

Joseph Fruscione

“One Tale, One Telling”:  
Parallelism, Influence, and  
Exchange between Faulkner’s *The  
Unvanquished* and Hemingway’s  
*For Whom the Bell Tolls*

As two of America’s most distinctive, innovative, competitive, and accomplished Modernists, William Faulkner and Ernest Hemingway shared a host of common themes—among them hunting, troubled gender relationships, the interconnection of people and place, and, most germane to this essay, war. Both the experience and memory of war underscored much of their fiction and masculine public personalities—including their respective post–World War One posturing as decorated war heroes, despite the fact that neither man had in actuality been the soldier he later purported to be. Although Faulkner wrote two novels and a handful of stories about the First World War, his primary artistic concern was the American Civil War and how it was remembered and relived in the modern South—works such as *Sartoris* (1929), *Light in August* (1932), and many stories reveal how the Civil War was indelibly imprinted onto the fabric of Faulkner’s South. Hemingway used his fiction and journalism to examine—among others—both world wars and the Spanish Civil War—*The Sun Also Rises* (1926), *A Farewell to Arms* (1929), and many of his finest short stories likewise depict the experience and aftereffects of war on soldiers and civilians.

The idea and concrete experience of national internecine war influenced these two Modernists’ fiction in the 1930s in particular, as we see in two of their works from late in the decade. As books by two rivals who exerted a remarkable psycho-competitive influence over each other, *The Unvanquished* (1938) and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940) parallel each other in symbolically rich ways. Though the civil wars that they depict—and their authorial perspectives on them—differ, Faulkner and Hemingway each wrote books that are analogous in several ways: a structural-thematic focus on storytelling; similar imagery; focus on a set of

resilient and courageous people on the losing side of the conflict; and illustration of the detrimental effects of a nation at war with itself.

Although Faulkner and Hemingway spent virtually no time together socially, there existed between them a complex and many-sided artistic relationship that spanned most of their writing lives. Both *The Unvanquished* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* are, generally speaking, part of an ongoing textual dialectic between Faulkner and Hemingway in which they explored the style, themes, and direction of American Modernism. Moreover, these two books are components of a textual spectrum that manifested itself in a number of different works, including Hemingway's *Death in the Afternoon* (1932), Faulkner's *If I Forget Thee, Jerusalem* (1939), both the novel and screenplay of *To Have and Have Not* (1937; 1945), their letters, and their Nobel Prize Addresses (Faulkner's, 1950; Hemingway's, 1954). Throughout their long careers, Faulkner and Hemingway were engaged in a complex sequence of rivalry, exchange, and influence. In much of their work, Hemingway and Faulkner took on each other in a decades-long contest for primacy in the American literary scene in a manifestation of what Harold Bloom would later call "the dialectic between art and art" in *The Anxiety of Influence*.<sup>1</sup> In many ways, Hemingway and Faulkner were the prime movers of American Modernism, and they were also one another's primary adversary. Their literary rivalry and frequent criticisms of each other notwithstanding, Faulkner and Hemingway significantly met on common artistic ground where intra-national war was concerned.

For my purposes in this essay, *The Unvanquished* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* are two of the many ways in which Faulkner and Hemingway psychologically and artistically influenced and referenced each other in their writing. This enables their readers to identify a solid line of textual communication and psycho-competitive influence between them. Because their artistic and professional relationship was multi-dimensional and long lasting, it reveals to us how Faulkner and Hemingway influenced each other literarily and, more so, psychologically; what is more, this dual influence came about consciously and unconsciously. From a literary perspective, Faulkner and Hemingway had an indirect impact on one another's work. Faulkner may not have led Hemingway to his minimalism, nor did Hemingway lead Faulkner to his loquaciousness; nevertheless, each man's writings and ideas shaped the other's. In certain cases, they are superimposed on each other's work. Throughout their decades of intertextual dialogue, Faulkner and Hemingway often responded to one another—as, for instance, Faulkner's *If I Forget Thee, Jerusalem* fired back at Hemingway's *Death in the Afternoon*, or Hemingway's Nobel Prize Address retorted Faulkner's critique of Hemingway's *A Farewell to Arms* in his Nobel Prize Address.<sup>2</sup> More generally, they explored

themes such as war and hunting in conjunction (as well as in contradistinction), and they knowingly alluded to each other through references (direct and oblique), wordplay, quotation, and the like.

Their artistic influence was strong, but their psychological influence was much more pronounced. From the latter perspective, Hemingway and Faulkner each had a strong competitive drive that impelled him to be the best writer in America, but at the expense of the other. In terms of popularity and financial success, Hemingway was far and away number one, while, in terms of artistic value, they shared the culturally-imagined “first place” for most of their careers. When Faulkner started to pull ahead of Hemingway in the early 1950s as he won the Nobel Prize and other literary awards, his feelings of superiority were countered by Hemingway’s feelings of insecurity and defensiveness. Throughout their careers, their rivalrous attitudes towards one another comprised both resentment and admiration—each knew that the other was a worthy adversary to be bested and directed his artistic energies accordingly. In the process, both embodied what Bloom has also described in *The Anxiety of Influence* as “the agonistic basis of all imaginative literature.”<sup>3</sup> By and large, Faulkner and Hemingway pushed each other to innovate, excel, and take artistic chances; they competed with and influenced one another intragenerationally, in the same way that writers often grapple with their influential forebears, as Bloom’s book examines. In the present case, these two competing Modernists were hyper-aware of each other, and *The Unvanquished* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* are two of a series of texts that bear traces of this shared awareness, rivalry, and influence.

The similarities between these *The Unvanquished* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* are important to an understanding of the Faulkner-Hemingway relationship, precisely because we see in them two stylistically different authors writing two thematically congruous books.<sup>4</sup> While *The Unvanquished* is a short-story cycle comprised of seven stories and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is a novel, we can cast aside these basic generic differences and consider their weighty correspondences in theme, characterization, and imagery. Faulkner and Hemingway may have been writing about different wars, but that they wrote about them in such corresponding ways is significant, as it is further evidence of the fact that war was an important theme that they shared, partially due to their common backgrounds and to their efforts to write about similar themes in what they thought were superior ways. Whereas the First World War was a foundational element of their early fiction and masculine public personae, the American and Spanish Civil Wars were central to their mature 1930s’ fiction. And, though Hemingway’s and Faulkner’s personal connection to each civil war is also dissimilar—Hemingway saw the Spanish Civil War first hand as a journalist, while Faulkner grew up in

a culture still reeling from and telling stories about America's Civil War—both of their texts concentrate on war from different perspectives: soldier and civilian, male and female.

