

COMPARISON AND DEVELOPMENT OF HEMINGWAY'S
TECHNIQUES IN FAREWELL TO ARMS AND
FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS

by

JEUNE BLOMQUIST KIRMSER

B. S., University of Minnesota, 1941

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of English

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE
OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE

1944

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 1

INTRODUCTION 1

THEMES AND CHARACTERS IN FAREWELL TO ARMS AND
FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS 13

CHANGE IN HEMINGWAY'S PHILOSOPHY AS SHOWN IN
FAREWELL TO ARMS AND FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS 35

HEMINGWAY'S TECHNIQUE AS CONSIDERED FROM HIS
DIALOGUE, SIMPLICITY OF STRUCTURE, AND
MANNERISMS 51

CONCLUSIONS 61

BIBLIOGRAPHY 64

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appreciation is expressed to Miss Helen E. Elcock, Associate Professor of English at Kansas State College, for her valuable assistance and counsel during this study; and to Miss Elizabeth Kerr, Professor of English at Rockford College, Rockford, Illinois, for her help in formulating the early ideas of this thesis.

INTRODUCTION

Ernest Hemingway's ideas show a distinct development from Farewell to Arms in 1929 to For Whom the Bell Tolls in 1940. This advance consists in a progression from loyalty to an individual to a consideration of larger, ultimate issues of human welfare. This progress is shown in the choice of a more complex central character, a heightened unity secured by a correspondence of the character's two central passions instead of a division of purposes, a better portrayal of minor characters, and a much more eloquent, emotionalized style.

Hemingway has a technique of harmonizing simplicity of style with simplicity of ideas, situations, and motives that excites one's curiosity. This over-all simplicity is one of the outstanding qualities of Hemingway's technique; and although there are changes in philosophy and actual methods used for effect, this same simplicity remains.

Hemingway's philosophy in Farewell to Arms is that of the soldier of World War I. He is a member of the famous "Lost Generation." He is called "pessimistic" and "disillusioned" by those who were arm-chair advocates of democracy in this past war. But to the followers of Hemingway he is not pessimistic but rather realistic. He realizes that the influential moments of life are those that build and destroy. He sugar-coats nothing; he blackens nothing; and he apologizes for nothing. He sees an unpleasant situation, and because he is an adherent of

the realistic school, describes it as he sees it. He does not search for "nice" words to describe an act. He says "vomit" instead of merely implying what he means by lengthy circumlocution. On the other hand, he does not exaggerate his picture but describes it until the desired effect is acquired. Still he apologizes for nothing. Hemingway reports what he sees whether it be pleasant or unpleasant.

The orthodox realist is a good reporter. He sees an ordinary situation in the light of an ordinary situation and reports it as such, but his observation of moments of fundamental feeling is conveyed by the emotional words and rhythms which correspond to the sensations aroused. In other words, he gives his reader life as it is, seldom succumbing to the naturalistic tendency to give everything as many diabolical twists as possible. Unlike the naturalist, the realist has more sympathy with his characters and includes more favorable qualities than his naturalistic brother.

Throughout the five novels, Hemingway tries to record what he himself sees. He is an excellent reporter, recording simple people, simple situations, and simple ideas with veracity.

Both Farewell to Arms and For Whom the Bell Tolls are superior to his other three novels -- Torrents of Spring, The Sun Also Rises, and To Have and Have Not.

The first of these was Hemingway's attempt at satire. And it was a dismal failure, the dialogue being its only redeeming feature. The plot is so confused and incoherent that sometimes

one wonders whether there is any plot. The writing certainly follows his pattern of simplicity; but in spite of its simplicity, it is hard to understand the purpose of the book. There is deliberate imitation of another's technique, but the writer does not recognize the style. It suggests the writings of the mid-Victorian period because Hemingway often interrupts the story to put in personal comments addressed directly to the reader. The principal adverse criticism of the book is its lack of direction.

The Sun Also Rises shows more promise than either of the other two novels. It shows more clearly the philosophical Hemingway. The people in the book are those of the "lost generation" and are somewhat like Ben and Eugene of Thomas Wolfe's Look Homeward, Angel. They have just fought a war, and the dead calm of the aftermath depresses them so that they do not know what their goal is or even whether there is a goal. They have just fought for someone else's abstractions, for vague reasons, and with embarrassing results. Theirs is the difficult task of trying to readjust themselves to an abnormal world, and they find that the world does not care whether they live or how they do it. This world needed these people to fight a war; but now that they have fought and won, they cease to have any real value. In other words, these young people are really "lost" in an unsympathetic world. Hemingway's people try to ignore their physical and mental hurts by resorting to escapism. They drink; they dance; they love; they hate; and the rest of the time they spend being clever. They even go off to other countries to "have

a good time," but without much success. Nothing seems worth trying. As one of the characters tries to convince them all, "...going to another country doesn't make any difference. I've tried all that. You can't get away from yourself by moving from one place to another. There's nothing to that."¹

It is interesting to note that even in this early book Hemingway establishes some philosophical ideas that are carried through every one of his succeeding novels. For instance, in The Sun Also Rises he says that immorality consists in "things that make me disgusted at myself."² In each of his other books he makes similar statements.

Perhaps the outstanding thing about this book is its superb dialogue. It is concise, crisp, and natural enough to have been copied from a court-room reporter's note-book.

In The Sun Also Rises Hemingway establishes a technique -- that of simplicity -- that is found in all the succeeding novels. He deals with bull-fighting, war, love, and hate because the emotions involved are violently active and elemental to all men. The result is a study of man as he really is. The characters are concerned with the immediate outcomes of their actions, not with far-off ideals. As Joseph W. Beach says, Hemingway keeps away from "the more common practical situations in life in which people are working for long-distance ends, -- business, farming, the professions, politics, family life--."³

¹ Hemingway, Ernest, The Sun Also Rises. Charles Scribner's & Sons, New York. 1929. p. 11.

² Ibid. p. 153.

³ Beach, J. W., American Fiction, 1920-1940. Macmillan Company, New York. 1941. p. 99.

In other words, business, farming, and the like are important elements of life but are not fundamental. Hemingway chooses to write not about these customary occupations but about the basic emotions -- love, hate -- and his writing is much more intense because he does limit himself.

The last of the three novels is To Have and Have Not. It is inferior to the Sun Also Rises, but it is superior to Torrents of Spring. It is the sincere but unsuccessful attempt of Hemingway to prove Rousseau's doctrine that the simple life is the best. He contrasts the idle rich with the simple man, Harry Morgan. The story is that of Harry Morgan, whose occupations are various and whose main problem in life is how to exist in a capitalistic world that is made up of the "haves" and the "have nots." Although his jobs are usually honest ones, his motives for doing the things he does are not always clear. The idea is all right, but the method of carrying it out in print was the reason for failure. Hemingway's cardinal mistake was being so anxious to make the contrast that he completely forgot to prepare the reader for his conclusion. About three-fourths of the way through he lets the idle rich come in touch with Harry Morgan by hiring him to take them on fishing trips. Suddenly the idle rich are scorched with burning words of attack from Hemingway. The attack is so unexpected that the reader is left open-mouthed with amazement instead of being wrought up over the injustices done the poor man by the wealthy. The last quarter of the book is Hemingway at his worst.

After consideration of Hemingway's earlier novels, it is necessary to discuss the few available critical books and articles on Hemingway. Besides a collected bibliography done by L. H. Cohn, no other book devoted entirely to Hemingway seems to be available; and, of course, Mr. Cohn's book lists the works of Hemingway only up to a certain date.

J. W. Beach, perhaps, gives the most thorough and also the lengthiest discussion of Hemingway. In American Fiction 1920-1940 Mr. Beach says that Hemingway is here to stay. He believes that Hemingway's advance from portrayal of hunger, thirst, sexual urge, and delight in the sensations created by nature and sport to the moral ideals aroused by democracy represents a development of Hemingway's own philosophy. He thinks Hemingway's adherence to the vital experiences of life, excluding the matters of making a living is a part of his effort to simplify. His excessive coordination and use of vulgar diction are dramatic devices to represent the level of character. The advance in characterization by inclusion of states of mind results from his selection of more complex characters. The more heightened tone of his latest work is produced by the use of Latinized diction, pithy precision or understatement, inverted word order, fluctuating use of second person forms, and Biblical solemnity. Mr. Beach also says of Hemingway: "He is a scrupulous artist, who will use no material -- experience or conviction -- which he does not see how to assimilate to the terms of his art. Now with the publication of For Whom the Bell Tolls, we have the answer to this question. His latest novel is the largest in

scope, the most accomplished in technique, and the strongest in effect of anything he has written. And it demonstrates that he did indeed have something to say, something positive and tonic, which he had never said before, certainly not with the explicitness and power of the present statement."⁴

It is obvious from the above statement that Mr. Beach thinks Hemingway's For Whom the Bell Tolls is vital and says something important. He even goes so far as to justify the Maria-Jordan love affair. According to Mr. Beach this affair is highly romantic and is "the poetic formula of shining love projected against the shadow of death."⁵ He also admires Hemingway's devotion to simplicity.⁶

Another critic, H. J. Müller, devoted one chapter in his Modern Fiction -- A Study of Values to Hemingway. Müller is not so extensive nor so discerning in his criticisms as is Mr. Beach; in fact, he is rather extravagant in his praise. For instance, of Farewell to Arms he says: "A Farewell to Arms is the nearest modern equivalent to Romeo and Juliet."⁷ It is also significant that, although he is lavish in his compliments, Müller says that Hemingway's writing is good but won't last because Hemingway is a member of the "hard-boiled" school, and that this group is not

⁴ Beach, J. W., American Fiction 1920-1940. p. 69.

⁵ Ibid. p. 91.

⁶ Ibid. p. 97.

⁷ Müller, H. J., Modern Fiction -- A Study of Values. Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. 1937. p. 400.

destined to be permanent.⁸

In The Later Realism, Myers speaks of modern trends in fiction; and though he clothes much of his work in abstractions, he does express the aim of the modern realist when he says: "More and more have realists sought in description, in dialogue, in the presentation of mind content, to express truth, to free it from limitations of literary and social convention and to give it the potent, authentic immediacy of the actual."⁹ And this, of course, is exactly what Hemingway has done.

