HEMINGWAY'S CRITICAL RECEPTION IN SPAIN

FROM 1940 TO THE PRESENT

by

Dorothy Furr Yount

A Thesis Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Greensboro
May, 1966

Approved by

Robert D. Stephens

Director

APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, North Carolina.

Thesis Director Robert C. Stephens

Oral Examination Committee Members James Ellis

Charles D. Blank

Randolph M. Bulgin

April 19, 1966
Date of Examination

YOUNT, DOROTHY FURR. Hemingway's Critical Reception in Spain from 1940 to the Present. (1966) Directed by: Dr. Robert O. Stephens. pp. 68.

In Roger Asselineau's The Literary Reputation of Hemingway in Europe (1965), the absence of a survey of Hemingway's critical reception in Spain confirmed what was already apparent: that no survey of criticism written in Spain was available. Asselineau included in appendix, however, the essay on For Whom the Bell Tolls, Arturo Barea's "Not Spain but Hemingway," in order to complete the panoramic study which included essays from England, France, Germany, Italy, Norway, Sweden, and the Soviet Union.

An investigation based largely on the examination of Insula, from its original publication in Madrid, January, 1946 to the present, revealed that, apparently, during the forties no criticism of Hemingway and his works was published in Spain. This censorship was due, obviously, to Hemingway's involvement during Spain's civil war on the side of the People's Front, opposed to Franco and Fascism.

Spain's reconciliation with the United States after World War II paralleled her reconciliation with Hemingway in the early fifties, and immediately Spanish critics began to examine and evaluate the novelist's works, as well as that of other North American writers. Then the publication of The Old Man and the Sea in 1952 and Hemingway's winning the Nobel Prize in 1954 precipitated the publication of much Spanish criticism, not only in Insula but in several

other literary "revistas" in Madrid, Barcelona, and Seville. Spanish critics continued to write essays on Hemingway and his works throughout the late fifties.

With Hemingway's death in 1961, many posthumous tributes were written, assessing the author's importance and noting his influence on young Spanish novelists. Without exception, each critic acknowledged Hemingway's importance as a literary artist, not only in the United States but throughout the world. They named The Old Man and the Sea his best work.

Translation and evaluation of the critical essays investigated revealed that these Spanish critics, at least, demand "stark reality" in characterization and incident. They tend, also, to see the "man in his work." With their selection of The Old Man and the Sea as Hemingway's best work, apparently their interest in "man's eternal struggle" is of supreme importance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE FORTIES

When Roger Asselineau added the late Arturo Barea's "Not Spain but Hemingway" in appendix to The Literary Reputation of Hemingway in Europe (1965), he confirmed what was already apparent: that no survey of Hemingway's critical reception in Spain was available. Whereas the Asselineau text included critical surveys made in England by D. S. R. Welland, in Germany by Helmut Papajewski, in Italy by Mario Praz, in Norway by Sigmund Skard, in Sweden by Lars Ahnebrink, in the Soviet Union by Stephen Jan Parker, and in France by Asselineau himself, the best he could do for Spain was reprint the Barea essay, a 1941 response to a single Hemingway book rather than a survey of critical opinion in Spain. Printed as an appendix rather than an integral part of the book, the Barea essay, so Heinrich Straumann explained in the introduction, was included "to complete the panoramic view of Hemingway's European reception."[1]

Apparently the easy availability of the translated Barea essay accounted for Asselineau's selection, for other

[1]Roger Asselineau, ed. The Literary Reputation of Hemingway in Europe (New York, 1965), p. 7.

Spanish criticism had been cited by Carlos Baker in 1961. Baker included the Barea essay in his international anthology, Hemingway and His Critics. In appendix he published a checklist of Hemingway criticism enlarging Maurice Beebe's 1955 bibliography and bringing the entries up to 1960. The checklist was not complete, but it did include, besides Barea's essay, Ricardo Gullón's "Hemingway's Novels" (1952) and Carlos E. Zavaleta's "Hemingway's Novel" (1959).[2]

Why Baker and Asselineau used the Barea essay in preference to Gullón's or Zavaleta's can only be a matter of speculation. Ironically, in Spain Gullón is considered a "critic of first order."[3] And whereas in the 1952 essay Gullón reviewed Hemingway's works for Insula, a typical Spanish literary periodical, Barea reviewed the single work, For Whom the Bell Tolls (1940) for Horizon (May, 1941) while living in exile in England.

Both Gullón's and Zavaleta's essays were typical of Spanish criticism on Hemingway and his work during the early and late fifties. Hemingway had already published The Old Man and The Sea (1952) when Gullón wrote the essay, and he had already won the Nobel Prize (1954) when Zavaleta formally reviewed his works. The Barea essay, on the other

[2]Carlos Baker, ed. Hemingway and His Critics (New York, 1961), pp. 284, 290.

[3]Jose Luis Cano, "El Mundo de los Libros," Insula, I (April, 1946), p. 8.

hand, represented a liberal, individual point of view expressed during the early forties, in another country, when no Hemingway criticism was being written in Spain. Indeed, it is quite possible that during the early forties, immediately following the Spanish Civil War, little or no literary criticism of any kind was being published in Spain. The Union List of Serials reveals that many of the Spanish publications had closed out by 1939 and were re-established in the fifties. Many were established for the first time in the middle or late forties and early fifties.

Insula's first year of publication was 1946, the first issue appearing the first of January. Gullón had published a book of criticism, Contemporary English Novelists, in 1945. Juan Luis Cano, in reviewing the book in Insula (April 15, 1946), observed that the "poverty of books of literary criticism is so lamentable in Spain."[4] Candido Perez Gallego noted in his 1961 Hemingway bibliography that the essays of Gullón, Yndurain, Valverde, Castellet, and Aranda provided the "most commendable opinion written in Spain since 1939."[5] And yet, not one essay written in the forties was listed in the bibliography, not even Barea's.

It was evident in Insula as early as the first year

[4]Cano, p. 8.

[5]Candido Perez Gallego, "Aportacion Española Al Estudio De Hemingway," Filologia Moderna, III (1961), p. 59. Hereafter cited as Gallego.

of publication, however, that although no formal Hemingway criticism was being published, formal criticism of some American writers was being written. For example, an essay on Sherwood Anderson and his works appeared November 15, 1946. "The World of Books" in the same issue noted that Faulkner had been discovered for Spanish readers by Antonio Marichalar in 1934. As late as August 15, 1949, still no Hemingway criticism appeared, although a formal essay on T. S. Eliot was included.

From the Spanish point of view, Hemingway had betrayed them and, therefore, the silence was valid. Hemingway's The Fifth Column (1937), The Spanish Earth (1938), and For Whom the Bell Tolls (1940) revealed to the Spanish reader an apparent change in the author's love for Spain. He had never shown any political allegiance in his writing before 1937. Whereas in 1926 Hemingway had written of the Spanish fiesta and the bullfights of San Fermines in The Sun Also Rises and in 1932 had written what Arturo Barea called the "best book on the bullring"[6] in Death in the Afternoon, it appeared that he now had come back to Spain during her civil war, pledged to the Loyalists, the Communist-inspired People's Front, but dedicated to preserving democracy in Spain, to opposing Franco and the powers of Fascism, and to

[6]Arturo Barea, "Not Spain but Hemingway," Hemingway and His Critics, ed. Carlos Baker (New York, 1961), p. 211. Hereafter all Barea quotation references from this single essay, pp. 202-212.

distorting according to some critics, the image of Spain and the Spanish people. Barea believed that Hemingway came back to Spain and her war "tired of describing and observing the flabby violence of American gangsterdom." He observed that Hemingway mixed with the soldiers in the bars in Madrid and lived the "somewhat unreal life of a war correspondent . . . among foreign journalists, officers of the International Brigades on leave, and a motley crowd of tourists and tarts."

"Not Spain but Hemingway," then, though it does not survey the Spanish critical reception of the author and though it reviews a single work rather than Hemingway's major novels and stories, was, nevertheless, the important, and perhaps the only, formal critical essay on Hemingway written during the forties.

Barea knew Hemingway and liked him. He recalled that Hemingway "joked with the orderlies in [Barea's] Madrid office" and that "we grinned at his solecisms because we liked him." He remembered Hemingway in the early spring of 1937: "big and lumbering, with the look of a worried boy on his round face, diffident and yet consciously using his diffidence as an attraction . . . questioning, skeptical, and intelligent in his curiosity, skillfully stressing his political ignorance, easy and friendly, yet remote and somewhat sad."

Implicit in the essay was the feeling that Barea understood Hemingway's treatment of Spain and her war but

was concerned over the author's distortion of the image of Spain and her people in For Whom the Bell Tolls. He was "fascinated by the book and felt it to be honest in so far as it render[ed] Hemingway's real vision." But, Barea continued, "as a novel about Spaniards and their war, it is unreal and, in the last analysis, deeply untruthful." Barea admitted that Hemingway knew his Spain of the bullfight and fiesta but concluded that knowledge of this narrow section of Spain "blinded him to a wider and deeper understanding" of Spanish emotions felt in the "collective action of war and revolution." In effect, Barea was more concerned, in "Not Spain but Hemingway," with the "literary picture of Spaniards and their war" than in evaluating Hemingway's art.

Barea's analysis of For Whom the Bell Tolls, then, centered in the problem of Hemingway's realism. He saw Hemingway's "artificial choice of dramatis personae," for example, in his choice of Pablo and Pilar as gypsy leaders of a Sierra village. He reasoned that Hemingway's portrayal of gypsies from the world of the "toreros" as leaders did not render the "reality of the Spanish War and Spanish violence."