First, the structural elements of these books link them and their authors. Though Faulkner uses an older Bayard Sartoris as a first-person narrator looking back on his wartime experiences and Hemingway employs a third-person omniscient narrator, *The Unvanquished* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* are very similar structurally. They both, for instance, utilize stream of consciousness to help tell their stories—Bayard (the “Old Bayard” of *Sartoris*) and Robert Jordan both recall and reflect upon their pasts, their families, and their war experiences throughout each text. As Bayard is a first-person narrator, *The Unvanquished* is replete with reminiscences, thoughts, and tangents—Faulkner's *modus operandi* in much of his fiction, as we know. With *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, however, Jordan is not a first-person narrator; thus, Hemingway, in a manner of speaking, adopts a Faulknerian stream-of-consciousness style (unusual for him) to put the reader inside Jordan's head. For instance, after Jordan and Maria make love at the beginning of Chapter Thirteen, Hemingway goes on for eight pages to show the reader Jordan's train of thought, as it moves from post-coital musings to practical, more personal matters. Jordan then begins to worry about the Loyalists' chances in the conflict:

Because now he was not there. He was walking beside her but his mind was thinking of the problem of the bridge now and it was all clear and hard and sharp as when a camera lens is brought into focus. [...] Stop it, he told himself. You have made love to this girl and now your head is clear, properly clear, and you start to worry. It is one thing to think you must do and it is another thing to worry. Don't worry. You mustn't worry. You know the things that you may have to do and you know what may happen. Certainly it may happen.<sup>5</sup>

Such interiority is typical of Faulkner (his use of multiple narrators in *The Sound and the Fury* and *As I Lay Dying* comes to mind) but is not so typical of Hemingway, who employed first-person narration in some of his earlier novels but not such stream of consciousness.<sup>6</sup> Hemingway uses such narrative interiority very effectively throughout the novel with Jordan—we read about his thoughts of his grandfather's wartime heroism, his father's suicide, and his life as a professor at the University of Montana, among other personal matters. Jordan's interior reflections are as important to our understanding of the novel as

his interaction with his fellow guerillas and his plan to destroy the strategically important bridge. We are privy to his reactions and memories, thus granting us a deeper understanding of him as a character because we know where he has been, how it affects his present and future actions, and how this in turn affects his relationships with the other guerillas.<sup>7</sup> This is an example of the ways in which Faulkner and Hemingway pushed each other to innovate and take chances in their fiction. Writing to Faulkner in July 1947, Hemingway told him that he “was taking [sic] all chances” in the novel and even suggested that Faulkner read it.<sup>8</sup> Hemingway seems to have been psychologically motivated by Faulkner to take risks in his writing and, by extension, to eclipse Faulkner. Using such interiority and flashbacks (largely untried by this point) enabled Hemingway to take “all chances” in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* in different but comparable ways from how so much of Faulkner’s work took bold artistic chances.

We get a nearly identical experience with Bayard, as the seven stories of *The Unvanquished* are a cycle of memories upon which the narrator/central character reflects—killing a Union horse with his African American companion Ringo (“Ambuscade”), seeing the remains of a railroad that has been destroyed by General Sherman’s troops (“Raid”), killing the man responsible for the murder of his grandmother (“Vendée”), and confronting but not killing the man who murdered his father (“An Odor of Verbena”). This stream-of-consciousness narration seemingly prefigured Hemingway’s depiction of Jordan—we see not only what Bayard experienced as a child during the Civil War and Reconstruction but also how he makes sense of his past as an adult. Bayard also has a familial connection to the Civil War through his father (Colonel John Sartoris), grandmother (Rosa Millard), and cousin-stepmother (Drusilla), thus granting him a personal association with one of American history’s most tumultuous eras. In this way, these two books fit nicely together, as both Jordan and Bayard seek to understand their present situations through the lens of personal and national history—for both men, male ancestors fought in the American Civil War and embodied a legacy of wartime courage, honor, and legend-making that they seek to emulate.

Though he did not write about the American Civil War as much as Faulkner did, Hemingway nonetheless makes a connection between the American and Spanish Civil Wars, again through Jordan’s consciousness. As he remembers his grandfather and the Civil War’s leadership, Jordan thinks about his similar predicament in Spain: “There wasn’t any Grant, nor any Sherman nor any Stonewall Jackson on either side so far in this war. No. Nor any Jeb Stuart either. Nor any Sheridan. It was overrun with McClellans though. The fascists had plenty of McClellans and we had at least three of them.”<sup>9</sup> Jordan, clearly, rues the fact that the current war lacks the heroism and military successes embodied in the 1860s by Ulysses S.

Grant, William Tecumseh Sherman, J.E.B. Stuart, and Philip Sheridan. Jordan, contrarily, realizes that war in Spain does not lack the battlefield ineptitude and failures of George McClellan. Moreover, Jordan associates the bureaucratic and confusing Loyalist leadership with McClellan's tendency to avoid combat while commanding a numerically greater army; infamous for his procrastination and ineffective leadership, McClellan assumed command of the Army of the Potomac in the summer of 1861, after the Confederates won their earliest major victory at First Manassas. Frustrated by his superiors' inaction and paper-pushing, Jordan notes the symbolic presence of a less-than-ideal American Civil War figure in the Spanish Civil War.