A book dealing specifically with the war novel is Sophus K. Winther's The Realistic War Novel. Although only 132 pages long, he presents some characteristics of the war novel that might have taken some others three times that number of pages to present. As with most of the authors already mentioned, Winther shows his gratification to modern novelists for throwing out the traditional hero. According to Winther, the virtues of the modern hero are those of the common man;¹⁰ "The significant thing about this modern hero of war literature is that his limitations constitute the essence of his reality."¹¹ In other words, the "superman" of earlier novels is gone, and in his place is the modern hero who is real because he is a human being with faults and failings. And Hemingway's characters follow this pattern.

⁸ Müller, H. J., Modern Fiction -- A Study of Values. p. 400.

⁹ Myers, W. L., The Later Realism. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 1927. p. 162.

¹⁰ Ibid. p. 16.

¹¹ Winther, S. K., The Realistic War Novel. University of Washington Book Store, Seattle. 1930. p. 16.

Winther also sets off six characteristics of the war novel, and these six characteristics can be found in Farewell to Arms. They are as follows: a) The hero of the war novel is now an ordinary man instead of a high-ranking man of earlier novels. b) "The war novel is pre-occupied with human values to a degree which sometimes interferes with its art as a story."¹² c) There seems to be a uniformity of outlook among war authors because their experiences and situations are similar if not identical.¹³ d) The writers are all disturbed by the problem of reconciling the existence of human suffering in a world created by a benevolent deity.¹⁴ e) There is general rebellion against the existing social conventions.¹⁵ f) Techniques of these authors are somewhat the same because their outlooks are so much alike.¹⁶

Cohn's Bibliography of the Works of Ernest Hemingway proved a great satisfaction and help in locating a few of the hard-to-get novels.

These foregoing five volumes are the extent of the available book reading on Hemingway. Although there are other general works, they had no direct bearing on the subject of this paper.

The magazine articles read were twenty-four in number.

Taken as a whole, they were fascinating because of their ever-

¹² Winther, S. K., The Realistic War Novel. p. 16.

¹³ Ibid. p. 25.

¹⁴ Ibid. p. 30.

¹⁵ Ibid. p. 30.

¹⁶ Ibid. p. 31.

conflicting views on Hemingway as an author. They range from mere anonymous book reviews to lengthy controversies. Robert Herrick calls Hemingway's love scenes "unpleasant garbage,"¹⁷ while Clifton Fadiman applies terms like "beauty" to Farewell to Arms and also to a later work.¹⁸ A Catholic magazine berates Hemingway's people for being "zombies."¹⁹ But others, like Mr. Canby, commend Hemingway's forceful presentation of real people.²⁰

The most important articles examined were the following. Accompanying each is a short summary of the contents.

Robert Herrick's "What Is Dirt?" contains a brief discussion of a Farewell to Arms, comparing and contrasting it with Remarque's All Quiet on the Western Front. Herrick contends that frankness and sex are justifiable in a realist if they help to illustrate his thesis. He maintains that Remarque's pictures of human indignities illustrate the invasion of man's rights by war, but that the love scenes and repulsive physical details in Hemingway are not so justified because they are not connected with the war.

Seward Collins' "Inflammatory Topics" is a reply to Herrick's article. Collins says that Hemingway is justified in his treatment of love because war does terrible things to people and throws out of line their ideas of what life is all about. As

¹⁷ Herrick, Robert, "What Is Dirt?" The Bookman. November, 1929. v. 70. p. 262.

¹⁸ Fadiman, Clifton, "A Fine American Novel." The Nation. October 30, 1929. v. 129. p. 497.

¹⁹ Allen, Hugh, "The Dark Night of Ernest Hemingway." Catholic World. February, 1940. v. 150. p. 529.

²⁰ Canby, Henry, "Story of the Brave." Saturday Review. October 12, 1929. v. 11. p. 231.

a result they put the emphasis on sex and love. And it is because of this observation that Collins defends Hemingway's detailed treatment of the love scenes in Farewell to Arms.

Lloyd Frankenberg's "Themes and Characters in Hemingway's Latest Period" is a fine discussion of Hemingway's last novel. He terms the Maria-Jordan love affair as insipid and has other anti-Hemingway comments to make such as: "It is in straining for 'significance' that his technique seems to be taking leave of him."²¹ And yet another comment: "But irony, gentle or bitter is deserting him. In its place is the 'wise-guy' satiric strain initiated in 'The Torrents of Spring.'"²²

Clifton Fadiman's "Ernest Hemingway Crosses the Bridge" is an objectively honest account of Hemingway's latest novel. He says For Whom the Bell Tolls is the same as Farewell to Arms except for the change of background.²³ He states also that in both books "the mounting interplay of death and sex is a major theme, the body's intense aliveness as it senses its own destruction."²⁴ Of For Whom the Bell Tolls, he says, "It touches a deeper level than any sounded in the author's other books. It expresses and releases the adult Hemingway..."²⁵ He also contends that this latest novel is by far the most sensual and

²¹ Frankenberg, Lloyd, "Themes and Characters in Hemingway's Latest Period." Southern Review. Spring, 1942. v.7. p.784.

²² Ibid. p. 787.

²³ Fadiman, Clifton, "Ernest Hemingway Crosses the Bridge." New Yorker. October 26, 1940. v. 16. p. 66.

²⁴ Ibid. p. 66.

²⁵ Ibid. p. 66.

"the most truly passionate of all his books."²⁶

Clifton Fadiman's "A Fine American Novel" is an objective discussion of Farewell to Arms. In this article he especially points out that Hemingway's main doctrine is simplicity. As he says, "A large part of the novel deals with simple things -- eating cheese, drinking wine, sleeping with women. But he does not try to make you feel that these activities are 'elemental' or overly significant."²⁷ Later on Fadiman condemns some of Hemingway's descriptive passages: "I find the military descriptions dull, and for a paradoxical reason. Hemingway's crisp, curt, casual style, so admirably suited to the rest of the narrative, fails in the military portions because of these very qualities."²⁸ The other articles read were either so very general in their discussions or their points of view were so little connected in any way with the subject of this thesis that they will not be discussed.

The principal suggestions of these writers which have directed the approach in this thesis are their statements about changing ideals in heroes of novels, their opinions about the effects of war upon its participants and victims, and their analyses of Hemingway's style.

²⁶ Fadiman, Clifton, "Ernest Hemingway Crosses the Bridge." p. 67.

²⁷ Fadiman, Clifton, "A Fine American Novel." p. 498.

²⁸ Ibid. p. 498.

THEMES AND CHARACTERS IN FAREWELL TO ARMS
AND FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS

Two of the most important phases of Hemingway's novels are theme and characterization. His novels -- especially those dealing with war -- have clear-cut and obvious themes, and he draws his characters carefully to fit in with these various themes.

In Farewell to Arms the main theme seems to be that life is not very good to any one, but it aims its poisonous arrows especially at those who are courageous and good. Hemingway sets out to prove that no matter how good you are in this world, the world is against you; and eventually you will cease to struggle against the tremendous odds and either die in self-defense or allow the world to do away with you. To quote Hemingway:

If people bring so much courage to this world the world has to kill them to break them, so of course it kills them. The world breaks everyone and afterward many are strong at the broken places. But those that will not break it kills. It kills the very good, and the very gentle and the very brave impartially. If you are none of these you can be sure it will kill you too but there will be no special hurry.²⁹

This is a bitter philosophy, one that has come from living as a young adult through a war empty of meaning, and Hemingway has put his feeling into strong phrases in Farewell to Arms. Perhaps such a theme suggests incurable pessimism; but those of

the "lost generation" -- of which Hemingway was a part -- call it realism. It is facing the facts of life as they present themselves. If Farewell to Arms proves this theme, then it is necessary to admit that pessimism to some is mere realism to others.

In the book Hemingway proves his theme by using as his main feminine character a courageous English nurse, Catherine Barkley. Without daring to look far into the future, Catherine tries to live life completely in each day's time span. Still she does not live a frivolous life. She is trying to gather up the serious moments of perhaps seventy years and pack as many as possible into each twenty-four hours. She falls in love mentally and physically with Frederic Henry, and this love, flashed against the background of war, is the central theme of his story of despair.

Together Henry and Catherine have a few months of stolen happiness, but these can be compared with the last meal of a man condemned to die -- he may eat what he chooses, but he must do it within a specified time because death will not wait. And so with Catherine and Henry. They must love and live completely within the space of nine months because at the end of that time Catherine must pay with her life, and Henry must fall into the category of those whom life sees fit to kill with "no special hurry." Catherine fights against time and death until she is exhausted, and she gives in only after a long period of blinding torture. Her last words are monuments to bitterness. Looking up at Henry, she says, "I'm not a bit afraid. It's just a dirty

trick."³⁰

Perhaps the most beautiful part of the entire book is the last sentence in which a man's soul loses its direction completely and falls into helpless confusion. After Catherine's death, Henry goes outside the room and into the halls where the doctor offers to take him to his hotel. But Henry refuses, wanting to be by himself in his grief. Like the closing notes of the Pathetique, Henry's soul ceases to struggle and the minor notes of the last sentence come through: "After a while I went out and left the hospital and walked back to the hotel in the rain."³¹

The main theme of For Whom the Bell Tolls shows more idealism concerning the same situations.

This novel has a double theme: first, that no matter how well-intentioned and brave a group of people may be, their efforts are doomed to fail unless they have careful organization; and that even impending failure does not excuse desertion of the cause in which one believes.

Hemingway knew from the beginning that the Spanish Loyalists could not win because they were so disorganized. Their strength -- such as it was -- lay in the small bands of guerrilla fighters.

Unlike the defeated, disillusioned Italians of Farewell to Arms, the people in the loyalist ranks have faith in their fight.

³⁰ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. p. 354.

³¹ Ibid. p. 355.

They feel sure that if they can win this war, there will be a better world for all. They are not fighting for terms that someone else has invented. Instead, they think they know what their war is all about.

