Maybe what prompted Hemingway to write the novels of this phase was simply his need to keep rank as one of America’s foremost novelists, some years having elapsed since *A Farewell to Arms* was published. Maybe he was answering the call for fiction with a social theme. Morgan’s dying words and Jordan’s actions and beliefs heed it. Maybe Hemingway was trying to refute the charge that he was a Johnny-one-note. Any truth in it would be overwhelmed by the ancient literary modes orchestrating *To Have and Have Not* and *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. Maybe Hemingway was hoping to restore for modern readers those classic modes of tragedy and epic, just as he had hoped to restore the esthetic dimension of spectator sports and hunting. Maybe his concern with esthetics in those two nonfiction books prodded him to pursue esthetics in a disciplined way in these two novels. Aristotle’s *Poetics* is not an unlikely starting place for an autodidact like Hemingway. Its interest in discerning those elements of a literary work that yield its distinct pleasures, after all, would appeal to him, and because he loves concealing, omitting things, he would enjoy putting to use knowledge that few readers or acquaintances would suspect he had. Perhaps Hemingway’s remark about studying Cézanne applies to Aristotle as well: “I was learning very much from him but I was not articulate enough to explain it to anyone. Besides, it was a secret” (*Feast*, 13). Or perhaps Hemingway’s interest in the rules, codes, strategies, and techniques of sports and war led him to spend time acquainting himself with some of the older rules, formulas, and conventions of the craft by which he earned his living.

Maybe what prompted the two novels of this phase was Hemingway’s fear that his artistic vision and imagination had gone
dry. To discover him using old literary conventions should cer­tainly also see his adventurousness. But it can also find him re­sorting to those conventions to charge his imagination, to get his own creative juices pumping. If one of Hemingway’s perennial problems was that he was better endowed to write short stories than novels—a fine sprinter but no long-distance runner—then the criteria of tragedy and the epic would set a task big enough to require a novel-length effort. And if Hemingway did not have that problem, then his use of those older literary modes still asks whether these two novels were internally or externally inspired, whether they are original or derivative works, whether they are organic or mechanical. To me the latter term in each pair seems the more likely answer, especially when I ask myself whether Morgan and Jordan are human beings on whom Hemingway has lavished detail and attention because of their intrinsic worth or whether they are characters subservient to a formula, cogs in some intricate literary machinery.

My maybes may answer why Hemingway wrote the novels of this phase. But I find more compelling the answer that Heming­way was driven to express in them a specific form of his fixation on his father. Deeply wounded by his father’s suicide on that Thursday morning of 6 December 1928, Hemingway here tries to exorcize his preoccupation with it by assigning it to Robert Jordan, perhaps still believing that “‘you’ll lose it if you talk about it’” (Sun Rises, 245). But even more, Hemingway’s anger at his father’s weakness erupts in these novels’ strong parricidal wishes. At the same time, those wishes are offset by the fraternal impulses of Harry Morgan and Robert Jordan, impulses that reveal an equally strong wish to save the father-as-brother. The marked ambivalence in this pattern of desiring both the death and the rescue of the father correlates with Hemingway’s feelings about his father during this period.¹

Whether the tragic protagonists are Oedipus, Antigone, Ham­let, or Macbeth, their recurrent adversary is the father, displaced though he may be as stepfather, uncle, or king. Harry Morgan’s father, of course, is never mentioned in To Have and Have Not. But he is present, however fragmented and displaced, in his treach­erous acts. He guns down three young Cubans, defaults on the money he owes a fisherman, and betrays a dozen of his racial kinsmen. Mr. Sing, Harry’s literal victim, succinctly typifies the terrible father, acting out the treachery of Johnson and the Cu-
bans' two assailants. By slaying Sing, Harry avenges the wrongs a "father" has done him, the three young men and the other twelve "sons," the trusting Chinese. He also avenges the wrong done the third parties of the perennial triangle—mothers, wives, and daughters—be they the Cubans', the Chinese's or Harry's.

Harry's specific adversaries, Johnson and Sing, however, are proxies for an even more treacherous father, the political system. It makes have-nots of Harry and his fellow dregs, have of people who sell for a dollar a pint something that costs them only three cents per quart (240). A capitalistic system that permits such economic inequities becomes the unjust father whose authority lets him tyrannize over his weak or malcontent sons. Denying that he is a radical, Harry nonetheless admits that he has been sore at the government for a long time, adding that it is trying to starve out the conchs, burn down their shacks, and build apartments to make it a tourist town (96–97). Cynically defining the government's attitude toward the vets, Nelson Jacks declares that President Hoover forced them out of Anticosti flats and President Roosevelt shipped them to the keys to get rid of them "because we are the desperate ones. The ones with nothing to lose. We are the completely brutalized ones' " (206). Jacks's Communist convictions and Harry's outlawry are like the revolutionaries' efforts to overthrow Cuba's dictatorship. All three express hostility toward the misconduct of government-as-father. Its arrogance is sketched in Frederick Harrison, one of the top men in the administration (80). Its ruthlessness is typified in the piratical sixty-year-old grain broker whose paternal greed, unrestrained by government policy, makes the many "sons" who compete with him commit suicide (237–38). Its castrating power is dramatized in the harm it inflicts upon the vets and Harry, costing him an arm and a boat.