Barea cited Hemingway's description of the "collective killing of defenseless enemies in a bull-ring atmosphere" as another example of the problems of Hemingway's realism. Also in Hemingway's account of the collective rape of Maria, Barea noted that the author "failed to understand

the individual quality of Spanish violence." In Hemingway's presentation of "organized slaughter like a fiesta" and Maria's collective rape, he concluded that the author failed to understand that such things are contrary to Spanish psychology.

Barea admitted the art of For Whom the Bell Tolls when he concluded that the "supreme skill of the narrative makes it seem stark reality." But he reasoned that by Hemingway's "not sharing the beliefs, the life, and the suffering of the Spaniards, he could only shape them in his imagination after the image of the Spain he knew."

Barea decided that Hemingway "must have had a bad conscience," finally, for not becoming truly a part of the Spanish or the Russian fight. He charged that Hemingway actually remained a "spectator who wanted to be an actor and who wanted to write as if he were an actor." In not participating in the Spanish people's struggle, he said, the novelist could not possibly feel what the people felt and, therefore, could not write truthfully. Perhaps Barea believed that Hemingway should have followed his own advice in Death in the Afternoon: ". . . if one has to write books on Spain, . . . write them as rapidly as possible after a first visit as several visits could only confuse the first impressions and make conclusions much less easy to draw. Also the one-visit books are much surer of everything and

are bound to be more popular."[7]

Barea's essay was never printed in Insula in the middle or late forties. And yet, as we noted above, an avid interest in North American authors in particular and in North American literature in general was evident. Spain was aligned with the Axis powers against the Allies during the years 1940-1945 following her civil war in 1939. American literature, therefore, was of the enemy. Insula revealed, however, in the short time between the end of World War II, in August, 1945, and the second publication February 15, 1946, an interest in formal North American criticism and also an interest in literary notices from North America.

Lesley Frost, daughter of poet Robert Frost and a novelist and critic in her own right, was serving in 1946 as Director of the Biblioteca de la Casa Americana de Madrid. She submitted articles regularly to Insula. Some were formal essays on North American literature and others were in the form of a letter-answering service called "Letter from North America."[8] A February fifteenth "letter" noted that just as in America "never has there been so much spoken or written about education," so in Spain also "our book-sellers reflect public interest in education." Remembering

[7]Ernest Hemingway, Death in the Afternoon (New York, 1932), p. 52.

[8]Lesley Frost, "Carta de Norte America," Insula, I (February, 1946), p. 4.

the great illiteracy of the Spanish people at the time of the Revolution of 1931 and the Second Spanish Republic, she noted that the Spanish public was asking for books they truly needed to read.

The editor of Insula, on April 15, 1946, cited Lesley Frost's "efficient collaboration" and stated that Insula was indebted to her for the information about literary and artistic questions concerning North America.[9] Though her formal criticism reviewed the North American novel rather than individual North American authors, she did not fail to cite Hemingway in a series of writers or to point to him, often subtly, in her presentation. For example, in "The North American Novel II," written for the May fifteenth issue, she noted that from the twenties, a period in which bitterness and negation prevailed, Hemingway emerged as the author showing "signs of new faith" in the world through Robert Jordan in For Whom the Bell Tolls: "The world is a fine place and worth the fighting for and I hate very much to leave it."[10]

On May 15, 1946, a literary notice called "U.S.A. Book News" appeared in Insula and reported that Eugene Reynal, director of the United States International Book Association had announced at an annual reunion in Princeton,

[9][Editor], Insula, I (April, 1946), p. 4.

[10]Lesley Frost, "La Novela Norte Americana II," Insula, I (May, 1946), p. 7.

New Jersey, January 17-18, the continuation of translations "for our readers." Insula's editor considered this news of "extraordinary interest for the commercial future of Spain."[11]

Thus, investigation of Insula, a typical Spanish literary "revista" of criticism and varied news items, revealed in the middle and late forties that though censorship of Hemingway and his works was evident, interest in North American literature and literary news from the United States was not lacking.

[11][Editor], Insula, I (May, 1946), p. 6.

CHAPTER II

THE FIFTIES BEFORE THE NOBEL PRIZE

Whereas in the forties apparent censorship of Hemingway and his works was evident, except in an incidental way, in the early fifties Hemingway's works were discussed freely, first in criticism of North American writing and later in formal Hemingway criticism. The accelerative factors were both political and literary. The United States and Spain found in 1951 a means of reconciliation after World War II. The United States extended economic assistance to Spain as a means of recovery from her ruinous Spanish Civil War. In exchange, American naval and air bases were built in Spain as the United States's key to thwarting communism in Europe. Apparently Hemingway and Spain reconciled their "lovers' quarrel" as well. Then in 1952 Hemingway published The Old Man and The Sea, and as we noted above, Gullón wrote for Insula what is probably the first important formal criticism of Hemingway, the artist and his works.

Two Madrid literary periodicals, Insula, as in the forties, and Arbor, now in the fifties, published criticism of North American literature: Ricardo Gullón, in Insula, September, 1951, wrote "The Eruption of the North American

Novel;" Francisco Yndurain, in Arbor, May, 1952, wrote "The North American Novel in the Last Twenty Years" and also, in Insula, November, 1952, "North American Literature."[1]

Gullón, in examining the North American literary period between 1900 and 1950, agreed with Maurice Coindreau, French translator of some of Hemingway's works, in that he, too, saw emerging by 1925, a group of North American writers "almost like [Spain's] generation of '98."[2] He cited Hemingway as the "representative of the lost generation" of American writers. Gullón saw in Hemingway's simplicity and terseness of style one of the diversities of talents among the North American writers that helped to explain the force of American literature. He admitted that it was "not easy to synthesize in a phrase the contribution of North American literature" but, he continued, "thanks to it--we feel in more direct contact with things as they are, in their simplicity and in their complications, with the forces of nature and the problems of life."

Yndurain stated in "North American Literature," after surveying literary currents, that "until the advent of the American authors known as the 'lost generation,' one cannot speak of an influence on European literature."[3] He felt

[1]Gallego, pp. 62, 64.

[2]Ricardo Gullón, "La Irrupcion de la Literatura Norteamericana," Insula, VI (September, 1951), p. 1.

[3]Francisco Yndurain, "La Literatura Norteamericana," Insula, VII (November, 1952), p. 3.

that these writers owed their "artistic forms as far as technique of human exploration and of composition" to Freud and Joyce but that the "accent, the personal impetus, the naked style, and the exterior and interior picture were new and very American." He noted that it was "not accidental that Jean-Paul Sartre made his first achievements in letters with critical reviews of Hemingway, Steinbeck, [and] Faulkner in the Nouvelle Revue Française."

Gullón, in Insula, November 15, 1952, noted immediately that The Old Man and The Sea had appeared in Life, September 1, 1952.[4] Then after recording the fact that Hemingway had written from 1925 to 1952 forty-nine stories, six novels, a theatrical work, and three books on travel and miscellaneous subjects, he stated that Yndurain had said that "with Hemingway . . . we see a decisive change in the American novel, particularly in the stylistic aspect," and that "his influence has been as great in America as in Europe."

Gullón stated explicitly that love and death were Hemingway's dominant themes: love sensual and exalted; death "intensely vibrant as amorous passion," sometimes "insignificant, futile, and evitable," and at other times, significant and a part of life. He reviewed then, though

[4]Ricardo Gullón "Las novelas de Hemingway," Insula, VII (November, 1952), p. 5. Hereafter all quoted passages from this single essay, p. 5.

briefly, Hemingway's works of the twenty-seven years from In Our Time to The Old Man and the Sea. Implicit in the brief examination of individual stories and novels was the search for Hemingway's influential "stylistic aspect" in each particular work and the subsequent judgment of its validity. Gullón's demand for true rather than representative characters was the chief criterion in judging them. He concluded that "The Snows of Kilimanjaro" was Hemingway's best narrative before The Old Man and the Sea. In the long story he saw, simply, the narration of Harry's agonizing death, with reality and illusion intensely revealing his total downfall.

In The Sun Also Rises, Gullón found a true story of the downfall of the Paris expatriates, interwoven with a strange mixture of eroticism and affection for bulls. He noted that Hemingway's "sobriety of style, his objectivity, the substitution of analysis for the notation of events seen from without, and economy in description" in The Sun Also Rises, and later in A Farewell to Arms (1929), were the aspects that produced the intensity and force of the works. He considered the relation between Brett Ashley and Jake Barnes "surprising [and] inconceivable."

With Frederick Henry and Catherine in A Farewell to Arms, however, and later with Robert Jordan and Maria in For Whom the Bell Tolls, Hemingway, Gullón observed, had imagined a "romanticism in reverse, an excess in contrary

feeling, with the forgetfulness that man is a totality, and love indivisible." He saw both romantic couples embracing Hemingway's convention that exalted, sensual love is "stronger than life, victorious over prejudices and obstacles, removed from the world and resplendent in solitude and remoteness."

Gullón noted that Hemingway's narration of the retreat from Caporetto in A Farewell to Arms explicated and reinforced Frederick Henry's nihilism, that Henry was just deserting to avoid the shooting. He found in Robert Jordan of For Whom the Bell Tolls, on the other hand, that Hemingway's protagonist had accepted discipline and then death and knew the meaning of sacrifice. But in For Whom the Bell Tolls Gullón discovered superficiality of characterization in that Jordan and Maria lacked "density necessary to make them true and not representative."

Gullón found Harry Morgan of To Have and Have Not (1937) "almost a caricature" and the "degenerated, inverted gangsters and traders . . . [in] a world so partial that its falsity appears evident even for the best disposed reader." He charged, also, that the novel was defective in technique and referred to the three totally independent episodes. He considered the novel frustrating in that Harry's protest against society was unsuccessful.