To Catherine and Henry there was nothing further than the present; but to the people of this loyalist group, there is little but the future. It must be added quickly, however, that the main character of For Whom the Bell Tolls, Robert Jordan, an instructor from Montana, comes to have somewhat the same outlook at times that Henry had. He knows that the loyalist cause is a good one but arrives at a realization that it will not succeed because of its disorganization. When he loves Maria, he often feels that there is nothing in the future for them. Sometimes he tries to convince himself that there is, but somehow he always ends on the note that there is nothing certain but the immediate present. Still he does not share Henry's philosophy of bitterness. This point is brought out particularly well in the last few pages of the book. Jordan is propped against a tree in the forest where he is waiting for the fascists to come and kill him. His leg has been broken, and he is unable to continue on with the rest of the guerrillas. He has a while to wait until the fascists overtake him, and his mind is full of thoughts pregnant with meaning for him. One of his moments is occupied by the following:

Who do you suppose has it easier? Ones with religion or just taking it straight? It comforts them very much but we know there is nothing to fear. It is only missing it that's bad. Dying is

only bad when it takes a long time and hurts so much that it humiliates you. That is where you have all the luck, see? You don't have any of that.³²

The last two sentences of this passage make the difference between the early Hemingway and the late Hemingway. In his World War I novel he tortures Catherine according to his early philosophy; but in For Whom the Bell Tolls, Jordan does not feel that life is plotting against him. He thinks he is lucky to get out so easily. Even in pain and facing death, Jordan cannot believe that what he has done or what he has been is nothing more than a futile fight for existence. It is far more than that. Perhaps it might be said that Jordan's philosophy is one that is generous enough to include other people; and Henry's is not. That is to say, Jordan feels that what he has fought for is basically good and he had hoped to make a better world, not so much for himself (because he was, after all, an American fighting a foreign cause) but for the people who believed in what they were fighting for. Henry, on the other hand, feels that what he is fighting for is nothing but someone else's abstractions, and he cannot bear the thought. He knows that war can only end in further confusion without having settled anything, and he is selfish enough to want his own happiness insured.

Henry and Catherine can see no future for themselves. Time

32

Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. Charles Scribner's & Sons, New York. 1940. p. 468.

and time again they say something about their lack of faith in anything but the very now of things. In one passage they are discussing their future, and Henry says:

"Where will we live after the war?"

"In an old people's home probably," she said.

"For three years I looked forward very childishly to the war ending at Christmas. But now I look forward till when our son will be a lieutenant commander."

"Maybe he'll be a general."

"If it's an hundred years' war he'll have time to try both services."³³

The utter futility in trying to plan anything further than the immediate present is shown in statements of this kind.

But in For Whom the Bell Tolls Maria and Jordan talk often of their future. Maria is sincere and believes that they will have a wonderful future. And that is as it should be. Maria is a simple girl whose pleasures are sensual and whose mind dwells far more in future things than in the present crisis. Jordan, however, does not always believe the things he tells her about the future and often doubts that there will be one, but just as often hopes there will be. He chides himself for allowing himself to entertain defeatist thoughts about the outcome of his mission. On one occasion he and Maria are talking about things to come, and he says:

"My beloved," he said, and kissed her. "Listen. The other night I was thinking about Madrid and I thought how I would get there and leave thee at a hotel while I went up to see people at the hotel of the Russians. But that was false. I would not leave thee at any hotel."

"Why not?"

33
Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. p. 152

"Because I will take care of thee. I will not ever leave thee. I will go with thee to the Seguridad to get papers. Then I will go with thee to buy those clothes that are needed."

"They are few, and I can buy them."

"Nay, they are many and we will go together and buy good ones and thou wilt be beautiful in them."³⁴

The conversation continues in this trend, and for a time Jordan loses himself to the charm of Maria and the excitement of a hope.

It is obvious from these two quotations that the tone of the latter book is on a higher plane of cheerfulness than is the former. But the change is in Hemingway. His presentation in each case is undoubtedly in keeping with his philosophy at the time of writing. Perhaps the difference in the philosophies of Henry and Jordan may be due to the fact that the themes in the earlier book revolve around love while the themes in the latter are concerned only in a very secondary way with the love of Maria and Jordan. Love of a person is more likely to be selfish than love of a cause.

Henry has no cause to fight for as Jordan has. Henry is concerned with the war only in so far as the war concerns his love for Catherine. Jordan has gone a step further. He has some definitions of his own, apparently, of words like democracy and freedom. But to Henry these are embarrassing abstractions as he says in one place.

I was always embarrassed by the words sacred, glorious, and sacrifice and the expression in vain. We had heard them, sometimes standing in the rain almost out of ear-

³⁴ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. pp. 342-343.

shot, so that only the shouted words came through, and had read them, on proclamations that were slapped up by billposters over other proclamations, now for a long time, and I had seen nothing sacred, and the things that were glorious had no glory and the sacrifices were like the stockyards at Chicago if nothing was done with the meat except to bury it. There were many words that you could not stand to hear and finally only the names of places had dignity ... Abstract words such as glory, honor, courage, or hallow were obscene beside the concrete names of villages, the numbers of roads, the names of rivers, the numbers of regiments, and the dates.³⁵

He hates patriots, but Jordan has a respect for them. Henry cannot stand to think of having to shed his and other men's blood for abstractions, but Jordan thinks he can define words like freedom, glory, and sacred. And it is for these terms that he willingly lays down his life.

It might be that Jordan is more idealistic than Henry because Hemingway sees fit to make Jordan a college instructor. It is common belief that college instructors and professors are idealistic sometimes to the point of excluding reality. And it may be for this reason that Jordan believes as he does. In connection with this, it might also be pointed out that Henry may be what he is because he is the hard-boiled and skeptical newspaperman.

The other theme of For Whom the Bell Tolls -- the matter of disorganized forces -- shares first place with the theme just discussed.

After spending only a few days with Pablo's band, Jordan sees that their cause is doomed to fail. In fact, it is more

³⁵ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. p. 196.

correct to say that within the first few hours, Jordan begins to suspect that their cause will fail. Although it may be mere guesswork to assume that there are symbols in both Pablo and Pilar, they seem to represent two definite aspects of the loyalist fight for freedom. Pablo is symbolic of the widespread disorganizational weakness of the guerrillas, and Pilar represents all the good things that the loyalists might have been. Pablo is weak, overly sentimental, and undependable; but Pilar is strong, stoic, and always dependable. Unfortunately, the conflict between the two forces of Pablo and Pilar leads to nothing but further chaos and confusion. Their two personalities exemplify the two divisions of the loyalists -- or the two divisions of any cause, for that matter.

Jordan, although he sees that the blowing of the bridge cannot succeed, tries to convince himself that perhaps something can be done to make his mission successful. He enlists those of the camp who he knows are faithful and can be trusted; but even at that he cannot be stronger than the weakest links. And it is this fear of failure through this disorganization that casts a brooding spell over many parts of the novel.

Comparing the themes of Farewell to Arms and For Whom the Bell Tolls, it is necessary to notice that, although all three main themes of the two books are thrown against similar backgrounds, Hemingway's point of view has changed radically. He has apparently learned to take life's good with the bad in his later writing. He knows that his cause will fail, and he

also suspects that he may have to die for it; but he does not feel that death is a total loss. He has a much brighter outlook on life, and perhaps one of the best evidences of this is the fact that he believes in abstractions. Often Hemingway gets inside Jordan's mind and lets him think things like:

You believe in Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. You believe in Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness. Don't ever kid yourself with too much dialectics. They are for some but not for you. You have to know them in order not to be a sucker. You have put many things in abeyance to win a war. If this war is lost all of those things are lost.³⁶

No one with the early Henry personality could feel the way Jordan does in the above passage.

It should be brought out here that although Henry often thinks that there is gross disorganization in the ranks of the allies in World War I, he has no faith in the cause himself and so is mostly unconcerned about the effect of this disorganization on the actual outcome of the war. He really is not interested in which side wins because he feels that both sides may be right. This is an interesting comparison with Jordan's speculations about the possible results of loyalist disorganization. Jordan is concerned with the over-all effect failure of the loyalist cause will have on the whole of Spain and the countries connected with Spain; but Henry is concerned only in so far as failure of the allied cause will affect his own personal life.

The themes, then, are nearly opposite although the situa-

³⁶ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 305.

tions of war and love in war are nearly identical.

But to turn to the characters of the two novels. They can best be compared in pairs.

Of the two women, Catherine is the more solid. She is a thinking woman, and this part of her character is well established by passages such as those found on pages 18 to 21 of Farewell to Arms. Her cleverness of reply is indicated in a good many spots, and her amusing bits of philosophy can bear speculation.³⁷ Although the book concerns itself mainly with Catherine's talking about how much she loves Henry, she is, nevertheless, a clever girl and responds to Henry's moods and statements in a way that Maria would be incapable of. Maria, in fact, cannot measure up to Catherine with regard to their capacities for logical thought. Maria, for the most part, depends completely on Jordan to do her thinking. One is momentarily encouraged when he reads the good account given by Maria of her sufferings at the hands of the fascists, but he is immediately discouraged by the fact that Hemingway allows Maria to slip back into her adolescent thinking. Maria is fighting the fascists because of what they did to her and to her family. This is from a purely emotional point of view. She is completely loyal to her cause, but the loyalty is closely woven with bitter hate. She has a right to hate the fascists for what they did, but she seems to hate immaturely and in a way unworthy of one, who

³⁷ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. pp. 132-133.

could, if she wanted to, be more coldly logical and accomplish more.

Catherine is able to see further than today. She avoids looking into the future if she can because she sees nothing but eternal strife for men.³⁸ But Maria, living right in the midst of war, would rather look into a tomorrow of fairy-tale brightness than face the actual dangers of today.³⁹ Maria's cheerful outlook on life, however, is somewhat more refreshing than Catherine's cold, logical, and often despairing point of view. The ideal woman, however, might be one with Catherine's brains, Maria's cheerful personality, and both their devotion to their men. If on no other point, Catherine and Maria can be said to be identical in their devotion to Henry and Jordan. There is nothing that Catherine would not do for Henry, and Maria would willingly give her life in place of Jordan's.

Hemingway, for some reason, is more generous with Catherine than he is with Maria. That is to say, he gives Catherine many more opportunities to speak for herself and be viewed by the reader than he does Maria. It is enough for Maria to be seen in several love scenes and to be mentioned as part of the background in the cave at times, but there is nothing that establishes her as nearly the woman Hemingway might have made her. In wondering why he neglected Maria, one could speculate and offer the suggestion that perhaps he intended her to be no more important than the love story itself. In Farewell to Arms, the love story is everything, but in For Whom the Bell Tolls the

³⁸ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. p. 150.

