens' *The Curiousity Shop* (1841), Sally Brass is also a "chap" (290). She embodies the Victorian anxiety concerning strong women in fiction from the period (Chapman 151). She prefigures Brett by over eighty years, and speaks "like a man," using "the familiar form of a Christian name," of her male colleagues to generate fraternity (155). This captures "the freedom of an exchange generally barred between the sexes not freed by family connection" that paints her as an early New Woman figure (155). As an outlier, and a tangential figure gaining ground, she adds an aura of modernist subjectivity to an otherwise Victorian text. Rita Felski names the interrogative impulse to treat those subjects previously on the periphery of social life as "central rather than tangential" as a key tenet of modernism (Doing Time 59). As a professional woman, Sally is edging away from marginalization, but she is not a fully central character in Nell Trent's story, hence the aura of modernism, whereas Brett dominates the focus in *The Sun Also Rises*.

Emphasis, the idea of focus or centrality, is linked to Halberstam's idea of the legibility of masculinity (2). Legibility involves clarity, the ability to readily distinguish symbols and tropes. Stephen Gordon from Radclyffe Hall's *The Well of Loneliness* (1928) is, according to Halberstam, "the best record we have of masculine inversion in women" in fiction from the modernist era (96).[11] Gordon's ability to openly perform her gender identity, her masculinity, relies upon her money and upper class entitlements in a manner similar to Woolf's Orlando. Gordon also never adopts a

[11] Psychoanalyst Havelock Ellis' work on "inversion," or lesbianism, in *Psychopathia Sexualis* (1886), had a marked influence on Hall's life and writing (Halberstam 81).

masculine speech style to suit her gender identity. Stephen Gordon dresses and looks masculine, like her cohort Jamie, but unlike that impoverished, wretched, friend, rejected by her family and left vulnerable to the "cruel dispensation of fate," Gordon is saved from destitution by her aristocratic birth (Hall 455).

In contrast with Orlando, Stephen's gender-neutral diction does not arise from any need to maintain that character's inner continuity in the face of outward change. Woolf was unimpressed by Hall's book despite its similar "protest against the notion that social or erotic gender roles are inevitably determined by biological sexuality" (Gilbert xx). For Stephen, a lordly status simply precludes the need for other forms of linguistic empowerment. In contrast with "'E do be a wonder," the dialect of the old stablemaster Williams, Stephen's Received Pronunciation oozes with confidence when discussing Raftery the horse: "Perhaps he's a poet like his namesake; I think if he could he'd write verses" (113). Orlando and Stephen Gordon defy the idea that gender is predetermined by, or inextricable to, biology, but because Stephen's masculinity remains the same there is no need to prove a deeper continuity of the self, and so her upper class expressions instead serve to spotlight the interactions with those she views as subordinate or inferior.

Stephen's aristocratic air contrasts with the very effeminate and verbose Jonathan Brockett. The playwright's hands are "as white and soft as a woman's" and she puzzles at him when he tries on a maid's frilly cap and apron (255, 258). Brockett's speech is meant to evoke disdain for Stephen's opposite. Indeed, "Hall's main portrait of a homosexual man, Jonathan Brockett, is no less of a stereotype than the manly lesbian Stephen Gordon herself" (Woods 27). The chief differentiation between these

types is a sense of disapproval, which is amplified by an abundance of femininity in Brockett's speech patterns. Brockett addresses the dog: "Puddle dear, do you mind if I put my feet up? It's my new boot-maker, he's given me a corn on my right little toe. It's too heart-breaking It was such a beautiful toe" (259). Delicate adjectives like "beautiful" or "lovely," and the hyperbole of "too heart-breaking," as well as Brockett's enthusiastic diminution of the dog, are all feminizing traits from the period (Jespersen 248-53).

The effeminacy in Brockett's speech proves that Hall was not rejecting gendered speech altogether. The suppression or emphasis of verbal femininity is a technique in characterization. This is similar to Djuna Barnes' portrayal of transvestite Dr. Matthew O'Connor in *Nightwood* (1936). Dr. O'Connor's tone is highbrow, knowledgeable, and reminiscent of a professional's self-important diction: "Well, I, Dr. Matthew-Mighty-grain-of-salt-Dante O'Connor, will tell you how the day and the night are related by their division. The very constitution of twilight is a fabulous reconstruction of fear, bottom-out and wrong side up" (80). The tone is commanding, educated, and his obtuse claim is a source of parody. The confluence of order and disorder in his dialogue echoes the image of his maple dresser where "rusty forceps [and] a broken scalpel….a catheter" are strewn alongside "creams, rouges, powder boxes and puffs" (78). These objects are leant a delicate brutality by their inertia, and by the illogical jumble of savage medicine with soft maquillage.

The blurring of masculine and feminine, of hard and soft, might generate an androgynous image, but his speech and dress develop a kind of male femininity here, the parallel opposite to Halberstam's theory. As an individual split between different

impulses and influences, Dr. O'Connor's femininity becomes highly legible precisely because it transgresses the norm on his male body and persona. In *Nightwood* or *The Well of Loneliness*, derivation, where heightened visibility relies on a knowledge of male masculinity, becomes a means to reiterate, to transfigure through repetition. Halberstam argues against treating female masculinity as:

> derivative of male identity. Given my premise in this book, namely, that female masculinity is a specific gender with its own cultural history rather than simply a derivative of male masculinity, psychoanalytic approaches that assume that female masculinity mimics male masculinity are not especially helpful. (77)

However, it is difficult to escape derivation entirely when gender identity is reliant upon constraints governing improvisation, including those inescapable forces outside the performer. A gender identity can have "its own cultural history," but it cannot exist in a sociological vacuum. By imitating masculine idiom to command conversational power, in public or private, Brett Ashley participates in cultures of gender identity formation that are ultimately beyond her exclusive control.

In *Masculinities Without Men* (2002), Jean Bobby Noble uses Halberstam to insist that modernist writers not only interrogated masculinity, but represented "both masculinity and femininity as modern(ist) subjects in crisis" (xvi). "Subjects in crisis" implies these identities have a troubled life of their own that modernists seize upon. I often use masculinity in the singular, to mark it as a systemic social construct comprised of many shared beliefs, but each speaker employs his or her own distinct manner in performing identity, suggesting the presence of masculinities in the plural. Female, male, overt, latent or androgynous masculinities invite inquiry precisely because they present a categorization of individuality that is morphologic and not static. Noble argues that female modernists such as Zora Neale Hurston and Djuna

Barnes, "interrogate the supposed self-evidence of femininity as well as the relationships between sex, gender, sexuality, desire, and representation" (xvii). Dialogue from Lawrence, Hemingway and Forster suggests that male authors' writing also queries the "supposed self-evidence of femininity" as well.

As modernist writers gained notoriety and their works garnered acclaim, the border crossing that had once seemed so peripheral began to move towards the centre of literary culture. In *Bad Modernisms* (2006), Douglas Mao and Rebecca L. Walkowitz emphasize that this is "modernism's most notorious way of going bad: its alleged surrender of resistance and transgression…to sanctification and success" (14). A commitment to the new, the avant-garde, was inherently prone to self-subversion because it meant "it left modernism's program vulnerable to incoherence once its work achieved wide acceptance as good" (4). Rebellion does not always result in a truce, or an end to hostilities, particularly when it involves self-subversion in its most personal, psychological, incarnation. Cynicism, irresolution, and the abnegation of personal happiness are recurrent themes that lend a sustained element of contradiction to modernism's most popular narratives. Whether genderlect invites a favorable, negative or ambivalent characterization, close reading throws "light on the processes by which gender roles are created micro-interactionally, utterance-by-utterance, through discourse enabled modes of alignment between participants" (Herman 82). Genderlect empowers Brett Ashley's attention-seeking, maligns Jonathan Brockett's effeminacy, and hardens Jake Barnes' repressed emotions.

Fictional dialogue participates in the production and manipulation of gendered language norms because:

> Language does not merely mirror social beliefs about gender and reflect the nature of gender identity. Rather, it is through language (and discourse) that gender is produced and gains its significance as a social category. Thus, the study of texts and talk in interaction become prime sites for examining gender. (Weatherall 97)

Like Herman, Weatherall is using the term "talk" to reference the heteroglossia of discourse, but in this quote the aurality inherent in spoken discussion is further amplified. Talk can be the colloquial expressions or speech acts of a character, or the rhetorical vocabularies through which scholars examine fiction. For example, words including "suggest," "discuss," "state," "reply," "answer," "question," "assert" and "interrogate" generate an aura of aurality on the page, signal an envisioning of talk.[12]

If the conceptualization of talk seems anterior to the differences in dialogue craft between modernist authors, consider that Forster either suppresses the phonetics of dialect pronunciation to argue against class difference, or prejudicially exaggerates pronunciation and familiar colloquialisms to critique a character or elicit derisive humour. I stress how this manifests in his fiction in my third chapter. Dialect can elicit mockery or derision of a lower-class accent through associations with immorality or ignorance (Evans Davies 202-3). Dialect, a more overt dimension of aurality, is vital in establishing reciprocity between the writer and the audience. The perpetuation of aurality is integral to the very process of reading.

In "How Silent is Silent Reading?" (2012), neurological researchers contend that the auditory cortex, the same area of the brain engaged when listening to speech or music, is activated when we read. This means that the brain is actually hearing what

[12] Semiotic linguistics studies the interrelation of sign and symbol, and blossoms with the possible significations of language (Abrams 140-5). My choice to veer towards sociological dimensions instead grows from the discursive compulsion to qualitatively explain the constituitive functions of fictional talk for character development.

Perrone-Bertolotti et al. call an "inner voice" (17554). So, while from a discourse analysis perspective, any definition of talk relies on the communicative impulse inherent in using words, behavioral neuroscience adds the complementary qualification that, as it processes talk, the brain connects a reader's "inner voice" to the perception of real sound. Grammar implies the physical aspect (utterances, a pause, taking a breath) of the symbol (quotation marks, a comma, colon or period) on the page, to represent how talk is performed and received neurologically.

This is ultimately why the distinction between fictional dialogue and narrative voice, which quotation marks provide, and the effect when those marks are absent, is so fascinating. The brain perceives both in an aural way necessitating a rational, symbolic, distinction between the two in order to lessen ambiguity. Figural narration revels in ambiguity. Sometimes this ambiguity is temporal *and* perspectival, where, for example, quotation marks are at first exterior to Lily Briscoe's thoughts and then suddenly interior to them:

> "Oh but", said Lily, "think of his work!"
> Whenever she "thought of his work" she always saw clearly before her a large kitchen table. It was Andrew's doing. She asked him what his father's books were about. "Subject and object and the nature of reality", Andrew had said. And when she said Heavens, she had no notion what that meant. (*To The Lighthouse* 22)

In the immediate, spoken conversation, Lily's dialogue is laid out through an indent, and the use of the past simple tense. In her thoughts, the past perfect tense, "Andrew *had* said" adds a further degree of memory. Speech is both heard aloud and in the mind, and quotation marks allow these different senses of sound, its utterance and recollection, to take shape, to achieve a textual space indicative of their perceptual similarity.

Ambiguity again suggests realism, and the word "Heavens" appears without quotes, such that the reader wonders if she said, or merely thought the following words: "she had no notion what that meant." In fictional dialogue, aurality is not only achieved through punctuation. When reading fiction, a character's accent relies equally on the author's method of representation and upon the reader's aural memory and familiarity with that specific dialect. No matter how dutifully Lawrence sounds out the vowels, elisions and syllable stresses of Nottinghamshire dialect in *Sons and Lovers* (1913), if readers have never heard its accent, their inner voice will interpret his dialogue differently than persons better acquainted with it.

Talking Terms: Key Definitions

Continuing to define the dimensions of speech on the page requires a distinct negotiation of some key terms. A **dialect** is a manner or system of speaking unique to a particular geographic region or identifiable social group. In *The White Peacock*, Lawrence's first novel, his phonic representation of accent is eager for accuracy, but so thick it becomes almost indecipherable: "'Öwd on a bit,' said a black-whiskered man 'tha mun 'a'e patience when ta 't co'tin a lass'" (201). Phonics, vocabulary, and sentence structure cooperate well, but it is difficult to focus on what the black-whiskered man actually means. In his late narratives, the perspicacity of the early phonics gives way to a more uniform, less halting, and therefore more easily interpretable spelling: "Fancy Lady Chatterley takin' all that trouble over yer! Why, she shouldn't 'ave bothered!" (48). Vocabulary and structure are still indicative, but phonic smoothing allows the unfamiliar reader to avoid tripping over a more faithful simulation of accent.

When little Connie's "Gran" speaks in this example, it is possible she is taming her accent, elevating her diction, in Lady Chatterley's presence. Yet, this is difficult to remark clearly, as her cheery address, though easier to decipher, is still coarse: "She's frightened of 'im, that's wheer it is" (48). Once a prevalent technique amongst lower-class British women, who were seen to "correct their speech to correspond to that of the class above them," style-shifting involves the urge to "hypercorrect" speech in the presence of social betters out of a desire for prestige (Coates 54). Style-shifting is more commonly known as **code-switching** or **bidialectalism**. Code-switching can engage in a negotiation of regional dialects or different genderlects and is often class-based, and it involves the negotiation of two distinct manners of speech.

It can function to embolden, ennoble, add distance, or create familiarity in a conversation. In Lawrence's *The White Peacock* (1911), George uses an educated vocabulary and more neutral accent with his educated friends, but when he is with his fellow Nethermere townsfolk, or to endear his sweetheart Meg, he switches into dialect: "'Thou likest me, doesna ta?' he asked softly" (204). This is similar to groundskeeper Mellors' ability to switch between educated English diction and broad working class Derbyshire in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, and with Robert Jordan's ability to speak casual, common Spanish away from the front lines, then adopt a regional and archaic dialect amongst the guerillas, in Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940). Mellors' broad Derby ennobles him. He uses code-switching to resist, not to impress, upper class speakers. In an example of gender bidialectalism, Brett Ashley code-switches between masculinity and femininity, in the same conversation, to incite desire in Jake Barnes.

Dialect can occur in speech style, in narration or in the topic of conversation. When Mellors says: "an' tha canna ma'e it horrid. Dunna fret thysen," the narrative confides Connie "hated the dialect: the *thee* the *tha* and the *thysen*," leaving her to question: "Why should I say *maun* when you say mun?" (*Lady Chatterley's Lover* 146). Dialect-suppression, the absence of regional or gendered dialect in situations where it might logically appear, creates an atmosphere of equality between speakers of different backgrounds and is therefore the opposite of **hyperdialectalism,** where a distinct accent or dialect is amplified to manipulate power dynamics in conversations where it is pitted against Standard English (Leith 255).

Pilar's speech from *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, and Mellors' preference for the "*thee* the *tha* and the *thysen*" are indicative of hyperdialectalism because they repeatedly confront the reader with dialect features to elicit an atmosphere of nobility or prestige in juxtaposition with other speakers (255). Separate dialects can share a similar idiom, but differ in pronunciation, because idiom is less exclusive to a small single regional or class system. For example, British gamekeeper, miner and aristocrat may all use words like "fellow" or "chap" but otherwise have very different accents and vocabularies. **Idiom** involves expressions, phrases or bits of innovative jargon used by many speakers to engender and maintain a familiarity in opposition to other groups. Like dialect, idiom maintains belonging through differentiation. I**diolect** is still more particularized, and refers to the unique, habitual patterns of use in an individual speaker. It is the inspiration for the term "genderlect," and the suffix is meant to convey a verbal particularity, hence "dialect" (McConnell-Ginet 13).

Dialect, idiom and idiolect describe systems of speech, but other terms stress the internal and external forces of speech production. A **speech act** involves the intents and contexts that surround the utterance, and in fiction these include the author's influence, the character's intent and the scene in which it appears. J.L. Austin's speech act theory insists: "we must consider the total situation in which the utterance is issued—the total speech-act—if we are to see the parallel between statements and performative utterances, and how each can go wrong" (52). In contrast to the act, a **speech trait** focuses on the quality of the utterance, its characteristics, such as a type of laughter or stream of invective. The **utterance** is more basic, and refers to the production or sense of oral sound. While the speech act is behavioral, the speech trait involves conventions of linguistic expression.

Speech systems such as dialect or idiom, and their constituent parts, are forms of talk and methods of **discourse**. Bakhtin's understanding of discourse, as the use of words to convey meaning, is not entirely sufficient to distinguish it from talk as I have defined those terms thus far. Both imply the impetus to communicate with others, but discourse can support a disjuncture from the awareness of spoken language that talk evokes. Discourse can be so idiosyncratic that it begins to challenge conversational conventions altogether. Gertrude Stein's *Tender Buttons* (1914) illustrates this distinction brilliantly. Her compositions are intentionally indicative of discourse *and* uncharacteristic of talk.

This is due to her use of "words [to] assume a character purely aesthetic, in proportion as they can be converted from bearers of established meaning and unconscious association into plastic entities" (van Vechten xii). "Established meaning"

and “unconscious association “ are belief-based, shared aspects of talk. Without them the words are indeed plastic, but they are less conversions and more manipulations of the inner voice that disrupt the conversational comfort of more accepted prose or poetic forms. While there is no gendered language to be had in the examples from Stein that I discuss, it is of note that her writing resists systems such as idiom or genderlect, deliberately disrupting writerly conventions to abnegate the drive towards common understanding that talk evokes. In contrast, though Woolf’s figural narration is also experimental, also disruptive, it is a form of talk because, although its meaning is not fixed, it requires an impulse towards authenticity, towards a sincerity of understanding, that Stein’s writing so starkly defies.

For example, in one of two compositions titled “Milk,” Stein uses pleonastic repetition to interrogate the common structure of the sentence as a grammatical unit. The arrangement blurs the borders of clauses to intimate the connectivity and cyclicality of thought. This defies the usual processes of comprehension, to emphasize the inherent ambiguity so often obscured by traditional means of interpretation such as punctuation or sentence structure: “Climb up in sight climb in the whole utter needles and a guess a whole guess is hanging. Hanging hanging” (487).

“Hanging” reads like a pleonasm at first, but need not be extraneous. Consider the way “climb,” “whole” and “guess” tessellate their clauses by repeating adjacent arrangements. Instead, last two repeats of “hanging” appear without clauses altogether. The effect is that the word may be a verb at first, then possibly an adjective, and next, a noun. The simple word becomes obtuse. Each “hanging” also implies increase, progression. Her arrangement creates a swinging, to and fro dynamic. But hanging is

also a suspension, and so it simultaneously evokes a state of impasse. Bakhtin's unfinalizability is overt in "Milk," and in *Tender Buttons*, when Stein boldly enunciates possibility as an inherent force in the production of meaning. The reader's inner voice is denied a comfortable vantage from which to associate this composition with conventional talk.

Stein's compositions are exercises in imprecision; homophones and homonyms revel in conflation. One can "utter" the word "needles" or consider "utter needles." Colloquially, one climbs into a hole, not a "whole," although they lack phonic distinction. The only surety becomes the multi-dimensional pliability of meanings and impressions divorced from typical context. "Milk" allows one to distinguish between types of composition, including the repeated presence of words in any form whatever (iteration), the impression of speech sound (utterance), methodically using words to convey meaning (discourse), and a conveyance of meaning through a conversationally indicative style (talk).[13] In his introduction to *Selected Writings of Gertrude Stein* (1962), Carl van Vechten insists that words in *Tender Buttons* "come alive better when spoken" (xiv). In this way the act of reading aloud adds aurality to the work, rather than invigorating a sense of the spoken that is already present. Speaking aloud may lend a "laugh," but the wealth of "nonsense" and "non sequiturs" in *Tender Buttons* still generate a sense of foreboding, leading van Vechten to label it "darkest Stein" (xiii-xiv).

[13] While Woolf's figural narration is experimental, its manipulation of constraints heighten the verisimilitude of dialogue, thoughts and perceptions, suggesting talk. On the other hand, Stein luxuriates in the ability to deny easy comprehension.

Although for her re-negotiation of style, Stein's *Tender Buttons* holds parallels with Woolf and Joyce's experimental forms of talk, it is markedly uncharacteristic of speech. As such, it is not **fictional dialogue**, which involves the representation of speech in literature. Indeed, fictional dialogue can be imagined, can create a new language, but it is indicative of the linguistic systems governing lived speech. I use **lived speech** to refer to a conversation between real speakers that has been uttered aloud. Memoir, on the peripheries of fictional dialogue and first-hand testimony, obscures the quotational boundary line between report and representation. We take his word for it, so to speak, when Hemingway divulges in *A Moveable Feast* (2009) that it was a garage owner, and not Gertrude Stein, who first lamented: "you are all a génération *perdue*" (61). This anecdote could be fictional in whole or in part, or a faithful report. In this way memoir includes narrative dialogue that is perhaps fictional and not synonymous with lived speech.

Although meant to relate an impression of reality, fictional dialogue need not be a representation of an actual language or dialect. Philologist J.R.R. Tolkien created languages with Norse and Old English influence in *The Hobbit* (1937) and *The Fellowship of the Ring* (1954). In this way it references, but it is not a representation of, lived speech. In *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Hemingway's English approximation of Castilian is an invention meant to sound traditional, "archaic, poetic and noble…he often achieves his effects by rendering stilted Latinate equivalents instead of colloquial translations" (Meyers 342). Contrivances, narrative effacement or dialect approximation, paradoxically convey a sense of the genuine in Hemingway's prose.

Discussions of authenticity, contrivance and representation hinge upon a working understanding of **realism**. This idea of realism is almost indistinguishable from verisimilitude, except that realism conveys the desire or practice to achieve the appearance of reality, whereas verisimilitude encapsulates its effect. This definition is distinct from Literary Realism, which is a nineteenth-century "movement in the writing of novels" (Abrams 260). In contrast, realism is "a recurrent mode, in various eras and literary forms, of representing human life and experience" (260).

Genderlects add realism to conversations between characters because they feature the intersection of power, culture and identity in speech. A genderlect can facilitate a form of femininity, masculinity, androgyny or a transformation of these, but it can also be used as a taboo, to intensify erotic desire through fetishization. This is because **sexuality**, as a social construct, is shaped by the history of language. Michel Foucault explains in "The Repressive Hypothesis" that the repression of sexuality is an illusion because attempts to regulate it by governments and institutions only fuel, not quell, public obsession (8-18). A fetish involves a focus on, or obsession with, something persistently divorced from the norm in public discourse, and it relies on the maintenance of prohibition or taboo. In Hemingway's *The Garden of Eden* (1986), the masculinity in Catherine Bourne's speech is arousing because it negotiates illicit connotations. It relies on the lover's perception of transgression to facilitate their desire.

In *Sexing the Body* (2000), biologist Anne Fausto-Sterling insists sexuality is a phenomenon unique to the individual, informed by social processes and by biological factors (20). In the discussion at hand, sexuality is more about gender identity and

social aspects of sexual arousal, than about biology, or about describing the physiological effects of hormones in the brain or on our genitalia. While biology may feature in cultural forms of sexuality, my study focuses more on creative representations of performative behaviors, on their role in characterization, than on the impetus to prove or discuss a biological imperative.

For many modernists including Forster, Lawrence, Hall, Henry Miller and James Joyce, the legal obsession with, and regulation of sexuality in the courts was, far from keeping the population moral, or ensuring physical safety, a punitive process anathema to free expression and individual liberty. *Lady Chatterley's Lover* rejects sexual censorship as a personally damaging and fallacious pretense worthy of circumvention, but also exploits it as a source of arousal. Unlike *The Garden of Eden* or *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Henry Miller's *Tropic of Cancer* (1934) forcibly rips sexuality away from the tissues of religious repression altogether. While *Ulysses* is, according to the Judge who lifted the ban on Miller's book, "a pretty good aphrodisiac," *Tropic of Cancer* "is no aphrodisiac at all, because religious or so-called moral tension does not exist for him" (Shapiro xvii). Sex is just sex, the "business at hand" in the novel, and the amorality of this was revolutionary (xvii). In the modernist period, when literature challenged censorship laws sensationalism frequently ensued. As a result not all authors were as oppositional, as politically committed, as Joyce, Lawrence or Miller.[14]

Tropic of Cancer parodies the absurdity of some gendered and sexual slang: "can you beat that? that son-of-a-bitch of a princess has the clap!" (234). Fillmore's

[14] Forster refrained from publishing *Maurice* to protect it from the legal vitriol leveled at other portrayals of same sex desire such as Lawrence's *The Rainbow* (1915) or Hall's *The Well of Loneliness.*

obscenity, "son-of-a-bitch" clashes with "princess," the prostitute's nickname, in a preposterously gendered phrase. **Slang** can defy authority, embrace taboo and glorify impolite or sexualized language, but it can also mark the style of more lofty social groups. Broadly speaking, it is a bit of vocabulary that marks a linguistic trend. Informal slang can be innovative, and includes colloquial, casual abbreviations, such as "son-of-a-bitch" or "clap." It involves phrases that become fashionable or popular in a certain group that may become common use, or instead fall out of favor, over time. Slang was derided and dismissed as vulgar by grammarians well into the twentieth century, who considered it distinctly from proper, or formal, English. While J.B. Greenough and George Lyman Kittredge, in *Words and Their Ways in English Speech*, address the "prejudice" against slang as early as 1901, it persists in Jespersen's 1922 study (55).[15]

It is often thought of as the antithesis of formal language, a means to inform the popular vernacular, and I reference this throughout my chapters. Oxford University Press periodically updates their *Dictionary of Modern Slang* (2010) and it cements this perception of a difference between fashionable and formal speech. However, the upper classes can have their own slang, more frequently referred to as idiom, as well. Instead of using the word "**vernacular**" to characterize the language of a common field, as in a scholarly vernacular, for example, I prefer to use the term in relation to common, informal speech conventions. The word has negative connotations because it implies a hierarchy, with formal diction in the top position, and this is useful in a discussion of fictional representations of working-class speech. Mainstream speakers might continue

[15] This is one notable exception to Jespersen's preference for the speech of the white male, because slang, amongst young men, "is undoubtedly one of the human secondary sexual characters" (248).

to consider popular slang, and its role in vernacular speech, as offensive or inappropriate. Yet, as speech invariably alters over time, popular usage also changes. The temporal and teleological boundaries of trendy slang are acute; when an expression no longer serves a purpose to indicate fashionable speech it may become passé or shift from one regional group to another. Words that were once improper short forms invade the standard dictionary over time. Examples of common slang becoming Standard English during the late Victorian era include the abbreviations piano for pianoforte and kilo for kilogram (Greenough and Kittredge 61).

Slang illuminates the interpersonal dimensions of a fictional conversation. Fillmore resents Macha, and his vocabulary emphasizes his disdain. In *The Sun Also Rises*, Mike Campbell and Jake Barnes are in love with the same woman, but their antagonistic relationship is eased by the camaraderie that slang conveys. Jake assures him: "If he says anything, just say you were tight" and Mike replies: "Quite. And the funny thing is I think I was tight" (149). Their sense of identification is facilitated by a shared vocabulary that props up their common role as young and masculine. A euphemism for drunkenness, "tight" illustrates that an expression, at one time widely known, may become less immediately recognizable as the decades pass. In contemporary use "tight" refers to someone who is "mean" or "stingy" with money, and its affiliation with drunkenness is rapidly passing away (*Oxford Dictionary of Modern Slang*).

Jake and Mike are a part of a **speech community** that generates its own shared traits and vocabulary (Coates 34). Nethermere in *The White Peacock*, the English aristocracy, and professional groups are all speech communities. **Sociolinguistics**

studies the sociological forces governing the production of these groups to better understand variation in language use. Because it places a high value on the intentionality and contextualization inherent in verbal performance, prejudices, preconceptions and promoted beliefs garner sustained attention in the discipline.

This is why the notion of stereotyping and generalization can be so crucial in the effort to discern how aspects of genderlect are sexist, transgressive or empowering. A **stereotype** involves "cognitive representations of how members of a group are similar to one another and different from members of other groups" (Vescio and Weaver). While they can be incredibly detrimental, promoting racism, bigotry, misogyny and other forms of bias and oppression, people can internalize stereotypes "without feelings of prejudice," promoting them by failing to reflect on their implications (Vescio and Weaver). Stereotypes influence modalities of spoken language in a community, affecting not just what someone says, but how they say it.

In *Penelope's Web*, Susan Stanford Friedman contends that modernism is "**(en)gendered**," and that this gendering requires "reading the gendered strands of women's modernist texts….both with and against the grain of male texts" (3). By reading women writers against the grain of their male counterparts it is possible to illuminate how stereotyping, genderlects, and how binary tropes such as female/male, masculinity/femininity, woman/man, misogynist/feminist are varyingly destabilized, re-affirmed, or troubled through experimentation. Androcentric "male modernism" perpetuated the trope of the silenced woman to the degree that "many female modernists had to release themselves from this linguistic trap as the (pre)condition of their speech" (3). The gender of silence presents an interesting notion, particularly

when female characters use silence *as* speech in modernist texts written by men. To this point, in my next chapter I delineate how Clara Dawes uses silence as resistance, against her lover and against patriarchy, in Lawrence's *Sons and Lovers* (1913). The division between male and female modernisms is far from simple precisely because modernism insists on contradiction, self-subversion, and the interrogation of gender norms, even in those narratives where sexist tropes are otherwise advocated or affirmed.

Discourse analysis allows me to look at "isolated units of language" such as silence without requiring a divorce from the "circumstances of an utterance" (Abrams 66). Encountering questions of stereotyping and categorization, fictional dialogue craft implies "the use of language in a running discourse, continued over a sequence of sentences, and involving the interaction of speaker (or writer) and auditor (or reader) in a specific situational context, and within a framework of social and cultural conventions" (66). These tenets of discourse analysis are still the predominant model for dialogue studies, some forty years after its vogue in the 1970s, because they allow scholars to "explain how the characters represented in a literary work, and also the readers of that work, are constantly able to infer meanings that are not asserted or specified in a conversational exchange" (67). This is the realm of the not said, the omitted, where absence is actually a form of presence, a technique contributing to characterization.

Exclusion, absence, is an integral aspect of composition, as I have already highlighted in my look at Joyce, Woolf and Hall. Silence, the absence of sound, is in this way integral to conversation, consistent with Michel Foucault's assertion that

silence is “less the absolute limit of discourse, the other side from which it is separated by a strict boundary, than an element that functions alongside the things said” (“The Repressive Hypothesis” 27). **Silence** is a speech act gendered by notions of deference or the refusal to say more. It can be explicitly named in narration, indicated by a space on the page, or detected as the subtext behind dialogue that haunts the exchange. In this way, silence and absence attain a vital presence in establishing the moods and thoughts of a character. This is true in narrative prose, but silence and absence also function in different poetic forms, discernible, for example, in Dorothy Parker’s embrace of laconicism. In my concluding chapter, I speak to the gendered intersections of silence, space and time in poetry and prose.

Chapter One:

"Showing Spunk:" Female Masculinity in D.H. Lawrence's Fictional Dialogue

When *Lady Chatterley's Lover* was published in 1928, D.H. Lawrence had been fighting the British censors for over a decade. He refused to remove obscene words from its dialogue, or to omit its explicit sex scenes (Moore 24). His battle had begun with *The Rainbow* (1915), when the courts indicted the "Shame" chapter for its lesbian themes (Edwards, J. 60-1).[16] Their censure had an unintended benefit for Lawrence, in that it increased the public exposure of his work. The result was a "newfound articulation" of female sexual agency, representing "an important moment in British literary and legal history…[when] women's sexuality was becoming recognized as independent of male sexuality" (61). What follows here is an interrogation of gendered dialogue in Lawrence that focuses on the ways in which women's talk advocates against different forms of sexism or sexual repression. Lawrence's gendered dialogue generates a sense of romantic spirituality, and of allure in unexpected ways, and facilitates his portrayals of strong women. Women's speech in particular, when it displays masculine characteristics, is indicative of Lawrence's incessant atmosphere of self-contradiction where sexism is sometimes confronted and promoted by a single utterance.

Challenging Obscenity

Obscenity, in its linguistic form, was gendered in the early twentieth century because grammarians regarded it as the exclusive purview of men in "the smoking room, in the bar room, in the barbershop, but no woman was supposed to know them unless she was an utterly degraded woman" (Glass 209). When Lady Chatterley

[16] The book was launched on September 30th of that year and the trial was underway by November 30th (Moore 12).

swears, it counters the allegiance of expletives with men-only contexts and spaces. This was revolutionary not only because it used sexual expletives to develop a titillating tone that inflamed the censors, but also because Lady Chatterley, as a woman, demands knowledge of the "secret language of men," to generate autoerotic speech (Glass 209).[17] It is a source and manifestation of her own sexual excitement, because when she calls Mellor's erect phallus "cocksure," it references the expletive cock, which Mellors and her father both use casually, and her arousal when admiring how "strange," "proud" and "lordly" it is (174).