With Richard Cantwell and Renata in Across the River and into the Trees (1950), Gullón judged that Hemingway

"touch[ed] bottom." He considered both characters "parodies of themselves." He cited Cantwell's gesture of easing his intestine and observed Renata's colorless, devitalized archetypal character.

But with The Old Man and the Sea Gullón found Hemingway, who he thought was fundamentally finished at the time of Across the River and into the Trees, firmly re-established. He failed to see the judgment of some North American critics who reduced Hemingway's "ultimate invention . . . to a cheap symbol" of novelist versus critics. He emphatically stated that the novel "has more transcendency and alludes to the human condition, destined to combat and frustration, and exalted by the dignity with which [man] suffers downfall and prepares to conquer it."

Gullón was convinced that Hemingway "understood the language of man" and had let him speak truly: "through the fisherman who lives arduously in poverty . . . through heroism that is ignored and through nobility with which he incarnates adversity, not in a determined event or incident, but in a daily task, in daily agony, in life loving excessively in order to continue being a man with all dignity and entirety."

He was convinced, also, that the author who had written "The Snows of Kilimanjaro" had recovered. He declared that The Old Man and the Sea had the "precise and clear force, solely attained when materials capable of

expressing the conception of the world and the sentiments of the writer are maintained." He found the prose "compact and proportioned in its architecture to the narrative progress."

In closing, and as if re-evaluating Yndurain's statement of Hemingway's influence, Gullón affirmed that The Old Man and the Sea was a "confirmation and perhaps a conquest." In this novel, Gullón reasoned, Hemingway renounced as he had done in both "The Snows of Kilimanjaro," and "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber" sentimentalism and romantic exaggeration. Gullón felt that Hemingway had found in Santiago's struggle the "sense of life, the explication of life and the justification of his task" in his "interpretation of eternal man, . . . the simple and abnegated humanity of suffering."

José María Valverde, poet and critic, had written criticism of T. S. Eliot in 1949. Whereas Gullón, fundamentally a critic, had looked for fully delineated characters in Hemingway's novels, Valverde, basically a poet, looked for, and found, poetic elements in evaluating The Old Man and the Sea. Gullón found Hemingway, at last, firmly re-established as an influential novelist while Valverde doubted the author's final literary importance.[5]

Valverde observed that Hemingway had won the Pulitzer

[5]José María Valverde, "El Viejo Y El Mar, Indice de Artes y Letras, (July, 1953), nos. 65-66, p. 3. Hereafter all quoted passages from this single essay, pp. 3-4.

Prize for The Old Man and the Sea in 1953. He stated, therefore, that "now . . . it is a good occasion . . . to ask what is the place that [Hemingway] really occupies in North American literature." He reasoned that "in the beginning there is no doubt that it is a very prominent position, surely the most prominent of all." But later he added that perhaps Hemingway's "literary importance has been exaggerated a little."

Valverde saw The Old Man and the Sea as the "coronation of a long career of fame." He said the story, although of the most elemental action, had a rustic charm. He observed that from the first phrase, The Old Man and the Sea had a "strange tone, nothing novelistic, more a tone of semipoetic Psalmody, with the phrases running parallel, deliberately simple, like cutting things of little weight secretly, of not wanting to say all one thinks."

Apparently Valverde did not agree with Gullón that The Old Man and the Sea alluded to the "human condition" and that Hemingway had found the "sense of life" in his rendering. Valverde was convinced that the work was something of a celebration of the author himself. He said that the work, "except for its size, is a fable, and as a fable takes a lyric tone, perhaps symbolic." He found this prose unlike that of Hemingway's previous novelistic prose of action and descriptions of places and persons.

Valverde declared that a symbolic incarnation of

one's self is a "dangerous thing for a novelist, above all for a novelist as simple and deprived of second intentions and reserves as Hemingway [had] always been." He concluded, therefore, that "on that point, then, Hemingway was deficient, leaving his work in the air between the possible significant allusion and the same reality of his personage and the beauty of the sea dancing around."

On another point, however, Valverde was certain that Hemingway was not deficient: "in [Hemingway's] testimony of affection for nature . . . [in] his rustic sense, his elemental emotion of trampling the earth, of being immersed, of pursuing animals." He declared, also, that Hemingway was a "good war novelist, although he didn't give us the turn that we might call 'historic,' but only the simple emotion of a fighter who doesn't think of what party he has gone to die for."

Valverde called Hemingway a "recreational novelist" at one point. He cited novelistic weaknesses in having "persons that speak no more than to ask for whiskey or to curse." He noted excessive simplicity in the author's technique but admitted that "sometimes a true emotion appear[ed]," for example, "toward the end of A Farewell to Arms."

Valverde concluded that, finally, Hemingway "with all his force, must cede primacy at least to three more novelists . . . Faulkner, Steinbeck and John Dos Passos." He

quickly admitted that his judgment was strictly a "personal preference and, therefore, perhaps capricious." He added that "we cannot ask of [Hemingway] that which he does not pretend to give us" and that "we will have to overlook his downfalls and inconstancies." Valverde was inclined to think that in The Old Man and the Sea Hemingway had abandoned his former novelistic techniques to construct a new semi-lyrical fable, "something that [was] not mere objective narration, . . . the design of the poetic . . . a new novel with more invention and more lyricism."

CHAPTER III

THE FIFTIES AFTER THE NOBEL PRIZE

On November 15, 1954, Insula carried the news that Hemingway had won the Nobel Prize for literature. The editor noted that other possible candidates had been Claudel, Malraux, Camus, and Simenon from France; Moravia and Corrado Alvaro from Italy; Gottfried Benn from Germany; Niko Kozantzakis from Greece; and Baroja and Madariaga from Spain.[1]

The editorial response revealed great disappointment: "Because the prize was so recently given to Faulkner, [we] hoped that another North American author would not obtain it this year." Hemingway's "popularity" was acknowledged, however, and he was called a "great novelist without doubt." After noting that the "famous author" received the Nobel Prize for The Old Man and the Sea, which had powerfully caught the attention of the eighteen-member jury for its "concision and mastery of style," the editor observed that, with Hemingway, five North American writers had already won the Nobel: Sinclair Lewis, Eugene O'Neill, Pearl Buck, and

[1][Editor], "Hemingway, Premio Nobel 1954," Insula, IX (November, 1954), p. 2. Hereafter all quoted passages from this single editorial, p. 2.

William Faulkner. The statement that "Spain [had] again . . . been lamentably forgotten" set the tone of the editorial piece:

> This forgetfulness is so much more unjust in as much as our great writers of '98--all of them with sufficient merit for the Nobel-disappear little by little and when the Swedish Academy might remember them, no one is going to remain. Neither Unamuno, nor Valle Inclán, nor Antonio Machado can obtain it. Let us cite, once more, the names that are recorded on our pages as possible candidates: Baroja, Azorín, Ortega y Gasset, Juan Ramón Jimenez, Menéndez Pidal, Ramón Gómez de la Serra. And let us wait to see what happens in 1955.

In 1955 the "great Spanish writers" were again "ignored." The Swedish Academy was notified of Ortega's illness and the fact that Unamuno had died without receiving the Nobel Prize, but no answer to the request was received. The 1955 award went to Halldor Kiljan Taxness but in 1956 the award went to Juan Ramón Jimenez. In 1904 the prize had been equally divided between Frédéric Mistral and José Echegaray; in 1922 Jacinto Benavente received the award. With Jimenez's award, then, Spain now had received the Nobel three times and the United States five.[2]

Upon announcement of the 1954 Nobel Prize winner, Spanish critics contributed a considerable number of Hemingway essays. Such titles appeared as "Hemingway, Nobel Prize 1954," "Hemingway, Fifth Nobel Yankee (1954)," "Hemingway, Nobel Prize (1954)," and "Hemingway, Spectator

[2]William F. Thrall and Addison Hibbard, A Handbook to Literature, rev. by C. Hugh Holman (New York, 1960), pp. 316-17.

of Death (1954)."[3]

José María Castellet, in his formal critical response to Hemingway's winning the Nobel Prize, wrote:

> The granting of the Nobel Prize to William Faulkner three years ago represented the 'oficial' acceptance of a fact that, although it had been visible for several years many refused to recognize: the primacy of the North American novel in the world literary panorama of the period 1925-1950.
>
> The very recent awarding of this year's Nobel Prize to Ernest Hemingway is the confirmation of that which was initiated then.[4]

Castellet noted the Swedish Academy's order of preference in granting the prize to Faulkner before Hemingway but cited the work of Hemingway as of "exceptional importance." He saw Hemingway, along with F. Scott Fitzgerald, as one of the "most typical representatives of that which Gertrude Stein called the 'lost generation,' . . . a type of individual restlessness that succeeded the dissipated life of the 'happy twenties.'" Castellet believed, however, that Hemingway was one of the "survivors" of the resulting empty existence who freed himself of this individual restlessness by writing, first of all, A Farewell to Arms in 1929.

Then in For Whom the Bell Tolls Castellet saw the author "reborn from his ashes, . . . a new man that [had] discovered another dimension of life." He stated that the

[3]Gallego, pp. 60, 61, 62, 64.

[4]José María Castellet, "Hemingway Premio Nobel 1954," Revista (November, 1954), no. 134, p. 1. Hereafter all quoted passages from this single essay, p. 1.

"old individualistic fighter [had] discovered, suddenly, that he can and must fight at the side of others." For Hemingway, he said, "the word 'solidarity' acquire[d] a value unknown by him until then." Castellet stressed that Hemingway discovered this new value in Spain's war.