³⁹ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. pp. 341-355.

love story is certainly incidental.

In connection with their deep love, Catherine and Maria seem to share the same moral points of view. And these points of view are those of Hemingway himself. Hemingway stated at one time that he was being moral when he "felt good after doing something." Maria and Catherine express these same feelings in nearly the same language. For instance, in Farewell to Arms Catherine says after loving Henry, "You see? I'm good. I do what you want."⁴⁰ In other words, she says that she has a good feeling when she loves Henry. Maria expresses somewhat the same reaction many times.⁴¹

Both Maria and Catherine think that physical love outside wedlock is not immoral for them because in each of their cases it is inconvenient, if not impossible to be married legally. It is enough for each to know that they have pledged themselves to their men. Verbal statement is enough for them. Hemingway has not hesitated in any of his novels to set aside conventional morality because he early declares that morality is "something that makes you feel good."⁴² And it, therefore, becomes an individual matter. According to this theory, both Maria and Catherine are moral people.

Catherine is much more mature than Maria. She seems to have better insight than Maria does into what war can do to people, this insight sometimes being carried to the point of skepticism. Catherine feels that unless she and Henry continue

⁴⁰ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. p. 113.

⁴¹ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 161.

⁴² Mr. Beach quotes from Hemingway's Death in the Afternoon. p.4.

to love, life is as nothing. She says at one point after having a slight difference in opinion with Henry:

"But people do. They love each other and they misunderstand on purpose and they fight and then suddenly they aren't the same one."

"We won't fight."

"We mustn't. Because there's only us two and in the world there's all the rest of them. If anything comes between us, we're gone and then they have us."⁴³

Although she is one of the mediums through which Hemingway seeks to present his philosophy, Catherine is real; and the reader is able to feel her maturity and her feeling of insecurity through statements like these. She faces death in the same, cool way and is not afraid in the least but rather is disappointed in life. She really never thought she could live to be happy in a normal world, but there were small moments when she wondered whether there might be a chance for happiness. Her resignation is so well shown in a statement already quoted. She says, "I'm not a bit afraid. It's just a dirty trick."⁴⁴

In direct contrast with Catherine's quietly bitter resignation to death, we get Maria's attitude toward it. Of course, it needs to be said here that Maria might have acted somewhat differently toward death if she had been the one to die instead of her lover. But one cannot help thinking that had Catherine been in Maria's place, she would have accepted Jordan's death more calmly. At any rate, when Jordan knows he must face the fascists and be killed by them, he tries to convince Maria that she must go from him and save herself.

⁴³ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. p. 149.

⁴⁴ Ibid. p. 354.

Maria reacts hysterically, and Jordan finds it necessary to calm her by using words and arguments that one would use on a child.

"We will go to Madrid another time, rabbit," he said. "Truly. Now stand up and go and we both go. Stand up. See?"

"No," she said and held him tight around the neck.

He spoke now still calmly and reasonably but with great authority.

"Stand up," he said. "Thou art me too now. Thou art all there will be of me. Stand up."⁴⁵

One cannot imagine Henry having to speak to Catherine in that tone or in those words. It is Catherine who possesses the greater amount of mental acuity; and perhaps Hemingway intended that Maria should be less important to the story element.

The two men -- Frederic Henry and Robert Jordan -- are interesting because they represent Hemingway's changed philosophy. Henry sees nothing hopeful in life and feels that man is nature's cruelest joke. He tries to fight a war in which he has no interest. He cannot believe in the cause he is supposedly fighting for. It is another case of the "have nots" fighting for the "haves", and he cannot justify such irony.

Jordan, however, volunteers to serve with the Spanish Loyalists; and he is enthusiastic about their cause, thinking at the very beginning that they might be able to win. Even when he finds that they cannot possibly win, he does not allow himself to fall into a state of depressed discouragement. He

⁴⁵ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 464.

feels that even though they lose, having put up a good fight will be in their favor. And he gives himself unselfishly to the cause.

Both Henry and Jordan view themselves objectively for the most part. They are capable of introspective analysis and admit the truth about themselves on most occasions. Jordan, however, is capable of talking himself out of despair. Without a great deal of effort, he can send a black, pessimistic thought scurrying out of his brain and replace it with optimistic rationalization. For instance, one time he is thinking that tomorrow he may die, and he jerks himself up abruptly from his not unwarranted gloom by telling himself that he should

Cut out the dying stuff, he said to himself. That's not the way we talk. That's the way our friends the anarchists talk. Whenever things get really bad they want to set fire to something and to die.⁴⁶

And he actually rids himself of his fear by obvious rationalization. The truth of the matter is that deep down he knows that he may very easily and very soon be killed.

Henry does not fool himself that way. He is a straight thinker and looks for the worst to happen because he knows it is there. He cannot be cheerful about the future because he realizes that his personal future cannot be depended upon and that life gives out just so much happiness and then to only a few; and Henry feels that he is not one of those few. And he is not. Jordan does not feel that life is plotting

⁴⁶ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 305.

against or looking out for him. He believes that man often makes his own circumstances; and if he has made happiness for himself, he had better take all he can get in as little time as possible because it may be snuffed out any minute. He realizes and accepts this as a fact and is not bitter about it. Henry, on the other hand, had the Thomas Hardy view of the universe -- that the universe is intentionally malevolent, actively plotting against human beings.

As has already been pointed out, Henry and Jordan took opposite views, concerning abstract ideals. And in close connection with this are their feelings about the results of their respective wars. In For Whom the Bell Tolls, Jordan says, "If this war is lost, all of those things are lost."⁴⁷ By "all of those things" he means liberty, justice, and so forth. And Jordan sincerely believes this, but Henry cannot believe that losing the war will make any difference to him as a member of society. He feels that it may affect him in a narrow way such as keeping him from living a completely normal life, but he does not think that it will influence his "liberty" or his "justice." In one place Henry and the Italian priest are talking together about the war, and Henry notices that the priest appears very tired. He wonders what is wrong and questions him.

"What's the matter, father? You seem very tired."

"I am tired but I have no right to be."

"It's the heat."

"No. This is only the Spring. I feel very low."

⁴⁷ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 305.

"You have the war disgust."
 "No. But I hate the war."⁴⁸

These men hate every aspect of the war and look upon it as something that they can either put up with or desert from, but neither alternative is very welcome. Although they do not want to fight anymore, they must. But Jordan feels as though his war has a purpose in it. Although at the end of For Whom the Bell Tolls Jordan admits that "War is a bitchery,"⁴⁹ he feels throughout the book up to this point that there is a certain nobleness in fighting for something you believe in. Jordan feels very close to the war because it is real to him, but Henry never feels as though the war actually has anything to do with him. An example of his inability to relate himself with his chaotic surroundings is the fact that he cannot think that he may be killed. He is able to see how all the men around him may be killed, but it is impossible to imagine that he, Henry, may be the next victim. The following excerpt well shows his attitude toward war:

Well, I knew I would not be killed. Not in this war. It did not have anything to do with me. It seemed no more dangerous to me myself than war in the movies. I wished to God it was over though.⁵⁰

The attitude of the two men toward Catherine and Maria is interesting. Henry loves Catherine devotedly, but he did not love her upon seeing her. From her actions, he decided that she was out to get any man; and it was only after a great deal of close association with her that he found out she was

⁴⁸ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. pp. 74-75.

⁴⁹ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 465.

⁵⁰ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. p. 39.

good and that he loved her. From that time on he is miserable without her and thinks of her continually. Even on the battlefield, he thinks how nice it would be to be with her.

Jordan, on the other hand, falls in love with Maria when he first sees her. And although he loves her deeply, he is capable of sudden detachment from her. Actually, the war is more important to him than Maria is. He is in love with Maria, yes, but he came to this band of guerrillas to have them help him blow a bridge, not to fall in love with one of their members. Consciously -- or unconsciously -- he realizes that his first duty is to his mission. It is quite the opposite with Henry because he feels his first duty is to Catherine, and anything that does not concern her and him is merely incidental. Even in an exciting moment when he prepares for an attack on the enemy, he makes his arrangements mechanically and thinks constantly of her.⁵¹

Comparing the two men, it has to be admitted that Jordan is the stronger. He puts up a fight with life the way Catherine would; and even though he knows he is on the losing end, he keeps fighting to the very last when he shoots his machine-gun at the on-coming fascists. Henry is more resigned to the fact that everyone must die sooner or later, and no matter into which group you fall, it will not be pleasant. He does not feel as though anything good could come from his death. But Jordan wonders whether, if there are enough men willing to sacrifice

⁵¹ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. pp. 39-40.

themselves for a cause, the world might not begin to realize there is something to what they are fighting for.

Both Henry and Jordan are interesting characters because they mirror the early and late philosophical Hemingway.

The minor characters of these two books are divided into the "good" ones and the "bad" ones, the good people being those who express the lesser thoughts of Hemingway and the bad ones those who express the things Hemingway dislikes in life and people.

In Farewell to Arms Rinaldi, the Italian doctor, is Henry's closest friend; and he amuses with his charming personality and his broad sense of humor. He is a hypochondriac of the first order, and this constant pre-occupation with his illnesses lends to his amusing characterization. The Italian priest is one of the more important minor characters in this book too. He is the martyr and is lectured continually by the Italian soldiers because he professes a firm belief in his religion. Henry shows the priest kindness and understanding and offers him the respect that one ought to the priest of any religion. It is between these two that much of the 1929 philosophy of Hemingway is brought out. There are other minor characters, but they serve only as background material.

In For Whom the Bell Tolls the division is the same. Into the good category fall people like Pilar and Anselmo. Pilar is the hard-headed, hard-thinking woman who serves as a stabilizing factor for the whole camp. Anselmo is old, kind, gentle, and quietly philosophical.

