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PATTERNS OF GUILT IN RELATION TO DEATH
IN THE WORKS OF ERNEST HEMINGWAY

Ernest Hemingway is well known for his preoccupation with the theme of death. Philip Young makes a good case for showing that Hemingway's war wounding and personal encounters with death deeply affected his writing. "The Hemingway hero," he says, "is also the wounded man. . . . The man will die a thousand times, before his death, but from his wounds he would never recover so long as Hemingway lived and recorded his adventures."1 Certainly one cannot read many of Hemingway's works without noting how often he speaks of death and how many of his real-life and fictional creatures, both animal and human, are portrayed as facing death. In making a careful reading of the works of Ernest Hemingway, I have been impressed by the way in which he and so many of his characters feel a sense of guilt in relation to death, both in the taking of life and in the facing of their own end. Both Christian and pagan sources appear to cause the sense of guilt and influence the patterns for getting rid of the guilt.

The Christian source of guilt in relation to death is mainly a strong consciousness of the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill" and the teachings of the church that expiation is necessary for misdeeds. The pagan source of guilt in killing animals appears to be a sense of the sacredness of animal life. It is possible that Hemingway was influenced by early contact with the Indians in the north woods of Michigan. Since his family spent their summers on a farm there, located close to an Indian settlement, he had opportunity for many contacts with Indians.2 Sir James Frazer in his study of primitive rites notes that the North American Indians not only revere animals which they do not eat
but conciliate the animals which they kill and eat.\textsuperscript{3} As I shall show in this paper, Hemingway and his characters on some occasions involving the killing of animals show a deep sense of guilt similar to the conciliatory attitude of the North American Indian.

Pagan and Christian influences also are evident in Hemingway's portrayal of scenes involving the ridding of guilt. The bullfight for Hemingway becomes a religious experience paralleling primitive rites to overcome or purge evil forces. But there is also a strong Christian pattern of purging guilt which evolves from remorse for killing and for a misspent life. This pattern is similar to the Catholic rite of penance. In its wider sense, the term "penance" refers to the total sacrament and includes self-examination, contrition or sorrow for sin, confession, absolution and reparation.\textsuperscript{4} There is, however, no instance of actual pronouncement of absolution in Hemingway's fiction. Even when the character is of Catholic background, no priest is present at the moment of death. Consequently this part of the sacrament is lacking, unless one can assume it is symbolically present. The idea of reparation is also missing in some cases, but there are a number of instances where it is mentioned or implied. The elements of the sacrament most clearly paralleled in the experience of Hemingway's characters are examination, contrition and confession. This pattern of penance occurs again and again in the work of Ernest Hemingway.

H. E. Bates offers the interesting suggestion that "it is from Catholicism, perhaps, that Hemingway's constant preoccupation with the theme of death arises."\textsuperscript{5} Ernest's marriage to Pauline Pfeiffer, a devout Catholic, which lasted over a period of thirteen years, 1927-1940, may have influenced his attitudes toward death, particularly in some of his works of the Thirties and
later. The Christian pattern of contrition and confession before death is less in evidence in the very latest of his writings. In The Old Man and the Sea, the last of his work published before his death, Santiago does not die but he is near death. Yet his only confession is to the fish because he feels a sense of guilt for killing such a beautiful creature. He thinks of the fish as his brother, so he says he is sorry. The context is pagan, not Christian. Islands in the Stream was published posthumously but sections of it were being composed at about the same time as The Old Man and the Sea. 6 In Islands, Thomas Hudson also feels no compulsion to contrition or confession as he faces his death. It might be argued that he is ready to meet his end, since all through the book he seems aware of his shortcomings; therefore he is in no need of special confession at the closing moments of his life. Yet just as Catherine Barkley in A Farewell to Arms (1929) rejects any religious ministry as she faces her death, so Thomas Hudson dies quite serenely without any note of religious emphasis. In the light of the many instances which will be mentioned in this paper, it seems fair to conclude that the Christian pattern of contrition and confession when facing death is strongest in Hemingway's middle period of writing. On the other hand, the guilt pattern associated with the pagan concept of the sacredness of animal life persists and even appears to intensify in his later writings, such as The Old Man and the Sea and "African Journal."

The focus of this paper will be primarily on Hemingway's writings of the Thirties and later. The guilt pattern will be traced in relation to, first, killing of men, then to the killing of animals, and finally to the personal facing of death by the main characters in the stories. Christian and pagan attitudes toward death recur through all of these patterns.
The problem of guilt in relation to the killing of human beings is associated mostly with war. In non-war situations, Hemingway does not discuss the morality of the killer engaging in violence. For example, To Have and Have Not is a story conspicuous for its brutal violence. Yet Harry Morgan apparently shows no compunction for his murderous acts unless one can count his dying words as a kind of regret for waste of human life—"'No matter how a man alone ain't got no bloody fucking chance.'" This novel offers no real light on the author's views on killing in general. It would be rash on the basis of this one character to assume that Hemingway condones acts of brutal murder. Nor does A Farewell to Arms contain any sort of moral dilemma on the matter of killing in wartime. But A Farewell to Arms is from the earlier period of writing, thus furnishing further evidence that the guilt pattern associated with death does not occur in Hemingway's writing of the Twenties.

The problem of justification of the taking of human life is prominent in For Whom the Bell Tolls. Several characters discuss guilt in relation to killing. Pilar says the depriving of life is a thing of ugliness but a necessity to win. She is sickened as she describes the way in which a party of villagers became dominated by personal revenge and lust for violence in their slaughter of supposed Fascists. Her reaction seems to have no connection with religious convictions, but one can surmise that she may be influenced by previous Catholic training, even though she has now forsaken such beliefs. She blames Pablo as leader for stimulating emotions to such excess. Pablo, a cruel, hard man, on one occasion also surprisingly shows some remorse. When he expresses these sentiments he is drunk, so it is difficult to know how seriously to take his words. But he admits that in the early days he was bar-
barous in the way in which he killed. He even confesses, "'I would be happy except for those people I have killed. All of them fill me with sorrow.'" When Augustín reminds him that the people he killed were Fascists, Pablo still says, "'I would restore them all to life.'" Yet at the destruction of the bridge, he has no compunctions about sacrificing men from his own side in order to protect himself and to get the use of their horses for members of his band to escape. So one hesitates to take very seriously his earlier feelings of guilt. Yet Pablo's words of remorse sound religious, following the pattern of the Catholic sacrament of penance—contrition, confession and even a desire for reparation, since he wishes he could bring the dead back to life. True, this is not confession to a priest, nor is there any question of absolution. But though the sentiments may have been brought on by drinking, they suggest the remnants of Christian influence on this brutal leader.