In addition, Hemingway figuratively saw his rivalry with Faulkner as an extension the American Civil War; in this case, he used a letter to envision himself and Faulkner as warring writers. (In many ways, his epistolary correspondence was a forum in which he routinely judged and criticized Faulkner to third parties.) While his fourth wife Mary was in Mississippi, Hemingway wrote to Harvey Breit (then of the *New York Times Book Review*) on August 14, 1950, and linked his writerly war with Faulkner to the Civil War, even wondering if his grandfather defeated Faulkner's at either Shiloh or Chancellorsville.<sup>10</sup> Despite his respect for Faulkner as an artist, Hemingway always saw Faulkner in an adversarial light. What is more, Hemingway and Faulkner's longstanding competition suggested the brother *vs.* brother mentality—sometimes reality—of the Civil War; the writers were simultaneously allied and pitted against each other by their common standing as notable American Modernists. Thus, Jordan's evocation of the American Civil War, while he was wrapped up in the events of the Spanish Civil War, has textual as well as contextual significance; this fact, it strikes me, forges another strong linkage between *For Whom the Bell Tolls* and *The Unvanquished* and their respective authors, each of whom grasped the enormous import of the Civil War for their nation and their warring models of art.

While both books hone in on the act of remembering through their male protagonists, memory and storytelling become crucial to other characters, too. Both Faulkner and Hemingway give us a supporting cast—Colonel Sartoris, Granny Rosa Millard, and Drusilla Hawk; Pilar and Maria—who function as the source of a collective history through their routine chronicling of past events. For instance, Hemingway expands his focus on Jordan's memories to include Pilar and Maria, and Faulkner has Bayard consider the importance of both his father's and cousin's storytelling during the war. In both texts, telling stories of the past unifies characters, gives the past an immediacy as it is recalled, and affords people and events of the past an element of immortality (as long as the dead are remembered, they are symbolically alive).

Importantly, some of Faulkner's and Hemingway's primary sources of history are strong-willed (and short-haired) women who also act as mother figures: Rosa Millard and Drusilla Hawk share with Bayard news of his father and of other key events, while Pilar shares with Jordan, Maria, and others her experiences with (among other events) Pablo's brutality toward fascists and with Finito de Palencia, a bullfighter with whom she had a relationship. Bayard also learns a great deal from his father early in *The Unvanquished*, and Jordan remembers his grandfather telling him about life before and after the Civil War. As such, family is important to each plot—Faulkner chronicles the extended Sartoris family's wartime experiences, while Hemingway has Jordan invoke his grandfather and father when musing upon, respectively, the presence and absence of courage. (Jordan's father, like Clarence Hemingway, was a suicide, a fact that troubled the character as well as his creator.) This familial element takes on added significance in Hemingway's case, as storytelling enables a group of unrelated characters to form a symbolic family, as this conversation between Joaquín, Pilar, Jordan, and Maria illustrates:

“That is as a brother,” Maria said to him. “I kiss thee as a brother.”

The boy shook his head, crying without making any noise.

“I am thy sister,” Maria said. “And I love thee and thou hast a family. We are all thy family.”

“Including the *Inglés*,” boomed Pilar. “Isn't it true, *Inglés*?”

“Yes,” Robert Jordan said to the boy, “we are all thy family, Joaquín.”<sup>11</sup>

Joaquín has just told them about how some of his relatives were killed, and his act of storytelling fosters a familial bond between himself, his fellow countrywomen, and an American college professor. This familial structure is another similarity between *The Unvanquished* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Talking about the past—be it personal or national—is integral to each book, as it solidifies the Sartoris-Millard-Hawk contingent in *The Unvanquished* and creates a figurative family unit in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. This familial structure echoes that in *The Unvanquished* and, in turn, suggests more of Faulkner's influence on the novel. Many of Faulkner's families bonded through storytelling, and Faulkner seems to have guided Hemingway in this direction, since little of Hemingway's prior fiction depicted such a strong familial element. In contrast, Hemingway's past individualistic characters—Jake Barnes, Nick Adams, Harry Morgan—were largely missing any substantial family relationship, unlike Faulkner's family-

centric texts (though these were not without any tense divisions between family members, particularly the Compsons). In a significant sense, Faulkner had set an artistic example for Hemingway where family dynamics are concerned. Taken together, this grouping of characters serves the same function in each book—to share detailed stories of the past as a means to unify a group of combatants and noncombatants against a common foe during a time of civil war.

This parallelism pinpoints the importance of familial connections in both texts. Bayard and Jordan can claim an ancestral connection to war generally and to the American Civil War in particular. For Bayard, his father is Colonel John Sartoris, a noteworthy leader of an irregular cavalry defending the South from the invasion of Union forces (as was the case with Faulkner's own great-grandfather, William Clark Falkner). His grandmother and cousin also take on pivotal roles in the text as, respectively, civilian and soldier: Rosa daringly takes back captured animals and personal property from Federal troops in a complicated con game, while Drusilla eventually rides with the Colonel's cavalry and proves her mettle in battle. Thus, the three most important adults in Bayard's life are all players in the drama unfolding before his adolescent eyes.

For Jordan, his grandfather was a member of Union cavalry (as was the case with Hemingway's grandfather, Anson Hemingway, a Union officer). Further, Jordan himself embodies the courage and combat bravado with which he associates his grandfather. He recognizes that his grandfather had an important role in American history, and he, in turn, tries to play an equally important role in Spanish history. Both Faulkner and Hemingway had personal connections to the Civil War through a grandfather or a great-grandfather figure in ways similar to those of their male protagonists, and each author wrote about a war that was important to his ancestry as well as to his nationality, thus contextualizing his personal life, narrative, and characters in the larger schema of American history.

Within these contextualized historical narratives, Faulkner and Hemingway fuse textual components (such as character, theme, and the use of stories-within-stories/-novel) with the primary plot in an interdependent relationship: one cannot be understood adequately without considering the other. Throughout both *The Unvanquished* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, we see how the experience of war and the telling of history are interconnected. For instance, consider Bayard's stance on what he terms "war-telling": "Because wars are wars: the same exploding powder where there was powder, the same thrust and parry of iron when there was not—one tale, one telling, the same as the next or the one before."<sup>12</sup> As one sees in other Faulkner texts—such as *Sartoris* (1929) or *Absalom, Absalom!* (1936)—storytelling is a key component of the war experience and vice-versa; wars are shared, remembered, and relived through memories and tales. Narrating

several episodes of his youth, Bayard realizes that he must remember the national past and the war that was such an important part of his personal maturation; the “war-telling” unifies him with his fellow Southerners and helps him understand his nation’s history.