There is clear evidence to suggest that her dialogue had a wider social impact beyond promoting women's access to secret or taboo adjectives of sex. Hemingway's Brett Ashley and Jake Barnes were not the only characters from the modernist period to influence the idiom of young people and university students. In 1965, a few years after the book was un-banned in America 1959, students would use its association with the "obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent or filthy" to their advantage (Moore 112).[18] After campus police arrested Berkeley student John Thompson for holding up a placard that simply read: "fuck," his fellow students returned the next day to protest. They did so by reading aloud passages from the now legal, therefore officially decent, *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (Glass 223).

Undoubtedly, the novel's direct speech, Lady Chatterley's in particular, provided its most explicitly shocking reading material. This is because, although the book's sex scenes are explicit, descriptively narrated in the third person, its expletives

---

[17] This catchphrase first appeared in the American Lady Chatterley Trial of 1959 (209).

[18] This hearty use of adjectives on the part of the United States District Court of New York is also redolent of Foucault's repressive hypothesis. It epitomizes the sensationalism fueling such discussions of the regulation of sexuality in the court system.

only appear in dialogue. These would assault the ears of passersby with shocking immediacy. In addition, although the virile, earthy Mellors would be expected to swear, polite Lady Chatterley's insistence that "you don't fuck me cold-heartedly" would be even more shocking (171). It suited the purposes of these Berkeley youths perfectly because the book's legalization was new evidence against the criminalization of free expression. This is consistent with the impetus in dialogue studies to "reflect on whether fictional representations themselves help to instantiate an 'idea of dialogue' that has an impact not only on how we conduct our everyday verbal interactions but also on our wider social and political relations" (Thomas 36). Lawrence's dialogue craft politicizes the beautiful aristocratic Englishwoman and the working class groundskeeper, not only for their intimate bridge of the class divide, but also for their unexpectedly bawdy speech preferences. Lady Chatterley is not the only character to swear; her father proudly announces he was never one "to go back on a good bit of fucking, myself," but while this could be expected of an eccentric aesthete like painter Sir Malcolm, Connie challenges norms of femininity when she says "fuck" (237, 147).

In "#$%^&*!?: Modernism and Dirty Words," Loren Glass insists the "so-called 'filthy-speech movement' affirmed that the aesthetic significance of dirty words had modulated into an explicitly political register which no longer recognized the sacred integrity of literary texts," and he includes authors like Lawrence and Miller in that category (224). However, modernist politicization is not entirely contingent upon the rejection of the "sacred integrity of literary texts." For Lawrence in particular, "fucking" is a spiritual enterprise, and it needs a "warm heart" (171). If the text is free of base sexuality it is because that physical union should carry a sacred reverence

instead. Linguistic taboos are multivalent: they are a means of protest, a manifestation of body worship, a form of sexual fetishization and a challenge to conventional moral propriety.

When Lady Chatterley swears it is indicative of female masculinity in particular, because her dialogue exploits tropes of feminine politeness and upper class gentility to shift understandings of womanhood and female sexuality. Mellors' oaths are not as startling because the working class gamekeeper is not hampered by the expectation of propriety. For him, swearing is characteristic of the broad Derby dialect he prefers. Still, profane language of any kind, whether from Mellors or Connie Chatterley, would have been unusual, foreign to Lawrence's educated, if open-minded, target audience. The general public was unaccustomed to the open publication of taboo language.[19]

While Connie gains conversational and sexual authority over Mellors, contravening his habitual misogyny and subjugation, through words like "fuck" and "cunt," this obfuscates, but never wholly neutralizes, misogyny in the text. I use the word misogyny because of Mellors' dislike for strong women, an animosity established early on in the narrative. He has a particular hatred for his estranged wife, and is verbally abusive to his young daughter, whom he caustically reprimands, calling her a "false little bitch" while giving Connie a "smile like a sneer" (46).[20] Dialect is a wall

---

[19] Banned works with bawdy speech and erotic overtones have long held a special place in the heart of underground English culture. A notorious example, with ties to *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, is John Cleland's *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* (1748) also known as *Fanny Hill*. Buoyed by the British Chatterley trial in 1960, Mayflower, a publishing house, released the first open copies of *Fanny Hill* in 1963, but these were again suppressed and it "technically" remained a banned book in Britain as late as the nineteen-eighties (Sutherland 8-9).

[20] Mellors' daughter is also named Connie, inciting an immediate fellow feeling in the titular heroine. Yet when her annoyance at Mellors quickly fades, "Connie senior" instead becomes "well bored by

between Lady and employee here; it serves a role-distancing function before their affair begins. When Connie inquires of Mellors "why is she crying?" his broad speech is indicative of defiance to her authority, her butting in: "'Nay, yo' mun ax 'er,' he replied callously, in broad vernacular" (45-6).

Hyperdialectalism is a double-sided coin, characterized by its ability to convey admirable pride or add distance (Leith 255). Phonetic stress intensifies Mellors' rebellion along with his preference for "the heavy broad drag of the dialect….his voice dropped again into the broad sound of the vernacular" (*Lady Chatterley's Lover* 48). This stress is carefully done to avoid too much elision. Both Connie and the reader easily absorb Mellor's resistant answer. In this way, code-switching is another "badge of masculinity" for the already strong and bold hunter (Leith 254). His ability to social climb, by way of a successful military career and genteel accent, also underlines his implicit rejection of the corruption of title and monetary excess. His speech patterns constitute a genderlect, where a particular iteration of masculinity, that of the proud working man, is presented as evidence against the British class system.

Lawrence sexualizes Mellors', and Connie's gendered language. Mellor's speech becomes progressively broad through elision and variant spelling when it is meant to infer closeness, tenderness, and his sexual desire for Connie, or to indicate his physical strength and virility. He exemplifies the disparate functions of dialect in a single character. In bed, Connie perceives his mounting affection in the growing broadness of his speech, and playfully mocks his pronunciation: "'Sholl ter?' she

---

Connie junior" (47). Psychologically, his daughter initially represents Connie's inner self, but the events in the narrative, through her boredom, insist that Lady Chatterley will not be nostalgic for her past disaffection or ignorance.

echoed, teasing." (146). Far from annoying Mellors, her mimicry creates a convivial bond:

> "Th'art good cunt, though, aren't ter? Best bit o' cunt left on earth. When ter likes! When tha'rt willin'!"
> "What is cunt?" she said.
> "An' doesn't ter know? Cunt? It's thee down theer; an' what I get when I'm inside thee; it's a' as it is all on't."
> "All on't," she teased. "Cunt! It's like fuck then." (146-7)

Mellors praises Connie as a "good cunt." In *Sexual Politics* (1969), Kate Millett argues that Lawrence uses Mellors to reduce Connie to "mere passive 'cunt'" (239). Indeed, this could be an objectification, a reduction of the woman to her sex organ. However, they later talk to his penis "John Thomas" (189). So, if he is addressing his comments directly to her anatomy, he is personifying it through "cunt" as a slang word from his dialect, and not reducing Connie solely to her sexual function. He is *talking to* her vagina here. The detection of chauvinism depends on the reader's opinion of Mellors' intent, on the shared beliefs governing talk. The ambiguity of expression ensures intent is not always clear in lived or in fictional contexts. With this in mind, Mellors is aware of Connie's naïveté and takes advantage of this to suppress the word's more disrespectful connotations, it is possible he is mocking her ignorance as a female trait.

Like "bitch," "cunt" never strays far from its derogatory capability. The word's etymology is thick with debasement. The *Oxford Dictionary Online* traces "cunt" as a "term of abuse" as far back as Samuel Pepys' Diary in 1663.[21] The interplay of context and utterance insists that each of these interpretations maintains a degree of validity. If

---

[21] The Oxford Dictionary Online contextualizes the word: "*cunt* remains the English word most avoided as taboo." Although not "inherently obscene or offensive in the medieval period," the OED Online mentions that by 1796 Grose's *Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue* considers it a "nasty word for a nasty thing."

Mellors is objectifying his partner, exploiting her ignorance, Connie is accessing taboo words as new means of sexual agency. Mellors ambiguity is not so obtuse that it challenges the drive towards understanding. Connie is just as eager to say the word "cunt" with the implicit knowledge that it is obscene, as unspeakable as "fuck" in polite society. Mellors mocks her mimicry: "He laughed. Her attempts at the dialect were so ludicrous, somehow" (146). Far from dissuaded, Connie is entertained and amused. She teases him in return (146).

Its sexist roots ensure that "cunt" is a hypermasculine hypocorism. I use the term hypermasculine, because, for Lawrence, praising the common man requires an adulation of his stereotypes, including sexual dominance.[22] Paralinguistic information during, and following, this scene is what ultimately connects profane language with divine sexuality. As Mellors dresses, Connie lies on the bed "glowing like a gipsy" (146). The simile affiliates Connie with tropes of nature-worship and pagan magic. Her mischievousness and allure are exotic elements that "glow." It is then that Mellors praises her vagina as the "best bit o' cunt left on earth" (146). Rather than creating juxtaposition between the divine and the corporeal, this remark implicitly joins the worship of the body with the worship of nature, tying sexuality to the earth. The supernatural is ethereal and diffuse, while the swearword is blunt and direct. The narrator closes the scene with a complementary confluence of nature and spirituality brought on by sexual bliss: "in the twilight the world seemed a dream; the trees in the park seemed bulging and surging at anchor on a tide, and the heave of the slope to the house was alive" (147).

[22] As a prefix that appears in reference to genderlect and dialect in my study, hyper is used to denote exaggerated emphasis. This focus can be to praise or deride, dependent upon the narrative slant.

The sexual union of body and spirit is echoed in the wild yet pastoral, "surging," and "alive" Wragby estate. Narrative imagery and dialogue resist the repression of sexuality in mutual accord. Connie perceives the earth seething with a dreamy, ghostly movement, untarnished by any hint of the profane or obscene despite their discussion of "cunt" and "fuck." Yeats, "in a letter to a friend" (No. 81), praises the immutability of sexual spirituality in Lawrence. He writes that, when Mellors' coarse language is accepted by Connie, it "becomes a forlorn poetry uniting their solitudes, something ancient, humble and terrible" (Draper 21-22). It is not "lurid" or "smirched," charges that were also leveled at it by scholars in the early nineteen-thirties (Read 275). Instead, Yeats praises Lawrence's ability to relate sexual language to a sense of awe.

Connie's sexual awakening makes her a "chip of the old block," closer to a son in her father's estimation (237). Sir Malcolm gives no moral debridement for his daughter's lack of sexual restraint; rather, he intends to leave Connie all the money he can because "she deserves it for showing spunk in a world of old women" (237). Her "spunk" takes the "world of old women" to task, suggesting female masculinity as well. Etymologically, "spunk" is a benign synonym for determination, but it is also to the same extent a bit of vulgar slang: "when he's got none of that spunky wild bit of a man in him, you say he's got no balls. When he's sort of tame" (162). Spunk comes from that "wild bit of a man." Lawrence interrogates the supposed "self-evidence of [Connie's] femininity" manipulating the genders of sexual slang to rebellious effect (Noble xvii). The sexuality of expletives is not a given, although it is more so in the British context. While the majority of the most offensive expletives in English are

sexual, in contrast, strong French expletives are frequently religious in nature. In Lawrence, the gendered dimensions of obscenity trouble the legal regulation of sexuality.

Engendering Speech Acts

Not all masculinisms, traits that convey masculinity, are taboo. In *The White Peacock* (1911), Alice Gall uses an educated command of Latin "degustasse sat est—ain't it Lettie?" and quips like "awfully sorry, old girl," to evoke a gentlemanly genderlect (179, 178). Her speech contains class and gender-based code-switching. Regional dialect forms, such as "ain't" and "Laws" (Lord) collide with her witty command of historical events and trends: "Come on then—where's the Abode of Love?" (178).[23] Masculinity is a verbal means for Alice to climb the social ladder, to maintain authority through a confrontational, carefree and shocking tone.

In one way, her attempts at the new slang fall short. If Alice intends to be popular, to be endearing, it has the opposite effect. The group is either ambivalent about her friendship or put off by her entirely. Alice asserts her superior masculinity by feminizing the novel's protagonist. She calls Cyril "Sybil," and because this teasing is less playful than it is aggressive, it too carries a masculine undertone (178). In turn, Cyril strikes back with his focus on her undesirability to men: "Most men enjoyed Alice in company, but they fought shy of being alone with her" (24). This implies a profound anxiety concerning the New Woman and her overt challenge to the stereotype of feminine politeness and deference. Otto Jespersen conveys this anxiety, as Lawrence

[23] This was a love-cult, founded decades earlier in 1845, that advocated "spiritual marriages" (*The White Peacock* notes 382).

represents it in *The White Peacock*, when he laments that: "quite recently, with the rise of the feminist movement, many young ladies have begun to imitate [the fashionable slang of] their brothers in that as well as other respects" (247-8). Alice's speech refutes Leith's assumption in "Dialogue and Dialect in D.H. Lawrence" (1980) that bidialectalism, code-switching in any form, is exclusive to men's speech in Lawrence (246).

Her character uses gender bidialectalism to challenge patriarchy, but Alice's attempts to subvert sexism actually achieve a reaffirmation of the prejudice that experimental speech is best left to young men. This is because Alice's wit is too unusual, too unfeminine, to create a favorable impression. Unlike *Lady Chatterley's Lover,* in this much earlier narrative, there is no dreamy, ethereal element to the empowered woman. After Alice finishes her mash-up of oaths, gentleman's slang, local dialect and Latin: "Emily flashed looks of rage; Meg blushed and felt ashamed; Lettie began to recover from her first outraged indignation, and smiled" (178-9). Lettie could be suddenly approving of Alice's rebelliousness, becoming her comrade-in-arms, or, just as easily, be pleased by Alice's difficulty, and amused by the chilly reception of her intellectual rival. The narrative hints that Alice's primary motivation is not endearment, or likability, but attention seeking for its own sake. Halberstam's idea that masculinity is most keenly visible in a female subject ensures that, when Alice's idiom is a hybrid of masculine forms, it is working to keep her in the spotlight. Her masculinity is confrontational and an advocation of difference. It does not solicit easy acceptance by her group.

In scenes of conversation where multiple women are involved in Lawrence, there is frequently a high level of competitive impulse similar to the clash between Lettie and Alice. Miriam resents Clara Dawes and Beatrice Wyld in *Sons and Lovers* (1913) for their ability to command Paul Morel's attention, which she often cannot achieve. The recurrence of this trope of cattiness in the two novels, combined with a lack of competitiveness on the part of male friends in the same narratives, suggests divisive stereotypes. It represents the inconsistent beliefs that women are meant to be polite but are inherently catty. Lettie and Meg are feminine, as they refrain from chastising their friend outwardly, and Meg's reaction to Alice is a girlish blush. However, their disapproval is sly, perhaps spiteful, and therefore a subtle indictment of the caricature that Alice presents.

In many of Lawrence's novels, male friendship is far more conducive to intellectual conversation. In *The White Peacock*, for example, Lettie and George struggle to overcome the divides of their gender and birth, whereas in *Women in Love* (1920), though similarly divided by class, Gerald and Rupert never backhandedly disapprove of one another in a similar manner. Gerald kills his own brother with a gun as a child, but when men damage one another in the book there is an air of unintentionality. Sisters Gudrun and Ursula argue over whether this accident required an "unconscious will" towards murder (48). The speculation over whether Gerald killed with any intent is left to women whose own ability to destroy other people is expressed so keenly later on. There is a sustained element of "diablerie" in the conversational impulses and tone of both central and peripheral female characters in that novel (397). Jealousy and other negative emotions are implicitly gendered

feminine in the novel's dialogue such that politeness drapes malice with a thin veil. The scathing portrayal of "the Pussum," Gerald's jilted lover, whose nickname is the embodiment of cattiness, testifies to this sexist trope.

While it could be argued that these portrayals are meant to indict women as an entire gender for an overarching ill-will, that they are far from ennobling in nature, this stereotype also appears to expose how social limitations, expectations of politeness and morality, stifle women and cause them to lash out. At its most basic level, feminine genderlect is a hybrid of competing impulses; in this instance a combination of two essentialized elements that are perceptibly distinct, often at odds. Lawrence favors dialectic investigation of the profane and the divine, of masculinity and femininity, of the aristocratic and the plebeian, of men and women as polarities. Lawrence, like Halberstam, arguably "manages to reinforce" the gender binary, developing a "very fixed classification of what falls within the categories femininity and masculinity" even while seeking to trouble it (Alsop et al. 161).

Lawrence portrays speakers who engage with conventions in order to destabilize them, and Alice's female masculinity allows the reader to perceive both the new, and the more storied "patterns of behavior" in dialogue representation (161). Mellors' preference for dialect dignifies him, as does Alice's attempt at hybrid genderlect and class-based code-switching, despite their inability to create wholly new or endearing modes of expression. Linguistic systems rely on practice to modify meaning over time, and so Lawrence could either be derided for caricaturing women's speech, or lauded for portraying the damages of feminine stereotypes on individuals and personal relationships.

Alice Gall's wit garnered early support from feminist Violet Hunt, who perceived the need for more fiction about this generation in transition. In a review of *The White Peacock* occasioned by its publication, Hunt, no stranger to modernist circles, legitimates Lawrence's portrayal of Alice Gall and her fellow educated, fashionable, youths growing up in the English countryside: "these sons and daughters of small farmers would do credit to any Hampstead gathering of blue stockings. They are extraordinarily and bewilderingly 'cultured'…this would appear incredible. But we happen to be able to supply corroborative detail from outside Mr. Lawrence's book" (Hunt 38-9).[24]

In *An Immodest Violet: The Life of Violet Hunt* (1991), Joan Hardwick emphasizes the friendship between Lawrence and Hunt, and highlights Hunt's own penchant for the political possibilities of talk (72). In Britain, the women's suffrage movement began to explode in the public eye. By 1907, it "was being galvanized into a new militancy" by Emmeline Pankhurst and her ilk (Matthews 136). In 1911, when *The White Peacock* was published, the cultured talk of bluestockings was being heard in parades that "were larger and better orchestrated" (137). Alice Gall's speech is a very early incarnation of the trend that Hemingway's Brett Ashley would further inspire, and spread across the Atlantic for American readers, fifteen years later.

Hunt's early New Woman's novel, *The Maiden's Progress: A Novel in Dialogue*, caused a stir when it was published in 1894. Written more like a play than a

---

[24] "Bluestocking" is an interesting term for Hunt to use. In this instance she implies its etymology, either late 17th, or early 18th, century in origin. It was used pejoratively in the 19th century to refer to educated women, but as women's intellectualism grew, it became less derogative and by Hunt's era "applied to intellectual women in general" (*Oxford English Dictionary Online*). There is the impression that the bluestockings are quickly outmoding their onetime critics through the rise of feminism.

narrative, Hunt uses conversational style to satirize middle class youth, and attributes educated, as well as novel or new, slang to young women, along with what was then highly fashionable French idiom in their speech. The increasing use of fashionable turns of phrase and dirty words in mixed company during the twentieth century was a direct result of women's increasing access to higher education in Britain and America in the decades before. After England passed the Elementary Education Act in 1870, education was made widely available to the lower classes and recommended for all English children, ensuring the production of a whole new generation of women with professional ambitions. The axiom that knowledge is power proved vital to the women's suffrage movement. Inevitably a wittier, knowledgeable diction followed. The New Woman's new slang tested the fences of verbal taboo, hybridizing popular slang, dialect, men's speech and foreign languages to convey strength and nobility in a similar way to Alice.[25]

Hunt goes on to call *The White Peacock* an "important work" that "should be read by all those superior persons who say that they have no time to read novels because they are engaged in public works" (Hunt 38). Her review is a response to other critics, notably playwright Allan Monkhouse, who describes dialogue in *The White Peacock* as "a kind of shorthand or coterie slang which leaves the reader out in the cold" (Monkhouse 34). Her perspective contradicts another well-circulated review in the *Times Literary Supplement* from January that same year, which asserts: "a good deal of the conversation is quite banal, despite its suggestions of advanced culture" (Draper 33). Hunt wanted to ensure that the political possibilities of domestic

[25] Hunt's dialogue novel, popular at the time, is not artfully written. Still, it indicted society for the dogged domestication of women.

friendships were thoroughly highlighted, in order to encourage and expand support of universal education, of platonic friendships between men and women, and suffrage. When Alice uses "old fellow" to refer to protagonist Cyril Beardsall, this implies she is his superior, as well as his "fellow," someone entitled to his respect (178). "Fellow," like chap, can refer to a man or a boy, but unlike chap it also means someone in the same position as the speaker. For Alice, superiority and respect are crucial in her effort to be treated as Cyril's equal.

Cyril's narrative perspective colours the direct speech in the novel, and actually forms an argument against Alice's masculinity in the details he chooses to include such as her lack of desirability. Cyril's gaze is controlling, but not insurmountable. This is consistent with Laura Mulvey's understanding of the male gaze in "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" (1975). Cyril takes a perceptible satisfaction in disliking Alice as a verbose woman. Were she more physically attractive, alluring, like Beatrice Wyld in *Sons and Lovers*, his allegiance to her speech style might change. In that novel, protagonist Paul Morel is titillated by Beatrice's similar form of gender bidialectalism. Cyril is analyzing Alice sexually, and finds her wanting, leading him to disapprove of her in other respects: "she was a short, plump girl, pale, with daring, rebellious eyes…. Lettie had a good deal of sympathy with her. But Lettie generally deplored Alice's outrageous behavior" (24). The opinions of other men, of Lettie, are a foil for Cyril's own estimations. Although Hunt is correct in spotlighting the new speech culture of these educated youth, Cyril's choices paint the New Woman's slang in a less favorable light, contextualizing her speech with reproofs and rebuffs that escape deeper scrutiny.

This technique gets at the modernist air of self-contradiction in Lawrence's narratives, that they repeatedly "disavow what they most desire and desire what they most disavow" (Baldick 265, 266). Lawrence "raises special problems because he was not afraid to contradict himself…this refusal to be tied to any one idea is central to all the writing Lawrence did about his art" (Blanchard 433).[26] In an imposing paradox, contradiction is one of the consistent elements across his body of work:

> Ambivalent responses to women lie at the center of D.H. Lawrence's work. While he is unusually sensitive to the experience of women, he is clearly also moved by a powerful animus against them. The glorification of masculine power and the phallic mystique of many of the middle and later works testify to animosity against female dominance, yet Lawrence continues to create strong and independent females. (Storch 117)

Lawrence's battle of the sexes is characterized by allegiances with chauvinism, phallocentrism and sexism, and underpinned with sympathy for the feminist cause in the early twentieth century. Cyril and Paul Morel both admire women trying to liberate themselves from the domestic sphere. In *The Rainbow* Ursula Brangwen yearns for a sense of equality and "the right of women to take equal place with men in the field of action and work" (*The Rainbow* 342).

Talking Courage

In her 1975 essay, "Love and Power: A Reconsideration of Sexual Politics in D.H. Lawrence," Lydia Blanchard contradicts Simone de Beauvoir and Kate Millett's derision of Lawrence as an anti-feminist:

> we need not agree with all of Lawrence's analysis, however, nor with all of his conclusions, to recognize the power in his descriptions of intelligent women

[26] By the time *Fantasia of the Unconscious* (1922) appeared, the critical reception of his contradictory style had made him incredibly hostile and angry: "I warn the generality of readers that this present book will seem to them ony a rather more revolting mass of wordy nonsense than the last" (53).

> trapped by a society that provides them inadequate outlets for their talents and energies. To read Lawrence's descriptions of the crippling effects of industrialization as arguments for the continuation of crippling relationships between men and women is to misread Lawrence. And to misread Lawrence is to forgo one of our better opportunities for understanding why we are where we are. Lawrence has described better than any other major twentieth century artist the destruction that inevitably occurs when one person tries to dominate or control another. (443)

Contradiction injects a much-needed element of honesty into the disruption of gender roles in Lawrence's narratives. Gudrun Brangwen's empowered spirit heralds Gerald Crich's untimely end in *Women in Love* (1920). Her feminism spurs her towards a more fulfilling life where she can travel and paint. The reader is left to lament Gerald's demise, admire Gudrun's undiminished liveliness, or to marvel at both. Gudrun's speech traits are not subversively gendered, not masculine. The effect of this absence is an emphasis upon Gerald's lagging authority; Gudrun does not need to match his lordly mentality to wrench her heart from his grasp. Characters like Gudrun or Gerald are as stereotypical as they are complex, and female masculinity is not a linguistic trend Lawrence represents consistently, or to consistent effect. Kate Leslie in *The Plumed Serpent* (1926) and Miriam Leivers in *Sons and* Lovers are not secret feminists or enduring models of the New Woman's new vocabulary.

Prone to autonomy, Kate longs for deference instead, associating it with femininity. She wants to embrace silence as femininity, but her vehement manner is flagrantly counterintuitive to her own urge to "ought to want to be limited" (457). She dreads becoming "elderly and grisly" as she says aloud to herself in a long masochistic monologue (457). The ambivalent portrayal of Kate is curiously counter to, and in support of, Lawrence's advocacy of feminine gentility in "Litany of Exhortations" from *Fantasia of the Unconscious* (176-8). Through confrontational irony and

overemphasis, this tract sarcastically advocates for an un-gentle, overbearing wife, while addressing his assumedly male reader directly (176-8). Attracted by a Mexican, neo-primitive, religion based in phallus-worship, Kate might as easily shirk off its bonds and return to Ireland after the narrative concludes (Edwards, D. 193). The offshoot of this is that neither chauvinism, nor feminism, emerges as the clear victor in any novel, or story, when Lawrence's whole body of fiction is considered in contrast.

Many of Lawrence's heroines are anti-heroines, antagonists pitted against partners, friends or family. Connie Chatterley is his only female protagonist to arrive at a détente between herself, her family and her husband. This is achieved by her retreat to Scotland, through an assent to social discourses of propriety, where she can more acceptably wait out the gestation of her pregnancy. There are a few aspects of Lawrence's dialogue craft, including mirroring and silence, that, like code-switching, demonstrate the political possibilities of gender in personal interactions. Each of these speech traits requires and conveys courage. Yet, this courage can be as empowering as it can be misguided or misplaced. Female characters grasp at threads of empowerment, struggle for their rights, but that struggle is left consistently unresolved.

In *The Rainbow,* linguistic mirroring amplifies Anna Brangwen's role as one of Lawrence's most unlikeable heroines. Her hostility is conveyed through mockery, and she matches her husband Will's speech patterns. Their marriage is a cautionary tale of dissatisfaction and hatred. In its post-1949 iterations, notably from "The Subversion of Subject and the Dialectic of Desire" published in *Ecrits* (1966), Jacques Lacan's mirror stage theory involves the twinning that arises out of the ability to see or imagine

manifestations of the self outside the body or psyche, to reproduce an exterior conception of the self as other.

In "Anna Victrix," Anna Brangwen's early marriage is described through the vocabulary of war, referencing the battle between husband and wife, between the sexes, a combat of wills. She uses twinning and imitation as mockery to achieve dominance:

> Very good, she was the enemy, very good. As he prowled around her, she watched him. As he struck at her, she struck back.
> He was angry because she had carelessly pushed away his tools so that they got rusty.
> "Don't leave them littering in my way, then," she said.
> "I shall leave them where I like," he cried.
> "Then I shall throw them where I like."
> They glowered at each other, he with rage in his hands, she with her soul fierce with victory. (156)

Although on the surface this exchange does not appear gendered, it is. Will's rage is that of a husband trying to dominate his wife, of a man proclaiming his sense of domestic entitlement. As a declaration, "Where I like" demonstrates Anna's strong will. The result is a conflict that might have been avoided without the insistence on separate spheres. Anna is ready to throw her husband's tools right back at him, to reject his sense of entitlement with her own.

While this conversation signifies the changes in domestic arrangements at the turn of the twentieth century, it also signifies impasse, stagnation and irresolution. Anna's daughters will reject the strictures of home life, in part because of this turmoil. Before Will and Anna are married, repetition generates a sense of twinning and of locomotion, of a progress in their affections. They meet in the moonlight. She calls out "My love!" to echolocate her mate, and he cries out "Anna," over and over, in reply to

draw nearer (117-8). Here, mirroring and repetition are a source of attraction. Later, repetition morphs Anna into an increasingly monstrous, "malicious" and aggressive, crone figure (196). As an aspect of dialogue craft, mirroring, like dialect, can serve disparate functions, allowing for endearment or for role-distancing between two essentially different characters.

The sounds of Anna's "malicious" laughter, a "Pouf!" and a "tinkle," are described as "profane" (196). Apparently gender-neutral on the surface, these traits are a form of latent genderlect. The vocabulary that is used to describe laughter is gendered. In *Sons and Lovers*, Beatrice Wyld is flirtatious, coquettish and silly. As a consequence, her laughter is repeatedly described using the word "giggled" (234-5). She does not cackle or cluck, which are also feminine, but more firmly affiliated with unattractive witchiness or hen-brooding.[27] Her laugh is girly, light, and infers an alluring naiveté. Morally, her giggles flaunt a lack of restraint and proclaim her sexuality. Paul approves of Beatrice, and so her sexualized laughter is intriguing, not "malicious" or "profane." Anna's laughter is unfeminine because it is inappropriate and impolite. It is therefore unattractive to her husband and fellow townsfolk.

Entertaining the idea of laughter as a gendered trait is connected to Hélène Cixous' "The Laugh of the Medusa" and its concept of écriture féminine. Cixous' argument revolves around the development of a distinctly feminine writerly impulse and space. A woman must "write her self" and demand to be heard (880). Her title infers that the Medusa's laughter would be multi-dimensionally powerful, independent,

---

[27] The gendered associations with these forms of laughter are clear in their entries from the *New Oxford American Dictionary* and in the *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. In the former, an example of "giggling" is given as "three giggling girls," and in the latter, a "cackle" is the sound a hen makes, the hen being a symbol of womanly brooding.

but tinged by the recurring male urge to conquer, to silence, or to judge her monstrous. It is not difficult to connect Anna's laughter with that of the gorgon, with the ill-fated figure refusing to be dominated despite the persistent threat. They each turn men to stone, perverted by the system that would punish them for their willfulness. By insisting on the need to speak, Cixous advocates women's writing as a panacea to the sexism in Lawrence's tracts including "Cocksure Women and Hensure Men."

Cixous' treatise is a response to what sociolinguistics calls the dominance approach, where men are seen as intrinsically dominant in mixed gender conversations (Coates 6). Akin to the androcentric rule, it assumes that verbally aggressive behavior is solely masculine in origin, and it risks perpetuating that fallacy. Identifying the presence of a shared belief amongst a group of speakers, who then exploit it, does not mean that trait is fixed, or generally verifiable. Gender involves the negotiation of socially imposed constraints to express identity. Those speech cultures Lawrence's work relies on, including androcentric dominance, are inculcations, not fundamental truths.

In *Laughing with the Medusa* (2006), Alison Sharrock argues that when critics identify such "gendered oppositions" in literature, a paradox appears where "we potentially create precisely the segregated conditions which we sought to oppose" (Sharrock 256). Sharrock cites, as "gendered oppositions," how "force and reason tend to be gendered 'masculine' while bodiliness or passivity are gendered 'feminine'" (255-6). Binary representations of gender in modernist fiction can and should be questioned and viewed through a dynamic lens. Perseus vanquishes the Medusa by using his shield as a mirror; Anna's laughter reflects the fear in her husband's rage,

exposing not only her callousness, but also his inability to live up to his name, Will, and to instantiate a loving dialogue with his equally willful wife.

As I highlighted in my introductory chapter, Virginia Woolf also deploys conversational mirroring in *Orlando*. Shelmerdine and Orlando infer aspects of their selves are visible in the other. Their diction achieves a gender neutral tone, but this generates androgyny through interchangeability. Anna and Will may have a far less positive atmosphere to their conversations, but there is also a sort of androgyny to the matched vengefulness at the heart of otherwise oppositional characters. Linguistic mirroring is therefore indicative of Lacan's governing impulse, described as the "decentring of all identity presumed previously to be stable and relatively unified," an urge integral to the "postmodern enterprise" (Alsop et al. 54, 55). Modernist dialogue, from wholly different texts, with different aesthetics and perspectives, hints at the origins of the postmodern subject. The characters mean what they say, the text has expressed political dimensions, and yet there is an undercurrent of instability, of a crumbling structure, creating a persistent challenge to the very signposts of gender those characters negotiate. The courageous heroine is not given a hero's welcome, and hatred and love form a disparate, inextricable, tangle of emotions.

Dimensions of Silence and Slang

This is where the idea of discourse as what is "said," of the use of words, also becomes contingent on the opposite, what is not said, on silence as a speech act. Silence, like laughter, is another trait that involves the absence of words. Regarding it as a feminine or masculine trait references the dominance approach. Silence "functions alongside the things said," and in Lawrence it is a tool that can convey anger, distance,

assent or dominance ("The Repressive Hypothesis" 27). Conversational silence is a consistent, frequent aspect of Lawrence's dialogue in both the late, and early, narratives. Despite this, extant studies favor a discussion of how his characters use words, than of how they use no words at all. This is because Lawrence's masterful presentation of dialect, as a uniting or divisive force, or as a manifestation of "moments of special significance" is overt (Page 72).