Robert Jordan, in the same novel, is also uneasy about killing. The overtones of the commandment, "'Thou shalt not kill," seem to hover in his thinking. He is perturbed because he has to admit that he has enjoyed killing as a soldier and that such an emotion does not seem right to him. He understands that killing is a necessity in war, but he believes that one should not like it and ought to avoid it, especially the killing of those who are unarmed. To keep track of the number killed like a trophy record is disgusting, he thinks. Telling himself that it is best to forget his shooting of the cavalryman, he suddenly feels that this is a cover-up: "You have no right to forget anything. You have no right to shut your eyes to any of it nor any right to forget any of it, nor to soften it nor to change it." Sardonically, he remarks that killing the cavalryman was his good deed for the day. Then in outright confession, he says to himself, "I'm sorry, if that does any good." He has read the dead man's letters, sees that the victim was
apparently a good man from a pious family, but he was an enemy who had stumbled on their hiding place and so had to be killed. Jordan's words indicate self-examination, contrition and confession. But nothing is said of restitution, nor does he address a Supreme Being. His words are uttered to himself, apparently to justify his actions to a troubled conscience. Jordan's conclusion is really a rationalization for killing: "No man has a right to take another man's life unless it is to prevent something worse happening to other people." Yet there evidently remains a nagging uncertainty in his heart about the moral right to kill. This too may be the influence of early religious training with emphasis on the commandment not to take life.

Even greater than Robert Jordan's sense of guilt is Anselmo's. Unlike Jordan, who does not like to kill animals, Anselmo does not mind hunting animals, but he does not like to kill men. Killing does not teach anything, Anselmo says; there should be ways to help men learn without resorting to such extremity. Yet, because of war he has killed and will do so again of necessity, but not with pleasure. He feels it is a sin to kill a man and wants to live later in such a way that it will be forgiven. The problem for him is, who will forgive, since the Republicans have no God anymore! Jordan suggests he must forgive himself. Watching the sentries at the bridge, Anselmo thinks it strange their lives will have to be blotted out. They are Fascists but also poor men, like many on his side. He feels they should not be fighting each other and doesn't like to think of killing them. Later, filled with a terrible sense of guilt, Anselmo thinks that when the war is won, if there is no longer any religion there will have to be some great penance done for the killing so that all may be cleansed or there will never be a true, kind human basis for living. Even though he understands that killing is unavoidable in
war, he believes that the taking of human life is a great sin and afterwards one must do something very strong to atone for it. Then he smiles to think that perhaps in the future the State will require certain work days as penance, similar to the provisions of the church. He wishes, though, there were a penance for it that one could commence right away because he feels badly about it when he is alone. At the final assault, Robert Jordan remembers Anselmo's repugnance toward killing and tells him to think of the sentry as a target, not a man. He also makes the killing an order to take away some of the curse. But after the deed, Anselmo, weeping, still thinks it is wrong, like striking one's own brother. But he is proud that he did not fail Jordan or the Republic. Earlier Jordan had reflected that Anselmo was a hunter, not a soldier, still untainted by the war, and that he was a Christian, something very rare in Catholic countries. Anselmo's words form the complete pattern of the Catholic sacrament of penance: contrition, confession and reparation. Outwardly he has lost touch with God; inwardly he retains the beliefs of the church to a deeper extent than he realizes. This is proven earlier in the story when, in the shock of seeing the beheaded corpses of Sordo's band, he instinctively begins to utter prayers for their souls. For the moment he has forgotten that he is supposed to have no God, no Church and no religious beliefs. But the loss of the rites of the church has left him without formal means for reparation and absolution. Anselmo thus retains a sense of guilt for killing from which he is never able to absolve himself.

In *Across the River and Into the Trees*, Colonel Cantwell also faces the problem of the morality of killing. He feels no compunction for killing individuals, but he is haunted by memories of mass slaughter in war. The pain is especially acute where the deaths are caused by his own errors of judgment or those of other commanders. These bitter wartime memories he feels he must
purge away before he meets his own death. At one point he states that he never wants to kill another human being. His feelings of guilt will be examined in more detail in a later section of this paper dealing with confession in relation to personal preparation for death.

In *Islands in the Stream*, Thomas Hudson hides his guilt beneath his wartime duty: "I know what I have to do, so it is simple. Duty is a wonderful thing." But he seems oddly reluctant to engage in actual combat and thinks it would be nice if someone else caught the Germans. He admits to an actual repugnance toward meeting the enemy. "It is my duty," he thinks, "and I want to get them and I will. But I have a sort of fellow death-house feeling about them. Do people who are in the death house hate each other? I don't believe they do unless they are insane." Earlier he expresses a sense of guilt which clouds any desire for killing: "Why don't you think of them as murderers and have the righteous feelings that you should have?" His answer to this question is, "Because we are all murderers... We all are on both sides, if we are any good, and no good will come of any of it." Thus, in spite of a sense of duty to fight in war, Hudson views the whole ordeal as having no ultimate gain, and his guilt feelings cause him to think of war-killing as murder. Whereas Robert Jordan drowns his twinges of conscience by arguing that good will come to a greater number of people if they win, and Colonel Cantwell, even though he is a professional military man and has spent his life in that service, has uneasy moments when he remembers the slaughter of the war, Thomas Hudson, in this later story, volunteers to serve in the fighting but is highly dubious about the morality of killing. The differences among the attitudes of the three may be simply one of characterization, but there is certainly no lessening of anxiety over the problem of the taking of
human life in war. For the major characters of these three novels the guilt pattern seems to have deepened.

Since much killing does occur in the war episodes of Hemingway's works, it is fair to assume that he recognizes two attitudes of soldiers as acceptable—those who feel no remorse, and those who because of religious traditions and beliefs retain a measure of reluctance to take human life and experience a sense of guilt when they are forced to do so. For all, the only valid justification seems to be the necessity of circumstance, such as duty, self-defense, and the conviction that the cause for which they fight will ultimately benefit a majority of people. Hemingway appears skeptical of the total rightness of any one side. In For Whom the Bell Tolls he ironically portrays the wrongs and rights of both warring sides and the evil and good in soldiers of both camps, Republican and Fascist, who are striving to kill each other. In many instances, he shows strong sympathy for those who experience a sense of guilt for killing human beings in wartime.