Jordan comes to a similar conclusion after hearing Joaquín, one of El Sordo’s men, recount how his father, mother, sister, and brother-in-law were killed in a raid by fascist forces in the town of Valladolid. Hemingway again puts us inside Jordan’s head:

How many times had he heard this? How many times had he watched people say it with difficulty? How many times had he seen their eyes fill and their throats harden with the difficulty of saying my father, or my brother, or my mother, or my sister? He could not remember how many times he had heard them mention the dead in this way. Nearly always they spoke as this boy did now; suddenly and apropos of the mention of the town and always you said, “What barbarians.”

You only heard the statement of the loss.<sup>13</sup>

Having heard countless stories of wartime atrocities, Jordan imagines all such stories blurring together into a single story of “loss”—in the same way that Bayard sees war stories as comprising “one tale, one telling,” essentially all the same (though no less meaningful) after a while.

We can read these ideas that both Faulkner and Hemingway express as a parallel commentary on the importance of storytelling vis-à-vis war. Both Bayard and Jordan understand the general experience of their respective civil wars through the stories they hear of destruction, death, and heroism. That both texts contain numerous sub-stories about particular people and events exemplifies the ways in which the past is crucial to the events of the present in each book. Hearing about specific heroes, heroines, and victims by name prevents both Bayard and Jordan from generalizing about their respective wars. They are told about, for instance, Drusilla, Pilar, and Joaquín; for both Bayard and Jordan, stories help them see war from a personal, concrete perspective. Because there are numerous episodes of storytelling in each book, both Faulkner and Hemingway suggest that talking about the past allows one to understand both the past and the war-ravaged present. Such parallelism between *The Unvanquished* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* ultimately shows a strong linkage between Faulkner and Hemingway at the textual level. Faulkner’s and Hemingway’s fusion of storytelling and war

evinces a shared—though competing—perspective on the relationship between war and writing.

Through their exposure to shared stories and memories, Bayard and Jordan form a personal connection to events of enormous historical significance. Both men are transported, in a sense, into the stories they hear; as such, Faulkner and Hemingway intertwine past and present in ways that were typical of Faulkner but atypical of Hemingway. Bayard's cousin Drusilla tells stories from a perspective of firsthand experience in "Raid," the collection's third story. As Bayard arrives at Hawkhurst, Drusilla's family estate, he, Ringo, and Rosa are greeted with a host of stories—about the death of Drusilla's fiancée at Shiloh, the mass exodus of slaves trying to cross the Mississippi River, and the destruction of the railroad that is adjacent to Hawkhurst. Drusilla's mother and younger brother supply bits and pieces of information, but Drusilla herself soon assumes the role of chief speaker/historian. She tells Bayard and Ringo—both of whom are in awe of railroads—about a train stolen by Confederate irregular forces prior to the destruction of the train tracks:

We saw it, we were there, as if Drusilla's voice had transported us to the wandering light-ray of space in which was still held the furious shadow—the brief section of track which existed inside the scope of a single pair of eyes and nowhere else, coming from nowhere and having, needing, no destination, the engine not coming into view but arrested in human sight in thunderous yet dreamy fury, lonely, inviolate and forlorn, wailing through its whistle precious steam [...] the flaring and streaming smoke stack, the tossing bell, the starred Saint Andrew's cross nailed to the cab roof, the wheels and the flashing driving rods on which the brass fittings glinted like the golden spurs themselves—then gone, vanished. Only not gone or vanished either, so long as there should be defeated or the descendants of defeated to tell it or listen to the telling.<sup>14</sup>

While not there at the time, Bayard can describe this fast-moving train as if it was his "single pair of eyes" that watched it pass, not Drusilla's—he shares details of the cab ("brass fittings," "flaring and streaming smoke stack") because these are the same details that Drusilla shared with him. Bayard—like Faulkner himself—is one of "the descendants of defeated" to pass along the story and, thus, preserve it in writing for prosperity.

As Drusilla assumes her role as a source of history for Bayard and Ringo, so Colonel Sartoris and Rosa Millard, collectively, serve a similar function in “Ambuscade,” the opening story. Bayard recalls how he and Ringo would eavesdrop on the Colonel’s conversations with Rosa and get wind of the happenings of the war. Thinking generally about his father and grandmother as a repository of history, Bayard recalls various stories that he and Ringo heard from the Colonel:

Then we listened. We heard: the names—Forrest and Morgan and Barksdale and Van Dorn; the words like Gap and Run which we didn’t have in Mississippi even though we did own Barksdale, and Van Dorn until somebody’s husband killed him, and one day General Forrest rode down South Street in Oxford where there watched him through a window pane a young girl who scratched her name on it with a diamond ring: Celia Cook.

But we were just twelve; we didn’t listen to that. What Ringo and I heard was the cannon and the flags and the anonymous yelling. That’s what we intended to hear tonight.<sup>15</sup>

As was also the case with Drusilla’s stories, Faulkner stresses sensory details as Bayard imaginatively sees and hears the events that his father describes. Major Confederate figures such as Nathan Bedford Forrest and John Hunt Morgan, as well as the Oxford legend about Celia Cook,<sup>16</sup> are a part of the Colonel’s storytelling because the Colonel himself is a key player in the War. As is probably typical of twelve-year-old boys, Bayard and Ringo only want to hear about fighting and combat heroics, not tales of love in war. Faulkner again—just as Hemingway would also do in his novel—calls our attention to sensory imagery, because Bayard and Ringo do not just hear the story but “the cannon and the flags and the anonymous yelling” as well, as if they are not adolescent boys but members of the Colonel’s cavalry.

Seemingly inspired, in part, by Faulkner’s clear storytelling imagery, Hemingway frequently focuses upon Pilar’s ability to tell stories and to immerse her listeners in her tales. Jordan, after hearing Pilar tell him and Maria of a public massacre of fascists at the hands of Pablo’s guerillas, comments on the sense of proximity to the events that Pilar’s detailed storytelling brings about:

Pilar had made him see it in that town.