In *Talking Lawrence* (2008), and more recently in "Community, Family, "Morel:" A Dialect Approach to *Sons and Lovers*" (2013), Hilary Hillier gives pride of place to Lawrence's ability to:

> reproduce as honestly and accurately as possible the structural and sound patterns of an authentic working class dialect and present(s) them for the eyes of a predominantly middle-class and standard-speaking audience, all the while trying to retain his readers' interest and avoid alienating them. (Web)

Yet significantly, silence, what is not said, is just as important to the realism and conversational dynamics that Lawrence represents, and to his politics of gender and censorship. In *Women in Love*, the Pussum confronts Gerald at the Pompadour, a café rich with "petty vice and petty jealousy and petty art" (396). Gerald refuses to indulge her questions, and when his laconic answers fail to satisfy her, and she continues in a "tone of challenge," he meets this with stony silence (397). This is consistent with the trope of the strong, silent type of masculinity.

In "Men, Inexpressiveness and Power" (1983), linguist Jack Sattel studied American men and their use of silence to manipulate the power dynamic in a domestic situation. A proponent of the dominance approach, Sattel found silence to be a crucial feature in maintaining the position of "king of the castle" (64). Susan Stanford Friedman's trope of the silent woman in male modernism relies on an external

silencing, on the idea that silence is deference (Friedman 3).[28] But there are significant moments in Lawrence's writing where a woman's silence is also an example of resistance. As a speech trait, "silence is a good example of the interdependence of meaning and context," suggesting that whether silence as deference or silence as resistance are gendered relies on the views of the conversational participants (Weatherall 63).

As the affection between Gerald and Gudrun comes undone, Gerald's anger bursts forth. She dashes through the door at the last moment to avoid his strangling rage (480). Rather than a verbal impotence, an inability to speak, his silence crystallizes his feral urge towards violence. It is Gudrun's "cunning comprehension" of this aggressive silence that saves her from his desire to "kill her" (480). Silence is never explicitly named, as otherwise is so often in Lawrence. The consequence is that the reader must read between the lines to discover this as the signal Gudrun perceives. This absence becomes an iteration of the principle of silence as space or in this example as the gulf between, rather than the time apart from, things said. Gudrun perceives Gerald's "blinding flash," that inner state of "blind, incontinent desire" to strangle her as his silent reply to her declaration: "I couldn't love *you.*" (480). His rage is a silent chasm once Gudrun slams the door: "she had a strange, tense, exhilarated sickness in her body, as one who is in peril of falling from a great height, but who does not look down, does not admit the fear" (480).

---

[28] Friedman's perspective is consistent with Sharrock's characterization of power-based gender tropes, and with linguist Edwin Ardener's "muted group theory," from 1975, where "women's silence was taken to mean passivity and powerlessness" (Weatherall 63).

In *Sons and Lovers*, an earlier narrative, silences are presented more explicitly, named as the central force of conversation. This is a less nuanced, if still valuable technique in characterization. Miriam introduces Clara to Paul, and Clara "ignored him," "would not trouble to answer" and "did not answer" and this forces him to turn to Miriam instead (212). Silence gives voice to Clara's sense of superiority. As a New Woman, Clara is using silence as dominance in a manner that appropriates the strong silent type for herself. Later, in an ideological tête-à-tête over the state of women in British society, Clara again "refused to answer this sally of his [and] held aloof" (263).

The implications of silence for Paul and Clara also suggest that her silences are gendered. Her early, aloof, refusals are counterpointed by a much later attempt to gratify Paul sexually, just before their relationship disintegrates, where she "submitted, and was silent" (410). Clara begins with a defiant "king of the castle" dynamic, but when she later becomes submissive, silence changes into a last ditch effort to save her affection for Paul. The idea of submission belies a cognizance of the stereotypical unfemininity of dominance. In this way, her submissive silence is an assent to Paul's fetish to dominate independent women. Yet, as a self-contradictory and therefore typically Lawrencean heroine, Clara cannot please herself, or Paul, by going against her own nature. Clara leaves off silence as submission when she leaves Paul, demanding and insisting that her husband take her back. While this could be read as a return to domestic life, as a rejection of her foray away from the bonds of marriage, it infers her urge to rid herself of Paul's unhappy disaffection as well.

Lady Chatterley's silences also rely on meaning and context. She is "stunned" by Michaelis' resentment of her ability to orgasm, an "unexpected piece of brutality"

on his part (42). The narrator takes a moment to relate this to the state of contemporary love relationships: “like so many modern men, he was finished almost before he had begun. And that forced the woman to be active” (42). There is a sort of closeness to Connie’s thoughts here that, although not strictly free indirect discourse, implies a silence in their conversation to make space for this form of reflection. There is a covert pause here, and although her astonished silence is broken by a sudden urge to change Michaelis’ thinking, ultimately she assents, is silenced again by her own sense of shock, and this becomes one of the “crucial blows” in her life (43).

Connie’s silences generate a space where someone so torn between the expectations of others and her own code of ethics can reflect. Soon after her scene with Michaelis, Connie probes Tommy Dukes for insight: “Men can love women and talk to them. I don’t see how they can love them *without* talking, and being friendly and intimate. How can they?” (44). Dukes is averse to most women and he will not be persuaded “into loving, or pretending to love them,” so he puts her off as well (44). Connie defers, when he insists: “let’s leave it alone,” and is silent, although this is again an implicit silence. Repeated examples of silencing portray Connie as someone lacking confidence whose sense of self is easily damaged. The dismissals of her verbal and sexual agency leave her “so forlorn, so forlorn and stray” (45).

Connie also silently obliges with Mellors. He commands her to “lie there,” inciting a “queer obedience,” when they first make love in his game hut (94). In this silenced state her “tormented modern-woman’s brain still had no rest” (94). Silence is a space where Lawrence can envisage the battle between the sexes. Mellors’ chauvinist preference for his own gratification demands Connie’s silence, but that silence is

confused and a mark of irresolution. It is contradictory, a moment where Connie cannot decide what she wants. This recurs once more when she is struck dumb as Mellors cries out in another sex scene: "Lie down! Let me come!" (174). There is a shared assumption of male authority in these scenes consistent with her internalization of the dominance approach. The man has the last word, refuses to speak further; the lady silently defers despite her internal disquietude. The havoc-wreaking desire to dominate strong women occupies so much of Lawrence's writing. The urge to silence women led to many acrimonious quarrels with his wife Frieda, as Hilary Simpson stresses in *D.H. Lawrence and Feminism* (1982).[29]

Silence is one of many spaces of conflict and irresolution in Lawrence's dialogue. Despite the many submissive silences early in the novel, as a shift towards an increasing vigor in Connie's opinions occurs, Connie will no longer defer to her male counterparts. When Mellors laments: "when a woman gets absolutely possessed by her own will, her own will set against everything, then it's fearful, and she should be shot at last" Connie does not assent, as she once did with Dukes, and instead she boldly rejoins: "And shouldn't men be shot at last, if they get possessed by their own will?" (234). Both interlocutors require agreement to achieve a more lasting resolve, and in light of the struggles amongst other couples such as Anna and Will from *The Rainbow* or Gerald and Gudrun from *Women in Love*, one might expect Mellors, or the narrative, to petulantly debate Connie. Instead, Mellors emphatically agrees without detectable sarcasm: "Ay!—the same!" (234). The tacit sense of resolution that this

[29] Frieda recalled their repeated disagreements over Freud, whom she greatly admired and he eventually came to detest. She would not be swayed (Simpson 91). In this way, the anti-Freudian *Fantasia of the Unconsciousness* (1922) is an effort to overwrite, to voice over, Frieda's opinions with his own vehement protestations.

generates is unique amongst the other novels I discuss in this chapter, evidenced in the disharmony of Kate Leslie versus herself, Paul versus Clara, Paul against Miriam, and Gudrun against Gerald. Mellors and Connie face an uncertain future, but her increasingly ability to speak for herself suggests a less disillusioned outcome.

As Connie's confidence continues to mount, Sir Clifford attempts to remind her of her linguistic limitations: "You are very elegant in your speech, Lady Chatterley!" (160). Connie proudly counters: "I assure you, you were very elegant altogether out there in the wood. I was utterly ashamed of you. Why, my father is ten times the human being you are: you *gentleman!*" (160). The roles of lady and gentleman are being demolished as an elaborate fantasy. The gender of dominance is a trope that Lawrence visits again and again, but by the time of this late work his characters are beginning to reach beyond irresolution and angst towards conversational equanimity.

It is important to stress however, that in finding her voice, Connie does not become a paragon of feminism. She leaves Wragby to await her baby's arrival in Scotland, in an effort to avoid, rather than protest, the scandal of illegitimacy, and she replaces the dominion of her husband with Mellor's chauvinist influence. She is, however, amongst the first examples of a woman explicitly seeking her own sexual gratification in English literature. Explicitness, as a trope, becomes indicative of the openness and rejection of immorality required to elevate sexuality from the profane towards the divine.

Still, no character, or speech trait, in Lawrence's work achieves an unimpeachable victory against the limitations of sex prejudice or class position. This is why it has been so important to outline so many examples thus far. Clara's silences are

not wholly feminist, Alice's witticisms are not wholly endearing, and Mellors' sexism is assuaged but not abandoned. Instead, Lawrence's fictional dialogue continually undermines the supposition that sexism and feminism cannot be treated with equal ambivalence. This "bad artistic behavior," readily tipping back and forth between misogyny and feminism, sometimes in a single conversation or utterance like "cunt," is characteristic of the modernist aesthetic so "shaped by a host of exclusions and embattlements pertaining to gender" (Mao and Walkowitz 3,8). Lawrence's novels had lasting impacts on the struggle for women's liberation, as evidenced by Violet Hunt, on the persistence of censorship laws, as evidenced by the trials and tribulations of *The Rainbow* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, and on the need to disrupt the acute damages of the British class system on personal ambition and relationships.

Silence might seem singular in nature, the absence of sound, but what I have shown is that it is similar to the colourful representations of vernacular and dialect in Lawrence, because it too achieves diverse functions in diverse contexts. It can be indicated blatantly, or indirectly hinted, it can be eagerly or woefully submissive, or repeatedly resistant. It can be gendered masculine or feminine by the shared beliefs of conversational participants or the reader, but perhaps most importantly, it can demarcate a space for change and contradiction in the character's convictions and emotions. The absence of silence, the ability to speak where it was once denied, is also a device. Less ambivalent, it demonstrates Connie's growing sense of ease with her sexuality and inner life.

This is consistent with being freed from the "trap" that Friedman marks as the "silent space of the feminine" (3). In addition, resistant silence, what the dominance

approach deems masculine, is also a means to counter such external silencing in a narrative. The narrative form allows silences to morph and develop along a traceable trajectory. Gender is ingrained in our vocabularies and systems of expression. Friedman's "trap" is also a snare, inextricably linked to the dynamic of the hunter and the hind, of the gamekeeper and his prize. Yet, fictional dialogue troubles the notion of Connie's absolute entrapment and commodification by moving her from silent assent towards conversational agency, towards honoring her own need to confide or withhold comment above those seeking to restrain her.

Like silence and swearing, slang is also gendered, fetishized and sexualized depending on its background. In *Sons and Lovers*, Beatrice Wyld's speech style is as unambiguous as her name, and though indicative of rural dialect, her elisions and abbreviations are more consistent with the new slang than with the thick Nottinghamshire accent of her region. Beatrice playfully flirts with Paul, calling him "'Postle," a hypocorism that elicits the biblical sin of coveting thy neighbor's wife (234). It is sarcastic, suggesting that Beatrice has street smarts, and it is flirtatious, conveying a lack of fidelity to Paul's brother. Her speech is rife with inventive exclamatory expressions such as "up its sleeve," that achieve a contrast between her "vixen" persona and that of the conservative Miriam (233).

Beatrice smokes, a pastime only politely acceptable for gentlemen during the period. Yet cigarettes were quickly becoming synonymous with the New Woman as the new century dawned, precisely because of their connotation with the movers and shakers of the smoking room, and because of the rapidly growing volume of cigarette smokers amongst working men (Doan 671). She uses the abbreviation "cig," "And

fancy me having Connie's last cig," and leans into Paul's personal space, suggestively asking "Light, old boy?" (234). Her speech is laconic, gentlemanly, close to Alice Gall's use of "old fellow," because "old boy" is dandyish and dominant.[30]

Beatrice oscillates between feminine and masculine speech traits to achieve a bidialectalism of gender. She uses variations of "boy:" "sweet boy" and "my boy" because these diminutive expressions are both strangely paternal and flirtatious (234). Her "wink" and tilt, as Paul lights her cigarette, creates an image where gender roles are momentarily reversed, because it is at precisely this moment that Miriam also perceives Paul's "full, almost sensual, mouth quivering….his full red lips" (234). The quivering lip and sensual mouth attribute feminine qualities to Paul. Red lips allude to female sex organs in a way that arouses and infuriates, rather than repulses, the typically reserved Miriam. This projects an element of same sex allure unto a seemingly heterosexual attraction.

In this moment the female gaze, not the male gaze, is what transgressively eroticizes the scene. The third person allows the reader to weave into and out of the perspectives of competing characters, and there is a latent aspect of the sexual voyeur when Miriam becomes what film theory calls the "female spectator" (Villarejo 130). Characteristic of Lawrencean contradiction, Miriam's pleasure in viewing Paul's moving lips is marred by her discontent, and quickly extinguished by her conflicted desires. Beatrice's laughter therefore seems "wicked" to Miriam as well, because it shocks her out of her trance (233-4). "Wicked," like Wyld, is another word signaling

[30] Alice's "mother was [also] a Wyld," further linking the two characters through a family that Cyril characterizes as "famous either for shocking lawlessness, or for extreme uprightness" (*The White Peacock* 23).

modernism's allegiance to a notorious, glorious, badness. Miriam detests Beatrice out of jealousy for her ability to command attention and to negotiate landscapes of fetish and allure with ease. For Paul, masculine slang is a fetish, and to Miriam's surprise and chagrin, its feminizing effect on Paul is equally arousing. This destabilization of heteronormativity is covert, and Beatrice's caricatured portrait of the New Woman is integral to the more nuanced transversion of gender imagery at work in this scene. Dialogue craft deepens the sense of dissatisfaction amongst the characters to enliven those tropes in the paralinguistic details with an inhabitable acuity.

The mouth, the site where talk is produced, can be as gendered as the words themselves. The result is a connection between the body and speech that amplifies the sexuality of a character's mannerisms or manner of speaking. This is not exclusive to modernist literature, and in Wilkie Collins' *The Woman in White* (1860), Marian's masculinity is filtered through Walter Hartwright's initial distaste for her "large, firm, masculine mouth" and later, his growing admiration of her "direct manner of speech" (Collins 32, Chapman 157). The male gaze is here again, and Cyril's gaze is similar to Hartwright's in its ability to guide the reader's perception towards a rejection of female masculinity. Miriam's gaze presents an atypical perspective in Lawrence, although there is a careful interiority to the third person narration of Connie's experiences in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Beatrice Wyld's speech style both embraces and disrupts the heterosexual gender binary to intensify the atmosphere of contradiction so crucial to troubling the tropes of married, or monogamous love in the novel.

In this way, the characters' vocabularies carry a political weight, making overt or implicit arguments for sexual liberation, greater access to education, or for an end to

obscenity laws. His dialogue craft has a foot in the Victorian past, because it acutely negotiates dialect phonics in a manner reminiscent of Dickens' representations of Cockney, and both Norman Page and Hilary Hillier have lauded its representative ability (Page 71). While his stylistics never strides away from typical direct speech, as Hemingway does in his effacement of the narrator, or Woolf's does in her figural narration, Lawrence's fictional dialogue engenders conversations to achieve arguments against classism, against the legal regulation of sexuality, and in favor of his own unique, often embattled and idealized, brand of romantic spirituality.

Chapter Two

"Hello you chaps:" Female Masculinity and Gender Subversion in Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises*, *The Garden of Eden* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls*

In an early study, *Hemingway's Craft* (1973), Sheldon Grebstein observed: "Dialogue is among the few aspects of Hemingway's work which has resisted the probes of even its most antagonistic critics" (94). Over forty years after this observation still rings true. The sheer wealth of Hemingway scholarship, where "well over 100 essays, notes, theses and books [appear] annually" is staggering in comparison to Grebstein and Lamb's isolated analyses (Larson 99).[31] The absence of more sustained inquiry is even more significant when one considers how extensively Hemingway's stylistic innovations changed how writers write. In addition to Raymond Chandler, many critically acclaimed authors admit a debt of gratitude to him, including Gabriel García Márquez, Nadine Gordimer and Derek Walcott (Lamb 6).[32] A better understanding of Hemingway's dialogue aids in illuminating why his method remains so influential. Particularly in light of Lamb's observation that "although critics have frequently commented on his distinctive dialogue, the exact nature of his achievement remains rudimentarily explored," because "no one had fully analyzed how it works, addressed all of the principles that lie behind it, or located it in the evolution of fictional dialogue" (Lamb 169, 245). While Lamb does a great deal to address this deficit, he is not concerned with identifying transgressive genderlect as a technique, which is the central concern of this dissertation.

What he does, however, is make great strides in delineating Hemingway's major influences and stylistic principles. These specific innovations are:

---

[31] Robert Paul Lamb's chapter on the topic in *Art Matters* (2010) remains the exception rather than the rule, because passing comments about direct speech are more typically buried within broader studies of sexuality or gender in a Hemingway novel, short story, or his entire body of work.

[32] Like Lamb, in his recent chapter on Hemingway's style from *Hemingway in Context* (2013), Milton Cohen also summarizes Hemingway's influence on a wide array of writers, past and present (116-7).

> minimum speech with maximum meaning, the elevation of banality into art, and the blurring of distinctions between the genres of drama and fiction. To achieve these goals, he removed or subtilized the controlling presence of the author's voice and incorporated into dialogue the techniques of his nondialogue prose: indirection, juxtaposition as a means of having meaning derive from proximity, irony, omission, repetition, the objective correlative, and referential ambiguity. In doing so, he met the challenge of writing modern dialogue: representing the dynamics of real-life speech. (Lamb 177)

Accompanying repetition, juxtaposition and indirection, and what Lamb succinctly dubs "minimum speech with maximum meaning," is a constant manipulation of gendered dialogue to facilitate these other stylistic aspects. There is a heteroglossia to the very act of composition, where different techniques cooperate to achieve a conversational dynamism that captures those emotional and contextual forces that are unsaid, but heavily charged, between characters.

Pamela Smiley's 1988 study of "Hills Like White Elephants" is one of the only analyses to specifically focus on Hemingway's gendered manipulation of sociolinguistic beliefs. She employs early theories from the field, the dominance approach among them, yet it would have helped her study to also consider the aesthetic or stylistic function of the dialogue between Jig and the American. She concludes: "Hemingway's accurate ear for speech patterns duplicates the gender-linked miscommunications which exist between man and woman in the real world" (10). Realism is a vital aspect in the composition of fiction, but only one of many. Smiley's choice of the word "duplicates" also infers verisimilar denial, a conflation of fictional and lived speech traits as one and the same. The lack of studies of gendered speech in his writing is not due to a dearth of examples. Instead, because the vogue for psychoanalysis has been so consistently sustained in Hemingway studies since the late nineteen-fifties, elements of speech act theory or dialogue craft are treated as

secondary factors. Mark Spilka, Debra A. Moddelmog, and Carl Eby are just a few of the experts in the field who have defined the study of, as Nancy R. Comely and Robert Scholes title their influential book, *Hemingway's Genders* (1994).

In their research, techniques in gendering speech are mentioned, but not lauded as innovative, or treated as a vital means of engendering characters. Perhaps this is because, as an assumed feature of verisimilar conversation, the compositional features of gendered speech fly in under the proverbial radar. Readers focus on Jake Barnes' troubled emotional state and nostalgic prejudices because they demand immediate attention. Brett Ashley's idiom fades into the background because, as the narrator, Jake has the final say. In Hemingway, as in Lawrence, "Differences in power and social roles held by men and women" frequently inform how speakers, listeners, and even readers, perceive language as gendered (Weatherall 66). Unlike Jig and the American in "Hills," characters in other narratives use gendered speech to manipulate and destabilize archetypal language. Hemingway's gendered speech craft becomes most highly discernible, similarly to Judith Halberstam's notion of female masculinity, where and when it transgresses and subverts social norms to create and promote new linguistic trends.

While transgressive genderlects appear in works across his oeuvre, it is important to stress that aspects of Hemingway's style vary greatly. There is a severe contrast between the laconic, "minimum speech with maximum meaning" of *The Sun Also Rises* (1926) with the lengthy and repetitive features of Tom Jenks' edit of *The Garden of Eden* (1986) despite the presence of repeating images, words and tropes in the former. Each time Catherine Bourne repetitively voices her desire to speak, look,

and behave like a "boy," the gyre widens between herself and her lover, her former self and her new identity. In Hemingway's later works, reiteration is a dialogue-based technique akin to narrative effacement or the objective correlative. In *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940), Pilar uses a mannish tone of voice, and conversational aggression, to convey courage. Her speech frequently juxtaposes her masculinity with more effeminate men to argue for her relevancy as a guerilla in an otherwise all-male band of revolutionaries before Maria appears. Hemingway's male protagonists do use femininized speech in isolated incidents, but never in the sustained, purposeful way these women adopt verbal masculinity. The result is that Hemingway values masculinity over femininity, whether visible in a male or female character. It highlights that verbal strength is as crucial to survival as mental or physical fortitude where and when characters are divorced from the comforts of home or financial stability. Scholars use Hemingway's penchant for androgynous and mannish women to explain their repeated appearance in his fiction.[33]

In Hemingway, masculinity is an obsession, but masculinities are multiple. Strychacz posits in *Dangerous Masculinities* (2008): "cultural constructions of masculinity are fluid and unstable, and [what] grants them an aura of inevitability and naturalness is a compulsory, but never wholly convincing, repetition of social roles" (9). In an earlier book, *Hemingway's Theaters of Masculinity* (2003), Strychacz makes the complementary point that "Hemingway's fiction forces us to try out various constructions of masculinity and femininity while recognizing that we are merely

---

[33] Carl P. Eby's discussion of "phallic women" in *Hemingway's Fetishism*, Debra A. Moddelmog's *Reading Desire*, both published in 1999, and Mark Spilka's study from 1990, *Hemingway's Quarrel with Androgyny*, focus on the echoes of Hemingway's life in his fiction.

staging significations that have no eternal or absolute validity" (76). Masculinity and strength are prized, linked and typified, but never escape the disfigurement of trauma, conflict or malaise as a result of war or the failed expectations of marriage. As in Lawrence, social roles and stereotypes are acted out, represented, but ultimately interrogated. The metaphor of the stage is apt in light of performative/performance theory. In a conversation, misunderstandings arise out of the differences between speaker and listener, whose systems of understanding are informed by society, but ultimately performed by individuals.[34] If gender is a performance within a quotidian theatre of sorts, then dialogue is a crucial vehicle for staging and constructing the shifting, multiple significations and understandings that critics are drawn to analyze.

Hemingway commented on his own techniques and writing philosophy, and expressly believed that speech traits, how a character talks, was as vital an aspect in characterization as what is said. In a retrospective interview held four years before his death, he stressed that when writing fiction: "if you describe someone, it is flat, as a photograph is, and from my standpoint a failure. If you make him up from what you know, there should be all the dimensions" (Hemingway qtd. in Plimpton, *Interview* 28). Dialogue is demonstrative. It shows, not tells, the "round," or nuanced elements of a character.[35]

Hemingway based Brett Ashley's mannerisms on his socialite friend and British expatriate Duff Twysden (Meyers 191). Through her inspirational example,

---

[34] In "Meaning, Speech Acts and Communication," (1994) Kent Bach highlights that this can lead to "lexical ambiguity" (2).

[35] Forster was actually the first to articulate this as a preference for "round" over "flat" characters (Plimpton 28). Forster's technique is distinct however, in that he favors narrative description much more than Hemingway's early prose.

Hemingway could emphasize alluring, or particularly innovative, traits over other frequent or typical, yet more average, speech behaviors. In this way, his fiction is able to intensify the modernism of Duff's original idiom, to advocate for a conversational vocabulary that shuns the limits of dusty feminine propriety. This is a decision about what a woman should say, or how they should speak anathema to the idea that women should be silenced.

As Hemingway's critical acclaim grew, the cultural impact of his avant-garde characters also spread (DeFazio 59). The readerly desire to imitate Brett arose out of the need, amongst fashionable young women, to push social boundaries. Gender and sexual taboos embodied the demands of "the new woman's radical challenge to the traditional social structure…. [;] Entering the public sphere without apology, she dares to frequent places and events previously off limits to her, such as the bar and the bullfight" (Martin 50). These women readily shed Daisy Buchanan's androgynous-yet-feminine flapper look in *The Great Gatsby*, written only a year earlier, in favor of Brett's hypermasculinity to intensify their rebellious image (Martin 47). Brett's masculinity is emphasized, amplified into a fetish, by "the multiplication of discourses concerning sex" that provoke the very allure and desire of that which they seek to repress (Foucault 18). Brett subverts gender norms by exploiting the power of the taboos created by the establishment, whether political, academic, or religious, transgressing the traditional ideals of womanhood.[36]

---

[36] I am not the first to discuss Brett as a subversive character nor is Brett "the first representation of a sexually liberated, free-thinking woman in American literature" although she may be the most famous modernist example (Nagel 92-3). James Nagel positions her in a long tradition beginning with Hester Prynne in Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter* (1850).

Yet while Brett's look and identity represented novelty and rebellion for her female readers, she is not as liberated as it may seem. Like Pilar in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940) or Catherine Barkley of *A Farewell to Arms* (1929), Brett is a composite of opposites, simultaneously archetypal and individualized, she cannot escape the chaos of disaffection and optimism infecting culture in the wake of World War I. Hemingway was fascinated, and frustrated, by strong women, but Brett's disaffection is never overcome by her rebelliousness or attempts at gaiety.[37] Some scholars argue that Hemingway demonstrates a respect for the figure of the New Woman, while "others think he was ambivalent," much like Lawrence, and there remains no critical consensus (Sanderson 178). As a "new woman of the 1920s, [Brett] is a transitional figure between the protected, idealized wife and the modern, self-reliant woman" (Sanderson 178-9). Jake praises what Martin sees as her "autonomous" independent spirit, and her "idealized" sexual abandon (Martin 48).

Brett's masculinity and rebelliousness is a well-trodden topic.[38] However, the idea that her speech could be even more masculine than Jake's has been afforded little attention. Consider the juxtaposition of adjectives in the last scene from *The Sun Also Rises*. Brett says: "we could have had such a damned good time together" and Jake counters: "Isn't it pretty to think so?" (251). Ira Elliott, Stephen Clifford and Wolfgang Rudat are just a few to paint this final conversation as indicative of larger social or psychological forces. Because of Jake's genital war wound, and his dogged emotional

---

[37] For a discussion of Hemingway's reasons for depicting, and relationships with, strong women please see Meyers, Lynn, and Baker. For psychoanalytic opinions, see Eby, Spilka, and most recently Nancy Comley's retrospective on "Women" in *Hemingway in Context* (2013).

[38] In early criticism, Brett was frequently "excoriated" for her strength and mannishness, "while her trauma as an abused wife was glossed over" (Comely "Women" 416). Some consider Jake and Brett to have "reversed the traditional gender roles" in this way (412).

disaffection, the phrase "we could have had such a damned good time together," could reasonably continue, "if only you'd had a penis" (Clifford 176). Although, as Clifford admits, such phallocentric conclusions are "inherently faulty," as they eliminate or supersede more nuanced understandings of the relationship's dynamics (200). The focus on Jake's sexual impotence, and the symbolism of his mental struggles in the final scene, endures because of the wealth of unexpressed pain working beneath Jake's perspective.

Psychoanalysis is a helpful method for analyzing two lovers who are so psycho-sexually troubled. Wendy Martin links Brett and Jake's despair here to Hemingway's divorce from Hadley Richardson (60). Biographical angles have been the "mainstay of Hemingway criticism since the beginning" (Larson 100). However, what is less examined is that, beyond biography and psychoanalysis, Hemingway's stylistic technique deploys linguistic juxtaposition to generate tension. The words "pretty" and "damned" infer irresolution and expose how gender can shift dynamically. They exploit the immediacy of the utterance to situate the displacement of the lover's affections within a larger atmosphere of gender trouble. If, as Elliott highlights, it is possible that "the use of so 'feminine' a word as 'pretty' further underscores Jake's mixed gender identification," or, as Rudat claims, that "pretty" has an effeminate quality and therefore signifies the descent of their relationship into meaninglessness, then there is also the possibility that "damned" has more personal ramifications for Brett (Elliott 76; Rudat 5).

Genderlect in *The Sun Also Rises*

"Damned" is a traditionally masculine expletive that appears over and over again in her speech. It develops Brett's boldness and attention-seeking. It also adds a despair to the futility in switching their gender or sexual roles. Were the very masculine Brett the virile male in their relationship, the success of their union would still be stymied, "damned," by her wandering eye and inconstancy, a traditionally male perogative. The word also signifies an internalization of "those extralinguistic beliefs and attitudes" that interlocutors rely on for information (McConnell-Ginet 1). Masculine speech rejects any interpretation of Brett as "fragmented, weak, and incomplete in her desire for what she cannot have—normative heterosexual sex with Jake Barnes" (Clifford 179).

In the apparent reversal of feminine and masculine adjectives here, consider that, if narrative effacement were used in this particular instance, each would be as likely as the other to utter either adjective based on what the narrative intimates about them throughout. Namely, each has a troubled relationship with masculinity in their sexual lives. Jake's use of "pretty" could be ironic, benign, *or* feminizing, but not as socially taboo as Brett's use of "damned" or "damn." Sadly, Brett's rejection of feminine propriety is also a trap. Her urge for autonomy in a patriarchal system forces her, out of financial necessity, to rely on Mike Campbell, Robert Cohn and Lord Ashley, the very men she would most wish to be free of (Martin 48). She travels widely, but this also leaves her economically tied to men she would otherwise reject. Brett's *de rigueur* speech is modernist because it facilitates her quest for personal liberation and implicitly invites Hemingway's audience to do the same (Wagner-

Martin 5). Yet it cannot save her from property divorce law, from Lord Ashley or her reliance on Mike Campbell, despite the personal and emotional ramparts that her masculinity tries to build.

Brett is not only a female chap, a woman desperately trying to live a life of economic freedom, she also transforms the women around her into chaps. Hemingway paints Brett as a far more desirable figure than Lawrence's Alice Gall or Dickens' Sally Brass, and she invites parallels with Beatrice Wyld of *Sons and Lovers*, although Brett is made far more cynical and serious because of her dire financial circumstances. Jake introduces Brett at the lively *bal musette*, a "dancing-club" in the "Pantheon," or Latin quarter of Paris, in terms that are as significant as they are deceptively simple: "she looked very lovely" (27-28). Jake's male gaze is adoring, laid bare in its simplicity, but this emotion is far deeper than the plain adjective implies. The reader is forced to speculate about the history between them and the nature of Jake's approving stare.

When Brett gives herself the moniker "chap" she owns it proudly, appropriating the label (29). It is not thrust upon her, as Sally's brother uses it, in Dickens' *The Old Curiousity Shop* (290). Over a page before Brett's iconic appearance is described in greater detail, we hear her speak for the first time:

> "Hello, you chaps."
> "Hello, Brett," I said. "Why aren't you tight?"
> "Never going to get tight any more. I say, give a chap a brandy and soda." (29)

The use of the word is consistent with her upper class British idiom, and therefore characteristic, but she uses it in a non-traditional manner, to transform her gender. Instead of signaling an aberrance that other characters find endearing, but ultimately

curious, as with Sally Brass, the noun promotes Brett's verbal agency, and extends her authority onto her peers. Mrs. Braddocks has just been talking to Jake when Brett sashays up to the bar. It is never indicated whether or not Mrs. Braddocks remains or has moved off. So, Braddocks, standing with Robert Cohn and Jake and Brett, is one of the "chaps" Brett says hello to. She could be using it to refer to the group in an androgynous fashion, however Brett's next use of "chap" invests the word with its masculine etymology.

When she demands of the bartender within earshot of everyone present: "I say, give a chap a brandy and soda," she can, as a chap, demand liquor at the bar rail in a way that is daringly novel, rather than socially inappropriate (29). Mark Spilka first commented in 1958 that "with a men's felt hat on her boyish bob, and with her familiar reference to men as fellow 'chaps,' she completes the distortion of sexual roles which seems to characterize the period" (36). This is less a distortion and more a torsion, a twist that couches the idea of transformation as innovation in a more accepting light, disconnecting it from any notion of inauthenticity or play-acting.