In Hemingway's writings, the killing of animals also emerges as a complex problem. At first glance, there appears to be a contradiction between the ecstasy of the hunter or the matador at a successful kill and, on certain occasions, the remorse for depriving the animal of the great gift of life. To comprehend how Hemingway could feel such conflicting emotions we need to realize that for him the bullfight and, to a lesser degree, the killing of large game animals were very close to a religious experience. Frederick J. Hoffman's suggestion that Hemingway liked the bullfight because it offered a more controlled environment of violence than war may be partially true, but it fails to account for the intensity of emotion. 11

From the detailed descriptions of the meaning of the bullfight in Death
in the Afternoon, it is clear that the rites of killing the bull must follow a prescribed ceremonial order and direction. In an excellent study, "Ernest Hemingway's Religion of Man," Joseph Waldmeir says that the bullfight "assumes the stature of a religious sacrifice, by means of which a man can place himself in harmony with the universe . . . ." The term "sacrifice" may be misleading if one thinks of the Christian sacrifice. The meek Lamb as the symbol of the sacrifice of Christ represents the willing victim. The primitive sacrifice retains an element of uncertainty and suspense. The tribal rites with which I am familiar, particularly the Tibetan Devil Dance, portray a drama of conflict. The conquest of the demon spirits, even where there is a chosen scapegoat, is fraught with danger and possible defeat. Where the use of a live victim has been banned, the symbolic movements of the dancers and the accompanying tones of the horns still dramatize a fearful struggle. The spectators are tense with excitement and emotion. The outcome is held in suspense until the climactic moment of victory. So it is in the bullfight, only here the primitive struggle still involves the actual physical danger and death. The bull is not intended to represent a willing sacrifice; he is an antagonist. His initial wounding by the picadors is intended to reduce him to more nearly equal terms of combat with the matador, but it must not eliminate the sense of struggle to the death. The big, dark bull is like a primitive symbol of the forces of evil--strong, immensely powerful, in many ways magnificent, but he must be overcome. John Killinger calls the bullfight a "kind of pagan sacramentalism," and notes that the bull is a descendant of a sacred animal in ancient rites. There is a kind of communion among the spectators, Killinger maintains, "as the great hairy god falters, topples in the ring that is an altar. They feel purged, cleansed, renewed. The sacra-
ment Hemingway describes is much more virile than the average Protestant communion service . . . ."\(^{14}\) If the bullfight is performed as intended, the matador wins. This makes the event very close to a tribe's primitive ceremonial rite of the struggle of good forces against evil, with the final triumph of the good shown in the mock death or actual death of the creature that is representative of the evil forces. It must be reenacted again and again, for in spite of the temporary exaltation of triumph, it is a recurring struggle in the world.

The matador who fakes the danger or unfairly deprives the bull of his fighting spirit and ability is despised by Hemingway. To cripple the bull by overwork with the cape, or to kill him in an easy way when there is no necessity for this, nullifies the whole effect. Although Hemingway admits that from a Christian point of view the whole bullfight is probably indefensible, he contrasts the matador who is a "butcher boy" with one who is a "priest." The butcher boy treats all bulls as though they were impossibly difficult, goes in lightning fast and "the bull drops dead as suddenly as an electric light is extinguished by the pushing of a button."\(^{15}\) The imagery suggests a mechanically contrived death. The dignity of the bull's death is lost. The matador has spared himself the terror and the test of a matched encounter. According to Hemingway, the less dangerous, rapid kill should be saved as an emergency measure with a difficult bull to avoid his prolonged suffering when he can no longer defend himself. Used at any other time, it means that the bull has been tricked into lowering his head and taken by surprise, and that the matador has not offered a fair fight. On the other hand, the "priest," says Hemingway, kills classically, slowly, beautifully, with a sense of honor which forbids use of an advantage or trick. The most perfect prescribed death stroke involves the greatest possible danger to the matador. At the "moment
of truth" one cannot be sure who has won—the bull and the man are like one unified being. This moment of suspense and terrible danger gives rise to the sense of supreme triumph. In vanquishing the bull, the matador has overcome Death as though it were a personal antagonist. Hemingway describes the emotion as giving the matador a sense of immortality. The spectator who participates in this struggle like a fellow-worshipper, enjoys the experience vicariously. Man has momentarily usurped the power of life and death, has killed the Adversary, rescued his own life from death and has triumphed like a god.

Somewhat the same experience occurs in the killing of wild game. The sportsman's code demands that the hunter not take unfair advantage of the prey merely to ensure his own safety. The animal must be allowed a measure of freedom to attack, thus producing inevitable risk of danger and death to the hunter. There should be a matching of forces, not a butchery. Hemingway has only contempt for the cowardly hunter. To shoot a lion from a moving vehicle, for example, would be a mechanized kill. (Twice in "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber," the white hunter, Wilson, cautions Macomber not to shoot from the car.) If man does not meet the animal on his own ground, there is no conflict involved, merely a slaughter, and he has taken the coward's way—shrinking from actual confrontation with the antagonist. The religious symbolism and significance are also lost. For Hemingway, as a hunter, the only means to achieve the godlike power over death is the face-to-face meeting with the opponent. Only then can one experience "immortality."

Since Hemingway enjoyed such exaltation in killing, how are we to explain the strong feelings of guilt which sometimes pressed upon him? The
first obvious source of the remorse is an unclean kill. In *Green Hills of Africa* in describing such an occasion he says, "I did not mind killing anything, any animal, if I killed it cleanly, they all had to die and my interference with the nightly and the seasonal killing that went on all the time was very minute and I had no guilty feeling at all. We ate the meat and kept the hides and horns. But I felt rotten sick over this sable bull."16 What upset him was not just the failure to obtain this animal as a prize but the fact that he had shot poorly, painfully wounded the animal and then lost him. The bull would suffer an agonizing death and then be eaten by hyenas, or worse yet, the hyenas would pull him apart before he died.

A second source of guilt seems to stem from an instinctive feeling that it is wrong to destroy certain animal life. Hemingway seems more strongly aware of this principle when the animal is beautiful and grand. To murder the hyena is just a joke because it is an ugly, undignified creature which does not bother to kill its prey but starts eating it alive. As a contrast, there is a sense of sadness and loss at the destruction of a lion because it is a noble, beautiful animal. The "god" who administers the death must also at some point lose his exaltation and become again a man, a vulnerable creature, like the beast he has killed. In *Death in the Afternoon*, Hemingway says the elation of killing is a "feeling of rebellion against death. . . . Once you accept the rule of death thou shalt not kill is an easily and a naturally obeyed commandment. But when a man is still in rebellion against death he has pleasure in taking to himself one of the Godlike attributes; that of giving it. This is one of the most profound feelings in those men who enjoy killing. These things are done in pride and pride, of course, is a Christian sin, and a pagan virtue."17 In *Green Hills of Africa* Hemingway
tells of the subdued feeling which follows the moment of triumph: "You cannot live on a plane of the sort of elation I had felt in the reeds and having killed, even when it is only a buffalo, you feel a little quiet inside. Killing is not a feeling that you share." The sense of awe in killing animals which Hemingway describes shows similarities to the primitive's propitiation of animals. Sir James Frazer explains that the savage "believes that animals are endowed with feelings and intelligence like those of men, and that, like men, they possess souls which survive the death of their bodies. . . . Accordingly, he makes it a rule to spare the life of those animals which he has no pressing motive for killing, at least such fierce and dangerous animals as are likely to exact a bloody vengeance for the slaughter of one of their kind." Frazer states further:

To him [the savage] many of the other animals appear as his equals or even his superiors, not merely in brute force but in intelligence; and if choice or necessity leads him to take their lives, he feels bound, out of regard to his own safety, to do it in a way which will be as inoffensive as possible not merely to the living animal, but to its departed spirit and to all the other animals of the same species, which would resent an affront put upon one of their kind much as a tribe of savages would revenge an injury or insult offered to a tribesman.  

We will probably never know to what extent Hemingway was influenced by his childhood association with Indians and familiarity with their beliefs about animal life, but certainly he shows a marked reverence for certain animals and admits a regret for killing them which resembles the conciliatory attitude of the primitive tribesman.

The third and perhaps the deepest source of guilt for killing animals derives from Hemingway's feeling of oneness with the animal. This trait could be attributed to a pagan reverence for animal life, but it could also be explained by a natural affinity toward animals. A. E. Hotchner recounts several
instances of Hemingway's skill and enjoyment in handling large zoo or circus beasts and the curious rapport he seemed to have with them. Like Santiago who calls the fish his brother, Hemingway had a strong identification with animals. There are numerous illustrations in his writings. In *Green Hills of Africa* he recounts that on one occasion he was in the hospital suffering from a severely painful break injury and suddenly, vividly imagined he was a wounded animal: "Alone with the pain in the night in the fifth week of not sleeping I thought suddenly how a bull elk must feel if you break a shoulder and he gets away and in that night I lay and felt it all, the whole thing as it would happen from the shock of the bullet to the end of the business and, being a little out of my head, thought perhaps what I was going through was a punishment for all hunters." In his fiction also, Hemingway sometimes identifies with the animal creature. In "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber," the reader suddenly discovers that the point of view has shifted from the hunter to the hunted. He is now the lion, meeting the attack of this two-legged intruder with the blasting machine, reacting to the shock and the pain of being wounded. It is a particularly effective technique in this story because it arouses the reader's sympathy for the lion and disgust toward Macomber who, at that point, is showing himself a very poor hunter and a coward.

In view of this feeling of oneness with animals, it is not too surprising to find that the Hemingway character's contrition over the destruction of animal life occasionally leads him to confess—not to himself nor to his fellowman but to the doomed animal itself. There are three interesting examples of this kind of confession in Hemingway's works. In *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Anselmo mentions that the gypsies believe the bear is a brother of man. Robert Jordan says the Indians in America have a similar idea: "When they kill
a bear they apologize to him and ask his pardon. They put his skull in a tree and they ask him to forgive them before they leave it." Robert Jordan's comment on the American Indian custom is important in showing Hemingway's familiarity with this tradition. Echoes of the belief for the necessity of a conciliatory attitude toward animals carry over into his fiction in The Old Man and the Sea and in his own personal experience in "African Journal."

In The Old Man and the Sea, Santiago expresses regret for having killed the fish. The first incentive for this sorrow is his realization of its size and beauty. Then, when the first shark hits the fish, destroying the dignity of its death and threatening it as a source of food for man, his sense of personal responsibility deepens. In searching his heart, he realizes that he killed the fish, not just to sell it for food but to gratify his pride. He attempts to defend himself by arguing that everything kills everything else in some way. The strain of fishing helps kill him just as it helps keep him alive. But as other sharks circle in to feed on his prize, his remorse deepens and he makes his confession to the fish: "I'm sorry about it, fish. It makes everything wrong." Later he says, "I shouldn't have gone out so far fish. ... Neither for you nor for me. I'm sorry fish." Santiago's struggle, which nearly cost his own life, has served no useful purpose, so he confesses his guilt for the sins of pride, presumption in going out so far and useless killing. The belief is pagan, resembling the American Indian tribal rite, but the pattern of searching of conscience, contrition, confession is similar to the Catholic sacrament of penance. There is, of course, no absolution and no reparation. This confession is to the fish, not to priest or God.
In "African Journal," written between 1954-56 but just recently published, the author makes a confession to a lion he has helped to kill. It was supposed to have been Miss Mary's lion but there were complications. She had lost one chance to get it because her husband and the Game Commissioner had forbidden the shooting, not knowing at the time that it was a marauding lion. Killing a large uncondemned animal is labeled by Hemingway "murder." Now they had been asked to kill this lion because he was preying on Masai cattle, but it became a problem to find another good opportunity for Miss Mary to shoot him according to the old sportsman's code as she insisted on doing. She was handicapped in two ways, by being only five feet, two inches in height and by a tendency to shoot too high. The latter trait Hemingway thought was a compensation for an inner antipathy toward actually causing the death of a living creature and he respected and loved her for it, but it increased the risks. It was unlikely she would make a successful first shot. Her short height meant that both she and her companions had to place themselves in great danger to arrange a face-to-face killing. In order to give Miss Mary the chance to shoot first so the lion could be claimed as her kill, they had to lull the animal into a false sense of security by inconspicuously following him around and offering free bait. After several weeks the lion was tricked into trapping himself in a bad place. Miss Mary got the first two shots but the wounds were minor so the beast ran on. (Hemingway discovered afterwards that the lion could have survived the small injuries she had inflicted.) Now, seeing the dark form running for cover, Hemingway shot, hitting the spine, felling the animal but not immediately killing him. As a result of this shot, the lion might have died slowly and painfully, in great agony. The animal was starting to rise to its feet when the head Game Ranger shot him behind the
shoulder, killing him instantly. Hemingway's remorse at the death evidently was caused by the trickery which had been used to get the lion in range and his own imperfect and painful shot. He had also observed the beautiful creature for some time—in love, in play, in majesty; thus the lion was like an old although troublesome friend, and its death deeply moved the author. Hemingway lay down by the beautiful dark body, stroking him and talking to him in Spanish, making his prayer of confession, begging the lion's pardon for having killed him. With his forefinger in the dirt he drew a fish in front of the lion, then rubbed it out with the palm of his hand. He did not explain what the symbol meant to him.

