

STUDIES IN AMERICAN LITERATURE

Volume XIV



HEMINGWAY

DIRECT AND OBLIQUE

by

RICHARD K. PETERSON

Second Printing

1974

MOUTON

THE HAGUE • PARIS

© Copyright 1974 in The Netherlands.
Mouton & Co. N.V., Publishers, The Hague.

*No part of this book may be translated or reproduced in any form
by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written
permission from the publishers.*

First Printing 1969

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NUMBER: 68-23810

Printed in The Netherlands

FOR JOANNE

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Excerpts from the following works by Ernest Hemingway are reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

From the novels:

Across the River and into the Trees (Copyright 1950 Ernest Hemingway); *A Farewell to Arms* (Copyright 1929 Charles Scribner's Sons; renewal copyright © 1957 Ernest Hemingway); *Death in the Afternoon* (Copyright 1932 Charles Scribner's Sons; renewal copyright © 1960 Ernest Hemingway); *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (Copyright 1940 Ernest Hemingway); *Green Hills of Africa* (Copyright 1935 Charles Scribner's Sons); *The Old Man and the Sea* (Copyright 1952 Ernest Hemingway); *The Sun Also Rises* and *The Torrents of Spring* (Copyright 1926 Charles Scribner's Sons; renewal copyright 1954 Ernest Hemingway); *To Have and Have Not* (Copyright 1937 Ernest Hemingway).

From the short stories:

"The Capital of the World", "The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber", and "The Snows of Kilimanjaro" (Copyright 1936 Ernest Hemingway) and "Up in Michigan" (Copyright 1938 Ernest Hemingway) from *The Fifth Column and the First Forty-Nine Stories*; "Chapter" X, "Big Two-Hearted River", "Cross-Country Snow", "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife", "The End of Something", "Mr. and Mrs. Elliot", "My Old Man", and "Soldier's Home" (Copyright 1925 Charles Scribner's Sons; renewal copyright 1953 Ernest Hemingway) and "On the Quai at Smyrna" (Copyright 1930 Charles Scribner's Sons; renewal

copyright © 1958 Ernest Hemingway) from *In Our Time*; “A Canary for One” and “The Killers” (Copyright 1927 Charles Scribner’s Sons; renewal copyright © 1955), “Fifty Grand” (Copyright 1927 Ernest Hemingway; renewal copyright © 1955) and “Hills Like White Elephants”, “In Another Country”, “Now I Lay Me”, and “Today Is Friday” (Copyright 1927 Charles Scribner’s Sons; renewal copyright © 1955 Ernest Hemingway) from *Men Without Women*; “A Clean, Well-Lighted Place” and “The Gambler, the Nun, and the Radio” (Copyright 1933 Charles Scribner’s Sons; renewal copyright © 1961 Ernest Hemingway) and “Fathers and Sons”, “The Light of the World”, “The Mother of a Queen”, “The Sea Change”, and “A Way You’ll Never Be” (Copyright 1933 Charles Scribner’s Sons; renewal copyright © 1961 Mary Hemingway) from *Winner Take Nothing*.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgment	7
I. The “Meaning” of Style	11
II. Cool, Clean, Well-Lighted Order	22
III. “Discipline”	56
IV. Expansiveness and Exaggeration	111
V. Phonies and Heroes	171
Selected Bibliography	217
Index	224

I

THE "MEANING" OF STYLE

A favorite pastime of literary critics in these critical times is the intellectual equivalent of reading character from a man's handwriting or his appearance: it is the game of interpreting a writer's "meaning" from his style. If it is slightly unfair to make sport of critics in this manner, it is probably harmless enough, since critics tend to disparage "critics" in a way which suggests that they do not consider themselves part of that rather disreputable crowd. Critics of Hemingway are perhaps especially prone to the self-flattering gambit of identifying themselves with the writer and sharing his low opinion of critics, whom he has described variously as camp-following eunuchs of literature and as coyotes yipping pleasantly outside in the snow on a cold night when "you are in your own cabin that you have built or paid for with your work".¹ Assuming, however, that criticism is occasionally necessary and serious (which should not mean solemn), it is still somewhat unfair to gibe at efforts to explain the "meaning" of a style, since that is plainly the goal of stylistic description. Mere description is of little value without some conclusion about the significance of the traits described. Having said so much and, moreover, embarking myself on an explanation of the "meaning" of traits which I consider central in Hemingway's style, I yet must find fault with the vast majority of the present interpretations of his style. In