According to the *Oxford English Dictionary* online, "chap" informally refers to a man or a boy, and was used to connote a buyer or customer, known as a "chapman," into the late sixteenth century. The abbreviation "chap," with the male suffix removed, began in the eighteenth century. This newer form of the word partially disconnects it from the lexicon of the British market economy. At one time fashionable, and during the early twentieth century a part of affected upper class British slang, as in the expression "old chap," Oxford currently considers this usage dated.

As Spilka pointed out, Brett uses "chap" to create a fellowship with men and this incites a homoerotic desire amongst her fellows. Jake's male gaze ensures a focus on her female, curvy body: "Brett was damned good-looking. She wore a slipover jersey sweater and tweed skirt, and her hair was brushed back like a boy's. She started all that. She was built with curves like the hull of a racing yacht" (30).[39] However, this focus does not obscure Brett's impulse to re-gender those around her. This is because her dandy-like speech has already been presented at the bar rail, much before her looks are described. In addition, "chap" infers an intentional exploitation of a homoeroticism permitted by her physical sex in an otherwise homophobic context. Jake is scathingly critical of the effeminate gay men with whom Brett associates (28). In this scene, her femaleness eases his anxiety, comforts, and in his mind authorizes, his desire for a masculine subject (28).

"Chap" achieves different goals, and like dialect, it can endear or deride depending upon the meanings brought to the conversation. Campbell repeats it, later in the narrative, to call Brett's paramour "the bull-fighter chap" (195, 227). He is manipulating the word to devalue Pedro Romero, as he refuses to take him seriously. Frequently drunk to the point of insensibility, each time he calls Romero by this moniker, Campbell has supposedly forgotten the name of his rival, but the reader knows better. He is using "chap" ironically, to devalue, denigrate and dismiss Romero as a boy. The bullfighter is, after all, a fellow competitor in the war for Brett's affections. Campbell acknowledges Romero as a chap, but Brett is his chap as well. Moddelmog identifies this as a "homosexual" arousal, but the idea of masculine

[39] Rena Sanderson details the chronology of the focus on this scene, and on Brett's body, in "Hemingway and Gender History" (177).

vocabulary as a fetish shifts the idea of attraction into the arena of eroticism (33). There is a sustained eroticization of the chap, of young masculinity, in the narrative that goes beyond the attraction to Brett. Energy, rebellion and invincibility are glorified in Romero and Brett through Jake's desire and excitement for those who resist the imposition of others, or in the bullfighter's case, of mortality.

Brett's prolific use of such affected exclamations including "what rot," "old man," "bung-o" and "I say" paint a hypermasculine portrait, a genderlect with a firm allegiance to her British nationality. One sociolinguistic explanation for Brett's masculine speech, beyond the bounds of Hemingway's craft, is that slang is contagious in a social group. Brett catches idiom like a cold while spending so much time in the company of men. The Englishman Harris indirectly attests to this when, during Jake and Bill's fishing trip, Bill infects Harris' RP dialect with a bit of American slang:

> "It has the look of a pub," Bill said.
> "It looks to me like a pub," I said.
> "I say," said Harris, "let's utilize it." He had taken up utilizing from Bill. (133)

RP, or Received Pronunciation, is a standard form of accented dialect, with its origins in the south of England. It is enunciated and aristocratic, with subtle subaccents and registers, and is easily distinguished from more overtly colourful regional dialects (*The British Library* "Received Pronunciation"). Like Hall's Stephen Gordon, or Woolf's Orlando, wealthy Brits in *The Sun Also Rises* likely speak in forms of RP. This is because Hemingway never uses phoneticisms to convey more regionalized speech sounds and traits. Even a reader familiar with the many variations of British accent would struggle to discern the regional origin of Hemingway's characters.

This has an unexpected function for characterization. In narratives where the protagonist is either a first person, or close to the third person, narrator, his inability to detect the variations in speech, to present them for the reader, demonstrates a lack of minute observational skill. For Jake, expats are expats, they are all uncomplicated and all alike:

> The English spoken language—the upper classes, anyway—must have fewer words than the Eskimo. Of course I didn't know anything about the Eskimo, Maybe the Eskimo was a fine language…The English talked with inflected phrases. One phrase to mean everything. I liked them, though. I liked the way they talked. (153)

RP is a means to continually infer that Jake only rubs elbows with the elites, down on their luck or otherwise. Yet, while there is no evidence that Jake associates with lower class Cockney or Geordie speakers, for example, he is also idolizing the British such that any phonetic representation of their speech might appear mocking or derisive, or indicate he knows them on a more profound level. Harris' Briticism, Britishness, is captured linguistically when he combines "I say" with "utilize" in an unusual context, portray an upper class slang similar to Brett's.

The combination of aristocratic manner with sexual promiscuity and heavy, unabashed drinking, creates hybrid figures, caught between old and new conventions of behavior. In "Hemingway and Gender History," Rena Sanderson calls Brett a "hybrid" between two stereotypical figures, the wife and the prostitute, because Brett also accepts money from the men she sleeps with (179). But as a female chap with an elite air, Brett is a less encumbered sexual consumer, more able to freely negotiate the sexual economy. She is able to seduce sexual partners without the social penalty that a more feminine role, or more direct association with lower class prostitutes, would

afford. Jake mocks Georgette Hobin, a "poule" or French prostitute (26). Brett's aristocratic air, in concert with her good looks, are what save her from the same indictment.

Promiscuity might be tolerated rather than persecuted *if* she is treated like an equal to young men like Jake, for whom sexual conquest is socially accepted and not perverse or taboo. Although not immune to the general reprobation of loose or wanton women, her cultivation of a masculine, classist identity assures that she precludes sustained reprehension by her contemporaries. Interestingly, although Jake notices her "hair brushed back like a boy's," he never detects masculinity in her speech (30). Instead, Jake attributes her dandyisms to her English breeding: "What rot, I could hear Brett say it. What rot! When you were with English you got into the habit of using English expressions in your thinking" (153). Overtly admitting masculinity in her speech would involve acknowledging an attraction to it. There is a sense that Brett is aware of Jake's apprehension in this regard, and so she manipulates upper class mores to exploit both the female and masculine poles of her gender identity.

The world "darling" has a gendered history that Brett exploits much like "chap." Not long after the *bal musette*, Jake and Brett are alone in his apartment. She addresses him: "I say, can a chap sit down? Don't be cross darling" (40). Jake presents Brett's dialogue in a way that allows him to be the "darling" of a "chap" without feeling abnormal or perverse, as he regards her homosexual friends at the bal, precisely because she is female. While sexual categories can be essentializing, Brett does not get past dynamics of heterosexuality or homosexuality because of this sense of hybridity, of a figure balancing opposite genders and erotic subjectivities. Jake's laconic speech

is less laden with familiarizing slang in this scene. Its absence is a technique to create distance between the two characters. It shows that Brett places more importance on fashionability than he does. Brett is concerned here with how Jake perceives her, while Jake is more concerned with her flings with different men. His comments are limited to short queries including: "Is he a count?" "Where did you go with him?" and "Why not?" (40-41).

Jake's silence is detectable, but not named in the narration. It is evidenced by his reticence to open up to Brett. Unlike Paul and Clara in Lawrence's *Sons and Lovers*, the silence after this conversation is not explicitly contextualized, and paralinguistic information is left to a minimum. What the reader gets are short, pithy reflections, with a masculine tone or vocabulary, which have a feminine emotionality to them: "I felt like hell again. It is awfully easy to be hard-boiled about everything in the daytime, but at night it is another thing" (42). His tone is masculine, he feels "like hell." At night he cannot be "hard-boiled," suggesting a lack of stereotypical masculine fortitude. As Brett decides to leave, they kiss, and she repeats the word 'darling' twice. The effect of this repetition is a maintained sense of affection. Jake is attracted to Brett's masculinity and this attraction coupled with his inability to act upon it, make him feel like crying. Ira Elliot argues that, in this way, "his relationship with women resembles that of the homosexual" (Elliott 70).

In Edith Wharton's *The Age of Innocence*, published in 1920 but set at the turn of the previous century, Newland Archer uses more feminine nouns like "darling," "dear" and "dearest" to refer to his sister Janey and love interest Olenska (153, 159). This ability is an affect of class authority more so than gender alone, as I illustrated

with *Orlando* in my introductory chapter (Lakoff 13).[40] Yet Newland Archer highlights the level of innovation in Brett's speech, because, although Archer would never refer to a man as a "darling" because of its amorous connotations, Brett does refer to other women and herself as chaps. Words are gendered because speakers develop conventions governing their use. Archer stays within bounds whereas Brett does not. It is precisely because Brett is upper class, like Archer, and titled, like Lady Chatterley, that "darling" does not feminize her as much as it might initially suggest. It can be a signal of femininity, evidenced in exchanges where narrative effacement is keen, but it is complex, and supports her hypermasculinity as well, allowing her to alleviate Jake's anxiety through an endearment so colored by the listener's interpretation.

By repeatedly using swear words and oaths in her expressions, including "damned interesting" "hell's own," and "don't be an ass," Brett, like Lawrence's Lady Chatterley, both *exploits* and destabilizes assumptions about women's "instinctive shrinking" from profanity (*The Sun Also Rises* 40-1) (Jespersen 246). This is not to make an anti-censorship argument however, particularly since stronger, unprintable expletives such as "cunt" or "fuck" are absent. In addition, whereas Connie Chatterley uses masculine expletives there is no evidence she is trying to portray herself as a "chap," to transform her gender identity, like Brett. Expletives are fetishizable, they can eroticize female masculinity, but the political dimensions of genderlect take on a

[40] It should be noted that later experiments, done in the 1970s through the 1990s, often revealed, in a controlled setting, that the different power roles traditionally held by men and women were far more influential in affecting how they spoke than the actual gender identity of the speaker (Weatherall 66). I expand on this idea in fiction by using Adela Quested's testimony at trial in *A Passage to India* (1924) in the Forster chapter. Upper class men use a wide vocabulary because their social status, not their gender, although the two are linked, permits them a greater degree of linguistic freedom.

transgendered element in *The Sun Also Rises* that is absent from Lawrence's tale of illicit love.

Not all transgressively gendered idiom in liberating in the modernist aesthetic, as Johnathan Brockett's effeminacy proves in Hall's *The Well of Loneliness*. Similarly, *The Sun Also Rises* also emphasizes effeminate speech to argue against male homosexuality, providing a point of intersection between the two works. Effeminate speech shows Jake's homophobic anxiety over Brett's friends:

> One of them saw Georgette and said: "I do declare. There is an actual harlot. I'm going to dance with her, Lett. You watch me."
> The tall dark one, called Lett, said: "Don't you be rash."
> The wavy blond one answered: Don't you worry, dear." And with them was Brett. (28)

Brett is "with them" because they are all transgressive subjects. However, Brett's masculinity saves her from reproach. One man calls another "dear," and they use an emphatic tone, peppered with qualifiers such as "I do declare" and "actual" to loosely suggest the dialect of the American South. The reader is meant to disapprove, to accord with Jake's condemnation of their affected airs. Elliott analyzes the linguistic nuances of these men's speech in *The Sun Also Rises* to conclude that the feminine "mannered speech" is "archaic," falsely "aristocratic," and that "both the prostitute and the homosexual are presented as poor copies of an original (authentic) female" (68). They act as a foil for Brett's female masculinity, and this figure of the authentic female never makes an appearance in the narrative, suggesting that its characters reference gender mores to interrogate their validity.

The anxiety surrounding male femininity in many modernist texts goes beyond biography, beyond the preferences of the author, and finds an origin in legal discourses

of the day. Homosexuality was illegal, but lesbianism was only beginning to receive equal legal sanction, to be recognized as form of sexuality "independent of male sexuality" (Edwards, J. 61). Novels including *The Rainbow* and *The Well of Loneliness* were just starting to introduce overt lesbian themes, what Havelock Ellis then called "inversion" (Halberstam 81).[41] Caricatures of gay men by Hall or Hemingway arise, in part, out of the justice system. However, it is of note that excusing these portrayals as indicative of the attitudes of the day oversimplifies the origins of this anxiety.

This is particularly true in narratives that otherwise advocate an anti-establishment politics or other transgressive sexuality. In Forster's *Maurice* (1971), the novel's portrayal of homosexuality also shuns male femininity. Homoerotic allure is contingent on Alec Scudder and Maurice Hall's masculinity in that novel, as I exemplify through dialogue analysis in my next chapter. The derision of femininity in the male context presents another crisis of femininity in the modernist aesthetic beyond the silencing that Friedman ascribes to male modernism (3). Transgression is seemingly encouraged, promoted, but in fictional dialogue this ultimately relies on a series of socially bound, prejudiced constraints. Idiom can indict, or liberate, different transgressive sexualities depending on its constitutive politics of arousal. It is an embodiment not just of the personality of a character but of a careful negotiation of biases and arguments. In *Nightwood*, Barnes' Dr. O'Connor dresses in women's clothes, but his speech is never as inflected with stereotypical femininity as the men at Hemingway's *bal musette*. The belief that men's speech was laudable, the androcentric

---

[41] In Lawrence's novella *The Fox* (1922) Banford and March are masculine women derided for their masculine lesbianism, an affect of this growing social prejudice. The obscenity trial for *The Rainbow* was highly publicized in 1915, adding an aura of perversity to lesbianism through character Winifred Inger (Edwards 60).

rule, is promoted in modernist texts even where gender or sexuality is otherwise highly troubled.

This preference for masculine speech, as the defensive centre of spoken language, is bolstered in a scene where Jake and Brett have a private discussion after drinking at the Spanish Festival. Brett uses masculinity as a defense mechanism to counter, or to avoid thinking of, potential trauma. Brett swoops in with her characteristic flare: "'Hello you chaps!' she said. 'I say, I have a thirst!'" (210). Mike berates Brett, and drunkenly matches her combative vocabulary:

> Brett stood up.
> "I am not going to listen to that kind of rot from you, Michael."
> "How's your boy friend?"
> "Damned well," Brett said. "Watch him this afternoon."
> "Brett's got a bull-fighter," Mike said. "A beautiful, bloody bull-fighter."
> "Would you mind walking over with me? I want to talk to you, Jake." (210-11)

"Damned" is insistent, while laconicity displays courage in the face of aggression, refusing to say more in open reprehension for Mike, despite the physical threat he poses. By shifting her attention to Jake, she puts Mike off.

Brett and Jake wish to walk in the park, but with all the festival-goers Brett shies away from the crowd to avoid being "stared at," presumably for her fashionably androgynous appearance (211). An equally restrained conversation follows:

> "I hope the wind goes down," Brett said. "It's very bad for him."
> "So do I."
> "He says the bulls are all right."
> "They're good."
> "Is that San Fermin's?"
> Brett looked at the yellow wall of the chapel.
> "Yes. Where the show started on Sunday."
> "Let's go in. Do you mind? I'd rather like to pray a little for him or something." (212)

Aside from the casual, almost incidental use of the Briticism "rather," Brett's idiolect is without affected slang, gender neutral and calm, suddenly free of bravado. Genderlect is absent, even though there is very little narrative guidance to attribute their speech. Jake and Brett discuss Romero, and Brett seems to momentarily assume a traditional womanly role, when she thinks to pray for her bullfighter, no matter how casual her inclusion of "or something" might appear. The need to appear cavalier is also an affect of her unease.

However, almost as soon as they enter the church, a change occurs in Brett:

> After a little I felt Brett stiffen beside me, and saw she was looking straight ahead.
> "Come on," she whispered throatily. "Let's get out of here. Makes me damned nervous…. I'm damned bad for a religious atmosphere," Brett said. "I've the wrong type of face." (212)

The narrative voice springs back, and paralinguistic detail suddenly insists her transgressive masculinity as a defense. In that holy setting the impropriety of such blatant swearing enjoys a heightened sense of taboo. She is afraid, because the church represents a suppressive force, despite the diminishment of the "intervention of the church in conjugal sexuality….over the previous two hundred years," and this belief is ingrained (Foucault 41). Brett perceives an atmosphere of rebuke that makes her "nervous." "Damned" is now repeated to convey unease; she has drawn her weapon.

Hemingway read T.S. Eliot's essay on the objective correlative "Hamlet and His Problems" (1920), and this "method of depicting the external phenomena that evoke the otherwise omitted emotion is the single most central element of his fictional technique" (Lamb 70-71). Brett's nervousness is embodied in her impression that she has the "wrong type of face" for church (212). Her face, physically wrong as an image,

evokes emotional suggestions, not just of the nervousness she mentions, but also of fear, dis-ease and restlessness in her fundamental roles as woman and human being. The image also suggests self-consciousness. Brett presents a notable exception to the rule that, in Hemingway, the objective correlative most frequently appears in narration, not dialogue (Lamb 72). The objective correlative is frequently considered the "tip" in Hemingway's Iceberg Theory, where a surface image hints at what emotions lie beneath (Beegel *Hemingway's Craft of Omission* 91). The image conveys her restless unease, much like the contrast between "sunlight" outside the church and its "dark" interior (Hemingway 212). They echo her shifting mood in each space.

This is similar to an earlier scene where Jake pours Brett's "glass half-full of Brandy and soda" down the sink, leaving his empty, pessimistic glass alone on the table (42). The objective correlative is closely tied to despair and anxiety in the novel, and after Pedro and Brett leave a Spanish bar, presumably for their first sexual encounter, Jake observes "our three empty glasses were on the table" (191). The empty glasses embody bereavement and loss, but also a unison, an emotional cuckolding within this implicit ménage à trois. Similarly, Brett's "wrong" face is a physical substitute for her unhappiness. T.S. Eliot and Ezra Pound admired Hemingway's ability to weave objective correlatives into his prose, as an affect of "terseness" and "attention to the world of objects" (Trotter "The Modernist Novel" 88). Jake can tell the reader how Brett feels, how he feels, but dialogue pushes the unhopeful image beyond Jake's interiority and unto the psyche of the narrative.

Voicing the New Woman

Brett's "throaty whisper" is also a constitutive element of Hemingway's aesthetic masculinity. In *Hemingway's Fetishism* (1999), Carl Eby provides a wealth of evidence from Hemingway's oeuvre to suggest that a "thick" or "throaty" voice, when attributed to a male protagonist, functions as a substitute image for the aroused penis (41).[42] After her men's haircut in *The Garden of Eden*, Catherine's voice becomes "throaty" too (42). Eby uses this to argue that Hemingway's most involved female characters are all actually "phallic women," in line with Hemingway's homoerotic fascination and sexual attraction to female masculinity (43). Any vocalization of a "deep voice," Pilar's for example, is a further incarnation of Hemingway's fetish for phallic women (Eby 44, *For Whom the Bell Tolls* 34).

Eby's argument values the protagonist and/or Hemingway's desires over those of the woman who speaks in the text. Hemingway's prose can be viewed as an objectification, but it is perhaps more interesting to discern how female characters might be manipulating the men around them as well. While Brett's "throaty whisper" is reactionary, presented as a defense or aspect of worry, there is also the idea that Pilar deepens her voice to use its authority to her advantage. Real women also deepened their voices: the Baroness Elsa von Freytag Loringhoven spoke in a "masculine throaty voice" (Gammel 196).

There is, again, a politics of arousal to the way that modernist subjects speak. A deep voice is masculine because it represents the physical changes brought on by testosterone. As a stereotypical signpost of male sexual virility, it is freer, powerful, a

[42] Eby goes on to reference characters from other narratives including Margot Macomber and Catherine Barkley, because, Eby claims, they use weapons, a gun or a stick, as phallic stand-ins (43). Short hair, a deep voice, a gun; these are not just masculine tropes, but phallic symbols, in Eby's Freudian estimation.

manifestation of the androcentric rule that Pilar internalizes and then rips free of the male body. In juxtaposition, the high, girlish voices of castrati, men denied their sexual maturity, "were heard in more than a few church choirs through the end of the nineteenth century" (Fausto-Sterling 148-9). For women, a deep or "throaty" voice signifies a rejection of extralinguistic beliefs about feminine deference. This is one of the few aspects of my study to reference a biological, rather than a sociological or cultural element of sexuality, in that testosterone provides the baritone timbre. The affiliation of a deep voice with authority is social, but its sexual role, signaling a suitably virile mate, has a biological connotation.

A deep voice shields Pilar and Brett from the harmful internalization of external threats: Mike and the church in Brett's case, enemy conquest in Pilar's. Like Brett, whose androgynous name conveys her personality and role, Pilar's name references her pillar-like strength and the supernatural authority of her catholic "namesake," Our Lady of the Pillar, "whose shrine, at Zaragosa in Spain, consists of an image of the Blessed Virgin on a pillar of porphyry" (Eby 44). Pilar's "booming" voice indicates her past self, as she reflexively recounts a past experience, which she counters by "imitating the weak voice of the wounded bull-fighter" Finito, whom the narrative calls "almost effeminate" (*For Whom the Bell Tolls* 59-60). She mocks his manliness, and the endurance of the bullfighter as a pillar of strength in contrast with her own fortitude: "How many times have I heard matadors talk like that before they took a goring….always do they talk that way in their arrogance before a goring" (59). To Pilar, men are foolish, more feminine than herself, and she imitates Finito by laughing at his figurative sodomy, quoting him in a high pitch: "from the back he throws me this

horn between the cheeks of my buttocks and it comes out of my liver" (60). Finito's name also contributes to his character development. In Spanish, it literally translates to "finished," and American audiences would have known it through its use in American vernacular to indicate "all done" or "its over." Pilar's masculine voice posits her as a symbol of strength contrasted against male examples of impotence.

Eby analyses this example as another indication of Pilar's role as a phallic woman, "assuming phallic attributes at the expense of her male partners" (46). Yet, she is manipulating the social discourses of power to circumvent traditional associations of weakness with her sex, to command respect and attention from listeners aware of those similar linguistic beliefs. Character traits are glossed over when Pilar is treated solely as a manifestation of the author's impulses, and it is therefore important to keep the heteroglossia of influences, from outside and inside the text, to mind.

Without masculine qualities to boost her credibility amongst the men, she would be taken less seriously by her fellow guerillas. This is consistent with Stacey Guill's recent reconsideration of Pilar and Maria as "Hemingway's feminist homage to the 'New Woman of Spain'" (Guill 8). As a female commander in the revolutionary war effort, Pilar is similar to Delores Ibárurri, aka La Passionaria (Guill 8). In his narration of the propaganda film *The Spanish Earth* Hemingway calls La Passionaria "the most famous woman in Spain" (9). He "attributes 'all the character of the new Spanish woman,' to La Passionaria's 'voice'" (9). This is significant for Pilar's ability to manipulate her tone. It suggests that Pilar's masculinity is feminist because her bravado achieves and maintains her "newfound autonomy" as the "New Woman of Spain" (17).

While Pilar's feminism is overt in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Maria's is much more contentious. As Robert Jordan's "little rabbit," following the communist band after being brutally raped and traumatized, young Maria is completely enamored with Jordan and subservient to his sexual desires. There was a marked feminist backlash against this character in the early nineteen-eighties and nineties because she was seen as "one of the backward women," representing "the classic stereotype who continues to impede the cause of women's liberation. You're the nubilized princess, the fantasized dream maiden whose infantilized dependency and submissive eroticism caters to all that feminists find most reprehensible in the male gaze" (Brenner 131).

Maria admires Jordan in the novel and loves him so fully she wishes to become him: "I am thee and thou art me and all of one is the other. And I love thee, oh, I love thee so. Are we not truly one? Canst thou not feel it" (284). If Maria is a submissive and deferent figure, she is also young and naïve. Through insistence and strong will "Maria becomes progressively more assertive as the story unfolds" (Guill 13). Her "girlish weakness" is a foil that enunciates Pilar's "womanly strength" (Comely and Scholes 49). Much of the discussion concerning androgyny in Hemingway's writing focuses on the ability of his women characters to don aspects from both genders, and to twin themselves with male protagonists, to become "truly one" as Robert and Maria attempt (*For Whom the Bell Tolls* 284). Pilar is more often seen as "a resistance fighter and one of Hemingway's strongest female characters" (Comely "Women" 414). Like Pilar and Brett, Maria is both a caricature, and a complex character whose own motivations are relevant. Hemingway's complex emotional portraits counterpoint his oversimplification and stereotyping of the New Woman. Maria's passivity and

weakness entice Robert Jordan, but they also belie her traumatic past. The narrative allows her to hint at a hopeful future, where she lives to fight another day and will not be defined by her hardships.

It is a popular myth that Hemingway's style adhered to its most iconic narrative devices all throughout his career (Cohen 113). Although "Hemingway's style has often been stereotyped and lampooned as merely a sequence of simple sentences," his narrative prose actually contains a great many "compound, complex, and fragmented sentences [even] in his early prose to achieve particular effects" (111). As his style developed into the 1930s and beyond, it was not strange to find, as in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, compound and complex sentences that leave off the simple, terse prose and become more "loose," with "heavily modified" adjectives, adverbs, participles and dependent clauses (114).

The implications for Hemingway's dialogue craft are that, in later narratives, the character's utterances remain terse but become far more repetitive. Characters say the bare minimum, with the greatest economy, in *The Sun Also Rises*. Repetition is deployed sparingly to heighten a mood or establish emotion. However, in later works such as *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, and even in Jenk's economical edit of *The Garden of Eden* manuscript, characters have more to say, and are more frequently given the opportunity to contradict themselves. Repetition enhances contradiction to embody discontent and confusion.

Reiteration in *The Garden of Eden*

The Garden of Eden was published posthumously precisely because Hemingway found it so plaguingly difficult to edit, and by his death in 1961 the

manuscript had ballooned to well over 200,000 words (del Gizzo and Svoboda vii). Although "of the 200,000 word manuscript, 130,000 words have been cut away," to create the posthumous edition, the characters are still verbose (vii). David and Catherine Bourne converse more and with a broader vocabulary than Jake Barnes and Brett Ashley (Peters 43). Each couple lives in a similar expatriate milieu with a similar idiom, yet Catherine's speech carries little of the manly slang that Brett's affects. This is because while Brett is a fixed type, a caricature with definite dimensions, Catherine's identity is more difficult to pin down. A striking idiolect would indicate a consistent personality, whereas bare and simple unidiomatic word use, in repetition, allows her speech style to instead take a backseat to the content and implication of what she says. The reader again encounters an American man and British woman, each tied to their masculine identity, but the suppression of distinguishing elements in their idiom serves to emphasize not just their androgyny but also their ability to shift genders from female to male, male to female, and back again.

Before I discuss the decentralizing, transgendering, dialogue in the novel, it must be stressed that, as a posthumous edit and not Hemingway's authoritative version, Tom Jenks's edition features a heavy editorial hand (Moddelmog *Reading Desire* 59). This makes it difficult to discuss Hemingway's aesthetic choices and makes them incredibly difficult to establish.[43] Jenks capitulates in a 2011 essay "*The Garden of Eden* at Twenty-Five," "if the edited version of *The Garden of Eden* represents an interpretation of the novel, it's an interpretation made without social, psychological, political, or any other theory involved but based simply on Hemingway's lyric

[43] E.L. Doctorow, K.J. Peters, Comely and Scholes and Moddelmog all foreground their approaches to Jenks' edit of the original manuscripts with a similar caution.

expressiveness" (Jenks 4). He downplays the influence that his opinions exert on the published version, but any editor brings a further dimension of heteroglossia to the text. Bakhtin ensures fiction can never be divorced from the conditions under which it is produced. It is not only a matter of what Hemingway's characters leave unsaid, but also of what the editor has left unexpressed. If the Kennedy Library were to publish Hemingway's original manuscripts they would be met with eager eyes.

Some scholars have had the privilege to study the drafts in detail. Moddelmog insists, after having read the manuscripts, that Jenks downplays aberrant sexuality in the manuscript to preserve Hemingway's heteronormative "public image" (61). Were some of the most significant edits openly contextualized and proclaimed by Scribner's, issues of editorial motivation would undoubtedly intensify. Patrick and Seàn Hemingway present their "restored edition" of *A Moveable Feast* (2009) as truer to Hemingway's original, but make clear choices about the order of its vignettes and the presentation of manuscript photographs. Their controlling influence is admitted without prevarication, but this only further skews the inhabitability of Hemingway's recollections for the reader.

What the *Garden of Eden* manuscripts reveal is that Jenks omitted a great deal of speech, including conversations from an entire eliminated storyline involving husband and wife Barbara and Nick Sheldon, and paramour Andy Murray (Moddelmog 74-76). Their situation mirrors the ménage à trois posed by its central characters David, Catherine and their lover Marita. Persistent mirroring like this suggests, as Maria Penas Ibanez asserts, that *The Garden of Eden* is actually an early postmodernist text where "Catherine stands for long fiction and Marita for short

fiction" (Penas Ibanez 138). Repetition ensures that Catherine's circuitous and disjointed failures hint towards a more apocalyptic future, that she cannot find comfort or brevity, whereas Marita is at ease when saying little. Penas Ibanez's interpretation also distances this juxtaposition from the idea of feminine silence, suggesting that Marita's restricted vocabulary is an affect of her solid self-confidence, and not her gender. Despite aspects of the postmodern, in the novel imperiled Christianity and the apocalyptic end of days are firmly modernist tropes. Catherine's dialogue is a collision of themes and identities, and it invites connections with Lacan's mirror stage as well as imagist ideas from William Butler Yeats' poem "The Second Coming."

Catherine's psychological state features prominently in the negotiation of mirroring and imagery that occurs in the text. Psychoanalytic approaches have attempted to understand, categorize and justify Catherine's erratic and confusing behaviour. In Hemingway studies, "readings of her character are as varied as the versions on which they rely" (Long 41). It is entirely logical that a fiction defined by its multiplicity should be the subject of variant interpretations. For Samantha Long in her 2013 article, "Catherine as Transgender," both Catherine's identity and the book itself are fractured, and multiple, in their versions and viewpoints (41). Strychacz also identifies mixed and unstable gender performances across Hemingway's oeuvre (*Dangerous Masculinities* 9,76). Long proposes that Catherine is a transgender individual, using today's clinical understanding of this gender identity, to undermine the disparaging notion that Catherine is insane. Damaging, insane Catherine is one of the "multiple Catherines" or versions of the character created by critics (Long 43).

Taking Comely and Scholes' notion that Catherine is both "mad and sane" into account, Long interjects: "she is certainly a troubled character but as of yet no critical position fully accounts for how and why" (44). In Jenks' edit, I argue that Catherine's speech style, her choice of words, is a prop, a red flag that foreshadows her unraveling with a disruptive immediacy that narrative description cannot provide. She is hyper-aware of her own unraveling: "wouldn't it be wonderful if I wasn't crazy," and her snippets of missing time: "I can't remember about lunch," indicate a growing sense of mental inquietude (137, 189). Catherine's problems are not limited to a gender dysmorphia. She is self-destructive, and she also takes pleasure in harming others. This culminates in the disturbingly cavalier, yet resolved, way she burns her husband's work in a gasoline-soaked bonfire (216). While this could be an act of resentment, Catherine's lack of ability to determine her own physical sex results in a need to control that manifests itself in her sex-talk.

Catherine controls the sexual conversations with her husband using every means at her disposal, whether for her amusement or to pleasure David.[44] Repetition allows her to conjure new identities through a continuing dynamic of destruction and renewal. Repetition is not a fetish here, the way that "Chap" is a fetish identity for Jake, but it is a means to eroticize Catherine's masculinity. Whereas in *For Whom the Bell Tolls,* Maria insists that she and Jordan become the same entity "I am thee and thou art me and all of one is the other…I would have us exactly the same" in Catherine's example, she would not wish to become one with her husband (284). Instead, Catherine wants to flip their genders. Her comment: "now you can't tell who is

[44] For notable examples of free-indirect discourse that ally the reader to David's perspective please see his thoughts on writing and the battle of wills he faces with Catherine (108, 194).

who can you?" is more about pushing femininity away and gaining masculinity than about making them the same (17). The effect is that the reader can detect, in Catherine's question, its destabilizing effect. Two do not become one, rather her question shows that Catherine wants to transgender them both.

The notion of Catherine as a destroyer, as a mentally unstable and ruinous personality, has been interrogated by Comely and Scholes in *Hemingway's Genders*, and by Amy Lovell Strong's feminist defense of Catherine: "Go to Sleep Devil." Long's notion that neither David nor Catherine are mentally ill, due to Catherine's confusion as a transgendered individual, is helpful in transforming critical viewpoints (44). Yet it perpetuates a degree of essentialism. Long makes a convincing argument that Catherine is a transgendered subject struggling with the restrictions of her world, but this cannot entirely excuse Catherine's pleasure in harming others, or the way that David's growing discomfort pleases and arouses her. She loses her memory and emotional control too often to be considered a victim of societal constraints alone. In addition, the130,000 words of unpublished material missing from the narrative make a psychological diagnosis approach to reading the novel even more difficult. Elliott contends that Catherine exercises dominion and control over David's body (Elliott "In Search" 309). Speech is her primary weapon in achieving this, because her control relies on a hypnotic ability to persuade, assuage or pacify David's discomfort during sex scenes, while knowing that his arousal springs out of his own discomfiture.