The entire episode has puzzling aspects. Why should the prayer be in Spanish? Did this make it more private, more secret, or did it attach some ritualistic significance? The drawing of the fish is also strange. It has no astrological meaning here so it must be the old Christian symbol, consisting of the first letters of the Greek words for "Jesus Christ, Savior of the World," which form the word "fish" in Greek. The contrition and confession follow the old pattern of the Catholic sacrament of penance, but the words are uttered to the lion, paralleling the American Indian rite to the bear. Finally an ancient Christian symbol is used, possibly as a sign or request for forgiveness. The ceremony is a mixture of Christian and pagan worship.

The account of "Miss Mary's Lion" is based on the Hemingways' last expedition to Africa undertaken in the fall of 1953. In contrasting the narration of the hunts in Green Hills of Africa to that in "African Journal," one cannot help but note a mellowing of attitude and a deepening of the sense of guilt associated with the killing of game. As a child Hemingway had been taught by his father that the meat of animals which had been shot was to be eaten—
killing was not to be a wasteful sport. 26 Eating the meat is mentioned in Green Hills of Africa but the point is more strongly stressed in "African Journal." In the earlier publication, Hemingway explains the code of Pop, his friend and white hunter: "He hated to have anything killed except what we were after, no killing on the side, no ornamental killing, no killing to kill, only when you wanted it more than you wanted not to kill it, only when getting it was necessary to his being first in his trade." 27 The accounts in the earlier book clearly reveal Hemingway's avid competitive spirit in the gaining of trophies. He seemed to have a compulsion to prove himself, not just as a successful big game hunter but as one better than everyone else. But in "African Journal" he says, "The time of shooting beasts for trophies was long past with me. I still loved to shoot and to kill cleanly. But I was shooting for the meat we needed to eat and to back up Miss Mary and against beasts that had been outlawed for cause and for what is known as control of marauding animals, predators and vermin." 28 Oddly enough, in the very next sentence he seems to contradict himself by mentioning he had shot one impala for a trophy. Evidently what he means is that the old compulsive competitive spirit to build up reputation and obtain countless trophies is gone. His final act of confession to the dead lion reveals also the great depth of his sense of guilt in relation to killing. This attitude appears to have deepened in his later life.

Whereas guilt for killing intensifies in Hemingway's later writing, guilt for past misdeeds when facing personal death is portrayed most strongly in Hemingway's middle period of writing. This preparation for death by his fictional characters tends to follow the order of Catholic penance—self-examination, contrition and confession. There is a hint of the need for such an attitude in To Have and Have Not. It is worth pondering why the author made
Harry Morgan's death so prolonged and so painful. During his life, Harry shows no regard for anyone but himself and his family, is brutal to friends and foes alike, sacrificing them to his own ends, even murdering where it suits his purpose. His dying is pictured as very dark and ugly. Harry likens the feeling in his belly to the cold sloshing water of the lake, or again to a cold rubber hose which has entered his mouth and is "coiled big, cold and heavy all down through him." He feels it in "his lower abdomen like a big, smooth-moving snake." To warm himself, he tries to pull himself over himself like a blanket and for a moment thinks he has succeeded but suddenly realizes "the warmth is the hemorrhage produced by raising his knees up." The graphic imagery suggests a man no longer able to nurture himself, facing a new dimension of terror, loneliness and pain. One wonders what goes on in his mind during those long agonizing hours on the boat. That there has been some soul-searching seems evident. When Harry is finally picked up, he insists on getting an important message across to the captain and first mate on the rescue boat and to anyone who will listen. The gist of it seems to be that a man alone hasn't got a chance. Implied in this statement is some implication of regret for a wrong view of life and people. It could be called a kind of confession for he has an impelling desire to tell it to others. In his weakness he is muttering incoherently, but makes a supreme effort to impart this new insight to mankind before he dies.29

In *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Robert Jordan does not meet death with any special guilt confession. Like Catherine's attitude in *A Farewell to Arms*, his religious emphasis at that moment consists of identification with his loved one, Maria. He will go with her, even though he stays behind to die. "'I am thee also now'" he says. There is also adherence to a moral code:
"Each one does what he can." "You can do nothing for yourself but perhaps you can do something for another," Jordan thinks. Then he wonders if religion helps the dying and concludes, "It comforts them very much but we know there is no thing to fear. It is only missing it that's bad." His sense of guilt in relation to killing has been noted previously, but at the point of death it is not evident. He is, in fact, poised to kill as his last act, "waiting until the [enemy] officer reached the sunlit place where the first trees of the pine forest joined the green slope of the meadow." The story ends with Jordan feeling his "heart beating against the pine needle floor of the forest." This final description, suggesting a oneness of man with nature, and Jordan's remarks of farewell to Maria tend more toward humanistic and pagan philosophy than to Christian religious beliefs.  

By contrast, there is one return to the faith of the Church by a character in the same novel. Joaquín, a member of Sordo's partisan band, is given to youthful excess in repeating the slogans of the Red propaganda. Sordo, whose zeal makes him willing to die for the Republic, gets a bit impatient at the mouthing of these meaningless mottos. When Joaquín is fatally wounded, he bravely starts out repeating the slogans but then suddenly switches to the "Hail Mary," a prayer for mercy to sinners, and starts an act of contrition, "'Oh my God I am heartily sorry for having offended thee...--'" In the roar of explosion he cannot remember the rest of the prayer, only the ending, "'Now and at the hour of our death. Amen.'" This reversion to the old faith is treated sympathetically by Hemingway. There is no sarcasm. Joaquín's religious turn-about is not presented as cowardly. The empty propagandistic sayings are, after all, of little use to a dying man. The old, tried prayers of the Church seem fitting and proper. So there is contrition and confession,
but unfinished in two ways—the dying man loses consciousness and there is no priest to pronounce absolution. As mentioned earlier, Anselmo on seeing the beheaded corpses, including that of Joaquín, also forgets he is no longer of the Church and begins to say prayers for his dead comrades' souls. Joaquín's prayer is thus taken up and completed by Anselmo.31