¹ The first description is from a letter to Sherwood Anderson, May 23 (1925?), which is in the Anderson manuscript collection of The Newberry Library, Chicago. The second is from "Old Newsman Writes", *Esquire*, December 1934, p. 26; the cabin sounds very much like Hemingway's "good place" where nothing can touch you, the critics being both outsiders and one of the inferior animals in Hemingway's imagistic value system.

general, their failing is concentrating on too few traits – often only one – with the foreseeable consequence of their being oversimplifications.

Before examining some specific examples of interpretations of Hemingway's style, I should explain that I employ *style* not just in the strict sense of the smaller elements of language – the choice and arrangement of words – but at times to refer to the larger elements of technique or method. For example, the habit of deflation is a trait of Hemingway's style which can be observed both in the use of a single "tough" word to spike the potentially precious or pompous (as in the combination *damned beautiful*) and in deflating progressions like deliberate anticlimax or a self-mocking turn at the end of an expansive passage. I think that such broad traits of manner are best seen by examination of the larger units of method, even by examination of recurrent themes, values and imagery, as well as by close examination of the smaller elements of prose diction.

To avoid an oversimplified interpretation of Hemingway's style, it is important to recognize that it is not all of a piece, a point which Malcolm Cowley makes well:

... it always makes me angry to hear people speaking of his "lean, hard, athletic prose". Sometimes his prose is beautiful, poetic in the best sense, in its exact evocations of landscapes and emotions. Sometimes it is terse and efficient. Sometimes, with its piling up of very short words, it gives the effect of a man stammering, getting his tongue twisted, talking too much but eventually making us understand just what he wants to say.²

Moreover, it is possible to speak generally of an early and a later style, of a change beginning somewhere in the 1930's toward greater expansiveness. Such a division is partly a critical convenience, since of course there are many traits which persist from the early to the later style and traits of the later style which are present in embryo in the earlier. Perhaps the difference is best described as a shift in emphasis – a movement away from the severe understatement of much of the early work.

² "Hemingway: Work in Progress", *The New Republic*, October 20, 1937, p. 305.

Philip Young notes the change in Hemingway's style by 1940 in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, but his interpretation of the style's meaning is based on the earlier style, specifically on its being a direct result of trauma (the result of Hemingway's "big wound" in World War I) which it both expresses and tries to control:

The strictly disciplined controls which he has exerted over his hero and his "bad nerves" are precise parallels to the strictly disciplined sentences he writes. Understatement, abbreviated statement and lack of statement reflect without the slightest distortion the rigid restraint which the man feels he must practice if he is to survive. The "mindlessness" of the style is the result of a need to "stop thinking", and is the purest reflection of that need. The intense simplicity of the prose is a means by which the man says, Things must be *made* simple, or I am lost, in a way you'll never be.

.
His subject is violence and pain, and their effects, and the recovery from the effects in the face of and partly through more of the same. The style which expresses this subject matter is itself perfectly expressive of these things, and of the message: life, which is the material, must be constantly forced under the most intense and rigorous control, and held in the tightest of rein, for it is savage and can get out of hand.³

Plausible as Young's explanation may appear (and certainly it has some truth in it), it is simply too biographical and essentializing – even as an interpretation of Hemingway's early style – and perhaps too sensational. Granted that the style seems both to reflect and try to control fears, pinpointing the fears so exactly is a dubious undertaking which leads too readily to amateur psychiatry or something akin to the analysis of handwriting. One's handwriting (to pursue the comparison a bit) obviously has a meaning or, more likely, several meanings simultaneously; but the

³ *Ernest Hemingway* (New York, Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1952), pp. 177-178. See also pp. 176, 179. Cf. John Atkins, *The Art of Ernest Hemingway: His Work and Personality* (New York, Roy Publishers, 1953), p. 126: "Everyone who knows Hemingway agrees that his wound in Italy marked him for life, spiritually as well as physically. The shock of this wound was so great that he has spent a large part of the rest of his life trying to assure himself that he is not scared. . . . The discipline of his writing is perhaps a reflexion of this other discipline in his mental life."

meanings cannot be deduced from the style alone, and the temptation always is to take what we know of a person and read it back into his style (or handwriting), thus "discovering" in the style what we already know. This circular process is a serious drawback of most of the explanations of the "meaning" of Hemingway's style.