Frankenberg claims that Pilar is the mystic in Hemingway.⁵² That is doubtful. It is easier to think that Hemingway allows Pilar the diversion of palm-reading because peasant women are superstitious; and Pilar is nothing more than the best of peasant women. It is nothing to be alarmed about. One may wonder why Jordan worries about what Pilar saw in his hand, but even the most intelligent scientist at times succumbs to a desire to believe that there are mysterious things that cannot be explained by man. It is nothing more than that. Pilar's palm-reading is just part of the whole Pilar. Concerning Pilar as a character, it may be said that she is really more important as a character than Maria is. No one has any trouble getting a definite picture of Pilar. She is capable of the most violent outbursts, and also capable of the tenderest utterances. Hemingway well describes her on page 149:

As he said that, the woman started to curse in a flood of obscene invective that rolled over and around him like the hot white water splashing down from the sudden eruption of a geyser.

And then again, Hemingway shows the maternal tenderness under the hard shell when he lets Pilar say to Jordan:

"Yes, Ingles," she said. "Thou art very worried and for good cause. But all will be well, Ingles. It is for this that we are born."

"I don't need a political commissar," Robert Jordan told her.

She smiled at him again, smiling fairly and truly with the harsh lips and the wide mouth, and said, "I care for thee very much, Ingles."⁵³

What could be more harsh than the first quotation, and what

⁵² Frankenberg, Lloyd, "Themes and Characters in Hemingway's Latest Period." p. 782.

⁵³ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 387.

more tender than the last? Pilar is dynamic in her character, and sometimes her importance even transcends that of Jordan himself. If one had to choose the most important character of this novel, one might be tempted to choose Pilar. Whatever Maria lacks as a character is much made up for by Pilar. Hemingway possibly intended no likeness of Pilar's name to that of the English word pillar, but that is just what she is -- the pillar of strength that supports her entire band of guerrillas.

No one has any quarrels with Anselmo because he is the type of old man that any young man who entertains lofty ideals would like to be. He is firm and wise as his years.

In the bad division, Pablo leads them all. He is stubborn, impulsive, undependable, emotionally unpredictable, and hard to get along with. He has his kind moments, but they are rare.

These are the characters around whom Hemingway builds his stories. In all, they are simple people with simple tastes, simple goals, simple speech, and simple actions; and they live in chaotic, violent circumstances.

It is to be noted that Hemingway's characterizations are realistic in their selection of everyday people. He could have written of aristocratic people or of the generals and their aides, but he chose to write about privates and guerrillas. And he admits that he limits himself to these people because he knows them best.

CHANGE IN HEMINGWAY'S PHILOSOPHY AS SHOWN IN
FAREWELL TO ARMS AND FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS

In order to simplify the presentation of this section, it will be divided into several distinct divisions: his attitude toward life in general, religion, morality, people, and war.

The first of these is broad; but in looking over the two books, some very interesting conclusions can be drawn about Hemingway's attitude toward life back in 1929 and what it develops into by 1940.

As has been pointed out already, the thesis of Farewell to Arms is the futility in man's existence. The tone of For Whom the Bell Tolls is quite different. But there are sections in the latter book that read as though they might have been taken from the former. For instance, in Farewell to Arms the passage has already been quoted about the world's pleasure in "breaking people" and the inevitability of hateful death.⁵⁴ A direct parallel of this can be found in For Whom the Bell Tolls. In this particular instance Pablo inquires after the health of a comrade named Kashkin, and Robert Jordan replies:

"He is dead since April."
"That is what happens to everybody," Pablo
said gloomily. "That is the way we will all
finish."
"That is the way all men end," Anselmo said.
"That is the way men have always ended..."⁵⁵

Although Anselmo goes on in this quotation to make fun of

⁵⁴ See page 14 for quotation.

⁵⁵ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 14.

Pablo's cowardice, he seems serious when he utters the above.

An even closer parallel to this in Farewell to Arms is the following. Catherine is telling Henry about the man she would have married if he had not been killed in the war. She says:

"I didn't know about anything then. I thought it would be worse for him. I thought perhaps he couldn't stand it and then of course he was killed and that was the end of it."

"I don't know."

"Oh, yes," she said. "That's the end of it."⁵⁶

There are other passages of this type in the 1929 novel, but it would be difficult to find many more in For Whom the Bell Tolls.

The utter lack of faith in the outcome of the war should be mentioned here again. Henry and Catherine do not feel that the world will be a better place because they are endangering their lives for it. Maria and Jordan believe that they are fighting for something very good and something lasting and that if they die, their comrades will go on fighting either to victory or defeat.

Another bit of philosophy that may be speculated about is Hemingway's attitude toward the peasant. In the earlier novel, he, through Henry, makes an interesting statement about the peasant soldier.

"They were beaten to start with. They were beaten when they took them from their farms and put them in the army. That is why the peasant has wisdom, because he is defeated from the start. Put him in power and see how wise he is."⁵⁷

⁵⁶ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. p. 19.

⁵⁷ Ibid. p. 190.

Apparently, Hemingway still holds with this particular idea concerning the peasant. He says the loyalists failed because of poor organization. It is doubtful whether he thought the peasant capable of organizing himself. He is able to carry out someone else's orders, but they must come from someone else. Of course, Hemingway does not blame the peasant for the failure of their cause because their failure is due to the poor leadership of Golz and his group; and they are not peasants by any means. But he does think that the peasant is capable of doing what he is told; and if the leadership is good, then the result is good.

A statement of Hemingway's whole philosophical outlook on those about him is well put in Farewell to Arms in the section in which he and the aged Count Greffi are chatting. Henry asks the Count,

"What do you think of the war really?" I asked.

"I think it is stupid."

"Who will win it?"

"Italy."

"Why?"

"They are a younger nation."

"Do younger nations always win wars?"

"They are apt to for a time."

"Then what happens?"

"They become older nations."

"You said you were not wise."

"Dear boy, that is not wisdom. That is cynicism."

"It sounds very wise to me."⁵⁸

Hemingway admits here that he is cynical, and he makes no apologies for it.

⁵⁸ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. p. 280.

In For Whom the Bell Tolls, he has lost much of this attitude and is no longer the cynic.

The second grouping is that of religion. In this respect Hemingway has changed little. With the exception of the Italian priest in Farewell to Arms and perhaps Anselmo in his last novel, Hemingway has no religious characters in his novels. In fact, his attitude toward religion, though one of respect, is nothing more than fear. In the book of 1929, Henry speaks with the Italian priest, and the priest asks Henry whether he loves God. Henry replies:

"No."

"You do not love Him at all?" he asked.

"I am afraid of him⁵⁹ in the night sometimes."⁶⁰

In For Whom the Bell Tolls, Robert Jordan has much the same indifference toward religion, but there is a shade of difference. He no longer fears God. This is shown especially well in the passage taken from page 468 in which he questions himself just before dying. He asks himself, "Who do you suppose has it easier? Ones with religion or just taking it straight? It comforts them very much but we know there is nothing to fear."

In the earlier novel, Hemingway has a great respect for the Catholic priest in his sincerity, and he has Henry befriend the priest many times. In this book he makes no statement about the Catholic Church as an institution. Rather he deals

⁵⁹ him is not capitalized because it appears this way in the book.

⁶⁰ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. p. 77.

with it in the form of the priest. But in the later novel, he openly attacks the Church as being responsible in a great degree for the war in Spain. The Catholic Church in Spain was wealthy and owned much tax-free land. The burden of heavy taxation fell on the "little men," and little men can stand to carry a severe and too-heavy burden just so long. Anselmo is one of these little men and has had to revolt because of it. To point out the distinction Hemingway makes between religion and the Catholic Church, Anselmo offers good opportunity. The Spanish Loyalists decided to rid themselves of the menace of religion, but Anselmo cannot. And of him, Jordan remarks to himself, "And do not think against Anselmo either. He is a Christian. Something very rare in Catholic countries."⁶¹ From this statement it may be seen that he still respects the Christian man but would rather not have him attached to any formal church or denomination. He has an aversion to strict form, especially if these forms are in connection with religion. To make this more clear, an example or two will be pointed out. In one place he attacks the Catholic confession because it is automatic and, therefore, meaningless to its users.

The captain, standing in the open beside the boulder, commenced to shout filth at the hilltop. There is no language so filthy as Spanish. There are words for all the vile words in English and there are other words and expressions that are used only in countries where blasphemy keeps pace with the austerity of reli-

⁶¹ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 287.

gion. Lieutenant Berrendo was a very devout Catholic. So was the sniper. They were Carl-ists from Navarra and while both of them cursed and blasphemed when they were angry they regarded it as a sin which they regularly confessed.⁶²

In this next passage Hemingway once more attacks the automatic use of things that should be employed only with the most sincere devoutness. The lieutenant of the fascists orders his men to cut off the heads of the captured loyalists and return to camp with these heads in bags. In the skirmish in which the loyalists are captured, the lieutenant's comrade is killed. After saying something vague about is not war a terrible thing, he turns and

Then he made the sign of the cross again and as he walked down the hill he said five Our Fathers and five Hail Marys for the repose of the soul of his dead comrade. He did not wish to stay to see his orders being carried out.⁶³

His last charge against the Church is made in conjunction with his speculation about the Spanish people as people.

He says of them:

There is no finer and no worse people in the world. No kinder people and no crueller. And who understands them? Not me, because if I did I would forgive it all. To understand is to forgive. That's not true. Forgiveness has been exaggerated. Forgiveness is a Christian idea and Spain has never been a Christian country. It has always had its own special idol worship within the Church. Otra Virgen mas. I suppose that was why they had to destroy the virgins of their enemies. Surely it was deeper with them, with the Spanish religion fanatics, than it was with the people.

⁶² Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 318.

⁶³ Ibid. p. 322.

The people had grown away from the Church because the Church was in the government and the government had always been rotten. This was the only country that the reformation never reached. They were paying for the Inquisition now, all right.⁶⁴

Hemingway is bitter toward the Church for what it has done to the Spanish people. He has turned from complete indifference to bitterness toward the Catholic Church as an institution.

It ought to be mentioned here that Henry at one point says that, "It is in defeat that we become Christian."⁶⁵ This statement is important only because there seems to have been a later shift in belief. If not, why would Jordan say what he does when he is already defeated and waiting for death? If in defeat one becomes Christian, why does Jordan say that he has no religion and fears nothing after death?

It may be said that Hemingway is not primarily concerned with religious feelings. But he is concerned with it in so far as it affects the lives of the people he writes about. And although he respects Christianity as it existed in its pure state, he has no time for "civilized" elaborations and supposed improvements.