Another unfinished confession occurs in "The Capital of the World." Paco, dying of a knife wound inflicted by his waiter-friend who was pretending to be a bull, laments that there is no priest available as in the real bull-fight. He too starts to say the death confessional but quickly falls unconscious. Part of the tragedy of the event is the unexpected suddenness of the death. Paco dies full of illusions about himself and the world. At first glance, this may seem a happy way to die—he never has to become disillusioned like the others in the story. The emphasis of the details, however, reveals that he needed time for preparation. Hemingway uses striking and strange imagery to portray his death. Paco feels "his life go out of him as dirty water empties from a bathtub when the plug is drawn." The swiftness of his death has already been emphasized by descriptions of the "hot scalding rush" of blood, the "widening warm pool" and the fact that in a real bull fight "they lifted and carried you, running with you, to the operating room. If the femoral artery emptied itself before you reached there they called the priest." Paco can repeat only the first line of the Catholic act of contrition before it is all over. The dirty bath water suggests the idea of uncleanness, a need for cleansing. I cannot agree with Richard K. Peterson's interpretation that the figure suggests that Hemingway looked upon life itself as sordid and dirty.32 It is not "life" that is dirty but the "going out of life"—in particular, the manner in which one dies. The implication is that
it is not good to die full of illusion. Paco thinks of himself as a heroic brave matador but he is actually a foolhardy, ignorant, untested lad. He has an utterly false picture of himself just as he has a false notion that the world is a glamorous fairy-tale place. There is no time for self-searching nor for confession. He is unprepared to die—his death is unclean. Of Paco, Hemingway says, "He had no idea how they really lived nor how they ended. He did not even realize they ended. He died, as the Spanish phrase has it, full of illusions. He had not had time in his life to lose any of them, nor even, at the end to complete an act of contrition." In this last statement, the author himself stressed the importance of confession.

The most lengthy example of a person who reveals the need of purging and of confession before death is found in Across the River and Into the Trees. It is clear that Richard Cantwell's visit to Venice is much more than just an attempt to pack in as many enjoyments as possible before dying. It is an elaborate, almost ritualistic preparation for a death he is aware must come soon. One can even find mock religious symbols in the story: The stones which Renata gives him to feel with his bad hand are a reminder of the Rosary; Renata's painting can be likened to an icon; Renata becomes almost a "Mother Confessor" to Cantwell. At one point in the story it is stated that the Colonel "was not lecturing; he was confessing." Renata also says, "Tell me true until you are purged of it; if that can be." Clearly Cantwell's recital of his past is a confession in preparation for imminent death, not a sharing of his experiences. "It cuts pretty thin for sharing," he tells Renata. "It's all yours, Daughter." Such a statement fits a Mother-Confessor and Penitent relationship. Later Renata insists, "Don't you see you need to tell me things to purge your bitterness? . . . Don't you know I want you to die
with the grace of a happy death?" The word "grace" hardly seems accidental, and this "telling" is in the nature of a confession, a means of purging guilt.  

Yet the "purging," as it is called, is not completely successful. Some experiences seem too painful to share in detail. The making of wrong decisions causing the death of his men is one of the bad memories for Cantwell: "Too many men are dead from when I was wrong." When Renata suggests that he is exaggerating and didn't make many errors, he says, "Not many, but enough. There is plenty in my trade, and I made all three." And later, "They beat the hell out of me to remember them." The Mother-Confessor does not require the entire history of such memories. She says, "You don't have to tell me and I know now it is not good for you. Especially not the Valhalla Express day. I am not an inquisitor; or whatever the female of inquisitor is."  

The lack of details on the personal and the painful, however, makes Cantwell's contrition lack plausibility. Floyd Watkins suggests that the Colonel's confession instructs us about warfare but recalls nothing of the individual—the protagonist has become part of an impersonal system. Certainly it appears that the war confession turns into a lengthy lecture—an appraisal of some of the campaigns of the war and the leaders. The average reader is likely to become bored and may be tempted to fall asleep as the Mother-Confessor does at one point. Cantwell, however, goes right on, talking to himself. Hemingway's desire to review land campaigns of World War II distracts from the main thrust of the book.  

To show Cantwell as a military man who must somehow rid himself of the bitterness and pain of war experiences in order to face a peaceful death is a good theme, and whenever the author returns to it, the narrative takes on in-
terest. Of the trembling Kraut prisoners of the invasion the Colonel says, "So you can see it was a good bombing. Just the thing we always need in this life. Make them tremble in the fear of justice and of might." The ironic tone is obvious here. And later he muses bitterly, "If a man has a conscience he might think about air power some time." The Colonel's desperation at the remembrance of his loss of his regiment and of individuals is also plausible; "Every second man in it was dead and the others nearly all were wounded." That the regiment was destroyed under orders, not through personal error, does not seem to ease his pain. Needless slaughter is a goading prick at his conscience. Cantwell is opposed to the "excessive butcher bill." "But you get the orders, and you have to carry them out. It is the mistakes that are no good to sleep with. . . . But they can certainly crawl into a sack sometimes. They can crawl in and stay in there with you." Those issuing the orders are the most to blame, but the Colonel has to share some of the agony of guilt. Even this confession is spoiled, however, by Hemingway's vicious criticism of the leaders. Admitting that his judgments of top men may be wrong, Cantwell still suggests he will bar them even from Hell and like Dante he will draw the circles even though they are unjust. Trying to face his own guilt more squarely he thinks, "I have failed and I speak badly of all who have succeeded." But his contrition does not last and he says to himself that those issuing the orders are the "'Brown nosers, the five and ten and twenty percenters and all jerks from wherever who never fought and held commands.'" Then he remembers that many of them got killed too, but it does not stem his verbal attack. So Cantwell turns from a confession of personal guilt to a tirade against leaders and at that point the confession fails to ring true and becomes more of a rationalization toward self-justification.
In this way, Colonel Cantwell loses plausibility as a penitent confessor of guilt. 37

Besides feeling the need to purge himself of the guilt for killing, the Colonel shows a strong desire to change his pattern of brutal speech and actions to one of gentleness. Robert W. Lewis Jr. suggests it is a "struggle to love broadly and well." But as Lewis notes, "being the man of violence that he is, he will never completely achieve that desired goal of universal love. Even in his love for Renata he can be cruel." To those outside his circle he can be as "irrationally wrathful" as he is "irrationally beneficent." His wounded hand, says Lewis, makes him a demi Christ figure, symbolizing "one half of him bearing the wounds of love and living a life of love, the other half unmarked, human, and living without agape." 38 Yet Cantwell longs to be less brutal, more tender, and he makes several confessions indicating his contrition for his brutal manner. Often Renata urges him, "'Don't be rough,' "'Don't be rude,' "'Don't say rough words,' "'Please tell me about combat without being too brutal.'" To the portrait of Renata, Cantwell confesses, "'I am sorry for all the stupidnesses I say. I do not wish ever to be brutal.'" About the women he has loved he admits, "You lose them the same way you lose a battalion, by errors of judgment, orders that are impossible to fulfill, and through impossible conditions. Also through brutality." To Renata, who says she loves him when he is gentle, he promises, "'I'll try very hard to be gentle.'" But his next remark about a man seated at another table is rude, and she chides him, "'You don't stay gentle very long.'" Earlier with the Maitre d'Hotel whom he calls the Gran Maestro, he is not able to capture the complete spell of mutual understanding and thinks, "Why am I always a bastard and why can I not suspend this trade of arms and be a
kind and good man as I would have wished to be. I try always to be just, but I am brusque and I am brutal. ... I should be a better man with less wild boar blood in the small time which remains." This struggle between kindness and harshness is summed up by Jackson, his driver, as they are on the way to Venice: "He sure is a mean son of a bitch, and he can be so God-damn nice." The recognition of his failure seems genuine enough; the confessions seem sincere. But the habit of brutality has been too long entrenched and thus the confessions do not seem to result in anything more than temporary restraint. 39