Another drawback, besides the tendency to consider too few factors, is a tendency to push conclusions about the style's meaning to untenable extremes. For example, Hemingway employs irony a great deal, and one effect of irony is to detach the writer from his characters and material. This effect fits very neatly with the recurrent theme of isolation in Hemingway's work and with what several critics, borrowing the phrase from Cowley, call Hemingway's "spectatorial attitude".⁴ The next step, reversing the usual relation between attitude and style, is to conclude that the style determined the outlook: "Journalism presented him this way of looking at the world when it taught him the use of the bare, detached style."⁵ Then one may conclude that an ironic style is appropriate only to the theme of isolation, so that a novel like *To Have and Have Not* (with a different theme?) must be a disaster:

For more than ten years Hemingway had worked at perfecting a detached, ironical style that would dramatize man's isolation in a blind universe and would convey through its terseness the belief that there is no remedy for man's condition but fortitude. As one might expect, it was no easy matter to enlist that style in the service of collective action for social justice.⁶

Deciding (I think correctly) that *For Whom the Bell Tolls* still expresses romantic isolation beneath its official surface message to the contrary, Weeks proceeds in the latter article to draw two untenable conclusions. First, he professes to see Jordan's view of life as "sufficiently ironic to enable him to accommodate himself

⁴ See *Exile's Return: A Literary Odyssey of the 1920's*, rev. ed. (New York, The Viking Press, 1951), pp. 43-45.

⁵ Robert P. Weeks, "Hemingway and the Spectatorial Attitude", *Western Humanities Review*, XI (Summer 1957), 280.

⁶ Robert P. Weeks, "Hemingway and the Uses of Isolation", *The University of Kansas City Review*, XXIV (December 1957), 122-123.

to the idea of sacrificing his life to a hopeless cause" (p. 124) – which is, I submit, the ironic view reduced to absurdity and not true of the novel anyway. Second, Weeks finds the same early "restrained tight-lipped style" in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* – surely an instance of mental set determining perception, since he is already committed to the inseparability of that particular style and an outlook of detachment and isolation, so that he must see a style which echoes the content.

The inseparability of matter and manner, of content and form, is a modern critical dictum often applied too uncritically in the analysis of style. Moreover, the implication is frequently that there is one "right" form for each idea expressed and that the form can successfully express only that idea. Carried to its logical extreme, the dictum becomes nonsensical; and Kenneth Burke disposes of it in his discussion of "significant form":

... we must question a quasi-mystical attempt to explain all formal qualities as "onomatopoetic" (that is, as an adaptation of sound and rhythm to the peculiarities of the sense). In most cases we find formal designs or contrivances which impart emphasis regardless of their subject. Whatever the theme may be, they add saliency to this theme, the same design serving to make dismalness more dismal or gladness gladder. ... To realize that there is such absolute stressing, one has but to consider the great variety of emotions which can be intensified by climactic arrangement, such arrangement thus being a mere "co-efficient of power" which can heighten the saliency of the emotion regardless of what emotion it may be.⁷

There is something not only quasi-mystical but almost prescriptive and essentially limited about comments on *For Whom the Bell Tolls* which run, "Because it is another story, this story could not have been told at all in the older style", since it is a "nearly poetic realization of man's *collective* virtues", while the earlier style was "an exact transfiguration of Hemingway's moral attitude

⁷ *Counter-Statement*, 2nd ed. (Los Altos, Calif., Hermes Publications, 1953), p. 135. John Atkins makes a similar point about the lack of a necessary equivalence between manner and matter when discussing Hemingway's "code": "... there is no relevance between code and object. To enjoy yourself on the physical plane there is no compulsion to deflate language and smother emotion. In fact, many Elizabethans did just the opposite in pursuit of similar ends" (p. 193).

toward a peculiarly violent and chaotic experience" – i.e., the attitude of the self-contained, tightly self-controlled, isolated individual.⁸ Pursuing the notion of the inseparability of form and content, Schorer makes *The Sun Also Rises* a consummate work of art because the form is so exactly equivalent with the subject and the style evaluates the subject:

Hemingway's early subject, the exhaustion of value, was perfectly investigated and invested by his bare style, and in story after story, no meaning at all is to be inferred from the fiction except as the style itself suggests that there is no meaning in life. This style, more than that, was the perfect technical substitute for the conventional commentator; it expresses and it measures that peculiar morality of the stiff lip which Hemingway borrowed from athletes. It is an instructive lesson, furthermore, to observe how the style breaks down when Hemingway moves into the less congenial subject matter of social affirmation: how the style breaks down, the effect of verbal economy as mute suffering is lost, the personality of the writer, no longer protected by the objectification of an adequate technique, begins its offensive intrusion, and the entire structural integrity slackens. Inversely, in the stories and the early novels, the technique was the perfect embodiment of the subject and it gave that subject its astonishing largeness of effect and meaning.⁹

Holding such a view of style, it is little wonder that Schorer can say, "When we speak of technique, then, we speak of nearly everything" (p. 190). Yet what he sees in the style is too limited in several ways. In the first place, a method of understatement and irony may posit a detached writer, but all that necessarily means is a writer who wants to be detached from his material – from the feelings expressed in his work, for example. It does not necessarily follow that the author or the characters in his fiction have to want to remain detached from the rest of the world.

The style shows something about the author's attitude toward his material, all right, something overlooked too often in explanations of the "meaning" of Hemingway's style: it shows

⁸ Mark Schorer, "The Background of a Style", *Kenyon Review*, III (Winter 1941), 104, 103.

⁹ "Technique as Discovery", in *Essays in Modern Literary Criticism*, ed. Ray B. West, Jr. (New York, Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1952), p. 203.

something about his attitude toward writing. It is an error to equate this attitude with his attitude toward life as reflected by all the characters, incidents and themes of his work, without producing considerable evidence to support such an equation. Hemingway's underlying distrust of words, for example, has a profound effect on the character of his style, seen not only in his "objectivity", understatement, and various forms of indirection but also in some of the forms that his tendency toward expansiveness takes – e.g., the toughness, the increase in the word *true*, the use of foreignism. In addition, his style shows a typical reaction of the times against the effusive emotionalism of earlier literature, a reaction of both the 1920's and our time which might be summed up in the motto, "Don't wear your heart on your sleeve". Since nothing is quite so gauche according to that view, a bare, "objective" style may reflect fear of possible criticism or ridicule if one allows his feelings open expression. Simply equating bareness of style (which is only part of the picture anyway) with the author's idea of the bareness of life is reduction and oversimplification. It is another example of the tendency to read back into the style an idea expressed otherwise in the work and then to make the whole style take on that "meaning".

To say that Hemingway's early style is appropriate to only one kind of content is a dubious assertion. It is much more accurate to say that it is appropriate to authors who share generally a certain kind of attitude toward their material, toward writing, toward words themselves. Hemingway's distrust of words, his fear of sounding pretentious, arty or "literary", has stylistic effects which have not been stressed sufficiently. One effect might be described as the cultivation of deliberate awkwardness, if it were not for the fact that it is not always clear how deliberate the awkwardness is. For example, it is hard to know how deliberate the awkwardness is in this sentence from *Across the River and into the Trees*: "Her voice was so lovely and it always reminded him of Pablo Casals playing the cello that it made him feel as a wound does that you think you cannot bear" (Ch. xi). Hemingway effectively clouds the issue by being self-consciously ungrammatical at times: "... she is sleeping so lovely. He said lovely to

himself since his thinking was often ungrammatical" (Ch. xxxiii). Yet the rather typical lack of parallelism in this sentence is not so obviously deliberate: "... it had the advantage of you moving while you do it and that you look at the houses . . . while you are walking" (Ch. xxi).

That the awkwardness is there I think no one will deny, in spite of Hemingway's somewhat touchy and self-flattering objection during an interview:

I might say that what amateurs call a style is usually only the unavoidable awkwardnesses in first trying to make something that has not heretofore been made. Almost no new classics resemble other previous classics. At first people can see only the awkwardness. Then they [*sic*] are not so perceptible. When they show so very awkwardly people think these awkwardnesses are the style and many copy them.¹⁰

It may be that Hemingway felt sensitive about his limited formal education, as his habitually disparaging remarks about the literati suggest.¹¹ If so, the feeling probably reinforces his determination to avoid sounding "literary", to make a literary virtue out of a possible weakness.