The third phase of Hemingway's philosophy to be discussed is his attitude toward morality as it appears in the two novels. Death in the Afternoon has already been cited as the book in which Hemingway sets forth his statement of morality, but this statement is short and so can be repeated here without becoming

⁶⁴ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 355.

⁶⁵ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. p. 189.

monotonous. He says, "I know only that what is moral is what you feel good after."⁶⁶ Without thinking very hard, it is evident that the veracity of such a belief is questionable. But Hemingway neither explains it nor apologizes for it. That is his idea of morality, and he is asking no one to believe in it. Perhaps he realizes the questions that might be asked if he were to offer an explanation. At any rate, it is necessary to accept this definition as true and sound for Hemingway, the individual. He uses it in each of his novels and sees no room for change apparently.

In Farewell to Arms this idea is expressed several times, but to choose one example is sufficient. Henry has just loved Catherine and is thinking about himself and her.

Catherine sat in a chair by the bed. The door was open into the hall. The wildness was gone and I felt finer than I had ever felt.⁶⁷

And later on, Catherine says to Henry, "You see? I'm good. I do what you want."⁶⁸

In For Whom the Bell Tolls the same thing is true. Jordan feels that to think of Maria's and his love as immoral is to say that the very earth is immoral. Jordan and Maria are normal people in an abnormal situation, and they adjust their morality to it. In fact, to Jordan it is not a question of morality at all.

What you have with Maria, whether it lasts just through today and a part of tomorrow or whether it lasts for a long life is the most important thing that can happen to a human being.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Explanation of this reference is on page 26.

⁶⁷ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. p. 99.

⁶⁸ Ibid. p. 113.

⁶⁹ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 305.

This love of Jordan for Maria -- like the love of Henry for Catherine -- is different from anything that he has experienced before. Both Henry and Jordan admit that they have lain with other women, but the whole intent was physical relief with no love of the mind attached. But with their loves for Maria and Catherine they experience a sense of security and mental and physical well-being that they have not felt before.

In the earlier novel, Hemingway's definition of morality is sound enough in so far as he proves it in that book. War is immoral because Henry does not feel good when he is in it. His love for Catherine is moral because it makes him feel good. That is all very well. But in For Whom the Bell Tolls he has a changed point of view about war. Jordan feels that the war is justified from the loyalist point of view and because he is a loyalist, he must think the war moral. Apparently, this obvious contradiction of earlier morality bothered Hemingway because he has Jordan talk with himself about it.

How many is that you have killed? he asked himself. I don't know. Do you think you have a right to kill any one? No. But I have to. How many of those you have killed have been real fascists? Very few. But they are all the enemy to whose force we are opposing force. But you like the people of Navarra better than those of any other part of Spain. Yes. And you kill them. Yes. If you don't believe it go down there to the camp. Don't you know it is wrong to kill? Yes. But you do it? Yes. And you still believe absolutely that your cause is right? Yes.⁷⁰

Here Hemingway, through Jordan, has to admit that he does not feel good about killing, but he still has to consider it

⁷⁰ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. pp. 303-304.

moral because he believes in the cause. This may be questioning himself before someone else gets a chance. Finally, however, Jordan justifies his point of view by saying that it is not for himself that he must kill but rather because it is for the general welfare of many other people.

Because if you are not absolutely straight in your head you have no right to do the things you do for all of them are crimes and no man has a right to take another man's life unless it is to prevent something worse happening to other people.⁷¹

Even though Jordan tries to assure himself that sacrificing a few for the many is sound judgment, he is, nevertheless, obviously worried about the soundness of the morality of the whole. It is almost as though Hemingway is afraid to admit that his earlier philosophy has seen a change. And he really does evade the issue. After the above quotation, he cleverly and cautiously slides into another subject in order to avoid having to make any decisions about it. The early Hemingway is sure about his feelings on this morality business, but the later Hemingway has to admit that there is room for question because there is nothing so final in life as definitions that work in every case. What may be moral in one situation may not be moral in another.

The next division of his philosophy is his attitude toward people. Hemingway's attitude toward people is very realistic. He realizes that there are the good and the bad, the sincere and the insincere. His Catherines, Marias, Henrys,

⁷¹ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 304.

and Jordans are good people because they are struggling for the best existence they know how. Hemingway is sympathetic with these people and would like to have them have what they want most from life, but he knows that life is not like that. He cannot use the cold objectivity that Arnold Bennett is able to employ because he likes people too well. But his liking for them does not interfere with what must happen to them. Although he is sympathetic with his main characters, he is much more aloof and objective toward very minor ones. For instance, he can view the doctors who care for Henry as mere individuals, and he has some fascinating observations to make about these incidental characters. A few examples will serve to point out what experience apparently has taught Hemingway about certain types of people.

When Henry is hurt and is receiving medical attention, the porter leaves the hospital room, and Henry is momentarily alone. Then the story continues:

Before he came back, three doctors came into the room. I have noticed that doctors who fail in the practice of medicine have a tendency to seek one another's company and aid in consultation.⁷²

In another spot in the same book, Henry speculates on a man's trying to be what he is not. He spicily notes that, "This tenor's name was Edgar Saunders, but he sang under the name of Edouardo Giovanni."⁷³ In still another part he ridicules man's peculiar, religious attitude toward things that are old. Henry is sitting waiting for Catherine, and he observes, "The

⁷² Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. p. 102.

⁷³ Ibid. p. 128.

frescoes were not bad. Any frescoes were good when they started to peel and flake off."⁷⁴

Besides these things, Hemingway also has some fixed ideas about drunkenness in people. He seems to feel that the drunken man is a coward, afraid to face life. He believes that through drunkenness a man loses his manhood because sexual potency is imperative to the whole personality of a real man; and if a man is an habitual drunkard, he is incapable of being a man in this respect.

It might be brought out here as an example of this attitude toward drunkenness the feeling of hatred that Pilar has for Pablo. She is disgusted with him because he has been constantly degenerating as a man, and she voices her disgust in many places. This sexual maladjustment is first in evidence early in the book (pages 54-55) when Pilar calls Pablo a coward because he can see no point in carrying out the plans of the guerrillas of which he is a member. They quarrel over the leadership of this band, and Pablo is taken to task by Pilar for his hesitancy. Her hate for Pablo constantly and quickly increases once it has started, and on page 58 she calls Pablo a murderer. Pablo's drunkenness began right after the butchery in the village of which Pilar tells later in the story. Her mounting disgust with Pablo's drunkenness finally expresses itself when she says on page 208:

"And now you are drunk," Pilar said.

"Yes," Pablo said. "With your permission."

"I liked you better when you were barbarous," the woman said. "Of all men the drunkard is the

⁷⁴ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. p. 30.

foulest. The thief when he is not stealing is like another. The extortioner does not practice in the home. The murderer when he is at home can wash his hands. But the drunkard stinks and vomits in his own bed and dissolves his organs in alcohol."

Pilar taunts Pablo, and he taunts her. He tells the group that Pilar will destroy them, and she again accuses him with the name "horse exhausted maricon."⁷⁵ This continues until finally, not only is Pilar sure that Pablo is treacherous in his intent, but the entire camp feels that it is no longer safe to trust Pablo with anything. Eventually he does betray them, and then returns to camp to try to make amends.

The whole situation seems to be set up to show Hemingway's belief in the moral, physical, and mental destruction brought about by constant and over-use of alcohol.

Hemingway's attitude toward all people is that the simpler they are the better they are. In both novels being discussed, the only character that approaches complexity is Robert Jordan, and even he is tempered to fit the situation. In Torrents of Spring and The Sun Also Rises his people are really simple people, trying to establish themselves in a befuddled world. In To Have and Have Not Harry Morgan, the simple man, has Hemingway's sympathy.

The next section of Hemingway's philosophy -- war -- has been discussed in other sections somewhat; but because both novels are so much concerned with war, it seems an important enough phase to elaborate on further.

⁷⁵ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 215.

In the earlier book, not only does Hemingway show his complete disgust and hatred for war, but he also points out how people's senses are dulled by the immensity of things. For instance, people become accustomed to the sound of things -- like announcements that the national debt is seventy billion dollars. People are not astounded because such denominations are completely outside them. And so in war-time. Huge numbers of men killed or wounded leave a tired populace unmoved. In Farewell to Arms Hemingway shows how indifferent people can become to numbers.

At the start of the winter came the permanent rain and with the rain came the cholera. But it was checked and in the end only seven thousand died of it in the army.⁷⁶

There is a withering bitterness in that last sentence, and the careful reader could not miss it. Hemingway realizes that the figure 7000 is made up of just so many separate individuals whose lives were being sacrificed needlessly. In this same book he discourages people who think that men go into battle with absolutely no fear. He points out that men at war are not automatons but human beings.⁷⁷

His hate of war takes in also his hate of arrogant officers and other personnel. Bitingly, he says, "They did not answer. They did not have to answer. They were battle-police."⁷⁸ And once again he observes,

So far they had shot everyone they had questioned. The questioners had that beautiful detachment and

⁷⁶ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. p. 4.

⁷⁷ Ibid. p. 198.

⁷⁸ Ibid. p. 238.

devotion to stern justice of men dealing in death without being in any danger of it.⁷⁹

On page 350 of Farewell to Arms he shows the result of war on a man who has had to kill. Men in war lose their feelings of human kindness and decency according to the 1929 Hemingway. Place after place in this novel records the hatred people have for war. If the book had to be put into one sentence, it might be that of the Italian, Passini, when he says, "There is nothing worse than war."⁸⁰ And at no moment can Henry think that anything good can come from war.

But Jordan has nearly reversed that opinion. As has been pointed out, he thinks that "war is a bitchery" but at the same time feels that some wars are just. And he has faith in just wars. Even at the moment of death when he is alone and might renounce war as a terrible business and not worth the effort put into it, he very clearly states that:

I have fought for what I believed in for a year now. If we win here, we will win everywhere. The world is a fine place and worth fighting for, and I hate very much to leave it.⁸¹

Is this not the 1929 Hemingway in complete reversal? To prove this point even further, the early Hemingway characters look on war as just something more to interrupt their few allotted moments of happiness. Having to live their lives fully within the space of hours, or at most in only a few months, does not appeal to them, and they do it grudgingly. But Jordan

⁷⁹ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. pp. 240-241.