At the end of the novel, at the duck hunt, the Colonel gets angry at the boatman for shooting to scare away the ducks and wishes the two of them could shoot it out. Then he is remorseful and tells himself to stop it, "You do not want to kill anyone anymore; ever." But he does not seem to believe his own words: "Who are you feeding that to, he told himself. You going to run as a Christian?" He does not want to make any bets on getting Christian toward the end. Returning from the hunt, the Colonel bluntly asks the boatman why he shot to frighten the birds. The boatman replies, "'I'm sorry that I shot. I shot in anger.'" The Colonel does not berate him because he thinks, "I have done that myself, sometimes." So he offers the boatman a friendly drink. Later when he asks his friend why the boatman was so full of hatred, he is told that the unfortunate man was "a bit over-liberated." It seems that Moroccans in Allied Uniform raped the boatman's wife and daughter. The Colonel makes no comment but one can assume that he now understands the boatman's antagonism and that he is glad their parting was on friendly terms. Cantwell in this little incident gives better evidence of compassion for others because of awareness of self-guilt. The offering of the drink to the
boatman can even be seen as a kind of reparation for his earlier anger. The pattern of contrition, confession, reparation as a preparation for death is not perfect, but it is similar to the Catholic stages of the sacrament of penance. 40

Although most of the imagery of death in Across the River and Into the Trees refers to the Colonel's bad heart, one figure—death is like going to the bathroom—points to the pattern of purging of evil. At one place Cantwell thinks, "Every worthless thing had been left in the bathroom. As always, that's the place for it." In speaking of burial and death, Renata asks if he would want Arlington or their local "boneyard" and suggests that she will see that he goes where he wishes and will go with him, if he likes. His answer is, "I would not like. That is the one thing we do alone. Like going to the bathroom. . . . It is very egotistical and an ugly process." The imagery suggests not only the solitude of death but the riddance of waste. Confessions of failure and waste of lives fit this pattern. For Colonel Cantwell an urgent preparation for death includes self-examination, a review of errors, contrition or sorrow for these faults, confession either to a "confessor" or to himself, and a desire to change, perhaps even to make reparation. 41

A more graphic and perhaps more successful portrayal of self-appraisal before death occurs in "The Snows of Kilimanjaro," published in 1936, fourteen years before Across the River and Into the Trees. Harry has actually come to Africa hoping to start again, "to get back into training," "to work the fat off his soul." When his neglected scratch becomes gangrenous and he faces death, he makes his confession partly to his wife but mostly to himself. His biggest regret seems to be that he has not used his gift for writing, but instead has let his wife's money, the easy comfortable life, "dull his ability" and "soften
his will to work" so that he has not reached his ideal as a writer. His first reaction is to blame his wife and her money, so he is very rude to her. But then he realizes this is not being completely honest. "If it had not been she, it would have been another." So he confesses that he destroyed his own talent "by not using it, by betrayals of himself and what he believed in, by drinking so much that he blunted the edge of his perceptions, by laziness, by sloth, by snobbery, by pride and by prejudice, by hook and by crook." The list sounds like a genuine catalogue of sins and even Harry is struck with this notion because he says, "What was this? A catalogue of old books?"

"Books" is an indirect way of saying "sins." He sees clearly he has never really loved his wife and now recognizes he has "sold vitality," that is, devoted his life to a woman for her money, just to get ahead. Another fault which he recognizes is that the women he really loved he had quarreled with so much that the love was corroded and killed so "he had loved too much, demanded too much, and he wore it all out." Three main categories are evident in Harry's recital of weaknesses: one, those involving faulty relationships toward loved ones resulting in loss of love; two, faulty attitude toward riches, expecting to buy life with money; three, faulty use of talent leading to destruction of his creative gifts. His self-analysis also reveals that good-sounding excuses, such as wholly or partly blaming other people, will not work. A man has a personal responsibility for his own life. The goal is high: complete dedication of one's time and gifts to the fullest power. When he does not attain this level, there must be complete honesty in recognizing the failure. There is a resemblance here to the Scriptural analysis of sin as a falling "short of the glory of God."42 In Harry's case, it is a falling short of the highest potential, and this is a serious flaw. Harry examines his past life in some-
what the same way as a good Catholic would examine his conscience. Recognizing his faults, he is sorry for them. His remorse parallels the Catholic contrition. Finally he confesses his flaws, partly to his wife, mostly to himself, as the penitent Catholic would confess his sins to a priest. 43

J. Golden Taylor in an article entitled "Hemingway on the Flesh and the Spirit" observes that for Hemingway the achieving of integrity by the individual is a sort of secular equivalent of the salvation of the soul—a man must be true to what is ultimately sacred to himself. Taylor sees the story of Harry as a composite in secular terms of certain elements of the Parable of Talents, the Prodigal Son, Pilgrim's Progress, Everyman and Paradise Lost, with similarities to Anne Bradstreet's "The Flesh and the Spirit" and Cotton Mather's "Advice to Young Puritan Ministers of 1726." It is religious, he says, "in the sense that it tells of a man's struggle toward the achieving of his ideal spiritual ends against the allurements of the world and the forces in his own nature that would defeat him." 44

Bern Oldsey in "The Snows of Ernest Hemingway" suggests that the Kilimanjaro story is the most complex of Hemingway's symbolic attempts to reach the heights of formal religion. The snows suggest the icy purification of death. The airplane journey, according to Oldsey, shows Harry going through death and rebirth and to absolution and the House of God. 45

Gloria Dussinger feels that the protagonist in "The Snows of Kilimanjaro" has even shown a changed attitude in the flashbacks by his conscious return to noting and recording the reality of his sensations. Such accurate recording was an important ideal to Hemingway. She also notes that Harry's attitudes just before death are suddenly free of bitterness and selfishness. He shows kindly consideration to the pilot and he calls his wife by her name for the
first time, acknowledging her separate identity. His writer's ability to record is no longer dulled, as shown by his precise and graphic account of the sensory details of the journey. If we accept her interpretation, Harry has won through to something similar to reparation for past misdeeds and has in a sense proven himself in a second chance. 46

Other interpretations, of course, may be given to the airplane journey in "The Snows of Kilimanjaro." For instance, one may consider it as a dying man's fantasy, even a cruel hoax, for the closing scene focuses the reader's attention on Harry's rotted leg, the obscene hyena and the wife's fear. But I prefer the view which sees the journey as a vital part of a story which suggests a parallel with the Christian absolution and perhaps even salvation. My reasons are based on the inclusion of the story's epigraph and the imagery of the journey. Why include the following epigraph if Harry's plane ride is not a spiritual flight, a journey of the soul?