If that woman could only write. He would try to write it and if he had luck and could remember it perhaps he could

get it down as she told it. God, how she could tell a story. She's better than Quevedo, he thought. He never wrote the death of any Don Faustino as well as she told it. I wish I could write well enough to write that story, he thought. What we did. Not what the others did to us. He knew enough about that. He knew plenty about that behind the lines. But you had to have known the people before. You had to know what they had been in the village.

[...]

But you were always gone when it happened. The *partizans* did their damage and pulled out. The peasants stayed and took the punishment. I've always known about the other, he thought. What we did to them at the start. I've always known it and I have heard it mentioned shamelessly and shamefully, bragged of, boasted of, defended, explained and denied. But that damned woman made me see it as though I had been there.<sup>17</sup>

Just like Bayard, Jordan vividly imagines events and details that he himself did not experience directly. Although Jordan was not in the town and thus lacks the firsthand experience that Pilar has, he essentially understands this massacre as if he had seen it himself. Jordan knows the details of this event—bloodied bodies, drunken behavior, the dying words of the fascists before they are thrown off a cliff—because of the sensory and emotional clarity of Pilar's story. Pilar "made him see it" through her narration because she is the voice of experience; she has seen similar instances of Pablo's cruelty, as well as a host of other related occurrences before and during the war. While not the narrator or even Hemingway's protagonist, Pilar is the novel's primary historian and, consequently, its voice of authority. In this capacity, she conveys to Jordan and the others an understanding of the recent past, a role similar to that portrayed by Faulkner two years earlier with Drusilla, Colonel Sartoris, and Rosa—Faulkner's use of storytelling also left a considerable mark on Hemingway's novel, as Hemingway had not before relied so much on storytelling to propel and frame his narratives.

Drusilla and Pilar, the characters who most often tell stories to other characters, convey to their audiences a sense of immediacy through clear sensory details. Moreover, both Faulkner and Hemingway devote substantial space in their texts to sub-stories, thus weaving the major and minor plotlines and showing the significance of memory for their protagonists. In fact, Hemingway includes several stories within the novel proper in Pilar's voice as a way to further illustrate her

importance as a source of history. Hemingway allows her to speak in her own voice, rather than have her tales paraphrased by Jordan. Faulkner does the same, effectively integrating Drusilla's voice with Bayard's retrospection. Though neither woman is the narrator, their narrative voices are heard in concert with the primary narrators of each book; figuratively, then, we can see them as secondary narrators.

More generally, Faulkner's and Hemingway's characters exhibit many similarities, the most important of which is that strong, confident women are at the center of each text and of each text's version of history. There are other parallels in characterization and plot, though. For one, both *The Unvanquished* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* focus on guerilla warfare during a civil war—in each book, we read about clandestine operations behind enemy lines, equipment and animals (mules or horses) stolen from the enemy, the destruction of a strategically important railroad, and the displacement and death of countless civilians.

Also, both texts have short-haired, strong women at the center of the action. Drusilla cuts her hair and dons a Confederate uniform when riding with Colonel Sartoris's irregular cavalry, while Maria's head was shaved when she was captured and raped by Fascist forces, which details she relates to Jordan when telling him her story. In addition to being a courageous cavalrywoman, Drusilla is also a link to the past, as she enables Bayard to feel a connection to his deceased father. As Bayard ponders in "An Odor of Verbena," after his father's murder,

But I didn't need to see him again because he was there, he would always be there; maybe what Drusilla meant by his dream was not something which he possessed but something which he had bequeathed us which we could never forget, which would assume the corporeal shape of him whenever any of us, black or white, closed our eyes.<sup>18</sup>

Memory thus grants the murdered Colonel a symbolic sort of afterlife; "he would always be there," his son realizes, as long as there are stories told about him.

While she is not as resolute or involved in combat as Drusilla, Maria serves a similar function as a source of history and of memory for Hemingway. As Jordan is dying, he tells Maria to go on with Pilar and the others: "Thou wilt go now, rabbit. But I go with thee. As long as there is one of us there is both of us. Do you understand?"<sup>19</sup> Jordan assumes an analogous type of symbolic life-after-death as Colonel Sartoris. In the same way that Catherine was imaginatively alive for Frederic at the poignant end of *A Farewell to Arms*, Jordan will symbolically evade

death as long as Maria remembers him and their relationship. Significantly, both Drusilla and Maria help make memory tantamount to immortality.

Another similarity at the level of characterization is internal dissension and cowardice that leads—either directly or indirectly—to a major character's death. In *The Unvanquished*, both Rosa Millard and Colonel Sartoris are killed by business partners—Rosa is set up by the craven Abner Snopes and eventually murdered by Grumby, both of whom had teamed up with Rosa to con the Federal Army out of horses and materiel; the Colonel is killed by Redmond, a former business partner who favored enfranchising freed slaves. (The parallel between the deaths of Colonel Sartoris and Faulkner's own great-grandfather is not coincidental; Faulkner based Colonel Sartoris on Colonel W. C. Falkner, who met a similar fate.) In *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Hemingway repeatedly shows us Pablo's cowardice and self-doubt as he questions his involvement in the war. Pablo, it can be argued, is indirectly responsible for the deaths of both Anselmo and Jordan. In an episode showing Pablo's fear, we see how he steals and then disposes of the detonators with which Jordan was going to blow up the bridge. As a result, Jordan and Anselmo take longer than necessary to affix explosives to the bridge, which in turn puts them into contact with Fascist forces when, according to their plan, they would have been making their escape. Anselmo is impaled by a steel beam, and Jordan badly injures his leg while trying to join Maria, Pilar, and Pablo. Although Pablo does not murder either Anselmo or Jordan, he is to blame to a degree, because he makes Jordan alter his plan and consequently delays their escape. While the deaths of Rosa Millard and Colonel Sartoris are avenged by Bayard, the deaths of Anselmo and Jordan are not avenged, at least by the novel's end. Perhaps Maria or Pilar will give Pablo his due, but we can never know with certainty—the novel ends with Jordan on the verge of death.