Beyond solidifying the parameters of Catherine's transgender identity, Long's insistence that "The instability of *Garden* mirrors the instability of gender itself; the reader is prompted to be self-reflexive" is promising for dialogue studies (56).

Transgendering suggests that the novel and its characters do not reject the features of Hemingway's early imagist style such as "idiomatic language" and "juxtaposition," because instead, these are "refunctionalized" into a more postmodern, metafictional narrative (Penas Ibanez 128). The plain and simple vocabulary that the lovers use, without slang or idiolect, is actually an iteration of the same, notably a constructed speech style that echoes the ambiguity of identity. Lacan's Mirror Stage relies on the ability to see manifestations of the self outside of the body or psyche, as evidenced, in "The Mirror Stage as Formative," and so the border between the fictional story and the readers' real lives act as the mirror, allowing them to see or impose aspects of their self in or unto the unstable reflection given by the fictional text. While repetition is a self-conscious metafictional technique, continually iterating the construction of the text, it also strongly recalls Bakhtin's understanding of the production of meaning in a narrative as reliant on the processes of perception.

Catherine's vocabulary intensifies the transgressive eros of the book because of its stark, confrontational language. The erotics of twinning, where Catherine and David could be "brothers" and Catherine insists "I want us to be the same" fetishizes masculinity and twinning, but also incest (22, 176).[45] Catherine reflects biases and assumptions about gender back at the reader as David reflects Catherine's desired self back upon her. However rebelliously empowering or freeing this may seem for sexuality in the modernist novel, Catherine's maliciousness foils her progression towards a new gender with a decentered dynamic of chaos and destruction. Catherine's impulses signify those of the greater narrative, remind the reader of its composition,

[45] Spilka also discusses twinning in his book on androgyny.

and in doing so they straddle the battlefront between modernist and postmodernist impulses.

Consider the first scene where Catherine attempts to swap genders. David and Catherine lie in bed post-coitus. She begins:

> "Dave, you don't mind if we've gone to the devil, do you?"
> "No, girl," he said.
> "Don't call me girl."
> "When I'm holding you you are a girl," he said. He held her tight around her breasts and he opened and closed his fingers feeling her and the hard erect freshness between his fingers. (17)

Notice that, rather than effacing the narrator, "he said" is repeated twice in a small excerpt of conversation. This repetition achieves the effect of positing their happiness firmly in the past, suggesting Eden just before the fall, with the knowledge of destruction already at hand. The word "girl" is like a grenade about to explode, bouncing back and forth between them, an identity that neither of them wants to inhabit. "Girl" lies at the heart of the battle between what she wants to be, wants him to be, and what he wants her to be. Girl, so common in our language, is a deceptively simple noun. This is a small excerpt, and while far from the longest repetitive conversation in the book, this exchange continues over the course of two pages. "Yes," "you" and "girl" are repeated with force: "Yes you are and you're my girl Catherine. Will you change and be my girl and let me take you" (17). Here, the homoeroticism of female masculinity, of Catherine's short hair and "hard erect" nipples, is only half of the equation (17). Catherine desires not only to be a boy in bed, but a boy, period. This is for herself as much as any lover. This is a dangerous prospect for their relationship. The idea Catherine would not want to be a girl at all would spell the end of their outwardly heteronormative marriage. Simultaneously resistant, fearful, and aroused,

David can only helplessly resist: "You're Catherine" (17). Catherine's need to transform is primary, and this leaves David an ambivalent, hesitant participant that her repetition serves to pacify.

Comely and Scholes turn to the manuscript version of the same conversation for clarification concerning Catherine's rejection of femininity (94). Jenks omitted an entire storyline about David and Catherine's acquaintance with Rodin's statue *The Metamorphoses* (93). Comely and Scholes see the sexual transgression of gender in this passage as significant for David: "what is at stake here for David Bourne is not just the breaking of a sexual taboo but the loss of his own identity as a heterosexual male" (94). Catherine's dialogue in the manuscript reads:

> "Will you change and be my girl and let me take you? Will you be like you were in the statue? Will you change?"
> He knew now and it was like the statue. The one there are no photographs of and of which no reproductions are sold. (K422.1/1, 21)

This direct speech in its original format demonstrates that Hemingway was fascinated with gender metamorphosis. The two lovers in the statue are androgynous, they could easily be two lesbians, two homosexual men, or of different sexes. This information couches Catherine's forceful, continually repetitive entreaties in Jenks' edit: "No. I'm Peter. You're my wonderful Catherine. You're my beautiful lovely Catherine. You were so good to change. Oh thank you, Catherine, so much. Please understand. Please know and understand. I'm going to make love to you forever" (17). Catherine uses words to pupate David into a new Catherine so that Catherine can become Peter. Her incantation holds weight because it cocoons her belief in its transformative potential.

It is important to stress that, rather than androgyny where the combination of gender traits affords alluring ambiguity, as in Rodin's statue, Catherine clearly *acts* as

a "boy," because the couple still engage in heterosexual sex. The idea that David owns the girl-side of Catherine, where he says "you're my girl Catherine," and she says later "Don't worry, David, I'm your good girl come back again" implies that, in using a mirrored vocabulary and lexical structure, she also wants to discover and own the girl in him (17, 21). Eby examines what he calls Catherine's "transvestic adventures," where she not only wishes to be a boy but to call herself "Peter" a euphemism for penis, to again expose authorial bias (32). These words are not akin to a transvestite's clothes, outwardly transforming gender. Femininity is a demon for Catherine, an unwanted possession, and masculinity is not something she experiments with or wears, it is a part of an inner and authentic self that she is trying to grasp.

An Apocalyptic Vocabulary

Catherine's momentary ability to transgender herself into Peter during sex does not present a hopeful characterization. Her need to return to femininity develops an overarching cynicism and resentment:

> "Plenty of people would be happy if their damned husbands had good reviews."
> "I'm not plenty of people and you're not my damned husband." (25)

Catherine rages at her husband, twins her speech with David to match his authority as Anna Brangwen does in Lawrence's *The Rainbow*. Twinned speech is a manifestation of combative dissatisfaction in each example. Brett also swears in reply at Mike Campbell, uses "damned" in aggressive fashion, in *The Sun Also Rises* (149). "Damned" takes on its religious connotation as well:

> "Do you like me as a girl," she said very seriously and then smiled.
> "Yes," he said.
> "That's good," she said. "I'm glad someone likes it because it's a god damned bore." (70)

Catherine is enraged, rejecting God, and she feels "god damned" as a girl. She continues: "Why should I hold it down? You want a girl don't you? Don't you want everything that goes with it? Scenes, hysteria, false accusations, temperament isn't that it? I'm holding it down…I'll read my damned mail" (70). Social expectations invade her very vocabulary: "I'm a god damned woman. I thought if I'd be a girl and stay a girl I could have a baby at least. Not even that" (70-1). As a boy, she is unable to "stay a girl." This implies that it is her true identity that impedes her fertility.

Her blasphemies are indelicate, masculine in tone and they serve to demonstrate a boyish inscrutability. Yet it is the female body that gets pregnant; she is convinced she has failed in this regard. Her words and thoughts are dysmorphic and confused, signifying her troubled gender identity. Were the conversational style of this narrative closer to Hemingway's earlier works, with less reiteration and repetition, it would have been much more difficult to communicate the consuming magnitude of Catherine's obsession. Her speech, in its vacillation between "boy," "girl" and "woman" is indicative of female masculinity, but it is reaching towards a rejection of the female body altogether.

Jenks is not engineering an edit where, due to his cuts, there appears a much higher ratio of dialogue to narration than Hemingway may have intended, or where other gendered terms are omitted in favor of "girl" or "boy." Hemingway's dialogue continues to display referential ambiguity and repetition. This is consistent with K.J. Peters' assessment of the manuscript, and of Jenks edition, in "The Thematic Integrity of *The Garden of Eden*:"

> If Hemingway were a static writer whose style and strategies never evolved, then such a method would be appropriate, but *The Garden* appears to be a step in the evolution of Hemingway which began with *The Old Man and the Sea*, Hemingway's experiments with self-reflexivity, his expanded use of dialogue, and the reassessment of his typical themes, all found in the manuscript, mark Hemingway as an evolving writer (Peters 43).

Peters has, like Moddelmog, compared the manuscripts for continuity (43). Other texts, such as *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, stress this shift toward relying on linguistic cues, obsessive reiteration, for example, to establish inner turmoil in a way more close to the character's psyche.

Although in narratives that feature direct speech style, dialogue and narrator are distinct, a result of the coinfluence of these two modes is that vocabulary often crosses the grammatical divide. This is the case with "boy" and "girl" in this novel. These nouns are so typical that they fly under the radar, so seemingly benign that the novel can use them to organically propel the plot forwards without the need for more explicit remarks about a character's persona or emotional changes. They become a self-conscious comment on narrative form. In the first chapters "girl" has typical connotations. It signifies innocence, playfulness and naiveté. Lengthy descriptions of gender are left out in favor of simple signals that can be imbued with ample meaning.

Unspecific nouns are a foundational feature of the narrative's style. For example, in the first part of the novel, Hemingway leaves Catherine's name aside in favor of her Eve-esque persona: "the girl," until the subversive sexual dynamic of the lover's relationship can be established. Her identity is figural; not particularized or nuanced, she is reduced to a role or archetype. Their love is Edenic, the original man and woman, boy and girl. This makes their innocence lost, and rage-fuelled downfall,

all the more poignant.[46] Similarly, until page seven, David is referred to as the "young man." Catherine's name is therefore a device as well, introduced in dialogue, to mark her identity confusion as one of the first particulars of her personality. Her exclamation "you're my girl Catherine," where she would transfer her name and gender away, foisting it unto David, is, significantly, the first time the reader is introduced to her pronoun (17).

This is similar to *A Farewell to Arms*, where Frederic Henry's first name is withheld until Book Two, some eighty-four pages into the Scribner's edition. It is revealed only after Henry returns from the front. As a wounded soldier, his given name de-militarizes him. It pulls his personality away from the field of battle and towards the women who nurse him, introducing his personal side, which will feature much more prominently in his relationship with Catherine. Nouns and pronouns can be manipulated to intimate a character's identity.

In addition, the systemic use of monikers in *The Garden of Eden* suggests that this technique is not a result of Jenks' edits alone. When the reader first learns her name, Catherine is already trying to give it away, rejecting it. Before this, as "the girl," Catherine is more of a commodity, chattel owned by her husband, than a fully knowable person or character. Her type is incredibly general and without distinct form. Her name acts as a dividing line, starkly demarcating the previous wife of David's fantasy with Catherine, the identity that will undo them both. Her rejection of the word girl ("Don't call me girl") initiates both the beginning of their battle of wills and the

---

[46] Peters argues that the biggest injustice Jenk's edit does to Hemingway's original material is, along with the excision "of words, phrases, paragraphs and even entire chapters," his decision to eliminate "almost all of the religious overtones and images that are the foundation of the manuscript…. Jenks has excised Eden itself from his *Garden of Eden*" (43).

end of her innocence (17). David will soon begin to call her "Devil," rather than girl. It is a diminutive of affection and hatred, with undercurrents of biblical sin. "The girl" as a technique, recurs later in the narrative to introduce Marita into the storyline. Although a narrative-based technique at this point, rather than a speech trait, it functions as paralinguistic detail to signal a shift in David's affections.

In Book Three, David and Catherine are carefully referred to using only their given names. When "two girls" arrive at their café they are immediately noticed. The as-yet unnamed Marita introduces her ineffable friend, Nina. In both dialogue and narrative, as David and Catherine begin to discuss their new anonymous interest, they call Marita "the one girl" (91). In a lengthy conversation, where she apologizes for Nina's coldness, Marita's name is still withheld; she is called "the girl" fourteen times (95-98). This is not an incidental or lazy accident in Hemingway's prose style. Again, rather than "she" or "her," "the girl" once more evokes naiveté and innocence, because at this point she is a stranger to their sexual transgressions. By the time her name is finally introduced on page 102, Marita, and not Catherine, is now the one who owns "the girl" throughout the narration for the rest of the novel. Catherine has fallen from Eden:

> "She's your girl and I'm your girl," Catherine said. "Now stop being stuffy and be nice to your girls. Don't you like the way they look? I'm the very fair one you married." (103)

The narrative and Catherine's dialogue are contradictory here. By this juncture the only "girl," from the narrative perspective, is Marita. David owns "girl" as a fantasy identity. Her insistent ownership of "girl" at this juncture, after desperately wanting to be a "boy" and be called "Peter," is both true and insincere. The consistent way that

Marita becomes “the girl” after this point, while the narrative never calls Catherine “the girl” again, intensifies and embodies Catherine’s supposed loss of an Edenic innocence that, in itself, was always an illusion, a result of David not really knowing his wife after their hasty marriage.

Different conventions of meaning, not only idiomatic, are gendered in our spoken language. In English, names are gendered and nouns are gendered; many other languages use gendered grammar. It would seem strange to read a conversation between two speakers not gendered in its very report. “She said” or “he said” are typical conventions. Indeed, although the impersonal can be gender neutral, as in “one might say,” even professional distinctions are, and continue to be, gendered. For the same profession, common use allows the words “tailor” and “seamstress.” Here the gender of the subject is, intentionally or not, still vital to shared understandings of that role. In French, “couturier” and “couturière” are conjugated along masculine and feminine lines. While people often use German as an example of a language with neuter personal pronouns like “es,” “sie” or “du,” to mean it or you, a tailor is a “Schneider,” while a seamstress is a “Näherin,” where “in” is a feminine suffix.

When a narrative disrupts the conventional use of such basic aspects of language, this is another form of rebellion, a facet of the modernist aesthetic. When Catherine asks: “You don’t really mind being brothers do you?” David insists he doesn’t, capitulantly admiring her tan, “You’re awfully dark, brother” (21, 22). The reader is left to conjecture whether he is indulging her glibly or playing along for his own erotic amusement. “Brother” can be a bit of idiom, of informal slang, as in “Oh, brother,” and it can be used between men who are not related to create or convey

fraternity. However, if Catherine is David's brother she is not female, not feminine, and an incestuous lover. The noun is a fetish that evokes the suspension of disbelief so necessary for sexual role-play. In this way, Catherine uses "brother" the way that Brett uses "chap." It is of note that while Catherine is sincere in her question, David's remark, where brother appears as a tag, is a sly joke. It shows that David's discomfort is barely concealed, and that, like many of Hemingway's protagonists, he thrives in a space where he is hanging over a precipice about to throw over whatever happiness he still has. Seemingly insignificant nouns like "girl" and "brother" are unstable, shifting, and manifest the unconscious effects of transgendering in their relationship.

Moddelmog insists that, in their homoerotic sexual encounters where Catherine becomes a boy "clearly Catherine has sodomized David" (*Reading Desire* 69). Catherine may initiate sodomy, or merely assume "the traditionally male posture in the missionary position" (Peters 45). The perception of this act feminizes David's body, but does it masculinize Catherine's as well? Without a clear reference in Jenks' edit, it is difficult to deduce these effects because their sex-acts are never named outright. Regardless, as brothers their lovemaking becomes both homoerotic and evocative of incest. This is why Catherine feels the need to counter the idea of twins, of David (cum Catherine) and Catherine (cum Peter), with an insistence he shouldn't worry in the daytime (22). A juxtaposition of daytime and nighttime identities heightens the allure of the taboo.

Catherine does not only refer to herself as "brother" or as a "boy" or "Peter," to David. Her obsession with her own masculinity overcomes her sense of social propriety. She asks Colonel Boyle:

> "How did you know I was a boy in the Prado?"
> "Why shouldn't you be?"
> "I only started it again last evening. I was a girl for almost a month. Ask David."
> "You don't need to say ask David. What are you right now?"
> "A boy if it's alright with you"
> "It's fine with me. But you're not."
> "I just wanted to say it," she said. "Now that I said it I don't have to be it…" (63-4).

"She" wants to be, is a "boy." Talk and paralinguistic information clash, and this decentres her identity. She is still the centre in one sense, the topic of conversation, but there is not one unifying gender to hold on to. Her claim that she no longer needs to be a boy is false, a capitulation. Dialogue intensifies the push-pull dynamic between gender identities in Catherine, positing her obsessive need for iteration directly in the middle of her disquietude. This is also visible when David toasts: "For heroes" (27). Catherine immediately picks up on it:

> "I don't mind being a hero," she said. "We're not like other people. We don't have to call each other darling or my dear or my love nor any of that to make a point. Darling and my dearest and my very dearest and all that are obscene to me and we call each other by our Christian names. You know what I'm trying to say. Why do we have to do other things like everyone does?"
> "You're a very intelligent girl." (27)

Were she thinking of herself as a feminine she might gravitate towards "heroine" instead, the feminine version of the noun. David's backhanded compliment reveals he has detected, and rejected, this transgression. "Hero" captures the vocabulary of battle, where she and David are at war. Shifting the focus to "dear" and "darling" allows her to devalue ideals of femininity, not to soothe or to endear herself to her lover, to suggest femininity is obscene. "You're a very intelligent girl" is tongue-in-cheek, but also combative, rejecting Catherine's masculine conception of herself. A name is a label, and as such, a classification. Catherine labels herself a "boy," "brother," "girl,"

"Peter" "destructive," "violent" and "crazy." David also labels her "the girl," "Devil," "boy" and "brother." Through repetition, labeling becomes a punishment, a sort of eternal recurrence thrust upon them for their sins.

Hemingway could not decide on an end for the narrative. His load-bearing dialogue hints at a reason: themes of gender identity and aberrant sexuality are meant to be cyclic, hellish, and again and again, the end is consumed by the beginning. A large part of the emotional weight of the text is balanced on each character's exhortative, imperative, tone. This creates a struggling, desperate atmosphere. I have presented these phrases again and again to better inhabit their effect in the novel. This is not only repetitive, but also musical and rhythmic. In an excerpt from a much longer example, the lovers develop a refrain:

> "You're a girl. You are a girl. You're my lovely girl Catherine."
> "Yes I am your girl and I love you and I love you and I love you."
> "Don't talk."
> "Yes I will. I'm your girl Catherine and I love you please I love you always always always— "
> "You don't have to keep saying it. I can tell."
> "I like to say it and I have to say it and I've been a fine girl and a good girl and I will again. I promise I will again."
> "You don't have to say it."
> "Oh yes I do. I say it and I said it and you said it. You now please. Please you." (55)

Single-syllables are rapid, panting, trapped by their competing impulses; the words are constrained, trapped in a cycle. A blank space follows to indicate sex, and a snippet of conversation leads to a second sexual arousal:

> They lay quiet for a long time and she said, "I love you so much and you're such a good husband."
> "You blessed."
> "Was I what you wanted?"
> "What do you think?"
> "I hope I was."

> "You were."
> "I promised truly and I will and I'll keep it. Now can I be a boy again?"
> "Why?"…
> "Now you change. Please. Don't make me change you. Must I? All right I will. You're changed now. You are. You did it too. You are. You did it too. I did it to you but you did it. Yes you did. You're my sweet dearest darling Catherine. You're my sweet my lovely Catherine. You're my girl my dearest only girl. Oh thank you thank you my girl…" (55-6)

Their sexual fantasies and vocabularies seem singular: Catherine wants gender subversion, David wants to be submissive during sex, and this is expressed in plain language. Simplicity is as necessary as rhythm or reiteration because they counterpoint the constant atmosphere of irresolution and change with an illusory aura of fixed meanings and significations. Hemingway's dialogue craft functions to resist fixed gender roles through the very linguistic limits that promote them. When Catherine proclaims: "I have a wonderful surprise for myself for tomorrow. I'm going to the Prado in the morning and see all the pictures as a boy," David replies "I give up" (56). David's surrender is another red herring. It will not last. The effect of all this uncertainty is that apparently concrete plot points are suspect, untrustworthy: Catherine and David's eventual estrangement feels more like a pause than an end to their hostilities.

The amount of repetitive dialogue is so prolific, so volatile, that it begs association with William Butler Yeats' "The Second Coming," where Catherine's words are continually "turning and turning in the widening gyre" (83). David and Catherine typify Yeats' prophetic line: "The best lack all conviction, while the worst/Are full of passionate intensity" (83). The Edenic state is reversed. David lacks conviction, Catherine's passion impedes affection, and the ideas of best and worse are so disrupted that they become empty. David is young, beautiful, healthy and talented,

but any likability that these qualities encourage is displaced by condemnation. Despondency, disaffection and disruption generate a love-apocalypse.

The second coming of Christ and The Book of Revelation in Yeats' work, and original sin in *The Garden of Eden*, manifest the collapse of a cautious optimism under the emotional weight of the lost generation. The Great War washed the world in death, like an apocalypse, and in this world, supposedly made clean, a second loss of innocence has led Catherine and David to fall again. They are swept up in a gyre, a turbulence of pain and desire that immolates them both. Catherine burns David's writing, creates a hell-on-earth, when she discovers the futility of their sex-talk, of its inability to heal their rift or change her identity.

Catherine's rhythmic cadence holds "you" as its false centre: "You are. You did it too. You are. You did it too. I did it to you but you did it. Yes you did." (56) This is because the focus here is not David but Catherine's desires. This kind of insidious repetition is evocative of Gertrude Stein's *Tender Buttons*. In Stein's fragment, "A RED HAT," the repetition of colour represents emotions. Stein begins: "A dark grey, a very dark grey, a quite dark grey is monstrous ordinarily, it is so monstrous because there is no red in it. If red is in everything it is not necessary" ("Objects" 467). The colour red, a red hat in particular, is special because it is a shock, a flash of colour in the recurring gloom. Catherine's insistent repetition that she become Peter, or a boy, stands out like a shock against heteronormativity, but it is ultimately devalued by her insistence as a form of emphasis, exemplifying the idea that "if red is in everything" it is no longer so abnormal, so covetable. Repetition solidifies Catherine's impulse to

change, but it eventually changes red into a monstrous grey, an implement into an impediment.

The abundance of grey, or unhappy themes in the narrative presents a far different portrayal of gender than *The Sun Also Rises*. In the earlier novel, Brett exploits masculinity to gain authority in an archetypal way. In the later novel gender norms are decentred to the point of implosion. Brett Ashley is a manipulation of masculinity and the female body that appears similar to Catherine. However, Brett's identity is far less imperiled, far less dangerous, and ultimately more imitable. Genderlects, or gendered language, are not just a manifestation of personal rebellion in *The Garden of Eden*. They are means to trouble the social processes of gender categorization. This is why Marita and David's turn towards heteronormativity feels so inauthentic in the second-last chapter. When Marita capitulates: "'I'm your girl,' she said in the dark. 'Your girl, No matter what I'm always your girl. Your good girl who loves you'" Catherine's spectre materializes, and the identity "girl" is robbed of any sincerity, made completely hollow (245).

Heteronormativity is necessarily difficult and empty out of the mouth of Marita, a bisexual character. David then demands that Marita go to sleep, he silences her, and she obliges (245). Transgression has been snuffed, killed, and what follows is a conspicuous absence of dialogue in the final chapter, the only chapter without it at all, where its driving force is subsumed. This is conspicuous because, up until this juncture the novel, scenes have been dialogue-driven. Homoeroticism and transgression have gone dormant as signified by Marita's silent sleep (247). Moddelmog attributes the championing of heterosexuality to Jenks manipulation of the storyline (65). In the

manuscript, she highlights, instead "it is precisely the 'abnormality' of their relationship that refreshes and renews [David's] creative energies" (Moddelmog 65). The absence of dialogue in the final chapter is a clue, solidifying the idea that normative heterosexuality is the oddest, least authentic, sexuality in Jenks' edit. This is because Jenks' last chapter synthesizes finality out of repression and silencing.

Ironically, it praises David's writing as "recovered, corrected and improved" where and when so many of the narratives' defining elements, including difficulty, resistance, disaffection, transgression and sexual revolution, are noticeably, suddenly, gone. Other novels, such as *A Farewell to Arms* or *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, end with an imminent change in the protagonist's bleak state of affairs. Frederic Henry moves out into the weather, away from his old life, and Robert Jordan prepares for a courageous death. Yet, neither text departs so significantly from the definitive prose style of the rest of the novel in its final moments. *The Garden of Eden*'s dialogue shows that Hemingway's story is, contrary to its conclusion, not a return narrative, about the restoration of grace after the fall. Instead, its repetitions are an elegiac lament, stylizing the irreparable harm that doctrines of sexual repression can wreak on the psyche, and on personal relationships to relate the effects of categorization, language and form on identity.

Chapter Three

"We are going to talk about women:" Gendered Talk and Dialect in E.M. Forster

In 1910, Forster wrote "The Feminine Note in Literature," a treatise on women writers and the feminine aesthetic.[47] He tailored its presentation to suit his audience and thereby gain their sympathy. In October of that year he addressed the all-male Cambridge Apostles, beginning with a jovial, androcentric air: "Men are Men, women are women, and in a discussion like the present it is impossible quite to keep one's eye off the other end of the plank. We are going to talk about women; and very fortunately, none of them are in the room" (qtd. in Lane 111-12). For his next delivery, in December, his audience was the Friday Club, comprised of Bloomsbury painter Vanessa Bell and her friends. The mixed company warranted a less chauvinistic, more serious introduction, and so he omitted his quip about women (111). Clearly, Forster was adept at using gender as a tool or writerly device, to create an affinity with his audience. However, the device had to be clandestine, to achieve an affect while escaping prolonged scrutiny, to be effective. The Apostles would respond well to fraternalism; however, the Friday Club would better admire a speech without such obvious prejudice. In each instance, Forster's speech evokes mutual understanding to develop his listener's approval, exploiting this positive predisposition for his later, far more socially progressive, argument that "great writers, male or female, [are] beyond gender categorization" (Goldman 123).

Christopher Lane, Jane Goldman and Wendy Moffatt have all used this anecdote to draw conclusions about Forster's attitude toward gender, gender awareness, and humanist philosophy. Forster suggests that categories, wherever they

[47] In 2002, this paper and its edited manuscripts were published for the first time, with an introduction by George Piggford. Since then, it has been frequently used to illustrate Forster's acute awareness of gender mores.

are found in literary studies, delimit the processes of interpretation. Yet, it can be difficult to get at a space that not only destabilizes, but also reaches beyond, those terms governing our shared understandings. Forster's argument for the equal merit of authors illuminates, and contextualizes, his acute awareness of gender mores. Not only in 1910, but also throughout his career, Forster manipulated genderlect, gendered language, to proselytize the belief that individual human connection should be prized over divisive social or cultural differences.

This is not to say that he erased gender differences. On the contrary, he alternately down tunes or stresses gender stereotypes for effect. His posthumous novel *Maurice* (1971), like "The Feminine Note in Literature," is an argument against previous modes of thought. It presents homosexual desire in a favorable light, a similar position to Radclyffe Hall's empowering portrayal of lesbianism. Yet to argue for same sex relationships, Forster presents archetypes: Maurice Hall is an educated gentleman and Alec Scudder is the noble groundskeeper. Their relationship holds undeniable class parallels with Lady Chatterley and Mellors. Maurice and Alec love one another, but their identities do not otherwise challenge normative roles.

In this chapter, I interrogate Forster's use of dialect and genderlect to advocate his principle to "Only connect…," the epigraph from *Howards End* (1910) and his humanist credo. Forster's two introductions to "The Feminine Note in Literature" highlight that he saw gender as a useful factor in the aesthetic construction of an argument. His ability to perceive linguistic conventions, and then adapt those as literary devices, stands out as one of the more under-investigated aspects of his work precisely because of its apparent conventionality. His direct speech is devoid of

obscenity, employs traditional grammar, follows a clear call and answer conversational structure, and rarely features any fashionable or rebellious slang. Absence is therefore a valuable technique in it subtlety for Forster's dialogue craft. For example, Dr. Aziz's English is indicative of dialect-suppression, primarily portrayed without phonic distinctions or malapropisms to indicate an accent. Dr. Aziz is confused, on occasion, by Anglo expressions, but his speech represents an effort to avoid mockery, to deny racism and critique colonialism.

Forster is trying to overcome readerly biases and to create an identifiable character. Were he to sound out an accent it would detract from his principle of connection. Unlike Mellors' Derbyshire in Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, phonics would not ennoble Aziz. Accordingly, speech is only highly accented or gendered where the narrative is unsympathetic to a particular group or class position. This dialect or accent manipulation supports the impulse to prize the personal development of young, intelligent men and women over those subjects Forster feels most divorced from, namely lower class, uneducated women. His bias against this group emerges through a consistent debasement of Cockney characters.

In his dialogue, Forster's admiration for individuality belies an almost paradoxical lack of fealty with those subjects he deems inferior. I outline how, for example, Mrs. Bast's dialect in *Howards End* (1910) is a manifestation of her undesirable traits as a lower-class, uneducated woman, whereas in *Maurice*, Alec Scudder's primarily neutral accent allows his worthiness, his connections with Maurice on a deeper level, to shine. Forster, champion of individual differences, actually

emphasizes dialect traits to indict speakers, unlike Lawrence, for their social inferiority.

Modernist Muddles

In a similar manner to his contemporaries, Hemingway and Lawrence, Woolf, Hall, Dorothy Parker and the Baroness, Forster's experiences and beliefs informed his art. What Forster famously calls "muddles"—were central to both his fiction, and his life (Goldman 128). As reflections on disorder, Forster's muddles rely on the contradictions, misunderstandings and ambiguities that arise out of everyday social interactions. Forster and Lawrence's first meeting characterizes this atmosphere of suspicion and misprision. Lawrence, after inviting Forster to his home, wrote a scathing letter to Bertrand Russell on February 12th, 1915. He lamented how Forster "tries to dodge himself….self-realization is not his ultimate desire."[48] This dismissal of Forster's early work was somewhat misguided: "it emerged that Lawrence's diagnosis of Morgan's problem was that he must 'satisfy' his 'implicit manhood' but 'He tries to dodge himself—the sight is painful'" (Moffatt 121).

This "implicit manhood," Forster's self-denial in his writing, was not precisely how Lawrence imagined it, as a need to exert heterosexuality. In *A Great Unrecorded History* (2010), a biography focused on Forster's homosexuality, Wendy Moffatt uses Forster's first name, Morgan, throughout in an effort to connect with her subject. Each author was keenly aware of the changes in sexual legislation and repression during the

[48] This letter is cited by Christopher Lane and Wendy Moffatt, and appears in *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, vol. II* (283).

period, and Moffatt adds the rejoinder that "for his own part, Morgan suspected a different problem in Lawrence's psyche: suppressed homosexual tendencies" (121).

Each thought the other was betraying his inner nature. To their credit, both Forster and Lawrence saw social and class divisions as damaging influences in the quest for individual connection. This quest often had an ambiguous, unsettled, rather than a clearly positive conclusion, a theme so common to the modernist narrative. Forster's preference for male subjects was detectable to progressive women like Frieda Lawrence and May Sinclair, as well as Forster's more intimate friend Virginia Woolf—who all brought their prejudices to bear, judging Forster a poor advocate for women, or for human connection in general.[49] Critics often revisit Forster's "homosexuality and outspoken misogyny," correlating these themes and searching them out in his writing to connect biography with creative expression (Langland 252).[50]

For, although Forster advocated that creativity should be divorced from gender in 1910, in his later years he expressed a more androcentric impulse. Moffatt regards this development as a result of his mounting preference for all-male contexts where he "developed a taste for categorical misogyny that would have been unthinkable to him in previous years" (Moffatt 200). Although it has already been said by Elizabeth Langland that, "in his personal embattlement with gender and his embattlement with patriarchal culture, Forster exposes the constructed nature of gender and his own

---

[49] David Medalie deftly enumerates Woolf and Forster's critical relationship in his chapter "Looking Past Polemic" from *E.M. Forster's Modernism*, while Jane Goldman summarizes Forster's interactions with Woolf and other Bloomsbury women in "Forster and Women" (127-30).

[50] See Elizabeth Langland, Elaine Showalter, Wendy Moffat, Christopher Lane, Robert K. Martin and George Piggford and Bonnie Blumenthal Finkelstein in my works cited.

ambivalent relationship to traits coded 'masculine' and 'feminine' in his culture," I stress that it remains to be explored how this codification is expressed, troubled, or promoted in the linguistic traits of his characters (Langland 252).

Trapped by cultural contexts, by the Raj in India, the Apostles at King's College, and the legal persecution of homosexuality at home and abroad, Forster's ambivalence rose up alongside the desire to expose the systems of contrivance beneath gender and sexual mores.[51] If "recourse to biography, whether in support or in refutation of Forster as a women's writer, furnishes mixed messages" this is not because, as Goldman suggests, such an approach is always perilous (Goldman 128). Moreso, it is because internal struggles, battles with social binaries, taboos, and the cultural hegemonies of class and race—are, as we have seen, perforce in the literature of the period. It is only fitting that this need to arrive at personal connection would result in more muddled interactions.