Sometimes the awkwardness is combined with or is the effect of indefiniteness, a preference for the simple or common word or construction rather than for the more specific and "literary". One form of indefiniteness which might be mentioned here is the coordinate clauses, connected by the simplest, common word – *and* – which does not specify the relationship between clauses, juxtaposing apparently unconnected ideas. One example, which Leon Edel thinks a successful *non sequitur* in its contrasting the ideas of spring (new life) and guns (death), is from *A Farewell to Arms*: "There were many more guns in the country around and the spring had come" (Ch. iii).¹² Less obvious in "meaning",

¹⁰ George Plimpton, "Ernest Hemingway" (The Art of Fiction, XXI), *The Paris Review*, XVIII (Spring 1958), 78.

¹¹ In "Monologue to the Maestro", *Esquire*, October 1935, Hemingway has "Mice" (the young aspirant writer) object, "That isn't the way they teach you to write in college." Hemingway answers, "I don't know about that. I never went to college. If any sonofabitch could write he wouldn't have to teach writing in college" (p. 174A).

¹² See "The Art of Evasion", *Folio*, XX (Spring 1955), 19.

perhaps, is an example from *The Sun Also Rises*, though it would be possible to interpret it as the kind of disconnected view one gets when driving through a town without stopping:

There were signs on the walls of the churches saying it was forbidden to play pelota against them, and the houses in the villages had red tiled roofs, and then the road turned off and commenced to climb and we were going way up close along a hillside, with a valley below and hills stretched off back toward the sea. (Ch. x)

Yet we must recognize also that the device is a generalized trait of Hemingway's, which cannot be completely explained by explaining the "meaning" of each individual instance in isolation.

Robert Penn Warren, contending with reason that the style reflects the sensibility of the author more than that of the characters, yet makes it reflect a view of the world more than an attitude toward writing: "The short simple rhythms, the succession of coordinate clauses, the general lack of subordination — all suggest a dislocated and ununified world."¹³ While it is no doubt true that any style has a psychological meaning, that it ultimately reflects a view of life even if it more immediately reflects an aesthetic purpose, I think that in this interpretation the "meaning" of the style is again oversimplified. In a review of O'Neill's *All God's Chillun Got Wings*, Edmund Wilson once commented that by eliminating excessive detail O'Neill had gained intensity.¹⁴ I wonder whether some such purpose is not the reason for a good deal of Hemingway's indefiniteness, his lack of specificity, since the highly detailed or particular passage may achieve complexity at the expense of intensity. One effect of the repetition which Hemingway uses so much, for example, is a gain in intensity by stressing a limited number of things, sacrificing "extra-concreteness", analysis, and complexity. When the method succeeds, such indefiniteness can result in considerable intensity and suggestiveness; when it does not succeed, the result may be anything from monotony to vagueness to evasiveness.

¹³ "Hemingway", *The Kenyon Review*, IX (Winter 1947), 18.

¹⁴ *The Shores of Light: A Literary Chronicle of the Twenties and Thirties* (New York, Farrar, Straus and Young, Inc., 1952), p. 103.

It is clear, however, that aesthetic purposes or values cannot be easily divorced from "moral" values or attitudes toward life in Hemingway's work, if only because of his belief that it is the writer's duty to tell the truth and expose the lie. Since he also feels that words are at least potentially lies, the resulting conflict is bound to have profound effects on the kind of writing he does. It results, for example, not only in his penchant for understatement but in his visible uneasiness in the face of his own tendency toward expansive writing – which in turn results in some of the stylistic traits examined later.