Moreover, as Jordan is on the verge of death at book's end, Hemingway leaves the reader with the sense that Jordan dies courageous and undefeated—or “unvanquished,” to use a more suggestive word. Dying with a compound fracture to his femur and, presumably, in excruciating pain, Jordan is as stoical and focused on military strategy as ever. He keeps his worries to himself while encouraging the others to escape and telling Maria that he will be with her in memory long after she leaves him. His final gesture is even performed with the war effort in mind: as he awaits a Fascist patrol looking for survivors, he is ready to engage them in a firefight and literally to go down fighting. Importantly, Hemingway does not conclude the novel with Jordan's death; rather, our last image is of Jordan waiting for Lieutenant Berrendo to come within range of his submachine gun. Faulkner depicts similar stoicism and purposefulness in all of his characters—Drusilla stands up to Union cavalry to save her horse from being stolen, and Rosa Millard

confronts Union officers and swindles them out of hundreds of mules and horses, to name only two situations. In a collection of stories entitled *The Unvanquished*, several characters exude courage and bravado in the face of a more numerous and ultimately victorious foe. Both Jordan and Faulkner's characters exhibit, in Hemingway's famous words, "grace under pressure"; they are defeated practically but not metaphorically.

Besides equivalencies in characterization, both *The Unvanquished* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* incorporate comparable imagery, further linking Faulkner and Hemingway in this cross-textual chain of psycho-competitive influence. As is the case in virtually all of Faulkner's and Hemingway's fiction, nature is a crucial element in each text. Characters in both books revere the landscape on which the civil war is being fought. Faulkner's text opens with an image in which humans, nature, and the Civil War are unified. Bayard and Ringo play with what Bayard calls their "living map" of Vicksburg, Mississippi: piles of wood chips meant to stand for the city, which was under siege until July 4, 1863, the time that the story opens.<sup>20</sup> The boys, too young to be involved in combat, become imaginative players in history by means of the earth that they have dug up and also their game (in which they take turns acting out the roles of Ulysses S. Grant and John Pemberton). This linkage between people and land takes on added significance in "Retreat." As Bayard, Ringo, and Rosa make their way to Hawkhurst, Ringo pockets a handful of dirt and Bayard immediately remembers that he, too, has a snuff box filled with dirt from his family plantation. As he and Ringo trade some of the Sartoris earth for a Union saddle buckle, Bayard ponders the rich symbolism of the Mississippi soil, a symbolism that is present in much of Faulkner's oeuvre:

So I took the snuff box from my pocket and emptied half the soil (it was more than Sartoris earth; it was Vicksburg, too: the yelling was in it, the embattled, the iron-worn, the supremely invincible) into his hand. "I know hit," he said. "Hit come from hind the smokehouse. You brung a lot of hit." (55)

Again, characters, land, and history intersect, because the soil symbolically embodies Vicksburg (which had just fallen) and the "yelling" and unvanquished attitude with which the besieged city was associated. Literally as well as symbolically, Bayard always has a piece of the South with him—both in a snuff box and in his mind, regardless of the South's looming defeat.

Hemingway also layers landscape, characters, and the historical significance of a civil war at the beginning and end of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Both the

novel's opening and closing images are identical—Jordan lying down on his stomach on the forest's pine-needled floor and thinking about the war effort. What differentiates these images is, of course, Jordan's health; as the novel ends, he is down on the forest floor waiting for the Nationalist troops who are fast approaching him and will most likely kill him. He symbolically communes with the natural world through physical contact, in the same way that Bayard and Ringo did. As Hemingway concludes,

Robert Jordan saw them there on the slope, close to him now, and below he saw the road and the bridge and the long lines of vehicles below it. He was completely integrated now and he took a good long look at everything. Then he looked up at the sky. There were big white clouds in it. He touched the palm of his hand against the pine needles where he lay and he touched the bark of the pine trunk that he lay behind.

[...]

Robert Jordan lay behind the tree, holding onto himself very carefully and delicately to keep his hands steady. He was waiting until the officer reached the sunlit place where the first trees of the pine forest joined the green slope of the meadow. He could feel his heart beating against the pine needle floor of the forest.<sup>21</sup>

As Nick Adams had done in “Big Two-Hearted River” (1925), Jordan bonds physically with the natural world. He touches both the forest floor and the tree to steady himself before opening fire, and his heart figuratively touches the ground. The pine-needled forest floor is, factually and emblematically, the foundation of the novel's primary action: it is on this ground where Jordan and Maria make love and where the climactic battle takes place; our first and last view of Jordan is of him prone on the ground; and, many of Jordan's fellow guerillas frequently profess their love for “the Spanish earth” (to borrow from the film's title). Hemingway interwove land and war before—*A Farewell to Arms* is rife with descriptions of the Italian landscape, and “Big Two-Hearted River” shows us nature as a therapeutic tool in which the traumatized Nick Adams recovers from his wartime experiences. *For Whom the Bell Tolls* depicts a different war, but the importance of the natural world is still abundantly clear.

In addition to similar usage of nature as a symbol, Faulkner and Hemingway share a nearly identical image of a dead body on display. At the end of “Vendée,” Bayard and Ringo return to Jefferson after exacting revenge on Grumby, the

man who killed Rosa Millard. Having attached his dead body to the door of a cotton compress, they nail his right hand to the wooden marker of Rosa's grave as proof of their courage. Here, Bayard lives up to the Sartoris name by acting courageously and avenging his grandmother's murder; as Buck McCaslin proudly announces, "Ain't I told you he is John Sartoris' boy? Hey? Ain't I told you?"<sup>22</sup>

A variation on this image resurfaces in Hemingway's book. Toward the beginning of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Anselmo tells Jordan how he killed a bear and nailed its paw to a church door.<sup>23</sup> Though the appendage here is a bear paw and not a human hand, the parallel imagery is nonetheless telling. As Jordan and Anselmo discuss hunting both animals and human enemies—Jordan disdains killing the former, Anselmo the latter—Anselmo describes the wolf hides, ibex horns, and a stuffed eagle in his home, before recalling a bear that he killed:

"On the door of the church of my village was nailed the paw of a bear that I killed in the spring, finding him on a hillside in the snow, overturning a log with this same paw."