Key thematic connections to Hemingway and Lawrence recur: including nobility, suffering, a preoccupation with strong women mitigated by androcentrism. In Forster, self-contradictory threads weave a tangle of transgression and traditionalism. Feminists including Sinclair and Woolf struggled to accept Forster during his lifetime, personalizing the ideological schism between male and female modernism. Necessarily, "there is much more to 'Forster and Women,' however, than deciding on whether or not he meets, in life or in letters, with feminist approval," but their detection

---

[51] Forster was afraid to publish *Maurice*, and his other homosexual writing, until after his death. He began the novel very early in his career. In 1912 his most sympathetic friends assured him it was unpublishable, given anti-gay laws at the time (Moffatt 116-7). Ambivalence towards feminine and masculine traits arose in Forster because he knew from a very early age that he was attracted to men, but was forced by his country, his society, to lie about this preference, even to his own mother: "all his life Morgan kept his homosexuality a secret from her" (Moffatt 32).

of mixed feelings is revealing (121). In portraying the British middle and upper classes, Forster focused on connections between men, on the damage when this goal or ideal cannot be achieved, much more so than on relationships between women. In *Howards End*, Helen and Margaret Schlegel have their struggles, but these are anterior to Margaret's confused dealings with patriarchy and its social expectations. Discourse theory, gender performance and ideas of representation comingle easily here because "Forster's fictional writing not only offers a variety of representations of women and the feminine, but it also opens up questions of how women and the feminine are caught up in the literary and cultural processes of representation" (126-7).

Forster's dialogue craft interrogates gender categories in a far subtler way than Lawrence or Hemingway. This is not incidental, a singular result of Forster's preference for grammatical regularity or unambiguous, clearly attributed direct speech. For Forster, subtlety, latency, is a form of armour that shields some characters from censure. This is made clear in examples where other characters are indicted for their faults through an emphasis on aberrant or undesirable linguistic traits. Austin's speech act theory ensures that all linguistic behaviors, real or fictional, depend on a series of culturally informed constraints to achieve meaning (Austin 52). Similarly, for Bakhtin, there is no monologic "language" in a written narrative, because although the author's influence is there, deciphering the fictional text requires a "determining [of] the heteroglot background outside the work that dialogizes it" (*Discourse in the Novel* 416).

Forster's aesthetic process is imbued with shifting, complex and often latent gender traits. For example, latent female masculinity is never an experimental means,

for women, to engage in sustained social rebellion. His narratives do not embrace avant-garde speakers as a matter of course. None of his direct speech resembles that of Catherine Bourne, Brett Ashley or Lady Chatterley, experimental for its content or form. Instead, female masculinity is present yet absent, a genderlect beneath the speech, illuminating the preconceptions of participants in a conversation to imply their shortcomings, and to hint at the need to overcome different social divisions.

In Forster's first novel, *Where Angels Fear to Tread* (1905), Mrs. Herriton and her son Philip satirize the muddle of social expectations and behaviors that is the British upper classes. A sense of division, of restriction, invades their linguistic mores. Mother and son discuss little Irma, Mrs. Herriton's granddaughter, and her use of fashionable vernacular. Irma symbolizes newness, innovation, hope and innocence. The reader is disarmed by humorous commentary, and the scene begins jovially when the ten-year-old affronts her grandmother's sense of propriety and incites her ire:

> "And, Granny, when will the old ship get to Italy?" asked Irma.
> "'Grandmother,' dear, not 'Granny,'" said Mrs. Herriton, giving her a kiss.
> "And we say 'a boat' or 'a steamer,' not 'a ship.' Ships have sails…
> "Righto!" said the little girl, and dragged the reluctant Harriet into the library. Mrs. Herriton and her son were left alone. There was immediately confidence between them.
> "Here beginneth the New Life," said Philip.
> "Poor child, how vulgar!" murmured Mrs. Herriton.
> "It's surprising that she isn't worse. But she has got a look of poor Charles about her." (6)

Irma's casual slang conveys a subtle female masculinity that her relatives are all too eager to suppress at her young age. Forster's characters are not left to "do all the talking," and paralinguistic detail characterizes the mood as one of collusion and "confidence." "Righto!" is a colloquialism, innocuous in many contexts but offensive to the entirely proper Herritons, exposing their shiftiness. Philip Herriton, along with

the early twentieth century reader, would have had an awareness of the purported connection between formality and verbal propriety, between masculinity and unfettered or uninhibited speech. A young girl, Irma may have heard words like "Righto!" spoken by other children, the servants, or men in their town, but she is held to a supposedly 'higher' standard.[52] "Old ship," employs the au courant prefix 'old,' an ironic endearment as in 'old boy' or 'old chap,' conveying an exuberant and youthful tone.[53] This reference, in concert with the informal abbreviation "granny" immediately evoke an association, in Philip's mind, with Irma's deceased father, ostensibly a freer (and therefore unfortunate, to his eye) and more unrestrained figure than himself.

It is significant that Philip characterizes this fatherly resemblance as a "look of," because this is a dismissive expression that implies a lack of fellow feeling in the likeness. Philip's word choice provides valuable insight into his narrow state of mind. He has no will to understand Irma beyond a passing comment: "she has got a look of poor Charles about her." In this example, "vulgarity" is associated, in Philip's mind, with maleness. This connection to masculinity is subconscious, latent, one that Irma and her relatives are not consciously aware of, but it functions as a narrative device through which Forster can insist on Irma's rebelliousness and individuality, show how innovation links her to the "new life."

Stephen Wonham's daughter is symbolically connected to the same future in *The Longest Journey* (1907), where as he sleeps al fresco in the final scene, her head

---

[52] The British morpheme "o," as in "bungo" or "cheerio," is a casual slang derivative. The *Oxford English Dictionary Online* categorizes "righto" as a colloquialism. Indeed a part of everyday speech, in this case it becomes slang because Irma is using it outside of its accepted context, uttering it in front of her stuffy Grandmother to rebel against upper class formal diction.

[53] Irma's experiment with the prefix recalls Alice Gall's use of "old fellow" in *The White Peacock*.

on his breast, he silently listens to the trains, indefatigable symbols of newness and progress, as they roll past. This newness, so confounding to Wonham, is threatening to the Herritons in *Where Angels Fear to Tread* because it rejects the longstanding requirement to preserve and indicate class distinctions. Satire is achieved through their disproportionate sense of worry over a little girl's innocent experimentation with language.

Her speech prefigures the sort of informal diction Brett Ashley, chronologically of similar age to Irma in 1905, would utilize in years to come. Irma's rebellion is noticeable precisely because of its short duration. As Mrs. Herriton's sense of control grows, as she tries to keep Irma away from her rebellious mother Lilia, and in doing so stamp out Irma's individuality, Mrs. Herriton foists her restrictive, genteel idiom unto the girl and quickly Irma begins to acquiesce. As a consequence the narrative begins to see her through Mrs. Herriton's eyes: "she was getting proud of Irma, who had certainly greatly improved, and could no longer be called that most appalling of things— a vulgar child" (11).

This close third person ironizes, adds a commentary that demonstrates the absurdity of Mrs. Herriton's "stuffy" obsession with the innocent child (Finkelstein 8). As she denies the child both a mother and her sense of play, the reader is increasingly "appalled at her" damaging influence (Finkelstein 9). Forster's characters are unable to understand one another; they harm one another through prejudice. In trying to overcome typifying binaries such as men and women, rich and poor, educated and not educated: "language takes them to the abyss, but it cannot reconstruct their lives on a new basis because they cannot form conceptions of that for which there is no concept"

(Langland 263). The theme of defying easy resolution recurs here, attributable at last to the processes of categorization that limit perception. Binaries are stymieing and inadequate, but still primary concepts in understanding seemingly harmless, yet ultimately stifling and divisive, social limitations.

Talking About Women

In *Howards End* the novel's protagonist, Margaret Schlegel, struggles with such binarism, with expectations of the gender hierarchy and its essentializing stereotypes of femininity. She attempts to subvert domestic norms while simultaneously showing the difficulty inherent in such an undertaking: "Margaret resists being controlled by this dichotomous thinking and instead manipulates the terms with the goal of dismantling and transcending them" (257). While her goal is transcendence, her speech fails to function in a transcendent way. Margaret's dialogue ultimately hints at an ambivalent, far more troubled, outcome. This is because she is less the rebel figure, like Catherine Bourne or Lady Chatterley, and more the troubled woman, struggling in her inability to create a language that would function positively, that would operate outside the conventions of her class-based idiom such that she is made entirely inert.

Catherine, Connie Chatterley, Pilar and Brett are all running away from the repressions of marriage, of feminine mores, and while such escape may be no solution at all, Margaret is tied to her life such that Howards End threatens to become a shackle, not a refuge. Her gentility is an expectation relayed by typically lofty expressions, such as "good of you" and "naturally" despite any underlying perturbation or annoyance (122). The narrative points out that her intense emotions "all lay too deep in her heart

for speech. On the surface the sense of his degradation was too strong. She could not command voice or look, and the gentle words she forced out through her pen seemed to proceed from some other person" (*Howards End* 251).

Gender norms are ever present, working below the surface to undermine her confidence. The effect is both humorous and tragic, where although Margaret's panic is so sincere it is almost satirical, her bright mind tries to silence itself to fit the stereotype that other people desire. The trope of the silenced woman, of silence as deference, occurs again in a male modernist text. Margaret cannot ultimately alter her nature, but she can internalize the damage that chauvinist Henry Wilcox rends on her suffragette stance. Her struggle continues as she composes the letter to Henry: "But she crossed out 'I do understand'; it struck a false note. Henry could not bear to be understood [by a woman]. She also crossed out 'It is everything or nothing.' Henry would resent so strong a grasp of the situation. She must not comment; comment is unfeminine" (251).

The sexist stereotype linking masculinity and intelligence is inferred again by Ruth's daughter Evie who, given the last word in Chapter 15, uses it as ammunition in an attempt to strike Margaret from her father's affections. Henry and his daughter pay a visit and, perhaps out of jealousy, Evie responds to her father's comments as they leave the house:

> "I am really concerned at the way those girls go on. They are as clever as you make 'em, but unpractical—God bless me! One of these days they'll go too far. Girls like that oughtn't to live alone in London. Until they marry, they ought to have someone to look after them. We must look in more often—we're better than no one. You like them, don't you, Evie?"
>
> Evie replied: "Helen's right enough, but I can't stand the toothy one. And I shouldn't have called either of them girls." (155-56)

Henry's patriarchal desire to "protect" the "girls," is overt. But for Evie, the Schlegels are not girls, but women whose knowledge threatens to thrust them from acceptability, and in this way they do not warrant his protection. Henry's use of "girls" is diminutive, for him an attractive attribute. Evie, claiming "I shouldn't have called either of them girls" also suggests that, beyond their un-girlish age, their behavior is unfeminine, un-innocent, that they do no warrant his care.

The cliché of the gentler sex, the woman who "ought to want to be limited," as Kate Leslie puts it in Lawrence's *The Plumed Serpent*, becomes another detrimental, common thread for Margaret (457). As *Howards End* comes to a close, Helen Schlegel is excited about the harvested hay and new crop, a hopeful image of new life and renewal. Margaret, however, "was silent. Something shook her life in its inmost recesses, and she shivered" (358). She is possessed by a foreboding sense of inaction, an inability to speak. This "something" is ambiguous, unspecific, but it represents a restraint outside of herself that is creeping inwards, a force she may surrender to rather than combat.

For Forster, silence is gendered feminine. There is no "king of the castle" resistant silence trope in *Howards End*. Margaret has internalized her predecessor's, the late Mrs. Wilcox's, conception of gentility and she doubts herself as a result. Any masculinity in Margaret is latent, an affect of her assured manner early on. The reader is introduced to a verbose, opinionated, confident and argumentative woman with bold mannerisms, anathema to the Edwardian ideal of feminine speech.[54] By

[54] In their 1901 treatise, Greenough and Kittredge do not question the idea that women's language is typically more "conservative" than men's (56). Like Jespersen, they praise this style over the New Woman's political idiom, finding the latter to be aberrant rather than progressive.

counterpointing her idiolect with Mrs. Wilcox and Mrs. Bast, the reader comes to know Margaret as a person struggling with social ideas about gender, femininity, and propriety. She is caught between intrinsic strength and expected deference, the uncharacteristic surrender that her silence signifies makes her state all the more lamentable.

Earlier on in the narrative, Margaret invites the secretly ailing Mrs. Wilcox to her home for a dinner with friends. Mrs. Wilcox piques the interest of the diners by firmly proclaiming: "We never discuss anything at Howards End" (80). This adds poignancy to Margaret's final silence in the book. Margaret may also come to "never discuss anything," in turn. Upon marrying Mr. Wilcox, after his wife's death, Margaret is being slotted into a deferent role. At the dinner party Margaret's young, political friends probe Mrs. Wilcox, prompting her to add: "I sometimes think that it is wise to leave action and discussion to men….I never follow any arguments. I am only too thankful not to have the vote myself" (80). Ruth Wilcox is older than the rest at the table, and her patriarchal sentiment is, to them, a relic of an outmoded belief that informed commentary is unfeminine, but Howards End threatens its return. Mrs. Wilcox exists in stark contrast to those women at the table only too ready to offer comments, however polite.

Yet it is also a satirical portrayal of the misguided impositions of the upper classes. She is arguing that she does not make arguments, a logical fallacy. The dialogue has meta-implications: Mrs. Wilcox talks about talk, making the inference that the other women at dinner are not adequately feminine in their desire to have opinions. The contradiction she presents is acute, for while ultimately the party

"dismissed [Mrs. Wilcox] as uninteresting," their respect for her age and position barely conceals the truth: that they find her comments absurd (80).

Margaret's muddles are indicative of the "hesitations," "tensions" and "irresolution" Forster shows in getting at the principle of human connection (Bradshaw 151). Her silence at the novel's close is a form of irresolution, as much a sign of her ambiguous feelings as her quick dismissal of Mr. Wilcox's rather large transgression in hiding the inheritance from her. If, as Wendy Moffatt suggests, Forster created the Schlegels to fulfill his New Year's Eve resolution of December 1904 to "get a less superficial idea of women," because he was "attuned to bigotry and aware of his own ignorance of women," then it follows that in trying to represent and identify with the Schlegels some of his ambivalence would appear (48).

In *Howards End* the gender binary is interrogated, re-thought, misunderstandings are unresolved, but ultimately never unsettled in the way we see this occur through dialogue in Hemingway or Lawrence, or through theme and fashion in other novels from the period. Woolf's *Orlando* features a protagonist of unfixed mortality and gender, while Hall's *The Well of Loneliness* focuses on the life of a lesbian most comfortable expressing herself by dressing and living as a man. While Forster publicly defended Hall's right to artistic freedom when her novel was threatened with legal suppression on the grounds of obscenity, in private he confided to close friends Leonard and Virginia Woolf that "he found lesbians 'disgusting: partly from conventions, partly because he disliked that women should be independent of men'" (Moffatt 216-17). Gender is a subtext in Forster, another unresolved construct hampering human connection. Equality, is a difficult exercise, however, particularly

because his portrayals of muddled females like Margaret and Helen Schlegel, or Lilia Herriton in *Where Angels Fear to Tread*, indict gender stereotypes, they do not transgress them in an overt manner.

Dialect Emphasis

As his 1910 lecture showed, Forster felt the need to maintain and exploit a readerly sympathy to bolster any political argument. Maurice and Alec are archetypal, masculine, and their dialogue embodies these positions. In order to emphasize the admirability of these characters, the differences in their speech patterns are downplayed. Latency is a device because the concealment of linguistic traits demonstrates how outward social pressures lead characters to suppress their individuality in an effort to achieve acceptance. It is a means through which Forster can imply the impact of stereotyping on personal confidence.

To gain a clearer understanding of how dialect-suppression in Alec's dialogue is engendered, of how Forster exploits latency to effect, it is best to begin with an outline of how dialect is emphasized to criticize and poke-fun at other characters. Mrs. Bast's and Signora Bertolini's speech derides lower-class women. They add dark humor to a given scene, to judge the biases of upper class characters, but are never pushed beyond the borders of caricature. In *A Room With A View* (1908), Forster uses subtle irony to interrogate speakers his narrative first seems allied with. Relatively wealthy, certainly snobbish, Lucy Honeychurch and her chaperone Miss Charlotte Bartlett are shocked to discover the innkeeper they assumed to be Italian is, in fact, a born and bred Cockney. Phonics mock innkeeper Signora Bertolini. As she bows to guests in the evening she is "supported by 'Enery, her little boy, and Victorier, her

daughter" (7). Supplying E's for H's, and including superfluous syllables, suffixes and consonants, the narration captures the stereotypical or oversimplified essence of the accent.

Forster could have made the choice to present direct speech, but instead, close third person criticizes this "attempt of the Cockney to convey the grace and geniality of the South" (7). The effect is that the reader is presented with Lucy and Miss Bartlett's priggish condescension as a means of critique. Their accent is, from all paralinguistic cues in the text, and this reference to the "South," likely a refined RP. Class-based assumptions about dialect as a mispronunciation, rather than an acceptable speech-variation, contribute to a division between the English abroad. Bigotry is not limited to racism against Italians in the novel, and free indirect discourse inhabits Lucy's perspective: "the Cockney Signora and her works had vanished like a bad dream" (15). Signora Bertolini's fusion of Italian and English is as threatening as her low birth to these supposedly refined ladies.

Forster's exploitation of dialect bias to infer social commentary is similar to George Bernard Shaw's satiric plot involving professor Henry Higgins and flower girl Eliza Doolittle in *Pygmalion* (1912), released just two years after *Howards End*. In the play, Higgins studies the phonetic differences in dialect, but his wager-based impulse, fed by feelings of class superiority, is to rid Eliza of her indelicate Cockney accent. Both Shaw and Forster disarm their audiences with humor to impart a greater lesson about the ills of the class system. Signora Bertolini's omission of her national origin in writing to guests becomes a lie by omission. The lie is necessary because, to ensure a steady flow of new customers, the innkeeper must hide her birth. The ironic inference

is that Lucy or Charlotte would have the propriety to avoid such an indiscretion because they, unlike the Signora, are not Cockney (2). The narrative exposes this narrow-mindedness, interrogating the women for their ignorance and intolerance in snubbing the Signora, however, there is the persistent sense that Forster's audience is meant to enjoy this mockery of a lower-class accent. They are in on the joke, on the idea that dropped syllables are lamentable, funny. Forster's parody of the Signora's Cockney is less blatant than Eliza's phonics, which literally cry out in *Pygmalion*. Again, Forster uses subtlety to play up the reader's allegiances, exposing the error of bigotry without directly confrontation.

Shaw published his play with a preface written in first-person, so thick with satire it is difficult to pinpoint his intent, save that he finds hilarity in the social foibles of his countrymen whatever their class position. When the audience is first introduced to Eliza Doolittle, her speech is verbose, and the script attempts to capture many more of the phonetic particularities of Cockney than the dropped h or superfluous r. The difficulty in accurately reproducing Eliza's phonetics is stressed from the play's outset:

> THE MOTHER: How do you know that my son's name is Freddy, pray?
>
> THE FLOWER GIRL: Ow, eez ye-ooa san, is e? Wal, fewd dan y' de-ooty bawmz a mather should, eed now bettern to spawl a pore gel's flahrzn than ran awy atbaht pyin. Will ye-oo py me f'them? [Here, with apologies, this desperate attempt to represent her dialect without a phonetic alphabet must be abandoned as unintelligible outside London.] (Act I, *Project Gutenberg*)

Shaw's wit insists that the audience confront the damages of divisive social mores. However, it is significant that Forster's depiction of Signora Bertolini is unredemptive of the Signora as well. Without in-depth reflection, no mirror is held up to the reader, showing how wrong it is to judge a lower class woman on her accent or appearance

alone. Instead, the Signora remains a spurious figure. Charlotte and Lucy are sanctimonious and judgmental, similarly to the crotchety Professor Henry Higgins, whose (overly rosy) epiphany in Act V is similar to Forster's own humanism:

> HIGGINS: "The great secret, Eliza, is not having bad manners or good manners or any other particular sort of manners, but having the same manner for all human souls: in short, behaving as if you were in Heaven, where there are no third-class carriages, and one soul is as good as another" (Act V, Project Gutenberg).

The irony in Forster's novel, unlike Shaw's play, is so deeply imbedded, the narrative leaves the reader free to honor it, or alternatively ignore it, in favor of dismissing Signora Bertolini as an inferior, essentially permitting one to continue riding in the first class carriage. The narrative simultaneously scathes class bias and allows it to persist, by failing to feature the Signora as a person worthy of individual connection.

In a similar example from *Howards End*, Helen Schlegel relates a not-too-flattering portrait of the poor and uneducated Mrs. Bast to her siblings. She tells of Mrs. Bast's search for her "notty" husband, who has gone on the "lardy-da," implying she finds the woman's accent hilarious (118). Again, accent is phoneticized second hand. Because phonics, by its very nature, involves misspellings, they easily conflate ignorance with a lower class accent. 'Naughty' is almost phoneticially identical to 'notty,' but the misspelling works to convey inferiority. In *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, phonics are manifestations of a distinct and proud dialect rather than a mispronunciation. Without redeeming qualities, Mrs. Bast is relegated to the gutters of polite society.

In her eagerness to imitate Mrs. Bast's perceived shortcomings, Helen joyfully gets ahead of herself, erring in her zeal to make fun: "Then we began—very civilly. 'I

want my husband, what I have reason to believe is here.' No—how unjust one is. She said 'whom,' not 'what.' She got it perfectly" (117). Helen's mockery condemns both women for their failings. Namely, Helen's speech exposes the inauthenticity of her otherwise idealistic affinity for the lower classes. She never really improves Leonard Bast's living conditions or education. Helen is not just getting Mrs. Bast's pronoun use wrong, but is wrong in mocking her. In the narrative, neither woman is spared judgment. However, Helen is consistently given the last word and therefore afforded more sympathy.

Although her ill use by Mr. Wilcox, early in life as a mistress, incites some sympathy when this truth is revealed later in the novel, Mrs. Bast is overweight, unintelligent, drinks too much, manipulates her husband, and cannot hold a figurative candle to the good-intentioned Schlegels. This is despite the grave social indiscretions of these independently wealthy Londoners, including when Helen becomes pregnant out of wedlock with the very married Leonard as her lover. Helen's behavior is indicted, but not mocked for humor in the same way Helen and the narrator mock Mrs. Bast for her pronunciation. In these two examples from *A Room With a View* and *Howards End*, among others, Forster's narrative technique embraces the power of dialect markers to imply social commentary, ironizes the class system, and yet some women still receive more sympathy than others owing to their heightened class position.

It is significant that while lower-class women have accents, use dialect, those lower-class males with which Forster has an affinity have softer, more neutral accents and suppressed dialects. Meaning, any accent is not phonetically downplayed; rather it

is not portrayed at all, in order to de-emphasize their social differences. When the reader is meant to wholly sympathize with a lower-class character, in a subordinate social position, the narrative rejects, almost repudiates, the qualities of accent in favor of elevated diction or an evenly matched vocabulary. For self-aggrandizing clerk Leonard Bast, who both admires and hates his social betters, there is financial and social benefit in rejecting an accent, shunning vernacular English, in favor of elevated diction. He confesses to Jacky, a "massive woman of thirty-three" who finds conversation "difficult and tiring" that "I care a good deal about improving myself by means of Literature and Art, and so getting a wider outlook" (54-55). Jacky is "indifferent," to Leonard's ideas, obsessed instead with securing his affections: "but you do love me, don't you" (56). While Helen detects and mocks Jacky's accent second hand, Forster refrains from affording Jacky an accent in all her scenes. This is consistent with the idea that low class dialect is portrayed only when it indicates upper class bigotry, lower class ignorance, or both.

Later in the novel, at Evie's marriage lunch, Mrs. Bast's dialect appears in direct speech. In her drunken stupor her manners devolve, and she says to Henry Wilcox "Hen, don't go. You do love me dear, don't you?" and "you're a nice boy, you are" (242). Her Cockney question tags indicate agreement. She pronounces the "h" on the familiar endearment "Hen," suggesting Mrs. Bast's primarily unphoneticized accent is not remotely as broad as Eliza Doolittle's version.

In Forster, informal language is not relegated to lower-class women alone. Evie's use of casual, yet still upper-class, slang in her dressing room, occurs before her wedding lunch. Her diction is informal and without self-conscious pretension: "Dolly

is a rotter not to be here! Oh we would rag [dance] just then!" (229). While "rotter" and "rag" are common Briticisms from her day, Evie's vocabulary is not genteel. It therefore presents a marked contrast to her restrained and lofty pronunciations when in her father's company. The ability to code-switch between formal diction and informal slang allows Evie to get what she wants. Good manners gain her father's sympathy, and in contrast, the new slang incites the sorority of her bridesmaids. Gender and class converge here because Leonard and Evie are permitted a verbal leeway that Mrs. Bast is denied. Each time Mrs. Bast uses dialect, elision or abbreviation, she is wholly unlikeable, pitiable. Leonard elevates his speech with the Schlegels, but he comfortably uses the occasional bit of fashionable idiom in Jacky's company, as in "That tune fairly gives me the hump," without the censure of narration or unfortunate circumstance (229).

The different possibilities and shifts in the verbiage of Leonard, Evie or Mrs. Bast exemplify Forster's manipulation of what Bakhtin calls the "extraliterary language." The narrative is polyphonic, affected by many discourses and forms of meaning:

> The novelist working in prose (and almost any prose writer) takes a completely different path [to the poet]. He welcomes the heteroglossia and language diversity of the literary and extraliterary language into his own work not only not weakening them but even intensifying them. (*Discourse in the Novel* 298)

Forster uses dialect and accent to value certain characters over others, and Lawrence does the same. It is a testament to their unique interpretations of extraliterary forces that Lawrence uses dialect as a positive character trait whereas Forster does not. This disparity does not detract from the verisimilitude of their direct speech. Instead, in each case, the writing manipulates shared beliefs, allowing the author's guiding aesthetic,

political and moral principles to speak through their characters. Poetry and prose are indeed distinct forms, but poetry is indelibly marked by an extraliterary language and heteroglossia; all literature is socially discursive, made so by the processes of language production and the relationship between signifier, "the speech sounds or marks composing the sign," and signified, "the conceptual meaning of the sign" (Abrams 142).

Dialect-Suppression

Because phonetics are imbued with extraliterary meaning, given social connotation in Forster, characters that could easily speak in dialect, or have an accent, do not. In *Maurice*, even as rural groundskeeper Alec Scudder half-heartedly tries to blackmail Cambridge graduate Maurice for money, the manner in which he speaks conveys pride and incites a shared sensibility. Like Helen, he is a character who commits a social transgression. Although Helen is eccentric and idiosyncratic, the alacrity that her extraneous modifiers and impulsive commentary conveys is, if partly attributable to her upper class freedoms, primarily a means to illustrate her silliness: "'Oh, the dears! Oh, Evie, how too impossibly sweet!' screamed Helen, falling on her hands and knees" (148). Helen's speech is gendered. Jespersen identifies hyperbolic adjectives, parataxis, as in her rote repetition of "Oh" to begin her exclamations, and "greater rapidity" as stereotypically feminine (249-52). Forster uses these beliefs to construct Helen's speech and to caricature it as a feature of a figure, the silly woman type. Again, linguistic affectations are stressed to demonstrate lamentable aspects of a female character, to render them laughable.

In this way, Forster could emphasize Alec's accent and dialect to portray his ignorance as the primary reason that he tries to blackmail Maurice. Yet, in a male character, the impetus is to suppress essentializing differences. In a scene where Alec threatens to expose his affair with Maurice, Alec still calls Maurice "Mr. Hall", ostensibly out of formal politeness and class duty. The class divide between the two men is verbally indicated by this formality, contrasted with the parallel diction they use, embodying Forster's belief in individual connection. Alec's lower-class diction is downplayed, benign, and unexaggerated. Barely detectable, it is typified by the anticipatory retort: "I'm as good as you" (*Maurice* 200). This generates irony. The colloquialism "as good," emphasizes that Alec's speech is actually not as educated, as formal, as Maurice's could be. Yet, Maurice's response demonstrates his will to narrow the divide between the ruling and subordinate classes. He readily uses equally informal speech.

In a similar manner to Helen, Jacky and Evie, colloquialisms are brought on by circumstance. However, this does not portray him satirically or negatively. Instead, his casual reply to Alec solidifies a sense of connection and evokes their intimacy. Maurice, in a passion, uses "quod," a slang word for jail, and a vernacular expression to stress his need to confide: "We'd have got you into quod, for blackmail, after which— I'd have blown out my brains" (200). As evidenced by Leonard, Evie, and Maurice, Forster uses dialect and slang as devices to impart irony, satire or varying emotions into a scene. Yet, Forster mostly avoids phonics in the speech of sympathetic characters to prevent a sense of caricature or bias.

Whereas Forster often suppresses phonetic portrayals of dialect to suppress difference, Lawrence romanticizes it instead. Oliver Mellors in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is a similar character to Alec Scudder in that he is also a groundskeeper and the protagonist's main love interest.[55] While Forster refers to his groundskeeper most often as 'Alec,' using his first name to accentuate, again, the need for personal connection over formal class distinctions, Lawrence prefers Mellors, the last name. Forster uses naming to convey a role, as in his use of a woman's title to indicate whether she is married or maintain distance and formality (Finkelstein 2-3). Mr. Wilcox is called Henry more frequently as Margaret's familiarity with her future husband grows. If the last name and title convey that a speaker is defined by his social role, disconnected from the reader, then the use of 'Alec' is meant to indicate the opposite, a transcendence of class in favor of familiarity.

Naming is a narrative trait, but it is also a speech convention. A given name is familiar and a family name adds distance. Maurice's need for connection, to call the groundskeeper Alec, not Scudder, actually takes this point further, and arouses suspicion in his lover. Alec's blackmail letter exemplifies this sense of transgression. He writes about the effects of subverting the class hierarchy through speech conventions:

> My father is a respectable tradesman. I am going to be on my own in the Argentine. You say 'Alec, you are a dear fellow'; but you do not write. *I know about you and Mr. Durham*. Why do you say 'call me Maurice', and then treat me so unfairly." Mr. Hall, I am coming to London Tuesday. (192)

[55] Moffat points out "the gamekeeper as-salt-of-the-earth lover may have become a stereotype since the publication of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, but it is well to remember that Morgan's story was written almost twenty years before D.H. Lawrence's" (114).

The juxtaposition of the formal, and familiar names here is highlighted through his inquiring tone and the repetition of "you say." "Mr. Durham" and "Mr. Hall" stress the intensity of his personal sense of affront and develop his serious tone. This letter confronts the class system, allowing the reader to perceive how dangerous a power imbalance can be when the tables take a metaphorical turn. Maurice's first, and physically-unrequited love Clive Durham is based on Forster's real life love H.O. Meredith (Booth 183). In the narrative, unlike Alec's letter, Clive is referred to by his first name. Fellow intellect Risley, based on the eccentric and cerebral author Lytton Strachey, is someone Maurice struggles to understand (Booth 183). Accordingly, the narrative defines him more formally, to convey a sense of impersonal separation, by his family name (179).

In *Lady Chatterley's Lover,* Mellors prefers a working man's dialect to emphasize the divide between employer and employee. For Richard Leith, this code-switching gives a sort of "schizophrenic" impression: "he has a foot in both camps, but identifies with neither" (254). However, for Lawrence code-switching solidifies the positive impression of the common man that he wants to romanticize. It develops contrast with Mrs. Bolton, a woman born to the same dialect, who "generally uses the less densely-marked speech" to infer but downplay her regional upbringing (254). This is also code-switching or shifting on her part, an elevation when in the presence of her employers. Alec and Maurice code-switch as well, between formal and informal registers, but they do so in sync. Their speech style changes to match the implications and atmosphere of the scene and their relationship.

In fictional dialogue, different dialects and forms of slang are suppressed, manipulated or heightened to fulfill different ideological imperatives. Forster's dialogue does not always function to achieve his humanist emphasis on intimacy and personal connection. In some cases, is caricatures or dismisses a character, and these characters are frequently women, of which Helen Schlegel, Jacky Bast, Lucy Honeychurch and Evie Herriton are notable examples. However, in all these instances, Forster consistently interrogates the disaffection inherent in class divisions to expose the harm in Evie and Helen's sense of entitlement or in Leonard Bast's crippling sense of inferiority.

So far, my discussion of dialogue in Forster's work has been limited to British speakers. In *A Passage to India* (1924), Dr. Aziz's alterity is defined by the colonial system. Aziz is sanctimonious and self-consciously more eloquent than his social superiors. He loans Fielding a collar stud, using the Briticism "I say:" "I say, Mr. Fielding, is the stud going to go in?" (59). This is their first meeting. Aziz's manners ensure his tone is polite and formal. Fielding detects this impulse to connect, and so he casually replies in Stage Scottish: "I hae my doots" (60). Fielding's attempt at adding a bit of informal comfort with Aziz has the opposite effect. Aziz is immediately confused, plunged into a sense of anxiousness. The attempt at familiarity, the dialect, drives a cultural wedge between them, and he replies: "What's that last sentence, please? Will you teach me some new words so as to improve my English?" (60). Aziz is self-consciously aware of his inferior social position in a British system where he is subject to racism, and not privy to all its linguistic nuances. Although Aziz does his level best to use formal English, almost to the point of anachronism, the novel's

dialogue is filled with "misunderstandings and misreadings" that are a testament to the "muddle" that is Forster's colonial India (Childs 198).