Harry's hostility toward Eddy is a different matter. Witness to Harry's murder of Sing, Eddy gives Harry reason to kill him, a relatively useless, untrustworthy parasite who might blab or try to blackmail Harry. Part of the reason Harry does not kill him is that he knew him back when he was still a good man (43). Harry's considerateness is like his regard for deaf Frankie, whimpering Wesley, and wife-nagged Albert. And Harry's considerateness seems motivated by fellow feeling for his downtrodden brothers, by his apparent wish to help these feckless men regain some shred of dignity. But Harry's altruism is compensatory at best. That is, to compensate for his parricidal acts against the treacherous fa-
thers, he tries to rescue from complete degradation men who are no longer what they once were, who are, like Albert, browbeaten by their wives. But when the Cuban Roberto shoots Albert, Harry is not angry just at Roberto, another bullying father. Nor is he angry just at himself for failing to protect Albert. He is also angry at Albert for being so defenseless, so resourceless, so deficient, in effect, as a father.

The pattern here, then, is that parricidal wishes find their conventional outlet against treacherous, strong fathers, and an unconventional one against the fathers whose weakness is also treacherous because it betrays the traditional role of the self-sufficient, masterful male. Concealed behind a mask of fellow feeling, Harry wishes them dead too. Among them only Albert actually dies. But though Eddy is only threatened and Wesley only wounded, they unaccountably disappear from the novel, suggesting Hemingway’s wish to rid his world of them. Again, the novel seems to solicit pity for the brutalized vets and for those men Hemingway’s narrator numbers as suicides (237–38). But the tone of both sections is hostile, attuned to “the mess they [suicides] leave for relatives to clean up” (238). Little wonder that Harry wants to do things singlehandedly. He wants freedom from tyrannizing, weak, and suicidal fathers because they all stir up parricidal wishes in him.

Parricide notwithstanding, Harry also wants paternal understanding and approval. This motive partly explains his narration of part 1 of the novel. To whom does he tell the exploits of that section? Not just to any chum, any friendly listener, as I mentioned earlier. Rather to someone he trusts, whose regard he seeks. His wife, Marie, meets these criteria. But the last page of Harry’s narration discounts her as listener. He would not tell her what he said to her upon his return to Key West. The only character who deeply respects Harry is Captain Willie Adams. Surprised to see Harry’s boat after the night’s storm, he thinks, “So Harry crossed last night. That boy’s got cojones. He must have got that whole blow” (78). Captain Willie’s defiance of Frederick Harrison, his attempt to protect Harry, and his admiration of Harry as equal suggest that he may be the unidentified listener of part 1, the father figure who bestows understanding and approval upon Harry. But he too is weak, unable to safeguard Harry. And perhaps his disappearance from the novel in part 3 suggests Hemingway’s unconscious doubts about whether Captain Willie is a trustworthy or a treacherous father.
Because Hemingway faulted his father for being an authoritarian father, a weak husband, and a suicide, it is easy now to translate some of the unconscious origins of *To Have and Have Not*, rooted as they are in Hemingway's hostility toward all three traits. To vent that hostility could well prompt creating the novel's three kinds of bad fathers and, of course, Hemingway's wish to project himself into a tragic hero. But his regard for his father's positive traits—charity, responsibility, and self-discipline—may also explain Hemingway's sympathies in the Oedipal triangle of Professor MacWalsey, Richard, and Helen Gordon.