"When was this?"

"Six years ago. And every time I saw that paw, like the hand of a man, but with those long claws, dried and nailed through the palm to the door of the church, I received a pleasure."

[...]

"[...] Yet the hand of a man is like the paw of a bear."

"So is the chest of a man like the chest of a bear," Robert Jordan said. "With the hide removed from the bear, there are many similarities in the muscles."<sup>24</sup>

The two men's discussion of the similarities between human and ursine body structure (and the image of the paw itself) echoes Faulkner's image of a severed hand. Both are nailed to a piece of wood, on public display and elicit a degree of "pleasure," and come from a body that was hunted down and killed by a major character. We can even note that both severed appendages are connected to religious symbols—the paw to a church door, Grumby's hand to Rosa's grave.

While this image is one of several correspondences between *The Unvanquished* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Hemingway was not making a direct reference to Faulkner. A letter that Hemingway wrote to John Dos Passos on June 26, 1931, reveals that Faulkner was not the primary source of this image. As Hemingway wrote after traveling through Spain, "Barco de Avila is wonderful town—Killed a wolf there while we were there—Bear paw nailed to door of church—good trout [...]"<sup>25</sup> As we can see, Hemingway's hunting experiences in Spain prefaced

Anselmo's—both killed a wolf and saw a severed bear paw nailed to a church door. The imagistic connection between *The Unvanquished* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, however, is still resonant. Reading the story in conjunction with the novel, one cannot help noting a strong connection at the level of imagery and of characterization. I find it remarkable that both Faulkner and Hemingway were moved by and then utilized a similar image in books about two different wars; at times, Faulkner and Hemingway were of the same artistic mind, their competition with and criticisms of each other notwithstanding. Hunting was yet another common theme for these Modernist rivals and, in a sense, war and hunting are fused here: both Grumby and the bear of which Anselmo speaks are hunted, killed, and put on display. Hemingway's version of this image lacks the element of revenge that fueled Bayard and Ringo's quest for Grumby, yet the end result is virtually the same.

Is it just a coincidence that they wrote about a civil war to which they had a personal connection, or that their characters engage in guerilla combat and have a strong appreciation for the natural world? Furthermore, why would Hemingway make some of his characters—Jordan and Pilar in particular—talk and think as much as some of Faulkner's characters? And, consequently, why is Hemingway overly concerned with history in this novel in ways that he was not in other fiction and in ways that Faulkner almost always was?<sup>26</sup>

As a result of Faulkner and Hemingway's competitive exchange, *The Unvanquished* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* exhibit many similarities and influences. Psychologically, each man was always driven to eclipse the other; artistically, each man consciously and unconsciously echoed his counterpart in choices of theme, character, and structure while manifesting Harold Bloom's sense of the anxiety of influence. Faulkner and Hemingway always pushed each other to innovate and take chances in their fiction. Hemingway seems to have been inspired by Faulkner to take risks in his writing; using such interiority and flashbacks was a way for Hemingway to take "all chances" in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, perhaps more "chances" than Faulkner took in *The Unvanquished*. If "taking all chances" in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* meant writing like Faulkner, and if Hemingway wanted to overtake Faulkner, then he would sometimes have to aspire to Faulknerian standards, despite the fact that doing so made his Spanish Civil War novel resemble his competitor's work. One could even argue that its stream of consciousness and storytelling actually strengthens the novel, as these techniques show Hemingway expanding his own aesthetic model. In this way, Faulkner and Hemingway sometimes unintentionally evinced their shared influence by simply having corresponding ideas, in this case about civil war, history, and storytelling.

The importance of knowing and remembering the past underscores each book, for Bayard, Jordan, and Pilar understand their respective situations because of their knowledge of history. Bayard sees the Civil War and Reconstruction as integral elements of his personal history in which he learned about courage, heroism, and death. Jordan understands his own involvement in the Spanish Civil War, in part, because of the example set by his grandfather in the American Civil War. Pilar, the voice of experience, disseminates her knowledge of the past to her fellow Loyalist guerillas to impress upon them what is at stake for them as well as the barbarity of which both their enemies and allies were capable. Neither *The Unvanquished* nor *For Whom the Bell Tolls* are about their particular civil wars as such, because both texts draw upon the past as a means of comprehending a war-torn present—more historiographical than historical, in the sense that both books call attention to how the past is remembered and historicized. What such an awareness of history reveals to character and reader alike are the ways in which Faulkner's and Hemingway's civil wars became "one tale, one telling" in which "You only heard the statement of the loss." Despite the ongoing rivalry between their authors—a rivalry that would become especially heated in the late 1940s and early 1950s—*The Unvanquished* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* can be read as companion pieces on the fictional representation and historicization of civil war.

Unlike Hemingway, Faulkner was not in Madrid with his mistress Martha Gellhorn while that city was routinely shelled, and he did not see countless young Spaniards die in combat. Unlike Faulkner, Hemingway did not grow up in a society that was still, in a sense, fighting a war that it lost in April 1865, nor was his great-grandfather a legendary figure to some Mississippians with a self-designed statue in Ripley, Mississippi. The war of the 1860s was tightly woven into the fabric of Faulkner's Yoknapatawpha County, while the war of the late 1930s was a source for several of Hemingway's fictional and nonfictional projects. Both wars were deeply personal for each man, and their corresponding works about these two wars separated by some eight decades are an intertextual connection that indicates how very conscious of each other Faulkner and Hemingway were during, before, and after the 1930s and how their textual parallels reflect this strong competitive awareness.