And then at the time of The Old Man and the Sea Hemingway, said Castellet, arrived, after years of evolution in this thinking, at that "serenity that time alone can give." He called The Old Man and the Sea Hemingway's "summit work," and asked: "To what point would Hemingway be able to continue an ascending career after this work?" Castellet decided that the Hemingway of 1929 would have finished the novel in "full individualistic desperation," but observed that the Hemingway of 1952 completed the work with the "resignation that surges with total acceptance of life." He concluded that in The Old Man and the Sea Hemingway showed, without desperation, the "history of human courage, of human energy, and also acceptance of the elemental values of human life."

Whereas Castellet saw Hemingway's literary evolution beginning in individual restlessness and arriving, with The Old Man and the Sea, at a mature serenity, Francisco Yndurain, writing also in 1954, began his "brief essay"[5] by

[5]Francisco Yndurain, "Hemingway, Espectador De La Muerte," Nuestro Tiempo (December, 1954), no. 6, p. 10. Hereafter all quoted passages from this single essay, pp. 10-20.

noting, first of all, that the Nobel Prize placed the author on a high plane. He proceeded, then, to consider the criterion applied by the Swedish Academy. He wrote: ". . . the Nobel Prize is given to the person who in the last twelve months has rendered in his field the greatest service to humanity.'" In the literary field the award went, Yndurain observed, "to the person who [had] produced the most detached work of idealistic tendency," adding that the Nobel Prize had been given, almost always, not for a single work but for the production of a life time dedicated to literary creation. Suggesting that perhaps the interpretation of the term "idealistic" as a condition for the awarding of the prize to an author had been variable, in that Sinclair Lewis, Pearl Buck, Eugene O'Neill, and William Faulkner had been winners, he concluded that, apparently, the "question becomes more and more a question of opinion."

Yndurain noted that Hemingway was, for the Spanish, an American author who was very wellknown and who, now, "[was] a person received without reservation in Spain." He referred, of course, to Hemingway's involvement in Spain's "guerra de Liberacion" on the side of the Popular Front, in opposition to the cause of the National Movement. He noted, however, that "international things now are not the same as in 1936" and that Hemingway's "presence among us a year, or a little more, is enough" to end that subject.

Yndurain emphasized that he never considered it useless to observe the "personal condition of a writer at the moment of making judgments about his work." He saw, in effect, that the author's "special 'aficion' for violent emotions, his inclination for trips precisely in search of those emotions, and a decided gusto for first hand information, resulted in scenes and situations which formed an "inseparable and essential part of his formation as a writer." In other words, according to Yndurain, Hemingway's "aficion" for the hunt, war, and bulls gave him a "special tendency to see that which for him [was] the supreme spectacle: man facing death."

Yndurain reasoned that Hemingway, therefore, discovered in Spain the source of his "aficion" for violent emotions. He observed that in the author's years in Paris, "decisive years for his literary career," Hemingway was "seeking painstakingly an expression" for his art and "discover[ed] Spain." He emphasized that Hemingway found in Spain a "rich vein of themes, although limited to bulls or to an elemental experience simple and primitive, when not to the cruelty of a civil war." Yndurain recalled that Hemingway, after his first trip to Spain early in 1922, wrote of the "great obscure mountains, like tired dinosaurs, descending toward the sea." He then suggested that with no wars to observe at this time, Hemingway took Gertrude Stein's advice to go to Spain and see the bullfights: "And

Hemingway [came] to Spain and discover[ed] the bulls. . . ." He added that after Hemingway "[had] seen some 1500 bulls killed . . . we [saw] the literary fruit of this experience."

Apparently, Yndurain, at this point in evaluating the author's works, had seen no evidence of the "idealistic tendency." However, he noted that by 1936, Hemingway had Spain's Civil War to observe, and in reconsidering the situation, Yndurain concluded that Hemingway, like so many European and American intellectuals, perhaps looked at communism as an ideal democratic philosophy. He stated that now "we understand better" Hemingway's engagement in the war, but he raised the question whether it would have been possible for the author to "watch the bullfights of San Fermin in 1953 and travel with great reception through Spain" had his ideals triumphed.

Then, after reciting many of the truisms of standard Hemingway criticism such as "the novelistic art of Hemingway has very definite American roots: his first model was Sherwood Anderson and the book Winesburg, Ohio," Yndurain declared The Old Man and the Sea, "the one that has received the Nobel Prize," Hemingway's best work. With this novel Yndurain saw Hemingway's art arriving "at its best moment." Seeing that "we are able to take the fisherman as a symbol of man in the world," Yndurain declared that whether Hemingway wanted the novel interpreted in this manner or not,

"it is the destiny of the great rewarded literatures to pass from the concrete to the abstract, from the particular to the general." Believing that this was the "maximum value of the little work," he stated that The Old Man and the Sea stood with other great works and that Hemingway rightly received the Nobel Prize.

Also in 1954 Joaquín Aranda Herrera wrote that he was not surprised that "with Hemingway the number of American writers receiving the Nobel Prize [was] raised to six."[6] He declared that "American literature [had] reached a maturity not found in that of Canada, Brazil, or Spanish America. . . ." He cited Ezra Pound and William Faulkner as influential contemporary writers but then affirmed that "Hemingway's novels [were] not an exception in this climate of elevated quality."

Aranda included Hemingway in the group of North American writers called the "generation of protest" and noted that each author of the group had an individual expression of the "tension created by the high standard of living and the spiritual poverty produced perhaps by the magnification of that same level of life and by the disastrous consequences of wars and of immigration, [that] make faith in a country of liberty decrease rapidly." He was

[6]Joaquín Aranda Herrera, "La novela de Ernest Hemingway," Estudios Americanos, IX (January-February, 1955), p. 63. Although published in Seville, Aranda actually wrote this essay November, 1954, in Madrid. Hereafter all quoted passages in this single essay, pp. 63-72.

especially interested in Hemingway's primitivism, his "hombre primario," as an expression of protest. Aranda stated at the outset that "it is fundamental to make clear that Hemingway [was] led to this primitivism by the social circumstances of his life." He reviewed, for example, Hemingway's service in Italy during World War I and his period of convalescence in a military hospital, noting that out of this experience came "a marvelous story: 'In Another Country.'" Continuing his observation of Hemingway's expression of primitivism, Aranda noted that the novelist's establishment in Paris, surrounded by a group of writers influenced by the skepticism of Proust, resulted in the author's pessimism seen in The Sun Also Rises. He added that Hemingway's primitive reaction in The Sun Also Rises appeared even more clearly in A Farewell to Arms: "I was not made to think. I was made to eat, to drink, and to sleep." But Aranda failed to observe that Frederick Henry's sleeping meant sleeping with Catherine.

After noting Hemingway's trip to Africa, his participation in the Spanish War, and his later participation in World War II, Aranda re-stated his thesis in saying that Hemingway's "technique respond[ed] with the fidelity of a mirror to this agitated life." He was aware that Hemingway did not, like Faulkner, treat the American scene, except in some of the early short stories: "the greater part, and the most important of his novels, develop exotic scenes[:]

Paris, Africa, Spain, [and] Cuba." Aranda confessed, however, that he was not able "to find among the Spanish writers as vivid a description of a semi-rural area of our country as the one [Hemingway gave] us of the San Fermines in A Sun Also Rises." After stating, on the other hand, that Hemingway's For Whom the Bell Tolls painted a "Spain of the tambourine, totally unacceptable to the Spanish reader," he said that in The Old Man and the Sea "Hemingway's style arrive[d] in this brief story at its limit." Apparently, Aranda found in Hemingway's objective treatment of the old man, the sea, and the fish the author's supreme example of his primitive narration.

In 1955, 1956, and 1957 Spanish critics continued to contribute formal Hemingway criticism. As late as 1959, Zavaleta wrote what could be considered a typical Hemingway essay for the late fifties, reviewing the life and works of the author, citing the author's place in North American literature as well as considering his influence on contemporary literatures. Zavaleta stated that after twenty-five years of learning, Hemingway's The Old Man and the Sea was the "splended book that crown[ed] and perhaps amend[ed] his restless literary past."[7] He added, further, that with this novel, Hemingway's style "reache[d] the interior life of the character, so neglected by the photographic realism

[7]Carlos E. Zavaleta, "La novela de Hemingway," Estudios Americanos, XVI (July-August 1959), p. 51. Hereafter all quoted passages in this single essay, pp. 47-52.

of his first novels." Zavaleta saw the author's style in The Old Man and the Sea based on the procession of "descriptions, dialogues, and soliloquies whose order can be altered at will in order to reach a rhythmic harmony." He also observed that the "pure old dialogue of Hemingway was replaced [now] . . . by two types of monologues: (a) the fisherman speaks out loud and (b) thinks in silence." He added that with this poetic and even theatrical device, the privacy of the protagonist [was] at last invaded." Apparently Zavaleta failed to note this "invasion of the protagonist's private thoughts" in the author's rendering of Robert Jordan in For Whom the Bell Tolls.

Zavaleta recalled that Faulkner had called The Old Man and the Sea the "best novel written by one of his contemporaries." He added that before 1950, Faulkner had ranked Hemingway in third place among the novelists of his country--after Thomas Wolfe and himself." He observed that "nowadays [late fifties], North American critics acknowledge Faulkner and Dos Passos as more endowed than Hemingway." Zavaleta declared, however, that the fame of Hemingway exceeds theirs and his influence over the young novelists is really enormous." He reasoned that the "intellectual preparation of Dos Passos" and the "tragic components" of Faulkner's novel were probably advantages over Hemingway. Zavaleta concluded, however, that Hemingway exhibited over Faulkner the "merit of being vital, never puritanical,

liberal, at least in certain aspects; and over Dos Passos, the fact of having written The Old Man and the Sea, a book of greater epic rank than the ideas devised in the turbulent metropolis by the author of Manhattan Transfer."