⁸⁰ Ibid. p. 53.

⁸¹ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 467.

is far more cheerful about those moments of happiness. He admits the war is not pleasant, but he says that "a good life is not measured by any biblical span."⁸² Instead, he maintains that it is possible to live as "full a life in seventy hours as in seventy years."⁸³

To Jordan war is a reality that must be met realistically. There is no escaping from it once you are in, so you may as well accept it as an impelling reality. If man chooses to waste his time hating all things about war, then he is sidestepping the possibility of living hurriedly but fully. He may make up in intensity what he lacks in continuity and duration.⁸⁴ Jordan does not consider the past nor the future. He realizes that there is only the now -- the present. He believes that "There is only the now, and if now is only two days, then two days is your life and everything in it will be in proportion."⁸⁵

Looking over these many examples, it is clear that much of Hemingway's earlier philosophizing about war has been replaced by a new point of view. Both views are understandable, and it is doubtful that Hemingway would apologize for either one.

⁸² Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 169.

⁸³ Ibid. p. 166.

⁸⁴ Ibid. p. 168.

⁸⁵ Ibid. p. 169.

HEMINGWAY'S TECHNIQUE AS CONSIDERED FROM
HIS DIALOGUE, SIMPLICITY OF STRUCTURE,
AND MANNERISMS

If nothing else could be said of Hemingway's technique, it can be said that his dialogue is as close to being perfect as is possible; for, without exception, he practices a careful realism, a striking economy of words, and a penetrating simplicity of presentation.

It is necessary to admit that some of his earlier dialogue needed improving, but the dialogue used in both Farewell to Arms and For Whom the Bell Tolls is perfection itself. Would one have to choose the better of these two, it would be nearly impossible because of the actual technique used in the presentation of the dialogue. In the earlier novel, Hemingway was careful to let his characters speak simply. These Italian soldiers, as well as Henry and Catherine, were simple people; and it would be complete lack of skill to allow these simple people to speak in the precise diction of a Walter Pater.

In the dialogue of the former book, however, the Italian soldiers talk in American idiom for the most part because Hemingway apparently felt that there was no need to reproduce the Italian in translation, and this lack of direct translation does not detract from the novel in any way. But in For Whom the Bell Tolls he tries a new experiment. His soldiers in this novel are Spanish and might have spoken American dialect as did the earlier Italian men; but, instead, Hemingway seeks

to establish a more genuine atmosphere by recording direct translations of the Spanish idiom. This is most effective, and this new technique bears comment. There is the use of the familiar pronoun forms such as "thou" and "thy". Further than this Hemingway renders obscene words with the least amount of effort but with the greatest degree of exactitude. In both novels, the words "this and that" are used in place of obscenity. On page 180 of Farewell to Arms appears:

"I can say this about your mother and that about your sister?"
 "And that about your sister," Rinaldi said swiftly.

A direct parallel of this in For Whom the Bell Tolls appears on page 11: "I this and that in the this and that of thy father. I this and that and that in thy this."

Secondly, he uses dashes in the earlier novel to substitute for actual swearing. As on page 201: "'I'm so --- sleepy I went to sleep three times coming here from Plava,' Piani said." This usage does not appear at all in the later novel.

Thirdly, he uses the straight Spanish word without translation as the use of the word cojones. This word appears in many passages in the latter novel.

Fourthly, is his use of words like unnameable, unsayable, and the like to substitute for the earlier use of dashes. He fills up the blank spaces, so the reader's mind won't have to labor over the obscenities.

Another phase of this employment of Spanish translations

is his use of the shift in verb tenses. For example, Golz says to Jordan on page 7: "'I like it very much when I was your age too.'" Still another use having to do with the verbs is the use of the infinitive as on page 16 when Anselmo says: "'Very little,' said Anselmo scornfully. 'Very little in my judgment. To steal, yes. To eat well, yes. To murder, yes. To fight, no.'"

It is also important to note the use of prepositional phrases for adverbs such as "with much rapidity" for quickly and also "of such a barbarousness" in place of the adjective barbarous.⁸⁶ And then, of course, there is the direct translation of the Spanish idiom itself, examples of which are numerous. A few examples follow:

"Yes," the young man said. "But we will eat later. How are you called? I have forgotten."⁸⁷

"Yes. It is a name I can never dominate..."⁸⁸

"Thyself, yes," Anselmo said. "Thyself now since a long time. Thyself and thy horses. Until thou hadst horses thou wert with us. Now thou art another capitalist more."⁸⁹

There is some direct translation of Italian idiom in the earlier novels, but this method is not consistent. An example or two taken from Farewell to Arms will show that Hemingway did use it.

Page 12:

"Since you are gone we have nothing but frostbites..."

Page 82:

How do you like that, baby? All right. Yes? You go

⁸⁶ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 27.

⁸⁷ Ibid. p. 34.

⁸⁸ Ibid. p. 29.

⁸⁹ Ibid. p. 115.

to live in a big city and have your English there to cuddle you. Why don't I get wounded?

Page 106:

"Ask her if she eats supper with me."

As a last notation on this method of using the Spanish translations, the lack of verbs in the speeches should be mentioned. Often one gets things like: "Dependable within the gravity of the situation."⁹⁰

Judging from these various phases of Hemingway's use of Spanish translation and idiom, it can be seen that such a rendering would be a long task in itself; and according to Edward Fenimore, Hemingway was completely successful.⁹¹

To show the further excellencies of the dialogue in each of these books, the following passages have been chosen with a view toward their general representation. Hemingway's simplicity of dialogue and his economy of words is best shown from this passage:

Together they made the bed with me in it. That was new to me and an admirable proceeding.

"Who is in charge here?"

"Miss Van Campen."

"How many nurses are there?"

"Just us two."

"Won't there be more?"

"Some are coming."

"When will they get here?"

"I don't know. You ask a great many questions for a sick boy."

"I'm not sick," I said. "I'm wounded."⁹²

⁹⁰ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 34.

⁹¹ Fenimore, Edward, "English and Spanish in For Whom the Bell Tolls." E. L. H. March, 1943. v. 10. pp. 73-86.

⁹² Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. p. 92.

Anyone doubting the consistency of this economy is welcome to open either of his novels to investigate. Passage after passage shows this complete simplicity and economy. As an example of this same thing taken from For Whom the Bell Tolls, the following passage will serve:

"Where is the old man?" [Pilar asked.]
 "At the camp."
 "Where was he last night?"
 "In Segovia."
 "Did he bring news?"
 "Yes," Joaquin said, "there is news."
 "Good or bad?"
 "I believe bad."
 "Did you see the planes?"
 "Ay," said Joaquin and shook his head.⁹³

If the economy of words were any more strict, the meaning of the statements might be entirely lost.

Hemingway's dialogue, then, is a masterpiece of economy, simplicity, and directness. What he may lack in other directions he amply makes up for in his fine treatment of dialogue.

The second phase of Hemingway's technique is the overall simplicity he employs in every part of his writing. His ideas are limited to a small scope, his situations are those that would be experienced by ordinary people, and his dialogue is that of the simple man. He deals in the simple emotions of man -- love, hate, fear. Man can most easily and clearly be sketched in relation to these basic emotions because each of these emotions is violent, and man is most honest when he is

⁹³ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. pp. 131-132.

violent and fundamental.

And then Hemingway carries this simplicity into the actual sentence structure. His sentences are of the simplest construction. He seldom uses involved, complex sentences, and his constant use of and serves his purpose of coordination. An example of this use of and is:

It [the cloud] came very fast and the sun went a dull yellow and then everything was gray and the sky was covered and the cloud came on down the mountain and suddenly we were in it and it was snow.⁹⁴

At first, this use of and may seem over-done, but if one is not the critic looking for such peculiarities, it is amazing how easily the words flow, one after the other when just one word such as and is used for coordination. The prize passage in which this use of a single coordinating conjunction is used is to be found on page 40 of Farewell to Arms. The sentence is 166 words long, with the only coordinating conjunction being and, and within this sentence are thirteen connecting and's to say nothing of the number of and's used to connect two nouns. Even into For Whom the Bell Tolls, Hemingway continues the use of this technique. An example drawn from this novel is:

...there was the whistle of the air splitting apart and then in the red black roar the earth rolled under his knees and then waved up to hit him in the face and then dirt and bits of rock were falling all over and Ignacio was lying on him and the gun was lying on him.⁹⁵

⁹⁴ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 6.

⁹⁵ Ibid. p. 321.

Although this use of and may strike some as an over-use and as mere lack of vocabulary, another look will show that the situations in both books are full of tense moments, and it is easier to write with coordination by and than to stop for periods.

Still in keeping with this simplicity, Hemingway puts his people in simple situations that are familiar to everyone, and his people spend a good deal of their time eating cheese, drinking beer, sleeping, loving, and living an everyday sort of life. Hemingway does not go in for the spectacular because an entirely different technique would then have to be employed.

Although the foregoing statements are set forth to prove that Hemingway's main concern in writing the novel is truth, through simplicity, he sometimes mars this simplicity by carelessness, hurry, or just poor English grammar. Coming to a sudden shift in person, for instance, is very disconcerting; and he does this in Farewell to Arms. He goes from I to you to we all within the space of a paragraph.⁹⁶ In another spot, only this time in For Whom the Bell Tolls, he does another shift. "This was a big storm and he might as well enjoy it. It was ruining everything, but you might as well enjoy it."⁹⁷

Occasionally Hemingway makes an obvious slip in English grammar. His special sin seems to be that of using adverbs where adjectives belong.⁹⁸

⁹⁶ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. p. 197.

⁹⁷ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 182.

⁹⁸ Ibid. p. 43.

But to return to his virtues. One of the interesting developments in Hemingway's technique in For Whom the Bell Tolls is his use of prose poetry. Many passages flow with beautiful words that challenge the loveliest of poems. One of the nicest is his explanation of what life is. On pages 312 and 313 he writes:

But living was a field of grain blowing in the wind on the side of a hill. Living was a hawk in the sky. Living was an earthen jar of water in the dust of the threshing with the grain flailed out and the chaff blowing. Living was a horse between your legs and a carbine under one leg and a hill and a valley and a stream with trees along it and the far side of the valley and the hills beyond.