Aziz and Fielding's relationship highlights that "power in the colonial scenario is never simply a one-way street. Instead, colonial ideas carry inherent contradictions when applied to the other….[this is] illustrated in the moments of doubt scattered across" *A Passage to India* (Morey 259). In the same scene, Fielding offends Aziz over a comment about post-impressionism. It is left up to the narrator to explain what Fielding really meant, to contextualize the conversational failing (Forster 61). Even though the narrative avoids portraying dialect phonetically, to prize individual differences over those that are class or regionally based, the system still generates inescapable layers of subalterity. Dialect-suppression, the subsumption of difference into the tissues of the novel, is not enough. Gayatri Spivak pioneered considerations of the subaltern in the colonial context, and she argues that Indians who are higher in the caste system or more educated are not truly subalterns (de Kock, *Interview*, 40). Aziz definitely experiences subalternity. Aziz's freedoms, such as they are in the caste system, are suspended at trial by the British courts. If Aziz has servants at different points in the narrative, after Adela's accusation, he is at the express mercy of the Raj. Aziz can speak at different points in the narrative, but he is denied his ability to speak at trial. Other subordinates given authority by the legal system, including the rebellious lawyer Amritrao, will speak for him.

The spectre of mockery is ever present in the novel, and so Forster uses diction, not phonetics, to demarcate the particularities of Urdu, representing it in English prose. The distinct impression is that Urdu is more formal in diction than English. Aziz,

Mahmoud Ali and Hamidullah meet for dinner, and do not use grammatical contractions. Subtle clues, such as a missing modal verb, or adjective to conjoin terms, suggest that they are not speaking English: "If so I go elsewhere" and "hookah is so jolly now" create verbal hybrids, where the Briticism "jolly" is included, but "the" before "hookah" is more casually omitted, suggesting their native tongue, or a hybrid dialect interspersed with English (9-10).

In the company of the English, Aziz encounters racism on a daily basis, and uses his formality as a kind of verbal armour to convey his education and use it to gain authority. The idea of speech trait as armour holds parallels with Alec Scudder's use of formal names, Brett's masculine slang in *The Sun Also Rises*, and Clara's resistant silence in *Sons and Lovers*. Postcolonial approaches to Forster's method of representation, "while they may question Forster's ability to transcend the intellectual conditions of his time, often emphasize his highly conscious arrangement of devices and awareness of the pitfalls of representing India" (Morey 266). The way his characters speak is arranged, purposeful, constructed, and it illuminates the lengths to which Forster crafted his fictional world to support his "advocacy of individualism and of art as the supreme mode of human communication" (Morey 267).

As is true with all artifice, in the postcolonial canon or otherwise, the artist manipulates the terms of expression to achieve a goal. Morey, in line with Spivak and Hubel, discusses the punkah wallah who, in the narrative, "stands outside the elite dialogue" (Morey 266). The punkah wallah is not one of the "educated Indians who take up most of Forster's attention" (266). Fan-wavers, drivers and house servants have almost nothing to say in *A Passage to India.* Again there is the notion that some

Indians are subalterns while others are not, depending on their economic and class-based circumstances. However, in insisting on the damages of social differences, colonial subjects, not just the punkah wallah operating the fan during the trial, are victims of colonialism. They are subalterns not only to their superiors in the social hierarchy, but are subordinates to the system itself.

Forster critiques the Raj, and such a project would be threatened by the potential for mockery that accent approximation might engender in the narrative for Aziz and his counterparts. Accents represent the divide, the negative, rather than the positive kind of difference for Forster. His dialogue craft demonstrates the collision of his ideal, where all people should focus on the need for individual connection, with the reality, that his narratives often bias a greater connection with some, with Leonard Bast or Dr. Aziz, rather than others, such as Mrs. Bast. Dialogue provides a site where "varying depictions of women" and the "cultural processes of representation" manifest the predispositions of the fictional perspective (Goldman 126-7). In light of his dialect techniques of over-emphasis and suppression, Forster's epigraph to *Howards End*: "Only connect…." might continue: "with the right people."

A Passage to India is "closely aligned with modernism's new awareness of epistemological complexities" because it maligns the heap of failures and limitations in the colonial system (Stevenson 216). Forster's modernism or postcolonialism, are, like gender, categories: "worthwhile only insofar as [they clarify] specific characteristics genuinely shared among authors, pointing to historical forces collectively shaping their work" (219). Forster's dialogue craft is not experimental, but those techniques that might appear entirely traditional can be used to develop the modernist project. Speech

and thought are often replaced by free indirect discourse in Forster, just as they are in Jane Austen (Stevenson 220).[56] Although Forster does not use free indirect discourse as Woolf does in her figural narration, to interrogate the limits of narrative form and subjectivity in *To the Lighthouse*, it is, in the tradition of Austen, a tool like dialect, contributing satire and "transcribing characters' thoughts and outlooks in ironic contrast with implied authorial norms" (220). Woolf's blend of perspectives is more interpretive, an aesthetic reflection that dwells comfortably in the ambiguities of perception: "Through the open window the voice of the beauty of the world came murmuring, too softly to hear exactly what it said—but what mattered if the meaning were plain?" (Woolf 116).

Instead, in *A Passage to India*, free indirect discourse is often a "tactic" to establish disaffected irony or make a political commentary: "'There is no God but God' doesn't carry us far through the complexities of matter and spirit; it is only a game with words, really, a religious pun, not a religious truth" (260). Irony is much more self-reflexive in the question and answer form of the "Ithaca" section from James Joyce's *Ulysses*. The self-aware narrator is at times entirely distinct; irony is present in form and content: "Wasthenarrationotherwiseunalteredbymodifications? Absolutely.", and at other times very close to Bloom's weary, somnambulant imagination such that their perspectives blend: "Sinbad the Sailor and Tinbad the Tailor and Jinbad the Jailer and Whinbad the Whaler…." (868, 871). The absence of quotation marks, the presence of talk that does not adhere to the conventions of direct speech, is a technical element

[56] Austen uses genderlect, over exaggeration to imply a girlish naivete and lack of perceptiveness, to signal the thoughts of her titular heroine in *Emma* (1816): "The picture! How eager he had been about the picture!....Who could have seen through such thick headed nonsense?" (99).

that exchanges one form of constraint for another. It unites narratives across different genres, Austen with Forster and Joyce, by illustrating that they are as committed to interiority as they are to each unique method of achieving it. Characterization, introspective subjectivity, bridges the categorical divide.

Femininity on Trial

Such a bridge befits a discussion of human connection, but categories cannot be left off for long, particularly in a narrative so guided by gender tropes. After the trial concludes in *A Passage to India*, the narration invades Cyril's thoughts. Fielding perceives a sea change: "Although her hard schoolmistressy manner remained, she was no longer examining life, but being examined by it; she had become a real person" (230). Adela attains personhood in his appraisal by rejecting the expectation that her femininity is somehow contingent on deference. On the stand, Adela is meant to defer to the system, to the men around her, but instead she will not be silenced, and finds her voice at trial.

Adela divides Fielding and Aziz through her accusation and the two men's friendship never fully recovers. However, if Adela is a device to separate Forster's male characters in the novel, she is also a speaker being altered by her experiences in a way that others detect. Both speaker and listener contribute to the meaning of the utterance. Her function is not solely derivative, her enlightenment is valuable in its own right, for her future independence. Although the Anglo-Indians in the narrative detest Adela after the trial, Fielding, and the narrator, appear to see her as a person for the first time. This signals an awakening that the reader is able to perceive through Fielding, who gains "a new respect for her, consequent on their talk" (229).

In their "talk" and in the trial, traces of female masculinity are perceptible. This perception depends, again, on the idea that participants imbue certain traits with a gendered association. Post-trial, Hamidullah, Adela and Fielding discuss her recantation with the vocabulary of a religious conversion:

> "Perhaps the age of miracles has returned. One must be prepared for everything, our philosophers say."
> "It must have seemed a miracle to the onlookers," said Adela, addressing him nervously. "The fact is that I realized before it was too late that I had made a mistake, and had just enough presence of mind to say so. That is all my extraordinary conduct amounts to." (228)

Hamidullah can barely contain his suppressed rage at Adela in this moment. Superintendent McBryde and the other Anglo-Indians at the trial are shocked. Adela's hesitation is not necessarily gendered. However, it does contravene the expectations placed upon her as a British woman:

> She was silent. The court, the place of question, awaited her reply…"May I have half a minute before I reply to that, Mr. McBryde?"
> "Certainly."
> …It was the doubt that had often visited her, but solid and attractive, like the hills. "I am not—" Speech was more difficult than vision. "I am not quite sure.
> "I beg your pardon?" said the Superintendent of Police.
> "I cannot be sure…"
> "I didn't catch that answer." (215)

Her silence is a refusal to do as McBryde wills. The Superintendent, representing the colonial power, tries to suppress Adela and control her, he claims an inability to hear the answer she gives. Tropes of femininity are figuratively on trial, and her ability to dictate the conversation, the outcome, relies on her capacity to deny the expectations of her role, as a young, British, white female. Adela is uncertain, but as her sense of conviction grows she moves from silence to a state where she, the witness and victim, holds control over the situation. By capturing a moment for herself, she is suddenly

guiding, rather than being led, by the proceeding for the first time. The analogy of the Indian hills evokes connections between the landscape and her doubt, once confusing, now "solid and attractive." In this way, India metaphorically becomes her solution. McBryde tries to guide the witness:

> "…I suggest to you that the prisoner followed you."
> She shook her head.
> "What do you mean, please?"
> "No," she said in a flat, unattractive voice…no one yet understood what was occurring except Fielding. He saw that she was going to have a nervous breakdown and that his friend was saved.
> "What is that, what are you saying? Speak up please." The Magistrate bent forward.
> "I'm afraid I have made a mistake."
> "What nature of mistake?"
> "Dr. Aziz never followed me into the cave." (215)

When her comments are unsure and hesitant, no guiding information about the timbre of her voice is given. But when she is direct, resolved, her tone is "flat," unmusical, and therefore "unattractive." The narrative momentarily relies on paralinguistic information in explaining her dialogue:

> Something that she did not understand took hold of the girl and pulled her through. Though the vision was over, and she had returned to the insipidity of the world, she remembered what she had learned. Atonement and confession—they could wait. It was in hard prosaic tones that she said "I withdraw everything." (216)

The utterance is contextualized as a manifestation of her newfound clarity. Her ability to rebel and go against the grain at trial is heroic, and her tone echoes this in a way that conveys a rebellion against the association of passivity with her gender. Her dialogue thus becomes unattractive for a woman, but very admirable to Fielding. It allows Fielding to see her as a "real person." The subtext of personhood, of the legal definition of individuality and authority, had very real ramifications for women in the

Anglo milieu during the continuing movement for universal suffrage.[57] After her echoing headache is gone, her fog lifts. She becomes very certain, resolved, and forceful in her "hard schoolmistressy manner," and her authority becomes synonymous, not with the system, but with her independent subjectivity (230). Adela's personhood is filtered through Fielding's eyes, through the male gaze, however. She never attains the same degree of sympathetic interiority that he is constantly afforded.

As the chapter concludes, Fielding thinks of Adela as the "queer honest girl…and felt that we exist not in ourselves, but in terms of each other's minds—a notion for which logic offers no support" (234). Social differences are, in the effort to reach a heightened state of individual connection, dividing walls in the mind of the interlocutors. The word queer is frequently used in the book (Childs 197). Indicative of "several layers of meaning" in the text, "its first slang use to mean 'homosexual' is recorded as 1922" and Childs suggests that Forster would have known its associations with othering and difference (197). Childs argues that the word "comes to describe the people in *A Passage to India* in the same way that the word 'extraordinary' attaches itself to the Marabar [caves], suggesting that personal dynamics are as remarkable, and possibility even as ineffable, as the caves" (197).

I would argue that, rather than ineffable, the word "queer" characterizes Adela, post-trial, as someone finally able to resist expectations and revel in contradiction as a generative force. After the trial, Adela is "queer," "honest," and therefore now a "real person," suggesting her ability to escape the silent space of the feminine. Although in

---

[57] It was not until 1929 that, after a Canadian case was brought before the British Privy Council, that women were officially considered "persons" under the law in Canada, a consequential if inexact concept, because the British North America Act did, as a consequence, then allow women to hold Senate positions for the first time ("Edwards v. A.G. of Canada").

literary theory queer is necessarily a very charged term, as Martin and Piggford highlight in their introduction to *Queer Forster* (1997), Forster can be "considered a queer artist [if he is seen as] one who seeks to disrupt the economy of the normal" (4). Adela is definitely a disrupting force in *A Passage to India*. Forster, Lawrence and Hemingway are all queer authors under this definition, through their persistent challenges to sexual, political and class norms.

In *A Passage to India* and *Maurice*, femininity is an aside to Forster's laser focus on personal relationships between men, but it deserves a more developed, juxtapositional, scrutiny for this reason. This is not to argue that women in his fiction solely function as a means to either "unite or separate the men" (Childs 196). Rather, in trying to embrace personal individuality, to suppress essentializing differences, Forster's dialogue only capitalizes on distinct linguistic traits, attributable to one gender, class or region, when trying to expose prejudicial shortcomings, to generate irony, or to satirize the British upper classes. The caveat is that the more caricatured speech of lower class women is still a troubling aspect in narratives so committed to social progress. Latency requires a degree of concealment, a lack of focus, to function. Forster is clearly manipulating what is not said, presenting how a polite individual should not speak, at times, to characterize individuals and facilitate his larger political arguments.

Ultimately, Forster's biases, as they manifest themselves in his dialogue, this notion of the "right people," is mitigated by the effort to establish a common language amongst characters from diverse backgrounds, to resist attempts at division and suppression, much as Adela also does when she puts the expectation of feminine

deference on trial. Woolf criticized Forster for what she saw as his allegiance to Literary Realism, and for "failing to denounce the old in favor of the new" (Medalie 188). Almost in retaliation, Forster stated that Woolf's writing "has no moral, no philosophy, nor has it what is usually understood by Form. It aims deliberately at aimlessness" (*The Prince's Tale* 26). Despite the antagonism Woolf had for Forster's work, and the gulf between their styles, both authors use traits indicative of talk in their writing to either suppress or emphasize aspects of genderlect, to "gesture" at dialogue's ability to communicate a subversive philosophy on multiple levels.[58]

It may seem a simple fact, but in fiction, what characters say is as important as how they say it. In prose or poetry, in direct speech or figural narration, gendered talk insists that the personal is political. Fiction gestures at reality as a space filled with varied beliefs and negotiations of norms. Changing gender mores shudder through Forster's dialogue in jolts of absence and presence, dislodging old individual and conceptual muddles so that they no longer settle. Although a "gesture towards an open space," this space proves elusive because "the pressure of resolution" produces dissatisfaction and "evasion" in *Howards End* and *A Passage to India* (Langland 264). Forster's ideal of human connection becomes a lament for the same, a softly elegiac yet still hopeful proposition, in those moments where commonality seems most elusive or unreachable.

---

[58] "Gesture" is inspired by Elizabeth Langland's article: "Gesturing towards an Open Space." Her work demonstrates that while the notion of an open space, of a place free from old restrictions, is a positive one, it is also dangerously, conceptually, close to a gaping abyss, where concepts tumble forth far from fully formed (263).

Conclusion

"Time Doth Flit:" Talking Poetry and the Temporality of Gender

"Time doth flit/ Oh shit." Dorothy Parker

Any lengthy research project ultimately raises as many questions as it answers. Time is limited, but there is always more to say. Dorothy Parker captures this conundrum in her wonderfully short poem above. Its brevity is a testament to, and an argument for, the importance of stylistic juxtaposition in achieving maximum impact. "Doth" is archaic, it implies authority, and yet it also simultaneously parodies the traditional avenues of wisdom as outdated. One need not be of advanced age, self-serious, or a member of the elite, to be wise. "Oh Shit" is an impolite colloquialism that functions like a punchline, creating shock when the expletive is held up against the elevated tone of the former line. In just five words, Parker conveys morality, mortality, the politics of knowledge production, and the limits and possibilities inherent in creative expression. Like the fictional Brett Ashley, Parker uses taboo language, in a fiercely laconic manner, to electrocute her audience into awareness. The poem is prescriptive, urging the audience to keep careful tabs on time's inevitable passage, but it is also a commentary on the social expectations of women. It boldly refuses politeness and insists on being heard, thereby crushing the connotation of silence with womanhood.

In this way, Parker's poetry is indicative of talk. It has a discernibly colloquial, casual, air and devil-may-care attitude that advocates for the responsibility to live life without fetters like outside expectations or moral inhibitions because time is short. Yet it is also cynical, wry in its refusal to go into greater detail. The poet's motivations, the impetus occasioning its composition, remain a speculative subtext. It laments our inability to change the past or to take advantage of lost time. In her biography of

Parker, Marion Meade stresses that, in this way, Parker embodies the "cynical spirit" of the 1920s (xix). In contrast with Parker's preference for formal verse, including structured rhyme schemes and consistent meter (even loose iambic pentameter), the suddenness of indelicate content and language acts to flummox her potentially scandalized audience through titillation.

Talking Poetry

If, after a look at gender-neutral and androgynous idiom in Woolf, Barnes and Hall, followed by examples of female masculinity in Lawrence, Hemingway and Forster, it seems male modernists wrote female masculinity into dialogue or talk whereas female modernists did not, Parker proves a notable exception to any such rule. Masculine language is a means to express disaffection for her. She characterizes the artist's struggle to remain relevant while producing 'good' art, and hints at this need for achievement and recognition in the final lines from "Coda":

> Oh, hard is the struggle, and sparse is
> The gain of the one at the top,
> For art is a form of catharsis,
> And love is a permanent flop,
> And work is the province of cattle,
> And rest's for a clam in a shell,
> So I'm thinking of throwing the battle—
> Would you kindly direct me to hell? (Parker in Meade, xix)

While Meade is right that this poem embodies a post-war cynicism about the state of art in a changing world, it is also an interesting bit of evidence proving that new women were using gendered speech, manipulating stereotypes of femininity and masculinity, to gain relevance in a world obsessed with innovation. World War I is over, but another struggle, this time for independence and understanding, still rages on.

This poem's careful meter, its pulsing rhyme, is precisely what emphasizes the emotional punch of its last word. Politeness and vulgarity conjoin to echo the hypocrisy of polite society in this last sentence. "Would you kindly direct me" is feminine, refined, but "to hell" is a final slap in the face to the idea that Parker would ever be required, on account of her gender, to restrain her vocabulary in the first place. The poet, the voice in Parker's poems, is so intimate to her own perspective that studies of her life and work, such as Meade's, rarely delineate the two as separate entities.

Meade contextualizes Parker's uninhibited speech style with a quote from one of the writer's college friends. I have reproduced the quote in its entirety because it explains the role of female masculinity, not only in Parker's idiolect, but in the idiom of the educated New Woman:

> lovely speech, a little drawl that was very attractive, very upper-class. It was finishing school talk, but not the Brearley accent, not the West-Side private school accent, it was her own. She talked like a woman who as a little girl had attended a very good singing school. That was what made her use of the words *fuck* and *shit* so amusing, because you simply did not expect it. (Meade 11)

Parker saw vocabulary as a means to transform ideals about the feminine in a manner indicative of personal independence. Her angst would become à la mode, a branded calling card. For a writer that often delivered her lines orally, Parker's speech style is closely connected to her poetic style. Her breath-length lines and commitment to a storytelling-style format amplify the aural quality of her poetry. She includes an introduction, a crisis, and a punchline, whether the poem is one line, or many.

Parker's confrontational language invited push back from her antagonists. It created both fascination and disapproval in equal measure. Like Lawrence's fictional

Alice Gall, with the commitment to self-expression and rebellion came notoriety, ensuring an easy target for her opponents. Parker's masculine speech sexualized her, making her seem 'freer' on many fronts. Her wit, her suit of armour, was built such that others rushed to test it for weaknesses.

For example, in February 1926, Parker and Hemingway met in New York (163). Hemingway initially liked Parker, but, as was the case with most writers he met, he would soon come to surreptitiously loathe her, to talk what Parker would have undoubtedly called "shit," behind her back and without her knowledge. Not the only independent woman Hemingway knew, others also traveled alone, drank openly and swore. Zelda Fitzgerald and Duff Twysden were similar in their embrace of the role of the New Woman (Sanderson 174). Yet such a powerful presence proved threatening to Hemingway. Parker visited Spain and did not like it. She told Hemingway so, and this cinched his animosity. Publically, Hemingway read an anti-Semitic poem aloud to friends, indicting Parker for her behavior, her ethnicity and her suicide attempts. Its atmosphere is captured best in the very title: "To a Tragic Poetess—Nothing in her life became her like her almost leaving of it." (Meade 173).

In the same years where he was heartily against Parker, he was writing his ode to her ilk in *The Sun Also Rises* (1926), and heartily editing the Baroness Elsa von Freytag-Loringhoven's far more experimental poetry out of a "fierce hunger for vanguard experimentation and in his angry rebellion against [Ford Maddox] Ford's staid modernism" (Gammel 363). Whether Hemingway objected to Parker because of her mechanic form, her rejection of his beloved bullfights, or for her religion, her powerful command of language and openly opinionated personality clearly challenged

his compulsion to be the centre of attention. Hemingway's contempt for Parker demonstrates the divide between the reality and the fetish at the heart of his ambivalent relationship with strong women. An apt metaphor would be that guns are alluring to some, like Hemingway, because of their power and ability to destroy, but when actually fired the destruction/new state of things is final, which his suicide proved. The symbol is no longer romantic, but painful.

My metaphor, of course, relies on a sort of simultaneous suspension of, and reference to, the gun as a phallic symbol. However, it does hint again at masculinity as an execution of, a trigger for, conversational control in a female context. Jake Barnes is aroused by Brett's masculinity in *The Sun Also Rises* because it never threatens to wholly overcome his central position of authority in the narrative. Hemingway edited the Baroness' poetry without such seething resentment from either party (Gammel 363). The modernists influenced each other's art through experience, experimentation, philosophy and editorship, shown in the intersecting lives and philosophies of Woolf, Forster, Lawrence, Parker and Hemingway, amongst others.

This culture of informed participation is ultimately a dimension of the modernist's role in idiom and language production. Linguistic practice relies on the promotion of certain concepts or modes while others fall away. For example, the apocalyptic effects of World War I interjected the language of battle, struggle, combat and war into the modernist aesthetic, typified by Parker's contemplated surrender: "I'm thinking of throwing the battle." The "battle of the sexes," to quote the colloquial expression, required a radical refashioning of identity on the part of the New Woman to combat sexism. Hemingway would continue to seek out global conflict, evidenced

by *For Whom the Bell Tolls* and his film *The Spanish Earth* (1937), many years after *A Farewell to Arms* (1929), to capture the tenuous, vivid humanity and inhumanity, of life at war.

The animosity and differences between authors of the period could be stark despite their similarities, such that in "A Tragic Poetess" Hemingway tells Parker to go publish "more poems for the New Yorker," a snide quip about the mainstream side of her rhyme schemes (Meade 173). In contrast, the Baroness' poetry was anything if conventional. Her body, found object art, and writing were all sites of discovery and experimentation on multiple fronts. Hemingway, Ezra Pound and Jane Heap saw the sheer innovation in the Baroness' writing (Gammel 364). Unlike Parker, the Baroness sloughed off conventions of rhyme and meter in favor of new uses and rejections of punctuation. The result is a sort of portrait on the page, or visual poetry, where the words and punctuation are arranged to visually impact the reader. In *Baroness Elsa* (2002), Irene Gammel notes that Hemingway admired this unique brand of American dadaism as less self-aware than some European alternatives (365).

The Baroness embraced the absurd and the profane, the non-sensical and the bizarre to comment on her own existence. There is less a self-serious, Lawrencean impulse to divorce sexuality from obscenity here, and more a desire to poke fun at the absurdity of its conventional morality. Gammel draws a connection between the tragedy of the Baroness as an impoverished and troubled woman with "aristocratically titled, profanity-spewing, and sexually aggressive protagonist Lady Brett Ashley, who like the Baroness is typically surrounded by homosexual or impotent lovers" (365). Duff Twysden was "a much more superficially carefree" woman than her fictional

doppelganger (365). The baroness embraced androgynous clothing and characteristics, but her experimental vocabulary is at times masculine. It disputes the silence space of the feminine in a monologic way, inviting comparisons to spoken idiom in its use of punctuation and word placement to create pauses of different lengths. Similarly to Parker, the Baroness hints at the breathiness of speech.

The Baroness' poetry hyper-emphasizes and draws together the most experimental elements and aspects of women's narrative dialogue. In "A Dozen Cocktails—Please," The Baroness "plays with the reader as she plays with herself: sexual freedom makes sex an arena of play and self-empowerment" (Clement, Web). *transition* acquired the poem in 1927 as an example of The Baroness' dadaist aesthetic, but did not publish it (Gammel 377). Tanya Clement also highlights the power of obscene language to garner special attention, emphasizing the way that the Baroness uses the shock of bum and ass talk to make a commentary on the social inferiority of Americans and their bathroom habits.

"A Dozen Cocktails—Please" also plays with and reinvents the conventions of language to reflect upon and disrupt sexual politics. "A man's a-- " is blanked out to infer the absurdity of censorship, and the vibrator's role as a "coy flappertoy" is a playful poke at the women's independence movement. The invented/inventive compound word "spinsterlollypop" is another term for vibrator, and the idea that "progress is ravishing" uses the double entendre of intense rapture and delight against idea of a "ravishing" as rape. Culture is astounding, impressing, and violating the Baroness. Its attack on her artistic freedom and sensibilities and the onward march of technology are both a source of inspiration and suffering.

Like a Rosetta stone, this poem translates the themes running perforce through the modernist narratives I have so far examined. Shock is an affect actively sought: masculinity is a gender identity no longer limited to the male body, and sexualities are multiple. The idea of the queer subject and queer authorship is encountered, rejected, embraced and played with in works like *A Passage to India*, *Maurice* and *The Rainbow*, and this troubling recurs in the final lines from "A Dozen Cocktails—Please:"[59]

"SAY IT WITH"- - -

BOLTS.
THUNDER!
SERPENTINE AIR CURRENTS - - - -
HHHHHHHHHPHSSSSSSSSSSSS! THE VERY WORD PENETRATES!
I FEEL WHOOZY!
I LIKE THAT. I AINT HANKERING AFTER
BILLY BOYS - BUT I AM ENTITLED TO BE
DEEPLY SHOCKED.
SO ARE WE - BUT YOU FILL THE HIATUS.
DEAR - I AINT QUEER - I NEED IT STRAIGHT -
-A DOZEN COCKTAILS - PLEASE!- - - -
E.V.F.L

The spacing and capitalization here are in line with the Baroness' own manuscript, and I have included these because of her dadaist insistence on the format of a poem, where even sounds are produced in a careful optophonetic fashion. According to Tanya Clement, optophonetics can take on different forms, but the Baroness uses phonics to

[59] The version I use, with particular punctuation and spelling, of which there are multiple, comes from a .GIF scanned from the original Freytag Loringhoven papers held in Special Collections at the University of Maryland libraries.

sound out auditory effects as in "HHHHHHHHHPHSSSSSSSSSSS!" This is a serpentine, sexual, sound of deflation that "penetrates" the ear, invades the body with the snake's tongue and its original sin. Penetration shifts sin from the female, to the male context here. The Baroness likes to like men, unapologetically, but this does not exclude her ability to revel in the queerness that is otherness, whether sexual or artistic or both. Yes, she "ain't queer" and wants it "straight," but this idea is also oxymoronic, self-satirical, at the end of such an arguably queer poem. The poem, presented as a lyrical embodiment of the poet, is precisely what it proclaims it is not.

The poem references those who will be "deeply shocked" by the Baroness and her friends. The idea of straight is again one of her many double entendres, implying both a sexual orientation and the way she takes her liquor. While many parts of the poem seem absurdist, exaggerated by capitalization or nonsense words, this pretension towards absurdity plays an important role in the argument for more freedom in love, life and artistic expression. The poem is as insistent as Connie Chatterley's casual acceptance of the word "fuck," as dynamically gendered as the reiteration in *The Garden of Eden*, and as experimental, if not more so, with the grammatical boundaries of selfhood as Orlando's reflective monologues about the "I" and shifting gender identity: "Greedy, luxurious, vicious? Am I? (Here a new self came in)" (Woolf 214).

"A Dozen Cocktails—Please" is likewise indicative of female masculinity often in a single image. In the following line, which reads like a newspaper headline due to its own use of quotation marks: "Eve's dart pricks snookums upon Wirefence," we see that Eve is able to use her prick, her dart, to impale a much more docile "snookums" sadistically, against barbed wire fencing. Eve's love is playful, but love is violent,

shoved against barbed wire. That Eve has become transgendered, using her dart to violate snookums in this image, hints at the direction beyond female masculinity in which much of the Baroness' poetry is headed. Like Woolf, The Baroness plays with the fluidity of gender roles in both her photographic art and poetry, to engage with and display masculinity or femininity while troubling the fixity inherent in such forms of categorization. Androgyny, embracing indeterminacy in its very definition, may or may not be the space beyond, because it relies on these polarities for its very existence.

What is farther beyond gender categorization here is the poem's "carnival of oral sexuality," the celebrative air with which it scathes and satirizes "modern consumer culture" (Gammel 377). The Baroness undermines the self-importance of the sexual spiritualism of other modernists, notably Lawrence, but does not go as far as to separate sexuality from intimacy altogether, as Miller does in *Tropic of Cancer*. Poet, author and character, the Baroness, Lawrence and Connie Chatterley, all use "sex-talk" to explore the aurality of arousal and the joy inherent in sex. Impropriety is rebellious by nature, and so obscenity obtains its innovative stance precisely through its representation in "good" art by pushing "badness" as an exhilarating factor (Mao and Walkowitz 2). Obscenity is a an offensive weapon, whose age-old connotations prove formidable when translated into new visions of sexuality, such as the Baroness' image of a vibrator cum "spinsterlollypop." Her poem is an engendered conversation, challenging patriarchal culture and male modernism.

The Baroness' poetry proves that nuggets of spoken language must be temporal, be of time, to be gendered. The parameters of her "hilarious spoof on self-serious sex-talk" are governed by the moment in which it is voiced (Gammel 378).

"Coy flappertoy" suggests that the flapper, a figure with a freer sexual reputation in the early twentieth century, would be the device's target audience (377). Her poetry translates images into idiom, but it also translates the sex culture of the moment into a cartoonish indictment of the hypocrisy of capitalist processes of marketing, advertising, and the appropriation of previously underground cultural movements into the mainstream. The economic promotion of sexism is implicit in the headline-grabbing, advert-making, language she uses. Sometimes written in German, or a mixture of German and English, the Baroness' writing also suggests that room remains in translation studies for a look at how gendered speech functions in fiction across languages ("Herr Peu à Peu" Gammel 153).

Querying Time

Literary and gender categories elicit scrutiny time and again. Different genderlects stretch across epoch and milieus, as Dickens' Sally Brass or Eliot's Rosamond Vincy prove in the Victorian genre, but they also investigate the future. In *Middlemarch*, Eliot's characters discuss the changing nature of slang, of its classist origins: "correct English is the slang of prigs who write history and essays. And strongest of all is the slang of poets" (12). The slang words I have mentioned in previous chapters, such as "chap," "tight," "righto," "bung-o" or "quod," have not been limited to lower-class characters, but they are reliant upon a historicity, on the knowledge that these once popular slang words are no longer as fashionable. Although "slang" can connote informal language, particularly for those opposed to it, such as Forster's Mrs. Herriton in *Where Angels Fear to Tread*, or grammarian Otto Jespersen, ultimately it invades all forms of talk (Chapman 28). Different authors create their own

slang, and "flappertoy" is a vital part of the Baroness' sexual language. Gendered speech, slang, or even a whole new vocabulary, can function not just to depict characters, but also to create and invigorate new imagined futures.

In Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932), for example, "freemartins" are sterilized individuals, "father" has become an obscenity, and viviparity is a scandalous idea (162, 151). Huxley's novel displays a shrewd understanding of the ways that common language not only reflects, but also shapes and influences society at a fundamental level. "State Conditioning Centres" harness the power of "hypnopaedia," reconditioning children to reject the biological imperative through an inculcation of pithy catchphrases and aphorisms that sometimes rhyme (47, 52-4). Chauvinism and the objectification of women insidiously invade the novel's vocabulary, used by Huxley to parody and criticize sexism, and to insist that an end to domestic obligation is not synonymous with equal rights.