CHAPTER IV

THE SIXTIES

The July-August, 1961 issue of Insula carried the news of Hemingway's death in Ketchum, Idaho. The editorial piece, headed "Ernest Hemingway," referred to the event as an "absurd and voluntary death" and to the author as an "avid enjoyer of life . . . [and] a great writer."[1] The editor spoke of Hemingway's life as a "career of adventures and emotions: from boyhood, violence and death attracted him, and he loved Latin myths--wine, passion, blood--and life, the open air, on the sea or in the woods."

The editorial stated that Hemingway "loved Spain with passion, and even with tenderness." And as if to give an example of Hemingway's love, the editor spoke of the author's love for Baroja--a love that was expressed with tears at the time of the great Spanish writer's death and, "even more when he assisted at the burial, mingling like a timid boy with the Spanish writers." But the editor reasoned that the Spain which Hemingway loved more--which would include country and persons apparently--was the "fiesta de toros." He recalled that Hemingway came to Spain

[1][Editor], "Ernest Hemingway," Insula, XVI (July-August, 1961), p. 2. Hereafter all quoted passages from this editorial, p. 2.

almost every year and saw thirty or forty bullfights a summer. He cited examples of Hemingway's use of the bullfight in his works from the writing of The Sun Also Rises (1926) to The Dangerous Summer (1960). He commented that The Dangerous Summer was the passionate and picturesque chronicle of the rivalry between two great bullfighters, Antonio Ordoñez--the "best Spanish friend that Hemingway had"--and Luis Miguel Dominguín. (Ricardo Gullón had written a caustic essay on The Dangerous Summer in November, 1960, "The Old Man and the Business," which might have caused Hemingway's reputation to undergo an eclipse had he not died!)

Remembering that Hemingway received the Nobel Prize in 1954, the editor concluded that the author was "without doubt one of the greatest North American writers of our time." He observed that although part of the author's work, the most journalistic, failed--specifically The Dangerous Summer--"some of his novels, especially A Farewell to Arms and The Old Man and the Sea, will remain immortal." The editor, in closing, alerted his readers to anticipate a major article by José R. Marra-López who would "study . . . the work of the great North American writer."

Marra-López wrote, as had been announced, the Hemingway essay for Insula's September issue. He stated that his intention was only "to point out some fundamental points in the vital trajectory of the last great adventurer of our

epoch, so suggestive and complex."[2]

The first point that Marra-López made was that Hemingway belonged to a group of the most important writers that gave a "gigantic impulse" to American literature: Dos Passos, Ezra Pound, Gertrude Stein, Sherwood Anderson, William Faulkner, and Scott Fitzgerald. He stated, also, that the name "lost generation" reflected a certain "reality" and that from the American point of view "those men went on being lost, drifting, having rejected the methods of their country, the conventions and suppositions of the society into which they had been born." The expatriation of Hemingway and the other writers, he recalled, was the "greatest act of valor and protest that they were able to carry out." He stated that Hemingway's exile, in turn, was the beginning of the great adventure his whole life was going to be.

Marra-López saw in Hemingway's early work--In Our Time, for example--"the memory of a lost paradise." He said that later, however, the "scene change[d] radically and [the] anguish characteristic of the Hemingway of this epoch appear[ed]" in The Sun Also Rises and A Farewell to Arms. He considered A Farewell to Arms the "best and most important of the novelist's work" and stated that the novel "represent[ed] the culmination of the anguished search of Hemingway to find an ordered meaning to existence." He

[2]J. R. Marra-López, "Hemingway, La Ultima Singladura," Insula, XVI (September, 1961), p. 13. Hereafter all quoted passages in this single essay, pp. 13, 16.

concluded that Hemingway found his answer while looking for "things that cannot be lost" with a kind of semi-stoic courage. He reasoned that Hemingway, knowing the instability of reality but having the capacity to begin again, "passe[d] from one sensation to another, in continual movement in search of renewed adventure, because he . . . [knew] that there exists nothing to direct one to completeness."

Seeing adventure, then, as a vital impulse of Hemingway, Marra-López reasoned that at this point the author began his "most brilliant and spectacular epoch," an epoch, however, that "[did] not correspond to the most highly esteemed of his work." Marra-López pointed to Green Hills of Africa (1935), To Have and Have Not (1937), and For Whom the Bell Tolls (1940) and saw, during these years, Hemingway as hunter, narrator, and war correspondent in his great living adventure. He said that Hemingway gave in each of the works during the period from 1929 to 1950 a "sober novelistic lesson," but that something was lacking to make "us feel fully enthusiastic about his vital aesthetics, something which would not occur with The Sun Also Rises and A Farewell to Arms." Concerning For Whom The Bell Tolls, he declared: "That is neither our civil war, nor is it Spain--a country which Hemingway knew very well--nor does he reflect a reality that is fundamental for us." What Hemingway did in this novel, Marra-López continued, caused the Spanish reader to "mistrust [him] a little in regard to

the attractive Parisian, Italian, African, and Cuban adventures." Marra-López noted that all of Hemingway's narratives, convincing or not, ended with the failure of the hero, suggesting that the author saw himself continuously searching and experimenting during this epoch but never quite arriving at completeness.

Marra-López called Hemingway a "great individualist" who loved and understood the human being "with a biblical simplicity." He saw in the author's individualistic world of adventure "sure defeat, without building anything, an absolutely individualistic attitude, as if life were a big orange, marvelously bitter-sweet, that was sucked with delight and thrown away once squeezed." He declared, therefore, that Hemingway followed a "perpendicular trajectory . . . scorning historical time . . . believ[ing] himself eternally young, that of the champion who does not know when to retire, that of the individual who cannot adjust himself to the passing of the years." He believed that Hemingway, along with others of the "lost generation," needed a "serene approach to life" in order to make the transformation to the "last bend in the road." He said that Hemingway did know, however, that the "hero cannot be a hero eternally and that sooner or later he must fall."

In Hemingway's individualistic approach to life during this period, in his devotion to "human solidarity," Marra-López pointed out, he "never attempted to transcend

it, making abstract the problems inherent in it." In other words, Marra-López was explicit in stating that Hemingway "never wrote in terms of social response . . . except for the problem of individual liberty." He echoed Priestley's opinion, then, that Hemingway "refuse[d] to fulfill the only act of true courage his life in art demand[ed] of him--to establish himself in an American city, to breathe again the life-giving air of the United States, to perforate some deep wells of exploration in his social strata, to create a new attitude and to coin a new style, and having done this, to write some great American novels of his maturity." From the theoretical and objective point of view, Marra-López agreed with Priestley but then asked whether this could be applied to Hemingway. He concluded that the author "was one of the few cases of the truly great individual men of learning" and doubted that Hemingway could have been otherwise even if he tried. He stated: "One must take [Hemingway] that way, admiring his work as a great writer, his undeniable talents, his incontestable prudence, the two or three novels that will remain as master works and his stories." His greatness, he continued, consisted in having been--though "dazzling" as a person--"a writer essentially honest, who gave us with simplicity--with a simplicity unlikely outworn--his vision of things just as he believed them to be, besides a sober lesson of human solidarity."

At the time of Across the River and into the Trees (1950), Marra-López saw the beginning of a change of attitude and an approach, at least, to the "serenity of maturity," but added that the novel was also a "clear omen of classicism, unmistakably confirmed with the marvelous fable of The Old Man and the Sea [1952]." He cited The Old Man and the Sea an an "unforgettable masterpiece of contemporary literature in which Hemingway [was] decidedly inclined toward a stoic attitude, serenely classic, although he [did] affirm with his indomitable spirit that a man might be destroyed, but never defeated."

Marra-López saw in Hemingway's unexpected death, then, the end of the author's adventure. In spite of signs of change, apparently Hemingway continued, Marra-López said, the arduous fight and refused to give up being a "violent apostle of physical health." To avoid passing from the full life of action to that of the spectator, Hemingway anticipated death, he continued, in a last complete act. Actual death was more preferable to Hemingway than apparent death, Marra-López reasoned, and the author made his final decision. He declared that the "most classically Hemingway-type death," completely in agreement with his whole life, would have been to die while he was hunting. But he concluded that Hemingway's unexpected death was also in keeping with his "perpendicular trajectory."

On the same page with the Marra-López essay, Insula

published a short article entitled "Remembrance of Hemingway," by Pablo de la Fuente.[3] The purpose here was not to study Hemingway's work but to study that "vacancy" created by his death. La Fuente contended that the author's life had to end this way, that Hemingway "was not the man who was able to admit the invalidity of the retired writer."

La Fuente saw Hemingway as a fleeing, simple, and humble man basically. He felt that the author "found some satisfaction in danger, [that] he searched to confront himself with difficult situations in order to be capable of conquering them and describing them." He declared that Hemingway's work, then, proceeded from an experimental impulse, that the author was always experimenting and was never satisfied. In noting that one of Hemingway's dominant themes was "to look for a sufficient explanation for his life, for life in general," La Fuente asked finally: "Can he be called now an existentialist?"

La Fuente stated that Hemingway "approached his readers with fear," and that the author knew he "did not have his own public." He declared, however, that Hemingway's readers and friends in Europe would assuredly include Spaniards, Italians, and Frenchmen. A list of Hemingway's works, according to La Fuente, indicated a sequence of high and low points, and almost always when the author was

[3]Pablo de la Fuente, "Recuerdo de Hemingway," Insula, XVI (September, 1961), p. 13. Hereafter all quoted passages in this single essay, p. 13.

attacked, it was said that "he was already worn out." La Fuente pointed out, however, that this sort of attack "like the prick of a spur carried [Hemingway] toward the realization of another great book."