Another passage that equals this one for sheer beauty is that in which Jordan lets his feelings seek expression when loving Maria.⁹⁹

Hemingway is capable of being equally poetic with his feelings about violent things as is in evidence in the long passage on bull-fighting. He can call up words whose very sound suggests wild action.¹⁰⁰ And as though being able to express oneself tenderly and violently in poetry were not enough, Hemingway proves that he is capable of further poetic feeling about a thing that ordinarily would not provoke poetry -- a merry-go-round. To quote part of this passage:

It is like a merry-go-round, Robert Jordan thought. Not a merry-go-round that travels fast, and with a calliope for music, and the children ride on cows with gilded horns, and there are rings to catch with sticks, and there is the blue, gas-flare-lit early dark of the Avenue du Maine, with fried fish sold

⁹⁹ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 159.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. pp. 182-183.

from the next stall, and a wheel of fortune turning with the leather flaps slapping against the posts of the numbered compartments, and the packages of lump sugar piled in pyramids for prizes.¹⁰¹

There are more passages of this kind, but they need not be cited.

Interestingly enough this employment of prose poetry enhances the simplicity of the writing. Had Hemingway meant to be pretentious and florid, there would be no beauty in the poetry. But, as always, it is Hemingway expressing himself in the simplest manner; and in this case, the simplest way is through poetry.

Hemingway, through simplicity, set out to do away with wordy drama and tearful sentimentalism and replace these with simple emotions -- ones with their roots in honesty. At one place in For Whom the Bell Tolls Pilar expresses what Hemingway feels about sentimentalism: "Drink thy coffee and let us go. So much theatre tires me."¹⁰²

Like most authors Hemingway has his share of mannerisms. Some of them run through all his novels and some appear only on occasion. Of the former group comes the repetition of phrases for effect. He does this not only in dialogue but also in the running narrative. Good examples can be found in both Farewell to Arms and For Whom the Bell Tolls.¹⁰³

The second peculiarity is one that has already been

¹⁰¹ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. p. 225.

¹⁰² Ibid. p. 390.

¹⁰³ Ibid. p. 260 is representative.
Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. pp. 31,133,135.

mentioned and that is his use of and as his most-used coordinator.

The third peculiarity appears only in his latest novel. That is the employment of the words obscenity, unnameable, and so forth. These are used in place of blasphemous terms, and their use is disturbing to many. Perhaps the best instance of this is one that appears on page 30. "What are you doing now, you lazy drunken obscene unsayable, son of an unnameable unmarried gypsy obscenity? What are you doing?"

The fourth peculiarity is that Hemingway leaves out a great many commas in the customary places for them such as before the coordinating conjunctions in compound sentences.

The last peculiarity to be mentioned is another one of structure. Hemingway never uses high-powered action verbs in the expository parts of the dialogue. That is to say, he finds it adequate to use the terms "he said" and "she said" in place of active verbs like "he sputtered" or "she screamed" or "they raged." And more often than not, he goes a step further and does away with even the simplest expository clarifications such as "he said." Sometimes he goes so long without clearing up the speaker that it becomes confusing.

The above examples point out most, if not all, of Hemingway's mannerisms, none of which is very serious but all of which attract the attention at one time or another of the discerning reader.

CONCLUSIONS

The attempt has been made in this thesis to compare and mark the development of Hemingway as a man and as a writer with a definite technique. The thesis has meant to be objective and fair, pointing out the good and the bad with equal weight.

The main conclusion that may be drawn concerning the development of Hemingway is that he has advanced considerably from Farewell to Arms to For Whom the Bell Tolls. He has developed in personal philosophy as well as in actual writing technique.

In personal philosophy, the main thing to be noted is his change from his deadly cynicism and bitterness toward war to that of tolerance and justification. It is Hemingway gone from black despair to faith in ideals.

In actual writing technique Hemingway has improved in a number of ways. The hurried sloppiness of writing that appears more than once in the earlier novel is no longer in evidence in the latter novel. His use of direct translation of Spanish idiom improves the novel from the point of view of easily establishing and keeping the Spanish atmosphere throughout the story.

Although in Farewell to Arms Hemingway's accurate reporting is one of the remarkable things about the book,¹⁰⁴ this same ability to record what he sees is increased in For Whom the Bell Tolls.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴ Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. pp. 58-59.

¹⁰⁵ Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. pp. 412-417.

Hemingway's simplicity has seen some improvement such as the inclusion of prose poetry; but, otherwise, it remains unchanged and as fine as ever.

Concerning the development of Hemingway's characters, Jordan is an improvement over Henry; but Catherine is far the better of the two women. Jordan is somewhat more the clear thinker of the two men -- Henry's views and thoughts are all colored by the "lost generation" philosophy. There is no doubt that Hemingway believed in Henry in 1929 and in Jordan in 1940; it is merely a changed Hemingway. But why he made Maria the bundle of emotions that she is is questionable. Sometimes it almost appears as though Hemingway added the love story to For Whom the Bell Tolls because he felt it would be too documentary without the love interest. It is doubtful that he felt any real obligation to Maria. It is hoped that he did not because even Bret of The Sun Also Rises is a far better sketch of a good Hemingway woman than Maria is. And Pilar is far better than either of these.

His minor characters are fine in both books. It would be difficult to improve on any of them. The characters in For Whom the Bell Tolls are given a better chance to talk for themselves than are the characters of the former book, however. One has a much more definite impression of Anselmo, for instance, than one does of the Catholic priest.

The themes of the two books are vastly different and reflect his change of philosophical outlook.

From these points of view it is possible to say that Hemingway's writing has been in the direction of improvement, that his general philosophy and technique have changed for the better, and that some of his works may establish him as one of the great American writers of the twentieth century. It is true that Hemingway has his minor defects, but every writer has. His merits far outweigh his defects.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beach, Joseph W., American Fiction 1920-1940. Macmillan Co., New York. 1941. pp. 67-119.
- Cohn, L. H., Bibliography of the Works of Ernest Hemingway. Random House, New York. 1931. pp. 1-116.
- Forster, E. M., Aspects of the Novel. Harcourt, Brace, and Company, New York. 1927. pp. 1-251.
- Fox, J. F., The Novel and the People. Lawrence and Wishart, London. 1937. pp. 1-172.
- Hemingway, Ernest, Farewell to Arms. Modern Library, New York. 1932, (first edition 1929). pp. 1-356.
- Hemingway, Ernest, For Whom the Bell Tolls. Charles Scribner's and Sons, New York. 1940. pp. 1-472.
- Hemingway, Ernest, The Sun Also Rises. Charles Scribner's and Sons, New York. 1926. pp. 1-260.
- Hemingway, Ernest, To Have and Have Not. Grosset and Dunlap, New York. 1937. pp. 1-262.
- Hemingway, Ernest, Torrents of Spring. Charles Scribner's and Sons, New York. 1926. pp. 1-143.
- Muller, H. J., Modern Fiction -- A Study of Values. Funk and Wagnalls Co., New York. 1937. pp. 1-447.
- Myers, W. L., The Later Realism. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 1927. pp. 1-173.
- Wilmotte, Maurice, Etudes Critiques sur la Tradition Litteraire en France. Librairie Ancienne Honore Champion, Paris. 1909. (Chapter on realism, "Eugene Fromentin et Les Realistes.") pp. 282-305.

Winther, Sophus K., The Realistic War Novel. University of Washington Book Store, Seattle. 1930. pp. 1-132.

Periodicals

Allen, Hugh, "The Dark Night of Ernest Hemingway." Catholic World. Feb., 1940. v. 150. pp. 522-529.

Baker, Howard, "Grand Tour of Fiction." Southern Review. Spring, 1939. v. 4. pp. 801-803.

Brooks, Van Wyck, "Fashion in Defeatism." Saturday Review of Literature. March 22, 1941. v. 23. pp. 3-4, 14.

Canby, H. S., "Story of the Brave." Saturday Review of Literature. Oct. 12, 1929. v. 11. pp. 231-232.

Collins, Seward, "Inflammatory Topics." The Bookman. Feb., 1930. v. 70. pp. 641-649.

"E. S.", "New Novels." New Statesman. Nov. 30, 1929. v. 35. pp. 267-268.

Fadiman, Clifton, "A Fine American Novel." The Nation. Oct. 30, 1929. v. 129. pp. 497-498.

Fadiman, Clifton, "Ernest Hemingway Crosses the Bridge." New Yorker. Oct. 26, 1940. v. 16. pp. 66-69.

Fenimore, Edward, "English and Spanish in For Whom the Bell Tolls." E. L. H. March, 1943. v. 10. pp. 73-86.

Ferguson, Charles, "Five Rising Stars in American Fiction." The Bookman. May, 1927. v. 65. pp. 251-258.

Frankenberg, Lloyd, "Themes and Characters in Hemingway's Latest Period." Southern Review. Spring, 1942. v. 7. pp. 776-789.

Herrick, Robert, "What Is Dirt?" The Bookman. Nov., 1929.
v. 70. pp. 258-263.

Hight, Gilbert, "Thou Tellest Me, Comrade." The Nation.
March, 1941. v. 152. p. 242.

Littell, Robert, "Notes on Hemingway." New Republic.
Aug. 10, 1927. v. 51. pp. 303-307.

Matthews, T. S., "Nothing Ever Happens to the Brave."
New Republic. Oct. 9, 1929. v. 60. pp. 208-210.
(Fall Literary Supplement)

Nation, The, "Notes by the Way." Anonymous. Dec., 1940.
v. 151. p. 609.

Priestley, J. B., "A Farewell to Arms." Now and Then.
Winter, 1929. v. 3. pp. 11-12.

Rascoe, Burton, "Wolfe, Farrell, and Hemingway." American
Mercury. Dec., 1940. v. 51. pp. 493-498.

Schneider, Isador, "The Fetish of Simplicity." The Nation.
Feb. 18, 1931. v. 132. pp. 184-186.

Survey, The, Nov., 1929. v. 63. p. 166. (Book Review of
Farewell to Arms)

Wilson, Edmund, "Ernest Hemingway." Atlantic Monthly.
July, 1939. v. 164. pp. 36-46.

Wilson, Edmund, "The Sportsman's Tragedy." New Republic.
Dec. 14, 1927. v. 53. pp. 102-103.