Kilimanjaro is a snow covered mountain 19,710 feet high, and is said to be the highest mountain in Africa. Its western summit is called the Masai "Ngāje Ngāi," the House of God. Close to the western summit there is the dried and frozen carcass of a leopard. No one has explained what the leopard was seeking at that altitude.

The imagery of the airplane flight is also significant. The pink sifting cloud, the heavy shower of rain like a waterfall can certainly suggest a cleansing. The top of the mountain, "wide as all the world, great, high, unbelievably white in the sun" suggest purity, ultimate attainment. The symbolism can suggest the parallel of cleansing and absolution in the Catholic rite of penance. Self-examination, contrition, confession, possibly reparation if we accept Dussinger's interpretation, and symbolic absolution—the pattern of the ritual of penance is complete. 47
"The Snows of Kilimanjaro" also contains a hint of Hemingway's pagan religious views in that he twice suggests an equation between animal and human creatures. The leopard, a noble beast in the author's classification, almost makes it to the top of the Mount. No one can account for such striving, according to the epigraph. He is frozen, preserved in a kind of purified state. He has attempted that which Harry wishes he had tried to accomplish as a writer—to reach the top and to achieve the immortality that comes with the accomplishment, even near-accomplishment of that feat. The hyena, which has been an ugly, ominous omen of death throughout the story, suddenly changes character at the end. The similarity of the whimpering of the hyena to human crying has often been observed, but the inclusion of this detail at the moment of Harry's death seems most unusual. It is as though even the hyena has lost his usual vicious desire for plunder and were grieving for the death of a fellow creature. For Hemingway, the animals—our "brothers"—are very near to attaining an equal plane with man.

The inclusion of pagan beliefs, the influence of the Christian commandment against killing observed in many characters, and, most important, the parallels to the Catholic sacrament of penance—all suggest a stronger religious emphasis in the writings of Ernest Hemingway than a casual reader might suspect. John Killinger's remark that the very hiddenness of God in modern literature is charged with the tension of his presence clearly applies to Hemingway's fiction. \(^{48}\) John Clendenning concludes that "paradoxically Hemingway's Gods are both dead and alive and the dramatic action of his fiction often results from the hero's attempt to resolve this ambiguity." \(^{49}\) I agree with Clendenning. I think Hemingway's simple vocabulary and apparently simple style mask a deep preoccupation with the universal problems which all men must
face—guilt, death, religion. As far back as 1945, Malcolm Cowley suggested, "It is this instinct for legends, for sacraments, for rituals, for symbols appealing to buried hopes and fears that helps explain the power of Hemingway's work and his vast superiority over his imitators." "Most of us," said Cowley, "are also primitive in a sense, for all the machinery that surrounds our lives. We have our private rituals, our little superstitions, our symbols, fears and nightmares; and Hemingway reminds us unconsciously of the hidden worlds in which we live." For me, the fears and hopes suggested in Hemingway's depiction of parallels to Christian and pagan attitudes of guilt add a new depth of meaning to his ever-recurrent theme of death. Carlos Baker's statement shows his depth of understanding of Hemingway's writings: "Death is for Hemingway somewhere near the center of life."
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PATTERNS OF GUILT IN RELATION TO DEATH  
IN THE WORKS OF ERNEST HEMINGWAY

Death is a theme which Ernest Hemingway explores in many ways in his writings. In relation to the taking of life and the facing of their own end, his fictional characters and even he himself often experience a sense of guilt. The Christian source of this guilt appears to be mainly the Christian commandment against killing and the teaching of the church that expiation is necessary for misdeeds. The pagan source of guilt comes from a sense of the sacredness of animal life, influenced perhaps by Hemingway's early contacts with North American Indians who practiced conciliatory rites after the kill.

Patterns for ridding oneself of the guilt are also both Christian and pagan. The bullfight, for example, parallels the primitive tribal rites to overcome evil. The Christian pattern tends to follow the Catholic sacrament of penance, which includes self-examination, contrition, confession and absolution. Absolution, however, is not achieved, except symbolically, in Hemingway's fiction.

The characters who experience guilt for killing men are usually engaged in warfare. Anselmo in For Whom the Bell Tolls is a good example. He is supposed to have forsaken his early religious training, but he shows a deep sadness when he has to take a human life. His pattern of guilt includes self-examination, contrition and confession with a longing for reparation, thus forming almost the complete cycle of the Catholic penance. Colonel Cantwell in Across the River and Into the Trees and Thomas Hudson in Islands in the Stream are also deeply troubled by the problem of the morality of killing men in war.
The killing of animals is also a complex question in Hemingway's works since it involves both the exhilaration of the hunter at the "kill" and his sense of guilt for the taking of life. According to Hemingway, the exhilaration which comes from the victory in the bullfight and in big game hunting gives man a feeling of "immortality." The killing represents a symbolic victory over evil and death. Although triumphant, both Hemingway and his characters also experience a feeling of guilt for the taking of animal life. Santiago in *The Old Man and the Sea* confesses his sorrow to the dead marlin which he calls his "brother." In "African Journal" Hemingway confesses his guilt to a lion he has helped to kill. In comparing *Green Hills of Africa* (1935) and "African Journal" (c. 1954–56), one notes that Hemingway's personal sense of guilt for killing animals has intensified.

Some of Hemingway's fictional characters who are near death also suffer guilt for their misspent lives. Their purging of guilt frequently follows the Catholic sacrament of penance: they examine their past motives and actions, show contrition and make their confession to themselves, to another person, or to mankind. This ritual-like pattern of self-searching and confession at the point of death appears most markedly in Hemingway's middle period of writing. The dying writer in "The Snows of Kilimanjaro" illustrates the pattern well; in his last hours he searches his heart, confesses his failures, and symbolically attains cleansing and immortality.

These recurring patterns show Hemingway's concern with the problem of guilt in relation to the taking of life and to the meeting of one's own end. As Carlos Baker has remarked, "Death is for Hemingway somewhere near the center of life."