Parallel with Insula's first news of Hemingway's unexpected death, the Saturday Review published July 29, 1961, "The World Weighs a Writer's Influence," articles from a number of countries assessing the author's importance.[4]

Salvador de Madariaga, an exiled political philosopher, cabled from Oxford his expression of Hemingway's impact on Spain. His essay, however, was a typical example of Spanish attention given to Hemingway the man rather than to Hemingway the writer. He said, in effect, that through Hemingway Spain's image of the American was changed. The American image, "shaped . . . by the memories of the Spanish--American Way," was that of a veritable "meat packer without history," Madariaga declared. The average Spaniard's experience of Americans in the "pre-Hemingway twentieth century" consisted of tourists, curio hunters, exploiting businessmen, "Bible peddlers, supercilious people" having no real interest in the Spanish people or land. Then, Madariaga added, "this debonair giant turned up," bringing

[4]Salvador de Madariaga, "The World Weighs a Writer's Influence: Spain," Saturday Review, XLIV (July 29, 1961), p. 18. Hereafter all quoted passages in this single essay, p. 18.

with him a "combination of geniality, virility, and esthetic sensibility which for most Spaniards was a revelation." Madariaga noted that Hemingway was "that rare thing, a human being, open-eyed, open-handed, open-hearted, open-minded, a man ready to learn, to understand, to appreciate, to see beneath the surface." He saw Hemingway "in Spain, inside Spain, living her life" in The Sun Also Rises and For Whom the Bell Tolls.

Madariaga observed that Hemingway's understanding of bullfighting as a spectacle uniting many arts--painting, sculpture, ballet, and tragedy--and not as a sport, was an essential factor in his understanding of Spain. In this realization, Madariaga said, Hemingway came close to the "core of this strange form of Spanish life." Hemingway revealed to America and to the world the essentials of the Spanish ethos: "love, death, and eternity." He revealed to the Iberians that aspect of American life: "a capacity for direct approach to the life of others without distance, prejudice, or reprobation, which may well turn out to be the chief asset of the United States in this period of inevitable American leadership." Madariaga noted that Hemingway "conquered Spain for the United States" and pointed out that all that happened "in the political sphere to destroy his work and alienate Spain from the United States . . . has not . . . succeeded in altogether undoing his magnificent achievement."

Concerning Hemingway's art Madariaga stated that he did not believe that consideration of the author's work could be confined to the relations between Spain and the United States alone. He declared:

> For Hemingway's manner of writing, his direct, simple, yet forceful prose, his straightforward approach to life even at its most awkward, his boldness in tackling even the unpleasant, though by no means seeking it out, have exerted an undoubted influence on the new generation of Spanish novelists.

Also at the time of Hemingway's death in 1961, Candido Perez Gallego provided, in Spanish, of course, what was probably one of the most important contributions to Hemingway criticism: a bibliography of Spanish critical essays, explanatory notes, and information on translations of Hemingway's works.[5] In his introductory remarks Gallego asked two basic questions: "How have the Spanish judged [Hemingway's] work? What opinion does he deserve and what interest has he awakened among us?" Gallego's stated purpose was to respond to the questions by "noting the judgments that [Hemingway's] books left in Spain." He listed fifty essays, extracting the positive ideas found in the six he considered major, and gave pertinent information concerning the eighteen translations of Hemingway works into Spanish. All this he did, as he stated in the introduction, as "a small posthumous homage to the writer recently fallen."

[5]Gallego, p. 58. Hereafter all quoted passages in this bibliography, pp. 57-71.

Gallego stated his awareness of the incompleteness of the bibliography but emphasized that his purpose was only to provide the "steps toward a definitive bibliography." Incomplete though it was, this bibliography did provide a checklist of Spanish criticism that led to the establishment of the "literary personality of Hemingway for Spanish eyes."

Gallego observed that "Spanish critics have been, in general, unoriginal in analyzing the work of Hemingway." He said that, in the majority of cases, the opinions used were those of the American critics: Philip Young, Carlos Baker, and Harry Levin. He noted that Spanish critics discussed Hemingway among themselves but almost never formed a new judgment. At times they relied on books of North American literature to provide more information, he continued, soliciting most of all Zabel's History of North American Literature; Cunliffe's The Literature of the United States; Hoffman's The Modern Novel in North America; Straumann's North American Literature; and Spiller's History of North American Literature.

Gallego considered Ricardo Gullón, Francisco Yndurain, José María Valverde, José María Castellet, and Joaquín Aranda the important critics who made "personal discoveries" in examining Hemingway's work. He emphasized that from their critical evaluations came, as noted above, the "most commendable opinion written in Spain since 1939."

We are reminded again, however, that the Gallego bibliography contained no criticism written during the forties, not even Barea's "Not Spain but Hemingway," and that when Gullón formally reviewed Hemingway's works in the 1952 essay, the author had already published The Old Man and the Sea and the strained relations between Spain and the United States had been eased. In fact, the earliest essay cited was Gullón's 1951 "The Eruption of the North American Novel," and was not Hemingway criticism as such.

Gallego declared, nevertheless, that Gullón, Yndurain, Castellet, Valverde, and Aranda "understood Hemingway best" and that their intentions in evaluating the author's work were good. He lamented that Concha Zardoya's History of North American Literature "[did] not provide the information hoped for." He stated that the pages on Hemingway only repeated the opinions of Maxwell Geismar and discussed them "with little critical rigor." In closing, he admitted that the translations of Hemingway's works were "all, without exception, imperfect," but added that the translations did represent the "most popular understanding that Hemingway has had in Spain."

José R. Marra-López, writing again in 1965 for Insula, confessed his predilection for memoirs, considering them "one of the most important forms of human expression."[6]

[6]José R. Marra-López, "Autobiografias Y Memorias (Ehrenburg, Pasternak y Hemingway), Insula, XX (January 1965), p. 5. Hereafter all quoted passages from this single essay, p. 5.

His interest in Hemingway's memoirs centered, of course, in Barcelona's Seix y Barral publication of A Moveable Feast, translated into Spanish, Paris was a Fiesta. Marra-López noted that perhaps almost all of Hemingway's narrative work was a "mixture of autobiography and imagination: The Sun Also Rises, A Farewell to Arms, For Whom the Bell Tolls, Across the River and into the Trees, the African stories, etc." He declared the book "marvelously written" and stated that "again Hemingway [has given] us a superior lesson of style almost without giving a story." He observed, too, that the work "persist[ed] undecidedly between fiction and reality." He noted contradictions between Hemingway's version of Paris incidents and those of the author's biographers: "Lania, Young, Aster, etc." Nevertheless, he found the book "superbly narrated, full of humor and grace, characteristic of the most vital Hemingway and full of technique and mastery."

CHAPTER V

GENERAL TENDENCIES IN SPANISH CRITICISM; HEMINGWAY'S INFLUENCE

In 1961 while on vacation from teaching Spanish literature at the University of Texas, Ricardo Gullón visited Insula's office in Madrid. When asked about the influence of Spanish literature in America, he declared that for most Americans, except perhaps Romance Language Department professors in colleges and universities, Spanish writing was "on another planet."[1]

Spanish literary interest in North American literature, on the other hand, was evident, as we noted above, from the end of the ruinous Spanish Civil War to the present. Literary journals that had closed out between 1936-1939 reopened in the forties and fifties, and new literary publications, Insula, for example, opened for the first time after the war. Spanish critics wrote--Gullón and Yndurain for Insula, for example--expressing their interest, first of all, in North American literature generally and in individual authors particularly.

The apparent censorship of Hemingway during the

[1][Editor], "Entrevistas: Ricardo Gullón," Insula, XVI (December, 1961), p. 6.

forties was ended in the fifties, as we have seen. After he won the Nobel Prize in 1954, Spanish critics, whether from a real conviction that Hemingway's art was of singular importance or whether from the obvious attention and interest that a Nobel Prize winner would receive, seriously considered the author and his works, attempting to assess his literary importance and influence. All of them, with the exception of the poet-critic Valverde perhaps, found The Old Man and the Sea Hemingway's "summit" work.

As we have seen, the Spanish critics investigated had a tendency, for the most part, to demand "stark reality" in a literary work, fiction or non-fiction. Apparently, they expected Hemingway, in telling the "way it was," to present individually real characters and incidents rather than typical ones. They failed to allow him the novelist's freedom of imagination and fancy. They granted his use of symbolism, however, as long as it was not used to cover anything they considered offensive to Spain and her people.

Beginning with Barea's "Not Spain but Hemingway" in 1941, Spanish criticism revealed that from the Spanish point of view, at least, Hemingway's For Whom the Bell Tolls was not Spain's civil war. His treatment of their ideological conflict of Fascism and Communism was considered untrue. His rendering of mass slaughter and collective rape was opposed to the basic individualism of Spanish psychology and temperament.

Marra-López in 1961, after Hemingway's death, said that For Whom the Bell Tolls "is neither our civil war, nor is it Spain--a country which Hemingway knew very well--nor does he reflect a reality that is fundamental for us." Only Castellet, in considering Hemingway's literary and personal "evolution," seemed more concerned about Hemingway's development than his treatment of the war: the "old individualistic fighter discovered, suddenly, that he can and must fight at the side of others."

Castellet's concern was typical of much of the Spanish criticism examined in that a tendency to see the "man in his work" can be observed. The extreme example, of course, was Valverde's declaration that in The Old Man and the Sea, Hemingway was really celebrating himself. And Yndurain "never considered it useless" to observe the "personal condition of a writer at the moment of making judgments about his work." Also, Aranda saw Hemingway's "pessimism" in The Sun Also Rises.