These two books can also direct us to consider numerous textual linkages—among others, their hunting texts (in particular *The Bear* [1942] and *The Garden of Eden* [1986]), the call-and-response dynamic between Hemingway's *Death in the Afternoon* and Faulkner's *If I Forget Thee, Jerusalem*, and their numerous letters to third parties in which they often and eagerly passed judgment on each other. In the scheme of this longstanding dynamic, the clear-cut parallels between *The Unvanquished* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls* reflect Faulkner and Hemingway's

competitive knowledge of each other, not only in the 1930s but also throughout their respective careers. Juxtaposing much of their work shows the reader how often both authors alluded to, critiqued, and praised each other. In the midst of this sharp mutual awareness and shared influence, Faulkner and Hemingway would continue to explore and define their vision of American Modernism in the 1940s and 1950s; despite their personal and stylistic differences, their warring artistic visions shared some common ground regarding, among other things, civil war.

### Notes

1. Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. (Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 99.
2. In *Death in the Afternoon*, Hemingway took Faulkner to task for his vast productivity and “prolific” nature. Faulkner fired back in each of *If I Forget Thee, Jerusalem*’s two stories: “The Wild Palms” recasts much of Hemingway’s work in Faulknerian form, while “Old Man” refers to the main character as a *matador* and his subservient backwoods companions as *aficionados*. In short, each story of *If I Forget Thee, Jerusalem* symbolizes Hemingway and Faulkner, respectively, and the allusion to Hemingway in “Old Man” implies—part-jokingly, part-seriously—Faulkner’s artistic superiority to Hemingway, as one cannot write *matador* and *aficionados* without calling Hemingway’s *The Sun Also Rises* (1926), *Death in the Afternoon*, and physically-active masculine persona to mind—Faulkner, as well as his readers, undoubtedly knew this.

In their Nobel Prize Addresses (Faulkner, 1950; Hemingway, 1954), they continued their war of words. Faulkner’s speech rebuts the famous passage of *A Farewell to Arms* (1929) in which Frederic Henry muses on the unimportance of “abstract” concepts such as *honor, courage, glory, and sacrifice*. Essentially riffing on Hemingway to articulate his own (superior, he thought) artistic model, Faulkner asserted the importance and literary value of these same words for he himself and for future writers. In his speech, Hemingway contrasted his own simple, non-rhetorical speechmaking with Faulkner’s highly rhetorical oratory; he also implied that his limited, yet focused artistic vision was superior to Faulkner’s vast, all-inclusive vision.

3. Bloom, xxiv.
4. As a corollary, both men shared the same ideological side of the Spanish Civil War. Hemingway tried to raise money for the Loyalist cause, covered the war in Spain as a journalist from the Loyalist side, and narrated (and helped fund) a film, *The Spanish Earth*, the proceeds of which were to benefit the Loyalist cause. Faulkner, though he remained in America during the war, nonetheless voiced his opposition to the war in a letter to the President of the League of American Writers (see *Essays, Speeches, and Public Letters* [New York: Random House, 1965]). Only Hemingway, though, experienced and wrote fiction about the war (four short stories, a play, and one novel). Generally speaking, neither man was overly political in his fiction, yet both felt that the situation in Spain warranted some form of public statement.
5. Hemingway, *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995), p. 161–62.
6. Hemingway did this, to a lesser degree, with Jake Barnes in *The Sun Also Rises* and Frederic Henry in *A Farewell to Arms*, but doing so to a character who was not his narrator was unusual for him. Hemingway did use a third-person omniscient narrator in “The Snows of Kilimanjaro” (1936) as we share the dying Harry’s thoughts of his past; most likely, using third-person omniscience in the story was a warm-up for doing so in the novel.

7. Because of the high degree to which we are inside his head, Jordan was probably Hemingway's most complete character up to this point. Santiago of *The Old Man and the Sea* is equally as complete, possibly more so.
8. Carlos Baker, ed., *Ernest Hemingway: Selected Letters, 1917–1961*. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1981), p. 624.
9. *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, p. 233.
10. This letter is part of the Hemingway Collection at the John F. Kennedy Library in Boston, Massachusetts. I thank them for twice permitting me to conduct research in their archive in August 2002 and June 2004.
11. *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, p. 139.
12. Faulkner, *The Unvanquished* (New York: Vintage, 1991.), p. 94–95.
13. *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, p. 134.
14. *The Unvanquished*, p. 98.
15. *The Unvanquished*, p. 15.
16. On this Mississippi legend, see James Hinkle and Robert McCoy, eds., *Reading Faulkner: The Unvanquished* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1995), p. 34. Cook, daughter of Oxford's jailor, scratched her name on the jailhouse's window as Forrest's cavalry retreated from Oxford. As legend has it, Forrest's son noticed Cook, and returned to Oxford in 1865 with the intention of marrying her, which he did soon thereafter.
17. *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, p. 134–35.
18. *The Unvanquished*, p. 253.
19. *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, p. 463.
20. *The Unvanquished*, p. 3.
21. *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, p. 471.
22. *The Unvanquished*, p. 186.
23. John Howell, in "Hemingway, Faulkner, and 'The Bear'" (*American Literature* 52, 1980), has noted another correlation between *For Whom the Bell Tolls* and Faulkner's *The Bear*—in the latter, the dried paw of Old Ben, the long-hunted bear, is nailed to the grave of Sam Fathers, Indian guide and hunting mentor to Isaac McCaslin. Howell does not discuss this similarity between *The Unvanquished* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Interestingly, the volleying of this image continued two years after *For Whom the Bell Tolls* in *The Bear* (where the paw of Old Ben is buried in Sam Fathers's grave).
24. *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, p. 39–40.
25. *Ernest Hemingway: Selected Letters*, p. 342.
26. See Michael Reynolds, *Hemingway: The 1930s* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1998.), p. 312. Hemingway was probably familiar with *The Unvanquished*—it was in his library at Finca Vigía (his home in Cuba) when he started *For Whom the Bell Tolls* in February 1939, and some of its stories had been published previously in periodicals.

**JOSEPH FRUSCIONE** received his Ph.D. in American Literature from The George Washington University in August 2005, where he has been teaching Introductory American Literature and Freshman Composition since Fall 1999. His dissertation examined the rivalry and anxiety of influence between William Faulkner and Ernest Hemingway, excerpts from which he has presented at several conferences. His other scholarly interests include Herman Melville, Richard Wright, Ralph Ellison, and Film (Theory; Adaptations).