At the same time the dedication to truth-telling and giving the lie extends to his presentation of character and incident – e.g., to his handling of those whom he identifies as fakes or phonies. Lionel Trilling makes the further point that Hemingway's emphasis on correct technique is another facet of his desire to replace fine words and grandiose sentiments with truth or "reality":

Another manifestation of the same desire in Hemingway was his devotion to the ideal of technique as an end in itself. A great deal can go down in the tumble but one of the things that stands best is a cleanly done job. . . . professional pride is one of the last things to go. Hemingway became a devotee of his own skill and he exploited the ideal of skill in his characters. His admired men always do a good job; and the proper handling of a rod, a gun, an *espada*, or a pen is a thing, so Hemingway seems always to be saying, which can be understood when speech cannot.¹⁵

The last chapter, then, though it differs in emphasis from the others which are more closely concerned with style and technique, is still connected with the others and with aesthetic values in its investigation of Hemingway's value system or "code" and the way that the value system affects the work. It deals more with the direct expression of some of Hemingway's ideas, perhaps, while the other chapters – especially iii and iv – deal more with the indirect or oblique. I have borrowed the title of Tillyard's little book on poetry, except for the first word, because it is a handy summary of my approach to Hemingway's work: the considera-

¹⁵ "Hemingway and His Critics", in *Hemingway and His Critics: An International Anthology*, ed. Carlos Baker (New York, Hill and Wang, 1961), pp. 65-66.

tion of the various forms of indirection that he employs, together with the overt themes and statements which say the same things directly. Through this approach, I hope that Hemingway emerges the clearer in both his matter and his manner, both directly and obliquely.

My estimate of Hemingway's achievement and influence accords pretty well with Malcolm Cowley's in "Hemingway: Work in Progress":

Partly it has been a bad influence. It has made people copy the hard-boiled manner of "The Killers" and "Fifty Grand". . . . Worst of all, it has caused many young writers to take over Hemingway's vocabulary and his manner of seeing the world – thereby making it impossible for them to be as honest as Hemingway. But in general I think that his influence has been excellent. It has freed many writers – not only novelists but poets and essayists and simple reporters – from a burden of erudition and affectation that they thought was part of the writer's equipment. It has encouraged them to write as simply as possible about the things they really feel, instead of the things they think that other people think they ought to feel. (p. 305)

Examination of what is bad in Hemingway's style and technique removes it from the honorific glow of what is good. No writer benefits from indiscriminate praise of his work regardless of its quality – as Hemingway once wrote to Sherwood Anderson in so many words.¹⁶ Moreover, the drawbacks of the ironic method (if not the ironic temper), a method of which Hemingway is so famous a modern example, need pointing out, since the virtues of the ironic method are too unreservedly touted nowadays.

We should be tough-minded enough to see the writer as a human being with a considerable talent – not as a demigod whose clay feet must be glossed over. To see a writer as a whole, we must look at all of his work. Though it is just that he should be renowned for his best work, the less good should not be hidden or dismissed according to the ironic double standard which makes his successes his own but his failures the fault of his characters.

¹⁶ Hemingway wrote to Anderson, May 21, 1926, trying to explain his motives in *The Torrents of Spring*. The letter is in the Anderson manuscript collection of The Newberry Library, Chicago.

II

COOL, CLEAN, WELL-LIGHTED ORDER

Indefiniteness, almost a refusal to specify, is a common denominator of many different aspects of Hemingway's style. His penchant for indefiniteness, akin to indirection in statement, can be seen in his preference for the common, unspecific word, avoiding more particularized and "literary" synonyms: in his liking for such general, valuative adjectives as *nice*, *fine*, *good* and in his mannered repetition of forms of the verbs *say* and *be*. Likewise, his many unmodified nouns lack the particularity of the modified, while his pronouns and adverbs without referents add to the effect of indefiniteness, as do the awkward, ambiguously placed phrases and clauses used as modifiers. "Personal pronouns frequently get involved in what is stigmatized . . . as faulty reference; there are sentences in which it is hard to tell the hunter from his quarry or the bullfighter from the bull."¹ Thus "The Mother of a Queen" begins, "When his father died he was only a kid and his manager buried him perpetually."

That sounds like deliberate awkward indefiniteness, but it is not clear whether it is deliberate in this ambiguous sentence from Chapter xxiii of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*: "The man who was leading rode along the trail to where Pablo had circled and stopped" (who stopped?). Compare, from *To Have and Have Not*, "I got out the Smith and Wesson thirty-eight special I had when I was on the police force up in Miami from under the mattress" (Ch. iii) or "He had to pretend he wanted to see Juan

¹ Harry Levin, "Observations on the Style of Ernest Hemingway", *Contexts of Criticism* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 154-155.