Not only did the Spanish critics tend to see the author in his work and demand "stark reality," that is, descriptive fidelity to the actual world, they also looked for intimations of the abstract universal in a literary work. Gullón said that "precise and clear force [are] solely attained when materials capable of expressing the conception of the world and the sentiments of the writer are maintained." He felt that Hemingway found in Santiago's struggle

in The Old Man and the Sea the "sense of life, the explication of life, and the justification of his task" in his "interpretation of eternal man." Yndurain, too, saw in Santiago a "symbol of man in the world."

Spanish criticism, then, with Valverde's "capricious" judgment the only exception, revealed that The Old Man and the Sea was the "favorite" among Hemingway's works. This is interesting in that American criticism rates The Sun Also Rises, A Farewell to Arms, For Whom the Bell Tolls, and the short stories over The Old Man and the Sea. Apparently, the expression of the universal, in what the Spanish allude to as the "human condition," is more important to Spanish critics than what they actually found in the novels American critics rate highly: sex, alcohol, an attraction to violence and death, a "strange mixture of eroticism and affection for bulls," "romanticism in reverse," and "exalted sensual love."

And therein lies the paradox: In a country where the bullfight is considered an art and not a sport, where form, control, design, clean line, and directness are demanded of the bullfighter, Spanish critics apparently place more emphasis in literary art on whether or not the work alludes to the "human condition of man's eternal struggle."

Gullón, in 1952, noted that Yndurain had said that Hemingway's "influence has been as great in America as in

Europe." Aranda, in 1954, declared that a Spanish writer had even affirmed that Hemingway "is one of the contemporary writers destined to last and influence." Yndurain in 1954, said further that "Hemingway's style has created a school in contemporary literature, even outside the United States." Zavaleta, as late as 1959, observed Hemingway's "influence over young novelists." And Madariaga, in 1961, as we have already noted, spoke of Hemingway's "manner of writing" and his "straightforward approach to life" exerting an "undoubted influence on the new generation of Spanish novelists."[2]

In 1965 Bernice Duncan, for Books Abroad, interviewed three Spanish novelists on the campus of the University of Oklahoma: Ana María Matute, Ignacio Aldecoa, and Antonio Ferres.[3]

Ana María Matute represented the "generacion inocente" that was "too young at the time of the Civil War to be directly involved in it." She noted that at the time

[2]Ricardo Gullón, "Las novelas de Hemingway," Insula, VII (November, 1952), p. 5; Joaquín Aranda Herrera, "La novela de Ernest Hemingway," Estudios Americanos, IX (January-February, 1955), p. 63; Francisco Yndurain, "Hemingway, Espectador De La Muerte," Nuestro Tiempo (December, 1954), no. 6, p. 15; Carlos E. Zavaleta, "La novela de Hemingway," Estudios Americanos, XVI (July-Aug., 1959), 52; Salvador de Madariaga, "The World Weighs a Writer's Influence: Spain," Saturday Review, XLIV (July 29, 1961), p. 18.

[3]Bernice G. Duncan, "Three Novelists from Spain," Books Abroad, XXXIX (Spring, 1965), p. 165. Hereafter all quoted passages in single essay, pp. 165-66.

she and her generation began to write "no one was interested in literature . . . great writers were available only in mutilated editions, and censorship laid the finger of silence over all." She named Hemingway among her favorite authors.

Don Ignacio Aldecoa declared that although the Spanish novelist Valle Inclán had been a great influence on his writing, he was "familiar" with the work of Hemingway and Fitzgerald.

Señorita Matute said that, finally, the intellectuals were the only ones who would read a literary book, not the masses who only wanted to be amused. Don Aldecoa volunteered, however, that "American novels in translation are popular in Spain."

Stephen Birmingham, for Holiday (April, 1965) reported that the young university students of Spain are "on a literary starvation diet."[4] He stated that when American authors are mentioned, Hemingway is inevitably the "first name" cited. And yet, Birmingham continued, "it is hard to find anyone who has actually read anything Hemingway wrote." He added that one "young admirer" of Hemingway had only read the posthumous A Moveable Feast. Ironically, the "young admirer," as it turned out, had concluded that Hemingway had a "curious habit of repeating many words and

[4]Stephen Birmingham, "The Restive Youth of Spain," Holiday, XXXVII (April, 1965), p. 164. Hereafter all quoted passages, p. 165.

phrases," but reasoned that "perhaps that is an error of the translation."

Apparently editor Asselineau, in his essay in The Literary Reputation of Hemingway in Europe, had made a point deserving some consideration when he stated: "Now, an author's reputation and success in a foreign country to a large extent depend on the quality of the translator who has happened to become interested in his works."[5] But we suspect that the naive university student failed to see Hemingway's intentional stylistic technique in operation, making the error his rather than the translator's.

Antonio Ferres, the last Spanish novelist interviewed by Miss Duncan, named Hemingway among his favorite contemporary writers also. He had suffered censorship in Spain because he believed that realistic novels have the greatest impact in depicting the social texture of a country. But apparently he learned something, at least, from Hemingway's failure to take certain precautionary measures when he wrote For Whom the Bell Tolls. Ferres's measures, labeled as defenses against censorship, were "not to choose a known place for the setting of one's novel, not to write about the war, not to use real persons or real incidents, not to use symbolism as a cover."

But in Hemingway's case, if Marra-López was right in saying that at the time of For Whom the Bell Tolls,

[5]Asselineau, p. 45.

Hemingway's individualistic and adventurous approach to life caused him continuously to search and experiment, to observe Spain's ideological conflict, though superficially, then we can understand how the Spanish critics could be disturbed over his treatment of their war. But we can also understand how they could "forgive" him and say, almost without exception, that at the time of The Old Man and the Sea, Hemingway had finally arrived at that "serenely classic, stoic attitude," a traditional Spanish characteristic exemplified best, perhaps, in the bullfighter facing death.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Asselineau, Roger, ed. The Literary Reputation of Hemingway in Europe. New York, 1965.

Baker, Carlos, ed. Hemingway and His Critics. New York, 1961.

Barea, Arturo. "Not Spain but Hemingway," Hemingway and His Critics, ed. Carlos Baker. New York, 1961, 202-212.

Birmingham, Stephen. "The Restive Youth," Holiday, XXXVII (April, 1965), 88-182.

Cano, Jose Luis. "El Mundo de los Libros." Insula, I (April, 1946), 8.

Castellet, José María. "Hemingway Premio Nobel 1954," Revista, 134 (November, 1954), 1.

Duncan, Bernice G. "Three Novelists from Spain," Books Abroad, XXXIX (Spring, 1965), 165-166.

[Editor]. "Entrevistas: Ricardo Gullón," Insula, XVI (December, 1961), 6.

_____. "Ernest Hemingway," Insula, XVI (July-August, 1961), 2.

_____. "Hemingway, Premio Nobel 1954," Insula, IX (November, 1954), 2.

_____. Insula, I (April, 1946), 4.

_____. Insula, I (May, 1946), 6.

Frost, Lesley. "Carta de Norte America," Insula, I (February, 1946), 4.

_____. "La Novela Norteamericana II," Insula, I (May, 1946), 7.

Fuente, Pablo de la. "Recuerdo de Hemingway," Insula, XVI (September, 1961), 13.

Gallego, Candido Perez. "Aportacion Española Al Estudio De Hemingway," Filologia Moderna, III (1961), 57-71.

Gullón, Ricardo. "La Irrupcion de la Literatura Norteamericana," Insula, VI (September, 1951), 1.

_____. "Las novelas de Hemingway," Insula, VII (November, 1952), 5.

Herrera, Joaquín Aranda. "La novela de Ernest Hemingway," Estudios Americanos, IX (January-February, 1955), 63-72.

Madariaga, Salvador de. "The World Weighs a Writer's Influence: Spain," Saturday Review, XLIV (July 29, 1961), 18.

Marra-López, José R. "Autobiografias Y Memorias (Ehrenburg, Pasternak y Hemingway), Insula, XX (January, 1965), 5.

_____. "Hemingway, La Ultima Singladura," Insula, XVI (September, 1961), 13, 16.

Thrall, William F., Addison Hibbard, and C. Hugh Holman. A Handbook to Literature. New York, 1960.

Valverde, José María. "El Viejo Y El Mar," Indice de Artes y Letras, (July, 1953), 3-4.

Yndurain, Francisco. "Hemingway, Espectador De La Muerte," Nuestro Tiempo, (December, 1954), 10-20.

_____. "La Literatura Norteamericana," Insula, VII (November, 1952), 3.

Zavaleta, Carlos E. "La novela de Hemingway," Estudios Americanos, XVI (July-Aug., 1959), 47-52.

APPENDIX

Hemingway, Premio Novel 1954

La concesión del Premio Nobel a William Faulkner, hace tres años, vino a representar la aceptación «oficial» de un hecho que, aunque era visible desde hacia varios años, muchos se negaban a reconocer: la primacía de la novela norteamericana en el panorama literario mundial del periodo 1925-1950.

El recentísimo otorgamiento del Premio Nobel de este año a Ernest Hemingway es la confirmación de lo que entonces se inició. Y el orden de prelación en la concesión del Premio no implica otra cosa que el mayor predicamento que Faulkner tiene en Europa--no se olvide que el jurado otorgante es sueco--frente al mayor favor que Hemingway goza entre el público y la crítica norteamericanos que ven en él al continuador de la tradición que inició Hermann Melville y que fecundamente continuó Mark Twain.

Sea como fuere, la obra de Hemingway--menos extensa que la de Faulkner--es de una importancia excepcional. Y bastarían sus tres obras más importantes--«Adiós a las armas», «Por quién doblan las campanas» y «El viejo y el mar»--para darle cabida, con pasaje especial, en esa incierta nave que es la Historia de la Literatura Universal.