In this *Brave New World*, androcentrism is ascendant and men hold the highest official posts. Benito Hoover calls Lenina "pneumatic," an informal adjective implying that her sexuality is itself an object, a mechanical and utilitarian function for men to exploit (60). This roboticizes Lenina, reduces her to her biological sexual function in a dissociative and inhuman fashion. Because absence is presence, this bit of sexist slang is also a reminder that no man is ever called "pneumatic" in a similarly reductive manner. Colloquialisms like these emphasize Bernard's instinctual disgust at the polyamory and objectification of women all around him. Huxley envisions new speech traits that intensify the dystopic ravages of inculcated racial, sexual, class and gender prejudices, whether these exist in a democracy, or in a genetically engineered

totalitarian state. The unique vocabulary of this imagined world, of Bokonofsky groups, feelies and sexophones, forms a scaffolding onto which Huxley hangs the taxing ravages of eugenics, authoritarianism, and the potential downfalls of "rapid technological progress" (xvii).

Huxley does not just create new words or phrases, he also employs the expressions of his day to illuminate narrow-mindedness. "Queer" is Lenina's "ordinary word of condemnation" (107). The word acts as a conceptual quarantine. "Queer" marks the New Mexico Reservation apart as acutely as its fences or desolate, alien landscape (131). As Lenina's epithet of choice, it also speaks to the dark implications of the regulation of otherness. In my Forster chapter I mention that the word "queer" first came to connote homosexuality in 1922 (Childs 197). This idea contextualizes the conspicuous absence of same sex desire in *Brave New World*. The bonds of marriage have been broken, the barrier of lasciviousness left off, but this does not mean that citizens are any freer to love whom they choose, and must date based on caste as well as gender regulations. Huxley was inspired by Lawrence's characterization of relationships between men and women, and Lawrence's fear that the continual processes of idealization would eventually generate purely mechanical, hyper-regulated relations between the sexes (Boone 135).

Other dystopian or speculative fictions link the regulation of vernacular conventions, of the rules of common language, to the restriction of knowledge as well. In Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* (1985), the protagonist has been renamed to suit the role of a breeding handmaid, "Offred," because she belongs to, and is

considered a part of Fred, the master to whom she is enslaved (104). [60] In Huxley and Atwood, social engineering relies on vocabularies that maintain and establish control over the population, such that genderlect becomes a fruitful thread in envisaging desolate futures.

While this dissertation has encountered multiple sexualities, authorial perspectives, and forms of fictional writing, new questions mark future paths: How do other non-traditional, subversive gender identities engender themselves in modernist dialogue, or even in the Baroness' other poems? What about other genres? How does men's speech explore divergent gender identity beyond Barnes' Dr. O'Connor, whose professional, if bizarre speeches, and feminine visage suggest a sort of male femininity? I afford men's speech only a partial analysis, explaining it to counterpoint women's speech acts. Dr. Aziz's idiom in *A Passage to India*, the laconism and slang of Jake Barnes and other male characters in *The Sun Also Rises*, Mellors' hypermasculine dialect, Alec Scudder's lack of it, or Pilar's report of the bullfighter in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, are worthy threads of investigation in developing the genders of modernism. Modernist techniques in character development argue for, against, or sometimes both, the transgression of those stereotypes informing the processes of identity production. Old categories are exchanged in favor of new stylistic constraints.

In more experimental prose, including Woolf's *Orlando* and Joyce's *Ulysses*, this notion of the genders of modernism suggests the intersection of other themes. Modernisms, in the plural, allows for female modernism, male modernism or, in Catherine Bourne's case in *The Garden of Eden*, a transgendered modernism, but the

[60] For an onomastic treatment of *The Handmaid's Tale* as a characteristic model of naming in dystopian fiction, see Henthorne.

idea of the genders of modernism hints past categorization towards the production of meaning within the text. Genders can and do negotiate other discursive processes, such as memory and time. In a written composition these concepts can show the categorization of meaning, but they too, rely on cultural understanding. Beyond conventional dialogue but still within the realm of talk, how is time gendered in modernist fiction? More briefly: "Time doth flit," but how "doth" it?

In Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*, "Time Passes" is self-consciously temporal. This remark suggests that Mr. Bankes is a Father Time figure: "Well, we must wait for the future to show" (103). He personifies time because of his authoritative fatalism, particularly in light of Andrew's reply that "it's almost too dark to see," which injects a sense of the magical, of prognostication, and of the wise seer, the Hermit holding up his lantern, lighting time like the lighthouse, in a manifestation of unknowability as absolute knowledge. Andrew's seeing is in the physical sense, and yet it also suggests the one to whom the future is shown in the pagan Tarot. It is almost too dark to see the future, and the darkening world connects light and time with gender.

In the night the passage of time slows as light extinguishes, although the lighthouse continues its steady revolution. As the storm gathers, with the future unknowable, the strands of hours lengthen out of sight. The moon, the magical, spiritual, feminine element of the night, sinks behind the rain and "downpouring of immense darkness" (103).[61] This is also consistent with the suppression of the second sight and the need to wait. In this nothingness, this time vacuum of darkness, gender

---

61 "The yellow moonlight" recurs later on, suggesting the return of the feminine force before Mrs. Ramsay's death (105). The pagan link between the moon and femininity is robust: the English Tarot features multiple images of the moon in its cycles, and its connection to a woman's reproductive cycle and wisdom, on the High Priestess card from the Major Arcana (Gray 154).

identity drowns, is consumed in the biblical "flood," such that "there was scarcely anything left of body or mind by which one could say 'This is he' or 'This is she'" (103). Gender is visible in the light, but the dark transgenders every character. Mr. Bankes as father time or the Hermit, and the wise woman in the moon, are cloaked, and these spiritualizations of gender are eclipsed by the night.

"One" is a neutral pronoun, and so time has removed gender, as well as individuality, from the sleeping figures who are, and are not, the sleeping house, as "all together gave off an aimless gust of lamentation" (104). Time distorts, and in doing so gender is transfigured but also suspended in its overt form, until the gender titles, family names, of Mr. Carmichael, Mr. Ramsay and Mrs. Ramsay appear in quarantined brackets at the end of each numbered section. Silence is a space, like darkness, because "one night" is described as a "short space" interrupted by the ghostly images of the ephemerality of life and the eternity of time's passage that the lighthouse floods over.

In section three, the "sleeper" is gendered for a purpose, named "he" to preface Mr. Ramsay's discovery of his wife's death (105). The sections act like the waves of the ocean, washing back and forth, bits of gender are glimpsed, then submerged, smoothing the men and women of the narrative into genderless pebbles, such that "meanwhile the mystic, the visionary, walked the beach, stirred a puddle, looked at a stone, and asked *themselves* 'What am I?' 'What is this?'" (107). This is not androgyny, but a kind of ungendering, because "themselves" is collective and gender-neutral. "Themselves," and "I" are ungendered. This echoes the idea that, although genders can be imposed on ethereal symbols of time, upon Father Time or the moon,

time as space resides both within and outside any gendered perception of the mortal individual. Flesh and age are one, united with the light and the darkness.

Like *Orlando*, identity and gender are repeatedly queried tropes. The absence of certain traits is as fascinating as their presence, absence is presence where silence or gender-neutral speech are constructed, purposeful behaviors or elements of craft. Indeed, what qualities of talk, of speech, apart from gender, facilitate characterization, narrative cohesion or verisimilitude in fictional texts? What other ways is dialect, for example, politicized, suppressed or emphasized in fictional narratives to advocate for or against the marginalization of working class subjects? How is dialogue racialized in modernist texts to promote, trouble or undermine otherness, division and hatred?

Some first-person narratives rely on aurality in large part to generate sympathy in the reader. To stay within the modernist canon, Jean Rhys' *Voyage in the Dark* (1934) encounters racial tension, racism, alienation and bias in the Caribbean and English milieu. The narrator Anna Morgan is intensely depressed, alienated and self-sabotaging. As a result, despite her pitiable poverty and ill use by other people, it can be difficult to identify with her. She is not an inherently likeable character. Yet, in using common expressions, and in evoking the second person, the reader is drawn into her place: "the damned way they look at you, and their damned voices, like high, smooth, unclimbable walls all around you, closing in on you," and invited to share her fear: "don't think of it, don't think of it. Because thinking of it makes it happen" (126, 138). Anna's interiority, her thoughts, are at times free indirect discourse, but at others a form of linear, self-conscious memoir: "And I knew that day that I'd started to grow old and nothing could stop it" (62). Her narration talks *with*, not at, the audience. This

creates a bond that cannot be easily broken by discomforting turns in the plot. In this way, the dialogue between Anna and the reader has the air of the confessional, it is more laid bare and intimate, than her frequently cavalier conversations with comrades and lovers.

Narrative forms of talk, of time as a form of characterization, of how time is characterized, and of dialect as a means of social or political argument, are all topics that cry out for another broad study of the forms of fictional talk and dialogue, similar to Bronwen Thomas' look at speech in texts from different genres. Indeed, as time flits darkness lifts, engendering further conversations on composition. These questions are not meant to invest a modernist atmosphere of irresolution into my conclusion. Rather, it would do a disservice to the mellifluous, multiple, voices and genders in fictional literature to imply too much finality to a discussion where the future is bound, as Mr. Bankes puts it, "to show" (103). It is enough to say that, like Lily Briscoe "laying down her brush in extreme fatigue" at the end of *To the Lighthouse*, "I have had my vision" (170).

Works Cited

Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms, 7th Edition.* Boston: Heinle and Heinle, 1999. Print.

Alsop, Rachel, Annette Fitzsimons and Kathleen Lennon. *Theorizing Gender*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006. Print.

Atwood, Margaret. *The Handmaid's Tale*. Toronto: Seal Books, 1998. Print.

Auerbach, Eric. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2003. Print.

Austen, Jane. *Emma*. New York: The Modern Library, 2001. Print.

Austin, J.L. *How to Do Things With Words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962. Print.

Bach, Kent. "Meaning, Speech Acts and Communication." In Robert M. Harnish, ed. *Basic Topics in the Philosophy of Language*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994. *Google Books*. Web. August 24, 2014.

Baker, Carlos. *Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story.* New York: Scribner's, 1969. Print.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. *Problems of Dostoyevsky's Poetics.* Trans. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984. Print.

---. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays.* Ed. Michael Holquist, Vern McGee. Trans. Caryl Emerson. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986. Print.

---. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays.* Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011. Print. "Discourse in the Novel." (1934) 259-422.

Baldick, Chris. "Post-mortem: Lawrence's Critical and Cultural Legacy." Fernihough

253-70.

Barnes. Djuna. *Nightwood*. New York: New Directions, 1961. Print.

Bateson, F.W. "The Literary Artifact." *The Journal of General Education*. 15.2 (1963): 79-92. *JSTOR*. Web. November 17, 2014.

Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. 1953. Trans. Ed. H.M. Parshley. New York: Vintage, 1989. Print.

Beegel, Susan F. *Hemingway's Craft of Omission: Four Manuscript Examples*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1988. Print.

Blanchard, Lydia. "Love and Power: A Reconsideration of Sexual Politics in D.H. Lawrence." *Modern Fiction Studies.* 21.3 (1975): 431-43. Print.

Bradshaw, David, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to E.M. Forster*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. Print.

---. "Howards End." 151-172.

Brenner, Gerry. "Once a Rabbit, Always? A Feminist Interview with Maria." In *Blowing the Bridge: Essays on Hemingway and For Whom the Bell Tolls.* Ed. Rena Sanderson. New York: Greenwood Press, 1992. 131-142. Print.

"broad." *Cambridge Dictionaries Online.* Cambridge University Press, 2014. Web. August 24, 2014.

"bluestocking." *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford University Press, 2014. Web. August 24, 2014.

Boone, N.S. "D. H. Lawrence's 'Men Must Work and Women as Well' in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World.*" *Notes and Queries* 61. 1 (2014) 133-5. *Oxford Journals*. Web. March 7th, 2015.

Booth, Howard J. “Maurice.” Bradshaw 173-87. Print.

Burke, Peter. *The Art of Conversation*. Cornell: Cornell University Press, 1993. Print.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990. Print.

---. *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.

“cackle.” *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford University Press, 2014. Web. August 24, 2014.

“chap.” *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford University Press, 2014. Web. August 24, 2014.

Chapman, Raymond. *Forms of Speech in Victorian Fiction.* London: Longman, 1994. Print.

Childs, Peter. “A Passage to India.” Bradshaw, David ed. 188-208.

Clement, Tanya, ed. Elsa von Freytag Loringhoven. “A Dozen Cocktails—Please.” A Critical Introduction. *University Libraries Digital Collections.* Web. August 8th, 2014.

Clifford, Stephen P. *Beyond the Heroic “I:” Reading Lawrence, Hemingway and Masculinity.* London: Associated University Press, 1998. Print.

Coates, Jennifer. *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language (3rd Edition).* New York: Pearson ESL, 2004. Print.

Cohen, Milton A. “Styles.” Moddelmog and Del Gizzo, eds. 109-18.

Coleman, Dan. “Tuning in to conversation in the novel: Gatsby and the dynamics of dialogue.” *Style*. 34.1 (2000): 52-77. *Literature Online*. Web. November 7, 2014.

Collins, Wilkie. *The Woman in White.* Oxford: Oxford World's Classics, 2008. Print.

Comley, Nancy R. and Robert Scholes. *Hemingway's Genders*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994. Print.

Comely, Nancy R. "Women." Moddelmog and Del Gizzo 409-17.

"cunt." *Oxford English Dictionary.* Oxford University Press, 2014. Web. August 24, 2014.

Del Gizzo, Suzanne and Frederic J. Svoboda, eds. *Hemingway's* The Garden of Eden*: Twenty-Five Years of Criticism.* Kent, OH. Kent State University Press, 2012. Print.

De Kock, Leon. "Interview with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak: New Nation Writer's Conference in South Africa." *Ariel*. 23.3 (1992): 29-47. *Ariel Synergies*. Web. August 14, 2014.

Dickens, Charles. *The Old Curiousity Shop.* London: Chapman and Hall, 1841. *Google Books*. Web. January 13th, 2015.

Doan, Laura. "Passing Fashions: Reading Female Masculinities in the 1920s." *Feminist Studies*. 24.3 (1998): 663-700. Print.

Doctorow, E.L. "Ernest Hemingway: R.I.P." Del Gizzo and Svoboda 15-21.

Donaldson, Scott, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Ernest Hemingway*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. Print.

Draper, R.P., ed. *D.H. Lawrence: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge, 1970. Print.

Eagleton, Terry. "Pork Chops and Pineapples." *London Review of Books Online.* (2003) *17-19.* Web. July 10, 2014.

Eby, Carl P. *Hemingway's Fetishism*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1999. Print.

"Edwards v. A.G. of Canada." *Judicial Committee to the British Privy Council.* 1930. *Canadian Human Rights Commission*. Web. February 23, 2015.

Edwards, Duane. "Locating D.H. Lawrence in *The Plumed Serpent*." *The Midwest Quarterly*. 51.2 (2010) 183-99. *Project Muse.* Web. December 3, 2013.

Edwards, Justin D. "At the End of *The Rainbow*: Reading Lesbian Identities in D.H. Lawrence's Fiction." *The International Fiction Review*. 27 (2000): 60-7. Print.

Eliot, George. *Middlemarch*. *Project Gutenberg eBook.* Web. August 25, 2014.

Elliott, Ira. "In Search of Lost Time. Reading Hemingway's *Garden*." Del Gizzo and Svoboda 298-314.

---. "Performance Art: Jake Barnes and the 'Masculine' Signification in *The Sun Also Rises*." Wagner-Martin, Linda 63-80.

Evans Davies, Catherine. "Dialect Humour." In *The Encyclopedia of Humor Studies*. Salvatore Attardo, ed. New York: Sage Publications, 2014. Web. *Google Books*. November 27, 2014.

Fausto-Sterling, Anne. *Sexing the Body: Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality*. New York: Basic Books, 2000. Print.

Felski, Rita. *Doing Time: Feminist Theory and Postmodern Culture*. New York: New York University Press, 2000. Print.

---. "Modernism and Modernity: Engendering Literary History." Rado 191-208.

Feinstein, Elaine. *Lawrence and the Women: The Intimate Life of D.H. Lawrence.* New

York: Harper Collins, 1993. Print.

Fernihough, Anne ed. *The Cambridge Companion to D.H. Lawrence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Print.

Finkelstein, Bonnie Blumenthal. *Forster's Women: Eternal Differences*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1975. Print.

Forster, Edward Morgan. *A Passage to India*. London: Penguin Classics, 2005. Print.

---. *A Room With A View*. London: Penguin Classics, 2000. Print.

---. *Aspects of the Novel.* New York: Mariner, 1956. Print.

---. *Howards End*. New York: Vintage International, 1989. Print.

---. *Maurice*. London: Penguin Classics, 2005. Print.

---. *The Longest Journey.* London: Penguin Classics, 2006. Print.

---. *The Prince's Tale and Other Uncollected Writings*. P.N. Furbank, ed. London: Penguin, 1999. Print.

---. *Where Angels Fear to Tread*. New York: Vintage International, 1992. Print.

---. "On the Feminine Note in Literature." *The Feminine Note in Literature.* George Piggford, ed. London: Cecil Woolf, 2001. Print.

Foucault, Michel. "Part Two: The Repressive Hypothesis." *The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction*. 1978. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1990. Print.

Friedman, Susan Stanford. *Penelope's Web: Gender, Modernity, H.D.'s Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. Print.

Gammel, Irene. *Baroness Elsa: Gender, Dada and Everyday Modernity—A Cultural Biography.* Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press, 2002. Print.

"giggle." *New Oxford American Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2nd Ed. 2005. Print.

Gilbert, Sandra M. "*Orlando*: Virginia Woolf's Vita Nuova." Intro. Woolf's *Orlando*, xi-xliii. Print.

Glass, Loren. "#$%^&*!?: Modernism and Dirty Words." *Modernism/Modernity*. 14.2. (2007) 209-24. *Project Muse*. Web. August 31, 2013.

Goldman, Jane. "Forster and Women." Bradshaw 120-137.

Gray, Eden. *The Tarot Revealed*. New York: Signet, 1969. Print.

Grebstein, Norman. *Hemingway's Craft.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973. Print.

Greenough, J.B. and George Lyman Kittredge. *Words and Their Ways in English Speech.* New York: MacMillan, 1901. *Archive.org*. Web. July 14, 2014.

Guill, Stacey. "Pilar and Maria: 'Hemingway's Feminist Homage to the New Woman of Spain' in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*." 30.2 (2011): 7-20. *Project Muse*. Web. February 25, 2014.

Halberstam, Judith. *Female Masculinity*. New York: Duke University Press, 1998. Print.

Hall, Radclyffe. *The Well of Loneliness*. Intro by Diana Souhami. London: Virago Press, 2012. Print.

Hardwick, Joan. *An Immodest Violet: The Life of Violet Hunt*. London: Andre Deutsch, 1991. Print.

Hemingway, Ernest. *A Farewell to Arms.* New York: Scribner, 2003. Print.

---. *A Moveable Feast: The Restored Edition*. Sean Hemingway, ed. New York:

Scribner, 2009. Print.

---. *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. New York: Scribner, 1940. Print.

---. "Hills Like White Elephants." *Men Without Women.* Scribner, 1927. Print.

---. *The Garden of Eden.* Tom Jenks, ed. New York: Scribner, 2003. Print.

---. *The Sun Also Rises*. New York: Scribner, 2006. Print.

Henthorne, Tom. "Naming Names: Identity and Identification in Margaret Atwood's The Handmaid's Tale." *Onoma: Journal of the International Council of Onomastic Sciences.* 40 (2005) 105-113. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. March 7th, 2015.

Herman, David. "Dialogue in a Discourse Context: Scenes of Talk in Fictional Narrative." *Narrative Inquiry*. 16.1. (2006) 79-88. *Project Muse*. Web. November 23rd, 2014.

Hillier, Hilary. *Talking Lawrence: Patterns of Eastwood Dialect in the Work of D. H. Lawrence.* Nottingham: Critical, Cultural and Communications Press, 2008. Print.

---."Community, Family, "Morel:" A Dialect Approach to *Sons and Lovers*." *D.H. Lawrence Review*. 38.1 (2013): 22-44. Web. September 27, 2014.

Hunt, Violet. *The Maiden's Progress: A Novel in Dialogue*. New York: Harper and Brother's, 1894. *Archive.org*. Web. August 24th, 2014.

---. "Review of *The White Peacock.*" *Daily Chronicle*. 10.2 (1911) Draper 38-9.

Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World*. New York: Harper Collins, 1998. Print.

Jenks, Tom. "*The Garden of Eden* at Twenty-Five." Del Gizzo and Svoboda 1-14.

Jespersen, Otto. *Language: Its Nature, Development and Origin*. London: George

Allen and Unwin Ltd. 1969. Print.

Joyce, James. *Ulysses.* Intro. and Notes Declan Kiberd. London: Penguin, 2000. Print.

Kime Scott, Bonnie. *The Gender of Modernism: A Critical Anthology*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1990. Print.

Lacan, Jacques. "The Subversion of Subject and the Dialectic of Desire." In *Écrits: A Selection*. Trans. by Alan Sheridan, New York, Routledge, 1977. Print.

Lakoff, Robin. *Language and Woman's Place.* New York: Harper and Row, 1975. Print.

Lamb, Robert Paul. *Art Matters. Hemingway, Craft, and the Creation of the Modern Short Story.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2010. Print.

Lane, Christopher. *The Burdens of Intimacy: Psychoanalysis and Victorian Masculinity.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998. Print.

Langland, Elizabeth. "Gesturing toward an Open Space: Gender, Form, and Language in E. M. Forster's *Howards End*." Claridge, Laura and Elizabeth Langland eds. *Out of Bounds: Male Writers and Gender(ed) Criticism*. Amherst, NY: University of Massachusetts Press, 1990. 252-267. Print.

Larson, Kelli A. "Critical Overview." Moddelmog and Del Gizzo 99-108.

Lawrence, David Herbert. *Assorted Articles*. London: Martin Secker, 1930. Print.

---. *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. New York: Dover Publications, 2006. Print.

---. "Morality and the Novel." In *Phoenix I: The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence.* London: Heinemann, 1961. 527. Print.

---. *Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious*. New York: The Viking Press, 1960. Print.

---. *Sex Literature and Censorship: Essays*. Harry T. Moore, ed. New York: Twayne,

1953. Print.

"Cocksure Women and Hensure Men." 46-8.

"Sex versus Loveliness." 49-53.

---. *Sons and Lovers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. Print.

---. Ibid. Intro. David Trotter. Oxford: Oxford World's Classics, 2009. Print.

---. *The Fox*. Adelaide: *University of Adelaide ebooks*. Web. July 10, 2014.

---. *The Plumed Serpent*. Middlesex: Penguin, 1977. Print.

---. *The Rainbow*. New York: The Modern Library, 2002. Print.

---.*The White Peacock*. London: Heinemann, 1965. Print.

---. "These Clever Women." In *The Complete Poems of D.H. Lawrence*. Intro. David Ellis. Hertforshire: Wordsworth Editions Ltd., 2002. 83-4. Print.

---. "Women are So Cocksure." In *Phoenix I: The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence.* London: Heinemann, 1961. 167-9. Print.

---. *Women in Love*. Intro. David Bradshaw. Oxford. Oxford World's Classics, 1998. Print.

Leith, Richard. "Dialogue and Dialect in D. H. Lawrence." *Style*. 14.3 (1980): 245-258.

Long, Samantha. "Catherine as Transgender: Dreaming Identity in *The Garden of Eden*." *The Hemingway Review.* 32.2 (2013): 42-57. *Project Muse*. Web. February 11, 2014.

Lynn, Kenneth. *Hemingway.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995. Print.

MacKenzie, Compton. *Poor Relations. Project Gutenberg*. Web. July 14, 2014.

Mao, Douglas and Rebecca L. Walkowitz, eds. *Bad Modernisms*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2006. Print.

Martin, Robert K. and George Piggford, eds. *Queer Forster*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997. Print.

Martin, Wendy. "Brett Ashley as New Woman in *The Sun Also Rises*." Wagner-Martin 47-62.

Matthews, Jean V. *The Rise of the New Woman: The Woman's Movement in America 1875-1930.* Lanham, MD: Ivan R. Dee, 2004. Print.

McConnell-Ginet, Sally, Ruth Borker and Nelly Furman, eds. *Women and Language in Literature and Society.* New York: Praeger, 1980. Print.

Meade, Marion. *Dorothy Parker: What Fresh Hell is This?* New York: Penguin Books, 1989. Print.

Medalie, David. *E.M. Forster's Modernism*. New York: Palgrave, 2002. Print.

Meyers, Jeffrey. *Hemingway: A Biography*. New York: Da Capo Press, 1999. Print.

---. *Homosexuality and Literature:1890-1930*. London: Athlone Press, 2000. Print.

Miller, Henry. *Tropic of Cancer*. Intro: Karl Shapiro. New York: Grove Press, 1961. Print.

Millet, Kate. *Sexual Politics.* New York: Equinox Books, 1970. Print.

Modelmog, Debra A. *Reading Desire: In Pursuit of Ernest Hemingway*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999. Print.

Moddelmog, Debra A. and Susanne del Gizzo, eds. *Hemingway in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Print.

---. "Preface" xxiii-xxvii.s

Moffat, Wendy. *A Great Unrecorded History: A New Life of E.M. Forster*. New York: Picador, 2010. Print.

Monkhouse, Allan. "Review of *The White Peacock.*" *Manchester Guardian*. 8.2 (1911) Draper 34-5.

Moore, Harry T. "D.H. Lawrence and the Censor-Morons." Lawrence, D.H. *Sex, Literature and Censorship* 9-30.

Morey, Peter. "Postcolonial Forster." Bradshaw 254-273.

Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Screen.* 16.3 (1975) 6-18. *Oxford Journals Online*. Web. January 13th, 2015.

Nagel, James. "Brett and the Other Women in *The Sun Also Rises*." Donaldson, 87-108.

Noble, Jean Bobby. *Masculinities Without Men?: Female Masculinity in Twentieth-Century Fictions*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2003. Print

North, Michael. *The Dialect of Modernism: Race, Language and Twentieth Century Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. *Google Books*. Web. February 11, 2014.

Page, Norman. *Speech in the English Novel*. London: Longman Group, 1973. Print.

Penas Ibanez, Beatriz. "Looking Through *The Garden's* Mirrors: The Early-Postmodernist Text." Del Gizzo and Svoboda 128-144.

Peters, K.J. "The Thematic Integrity of *The Garden of Eden.*" Del Gizzo and Svoboda 42-57.

Perrone-Bertolotti, Marcela and J. Kujala, J.R. Vidal, C.M. Hamame, T. Ossandon, O. Bertrand, L. Minotti, P. Kahane, K. Jerbi, J.P. Lachaux. "How Silent is Silent Reading? Intracerebral Evidence for Top-Down Activation of Temporal Voice

Areas During Reading." *The Journal of Neuroscience*. 32.49 (2012) 17554-62. Web. *Jneurosci.org*. January 6, 2015.

Plimpton, George. "An Interview with Ernest Hemingway." Wagner-Martin 15-32.

Pullin, Faith. "Lawrence's Treatment of Women in *Sons and Lovers*." Smith 49-76.

Rado, Lisa, ed. *Rereading Modernism: New Directions in Feminist Criticism.* New York: Garland Press, 1994. *Google Books.* Web. July 14, 2014.

Read, Allen Walker. "An Obscenity Symbol." *American Speech.* 9.4 (1934). *JSTOR.* Web. June 11, 2013.

"Received Pronunciation." *The British Library*. Web. August 25, 2014.

Rhys, Jean. *Voyage in the Dark*. London: Penguin Books, 1967. Print.

"righto." *Oxford English Dictionary.* Oxford University Press, 2015. Web. January 8th, 2015.

Rudat, Wolfgang E. H. "Hemingway's Brett: Linguistic Manipulation and the Male Ego in The Sun Also Rises." *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology*, 7.1-2 (1986): 76-82. Print.

Rylance, Rick. "Ideas, histories, generations and beliefs: the early novels to *Sons and Lovers*." Fernihough 15-32.

Sanderson, Rena. "Hemingway and Gender History." Donaldson 170-94.

Sattel, Jack. "Men, Inexpressiveness and Power." In *Language, Gender and Society.* B. Thorne, C. Kramerae, N. Henley eds. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1983. Print.

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

---. *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990. Print.

Shapiro, Karl. "The Greatest Living Author." Intro. Miller's *Tropic of Cancer*, v-xxx. Print.

Shaw, George Bernard. *Pygmalion*. Ebook. *Project Gutenberg.* Web. July 14, 2014.

Shorter, Clement. "Comment in 'A Literary Letter.'" *Sphere*. 23.10 (1915) Draper 96-7.

Simpson, Hilary. *D.H. Lawrence and Feminism*. London: Croom Helm, 1982. Print.

Smiley, Pamela. "Gender-Linked Miscommunication in 'Hills Like White Elephants.'" *Hemingway Review.* 8.1 (1988) 2-12. *Project Muse*. Web. January 21, 2014.

Smith, Anne, ed. *Lawrence and Women*. London: Vision Press, 1978. Print.

Spilka, Mark. *Hemingway's Quarrel With Androgyny.* Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1995. Print.

---. "On Lawrence's Hostility to Willful Women: The Chatterley Solution." Smith 189-212.

---. "The Death of Love in *The Sun Also Rises*. Wagner-Martin 33-46.

Stein, Gertrude. *Tender Buttons* in *Selected Writings of Gertrude Stein*. Intro. Carl van Vechtin, ed. New York: Vintage, 1990. Print.

Stevenson, Randall. "Forster and Modernism." Bradshaw, David ed. 209-222.

Storch, Margaret. "The Lacerated Male: Ambivalent Images of Women in *The White Peacock.*" *Style* 21.2 (1989): 117-35. Print.

Strong, Amy Lovell. "'Go to Sleep Devil:' the Awakening of Catherine's Feminism in

The Garden of Eden." In *Hemingway and Women: Female Critics and the Female Voice*. Lawrence Broer and Gloria Holland, eds. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2002. 190-203. Print.

Strychacz, Thomas. *Dangerous Masculinities: Conrad, Hemingway and Lawrence.* Gainsville, FL.: University Press of Florida, 2008. Print.

---. *Hemingway's Theaters of Masculinity.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003. Print.

---. "Masculinity." Moddelmog and Del Gizzo 277-86. Print.

Sutherland, John. *Offensive Literature: Decensorship in Britain 1960-1982.* London: Junction Books, 1982. Print.

Thackeray, William Makepeace. *Vanity Fair.* Oxford. Oxford University Press, 2008. Print.

Thomas, Bronwen. *Fictional Dialogue: Speech and Conversation in the Modern and Postmodern Novel*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2012. Ebook. Downloaded Aug. 2, 2013.

---. "Dialogue." In *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*. Herman, David ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 80-93. *Literature Online.* Web. July 30, 2013.

"tight." *Oxford Dictionary of Modern Slang*. John Ayto and John Simpson, eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. *Oxfordreference.com.* Web. January 13, 2015.

Tolkien, J.R.R. *The Hobbit.* New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1997. Print.

---. *The Fellowship of the Ring.* New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1982. Print.

Trogdon, Robert W. "Posthumous Publications." *See* Moddelmog and Del Gizzo 141-52.

Vescio, Theresa and Kevin Weaver. "Prejudice and Stereotyping." *Oxford Bibliographies Online*. Web. November 27, 2015.

Villarejo, Amy. *Film Studies: The Basics*. 2nd Edition. New York: Routledge, 2013. *Google Books*. Web. January 13th, 2015.

Wagner-Martin, Linda ed. *Ernest Hemingway's* The Sun Also Rises*: A Casebook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. Print.

Wallace, Jo Ann. "The Very First Lady Chatterley? Mrs. Havelock Ellis's *Seaweed*." *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920*. 51.2 (2008): 123-137. *Project Muse*. Web. November 7, 2014.

Weatherall, Ann. *Gender, Language and Discourse.* Sussex: Routledge, 2002. Print.

Wharton, Edith. *The Age of Innocence.* New York, Penguin, 1996. Print.

White, Hayden. "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact." In Brian Richardson, ed. *Narrative Dynamics: Essays on Time, Plot, Closure and Frames*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2002. 191-210. *Google Books*. Web. August 11, 2014.

Woods, Gregory. "The Other or More of the Same? Women's Representations of Homosexual Men." In Gabrielle Griffin, ed. *Difference in View: Women in Modernism*. New York: Taylor and Francis, 1994. 23-31. *Google Books*. Web. August 14, 2014.

Woolf, Virginia. *Orlando.* Intro. Sandra M. Gilbert. London: Penguin Books, 1993. Print.

---. *To the Lighthouse*. Intro. And Notes David Bradshaw. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. Print.