Rodriguez, who is a poor stinking gallego that would steal from his own mother that Bee-Lips has got indicted again so he can defend him" (Ch. ix), in which the ambiguously placed modifiers produce the awkward indefiniteness. In "The Killers" we read, "He had propped open the slit that dishes passed through into the kitchen with a catsup bottle."

Such indefiniteness requires that we qualify the frequent description of Hemingway's style as "concrete", a description based in large part on the unquestioning acceptance of Frederic Henry's denunciation of abstract words and fine phrases:

I was always embarrassed by the words sacred, glorious, and sacrifice and the expression in vain. . . . I had seen nothing sacred, and the things that were glorious had no glory and the sacrifices were like the stockyards at Chicago if nothing was done with the meat except to bury it. There were many words that you could not stand to hear and finally only the names of places had dignity. Certain numbers were the same way and certain dates and these with the names of the places were all you could say and have them mean anything. Abstract words such as glory, honor, courage, or hallow were obscene beside the concrete names of villages, the numbers of roads, the names of rivers, the numbers of regiments and the dates. (Ch. xxvii)

Philip Young says that Hemingway was influenced by Pound and the Imagists to avoid vague generalities, using ordinary speech and the exact word (p. 155), while John W. Aldridge says that Hemingway and the "lost generation" learned to "hold tight to themselves and to the concrete simplicities (until the simple and concrete seemed to be all there was, all that was worth knowing) when the world around them seemed to be breaking to pieces".²

However, as Joseph Warren Beach points out, the simplest word is the most common and indiscriminated word – not the exact or specific word, the *mot précis* – so that comparison of Hemingway to Flaubert in this regard is misleading.³ As a matter of fact, Hemingway takes pains to avoid the *mot juste*, probably because it sounds too "literary" to him, preferring the general,

² *After the Lost Generation: A Critical Study of the Writers of Two Wars* (New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1951), pp. 10-11.

³ *American Fiction 1920-1940* (New York, The Macmillan Co., 1941), p. 102.

unspecific word like *and*. In the sense of meaning highly particular, specific or "extra-concrete",⁴ the word *concrete* is an inaccurate term to describe Hemingway's style. Baker, among others, has called attention to the general, unspecific nature of many of Hemingway's descriptions, while Levin notes a trick of generalizing the specific episode: "They always picked the finest places to have the quarrels" ("The Snows of Kilimanjaro").⁵

Hemingway maintains his reputation for concreteness by incidental detail, Levin adds, suggesting that the arc light and the tipped-back derby hat were late additions to "The Killers". Other devices which maintain the impression of concreteness are the use of numbers (as in "The Light of the World": "Down at the station there were five whores waiting for the train to come in, and six white men and four Indians") and the catalogues which give a succession of "objective" details. Part of a catalogue from *To Have and Have Not*, detailing what Richard Gordon sees on his walk after the final quarrel with his wife, may serve to illustrate:

... he passed the frame houses with their narrow yards, light coming from the shuttered windows; the unpaved alleys, with their double rows of houses; Conch town, where all was starched, well-shuttered, virtue, failure, grits and boiled grunts, under-nourishment, prejudice, righteousness, interbreeding and the comforts of religion; the open-doored, lighted Cuban bolito houses, shacks whose only romance was their names: The Red House, Chicha's; the pressed stone Church; its steeples sharp, ugly triangles against the moonlight; the big grounds and the long, black-domed bulk of the convent, handsome in the moonlight; a filling station and a sandwich place, brightly lit beside a vacant lot where a miniature golf course had been taken out; past the brightly lit main street with the three drug stores, the music store, the five Jew stores, three poolrooms, two barber-shops, five beer joints, three ice cream parlors, the five poor and the one good restaurant, two magazine and paper places, four second-hand joints (one of which made keys), a photographer's, an office

⁴ W. K. Wimsatt, Jr., with Monroe C. Beardsley, *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry* (Lexington?, University of Kentucky Press, 1954), p. 138. In many respects Hemingway is closer to what Wimsatt calls the minimum concrete or "substantive level".

⁵ Carlos Baker, *Hemingway: The Writer as Artist*, 3rd ed. (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1963), pp. 50-51; Levin, p. 156.