Autor poco prolífico, Hemingway ha publicado esas tres obras en el espacio de veinticinco años. Así pues, no

es de extrañar que cada una de ellas--dentro de una unidad estilística en la que la mayor preocupación es el logro de una sobriedad expresiva tan excepcionalmente conseguida en la última de las tres, «El viejo y el mar»--señale una etapa decisiva en la evolución del pensamiento de su autor.

Hemingway fué, con Scott Fitzgerald, uno de los más típicos representantes de la que Gertrude Stein denominó «generación perdida», grupo de escritores norteamericanos, producto tipo de la desazón individualista que sucedió a la disipada vida de los «happy twenties». Esta generación se encontró, en un momento dado de su vida con que los valores epicureistas en que había sustentado su existencia se le venían abajo al descubrir su esencial vaciedad. El dinero, el cosmopolitismo, el sexo y el alcohol, resultaron a la postre débiles columnas en las que edificar una existencia humana, y la gran crisis de 1929 vino a significar el preludio de un derrumbamiento espiritual previsible, pero que casi ninguno de los componentes de la «generación perdida» supo evitar. Uno de los supervivientes fué Hemingway, que pudo librarse de su desazon individual escribiendo «Adiós a las armas», la novela de la primera guerra mundial publicanda en 1929. Esta es la novela de una generación que ha perdido la fe en todos los valores. Quizás este breve párrafo, que entresaco de sus páginas, sea más explicito que todo lo que yo pueda expresar:

«El mundo quebranta a todos, aunque muchos se hacen fuertes en sumismo quebranto. Pero a los que no se quieren quebrar, los mata. Mata a los bonísimos y a los mansísimos y a los muy valientes, imparcialmente.»

«Por quién doblan las campanas» es de 1940. Han transcurrido once años. Otros autores de la «generación perdida» han ido acabándose en el reducto de su individualismo sin salida, producto de la angustia del fracaso. Pero no así Hemingway, que renace de sus cenizas. Si comparamos la cita que encabeza su nueva obra con el párrafo que acabamos de reproducir, encontraremos la evidencia de un hombre nuevo que ha descubierto otra dimensión de la vida. La cita de John Donne que figura al frente de esta nueva obra dice así:

«Ningún hombre es una isla completa por si mismo; todo hombre es una parte de continente, una parte del todo; si una pequeña parcela de terreno es arrastrada por el mar, toda Europa se resiente de ello; la muerte de cada hombre me disminuye, porque formo parte del género humano. Así pues, no preguntes nunca ¿por quién doblan las campanas?: doblan por ti.»

El viejo luchador individualista ha descubierto, de pronto, que puede y debe luchar al lado de los demás y la palabra solidaridad adquiere un valor ignorado hasta entonces por él. Aun así, Hemingway descubre los nuevos valores en otra guerra, la nuestra, la del 36. Le falta,

sin embargo, esa madurez que sólo puede dar la paz del hombre a solas consigo mismo después de sus horas de lucha solidaria. O le sobra, si se quiere ese aire provisional y contingente que tiene toda guerra.

Transcurrirán doce años más hasta que alcance esa serenidad que sólo puede dar el tiempo. «El viejo y el mar»(1952) es su obra cumbre y casi asusta pensar que un escritor de cincuenta y seis años--cincuenta y cuatro cuando publicó el libro--haya escrito una obra de tanta madurez. ¿Hasta qué punto podrá Hemingway proseguir una carrera ascendente después de esta obra? La narración del argumento de «El viejo y el mar» es la mejor exposición que pueda hacerse del estadio actual del pensamiento de su autor.

Un pescador lleva ochenta y cuatro días sin obtener pieza alguna. Obstinadamente, se hace día tras día a la mar hasta que al fin un gran pez muerde su anzuelo. Ahora bien, es tan grande ese pez que, para vencerle, el viejo tiene que luchar con él, durante tres días enteros. Y tan grande es, que no puede izarlo a su barca y tiene que amarrarlo al costado. Agotado, aunque victorioso, regresa el viejo a tierra. Pero una bandada de tiburones ronda la barca. Con sus últimas fuerzas, el viejo pescador intenta ahuyentarlos. Es inútil: al llegar a puerto, los tiburones han devorado el pez que tantos esfuerzos le costó. Sólo quedan de él la cabeza y una gran espina.

El Hemingway de 1929 hubiera acabado la obra en

plena desesperación individualista. El de 1952 lo hace con la resignación que surge de la aceptación total de la vida. Hay una cierta alegría en el viejo pescador cuando al regresar a tierra comprueba que ha hecho todos los posibles por vencer totalmente. El haberlo logrado o no, es lo de menos. "Qué fáciles pueden resultar las cosas cuando se ha perdido, pensó. Nunca hubiera creído que fuera tan fácil perder". Sí, realmente es fácil cuando se tiene la conciencia tranquila: es el renunciamiento, la resignación, el despego.

Este es el Hemingway de hoy, capaz de pintar, sin desesperación ya, esa historia del valor humano, de la energia humana y, también, de la aceptación de los valores elementales de la vida humana. El Hemingway que acaba de obtener el Premio Nobel 1954.

José María Castellet

Hemingway, Nobel Prize 1954

The granting of the Nobel Prize to William Faulkner three years ago represented the official acceptance of a fact which, although it had been visible for several years, many refused to recognize: the primacy of the North American novel in the world literary panorama of the period 1925-1950.

The very recent awarding of this year's Nobel Prize to Ernest Hemingway is the confirmation of that which was initiated then. And the order of preference in the granting of the prize implies nothing more than the greatest degree of esteem that Faulkner has in Europe--let it not be forgotten that the authorized jury is Swedish--in the face of the greater favor that Hemingway enjoys among the North American public and critics who see in him the continuer of the tradition that Herman Melville initiated and Mark Twain fruitfully continued.

However it may be, the work of Hemingway--less extensive than that of Faulkner--is of exceptional importance. And his three most important works--A Farewell to Arms, For Whom the Bell Tolls, and The Old Man and the Sea --would be enough to give space with a special passage in that uncertain vessel that is the History of Universal Literature.

A less prolific author, Hemingway has published those three works in the space of twenty-five years. Thus then, it is not surprising that each one of them--within a stylistic unity in which the greatest preoccupation is the attainment of an expressive frugality so exceptionally achieved in the last of the three, The Old Man and the Sea--marks a decisive step in the evolution of the thinking of its author.

Hemingway was, with Scott Fitzgerald, one of the most typical representatives of that which Gertrude Stein called "The lost generation," a group of North American writers, an example of the individualistic restlessness that followed the dissipated life of the "happy twenties." This generation came upon, in a given moment of its life, the fact that the epicurean values on which it had sustained its existence, were collapsing upon discovering their essential emptiness. Money, cosmopolitanism, sex and alcohol, resulted finally in weak columns on which to build a human existence, and the great crisis of 1929 came to signify the prelude to a foreseeable spiritual collapse but which almost none of the members of the "lost generation" succeeded in avoiding. One of the survivors was Hemingway, who was able to free himself of his individual restlessness by writing A Farewell to Arms, the novel of the first World War published in 1929. This is the novel of a generation that has lost faith in all values. Perhaps this brief paragraph, that I pick from its pages, is more explicit than all that I may be able to

express:

> 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.

For Whom the Bell Tolls is of 1940. Eleven years have passed. Other authors of the "lost generation" have gone on exhausting themselves in the fortification of their individualism without ceasing, a product of the anguish of failure. But not Hemingway, who is reborn from his ashes. If we compare the quotation that begins his new work with the paragraph that we have just reproduced, we will find the evidence of a new man that has discovered another dimension of life. The quotation of John Donne that figures in the beginning of this new work says the following:

> No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less, [. . .] any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in Mankind. And therefore, never send to know for whom the bell tolls [;] it tolls for thee.

The old individualistic fighter has discovered, suddenly, that he can and must fight at the side of others and the word solidarity acquires a value unknown by him until then. Even so, Hemingway discovers new values in another war, ours, that of '36. He lacks, nevertheless,

that maturity which only can give peace to man alone with himself after his hours of solidary struggle. Or it is superfluous to him, if that provisional and accidental aspect which every war has, is desired.

Twelve more years will pass until he attains that serenity which only time can give. The Old Man and the Sea (1952) is his summit work and it is almost frightening to think that a writer fifty-six years old--fifty-four when he published the book--has written a work of such maturity. Up to what point will Hemingway be able to continue an ascending career after this work? The narration of the plot of The Old Man and the Sea is the best exposition that can be made of the present course of the thought of its author.

A fisherman spends eighty-four days without catching any fish. Obstinately, day after day, he goes to sea until finally a great fish bites his hook. Now, that fish is so large that, in order to conquer it, the old man has to fight with it for three whole days. And it is so large that he cannot raise it to his boat and has to tie it to the side. Exhausted, though victorious, the old man returns to land. But a group of sharks surround the boat. With his last strength, the old fisherman tries to drive them away. It is useless: Upon arriving at port, the sharks have devoured the fish that cost him so much effort. The head and a great spine only remain.

The Hemingway of 1929 would have finished the work in full individualistic desperation. The one of 1952 does it with the resignation that surges from the total acceptance of life.

There is a certain joy in the old fisherman when upon returning to land he confirms that he has done all that is possible to conquer fully. Having won or not is the least important. "How easy things can turn out to be when one has lost," he thought. I never would have thought that it was so easy to lose." [Hemingway's text reads: "It is easy when you are beaten, he thought. I never knew how easy it was.] Yes, really it is easy when one has a tranquil conscience: it is renunciation, resignation, and indifference.

This is the Hemingway of today, capable of painting, without desperation now, that history of human courage, of human energy, and also of the acceptance of the elemental values of human life. The Hemingway that has just won the Nobel Prize of 1954.

José María Castellet