Hemingway's satiric treatment of Richard Gordon is consciously directed at contemporaries who write formulaic, social-protest novels. But unconsciously it is self-directed. The near-duplication of Jordan, Morgan, and Gordon's rhyming surnames might imply that idea, since all three are self-projections of Hemingway. But even more, Gordon's betrayal of his wife Helen and his adultery with Helene Bradley retrace Hemingway's betrayal of Hadley ten years earlier for the seductive wiles of Helene-like Pauline, "'that dirty rich bitch'" (186), as Helen calls her. Hemingway's regret shows up in the contempt he lets Wallace Johnston voice against Helene-Pauline—"'She represents everything I hate in a woman'" (229)—and in Gordon's recall of his afternoon with her. The reason Gordon-Hemingway leaves her bed is not, I suspect, fear of her supposedly impotent husband, but disgust for Helène and shame at being caught by a father figure "*standing heavy and bearded in the doorway*" (189). Hemingway projects his self-loathing upon Gordon by allowing Helene to slap and mock him: "'I thought you were a man of the world'" (190). Hemingway compounds his self-punishment by having Gordon unjustly slap Helen and take drunken punches at MacWalsey. Helen's fondness for MacWalsey is reciprocated, acknowledging Dr. Hemingway's fondness for his first daughter-in-law and his disappointment in the son who betrayed her. So to his guilt for marital wrongs Hemingway adds more for betraying his father, portrayed as he is partly by MacWalsey. Though no ideal, Helen respects him: "'He's a man. He's kind and he's charitable and he makes you feel comfortable and we come from the same things and we have values that you'll never have'" (187). Hemingway respects him too; so MacWalsey's paternal attempt to care for the stupid, belligerent Gordon seems an oblique confession of Hemingway's blindness and filial ingratitude. As Gordon lurches away from the taxi MacWalsey had been taking him home in, the
driver asks, "'Is he your brother?' 'In a way,' said Professor MacWalsey" (221).

Hemingway's ambivalent feelings toward his father prompted *For Whom the Bell Tolls* too, for the novel's motif of suicide and Jordan's struggle with his father's suicide consciously acknowledge Hemingway's similar struggle. Indeed, the information on Robert Jordan's father and grandfather is an anomaly in Hemingway's fiction. The familiar pattern of his novels is to omit a clear account of his hero's family background, but here Hemingway breaks that pattern. His literary reason may be to defer to the requirement that an epic hero have a lineage of some stature. Though Jordan's father is a minus on that score, his grandfather's stature as "a finer leader of irregular cavalry than John Mosby" (339) (and as a member of the Republican national committee[66]?) is a plus. Hemingway's personal reason for breaking his pattern may be either to show that he can face his father's suicide without flinching or to exorcize its stigma: "If he wrote it he could get rid of it. He had gotten rid of many things by writing them" (*Stories*, 491).

The information on Jordan's background lets us infer the complex reasons Jordan is in Spain. His putative reason, of course, is idealistic: to fight for a country and a way of life he values. His Communist and Republican sympathies both express his presumed fraternal ethic. And they show that beneath his altruism is a normal hostility toward the repressive, dictatorial father, which fascism represents. Figuratively the Spanish Civil War acts out the classic struggle between the brothers and the father for possession of Mother Spain. But Jordan's fraternal allegiance seems questionable, since the four men he kills—Kashkin, the cavalryman, the sentry at the bridge, and, we are to assume, Lt. Berrendo—are his "brothers." Berrendo and the cavalryman come from Navarre, a region Jordan is especially fond of, Kashkin shares Jordan's military skills, and they are all young. As his killing of the sentry at the bridge suggests, Jordan wishes to slay fraternal rivals who interfere with his erotic pleasures of making the earth move, be it with sexual orgasm or dynamite explosion. Jordan's killing of the young cavalryman who comes upon him and Maria in their sleeping bag reinforces that interpretation.

I am more persuaded, however, that Jordan's fratricide reveals his unconscious sympathies with his father, circuitous though they are. After all, Jordan's fundamental reason for going to
Spain is to deal with the disgrace of his father's suicide. As his recurrent internal dialogues indicate, that act has so traumatized Jordan that he can only regain self-esteem by proving to himself that he is like his grandfather, not his father. He has pledged himself to the Republican cause, for example, as proof that he is not selfish; by contrast his father was so wrapped up in his own problems that he selfishly took his own life. Also, Jordan has learned the skills of a dynamiter so that his military duties will require hazardous assignments to test whether he will buckle under crisis and commit suicide too.

This view of Jordan's reason for being in Spain explains his relationships with several of the novel's characters. Rather than see Kashkin as Jordan's double, a brother whose nervousness, anxiety, and diffidence deeply unsettle his comrades, he is one displacement of Jordan's father. Kashkin represents a truly disgraceful father, someone whose self-preoccupation breeds worse results than did Mr. Jordan's. A suicide at least has the dignity of dying by a self-inflicted wound. But Kashkin, a "rare one," requires Jordan to shoot him, imposing guilt upon Jordan as a paricide or a fratricide.

Another displacement of Jordan's suicidal father is Anselmo. A benevolent man, the old guide's nonviolent ways are admirable. He is the obedient subordinate who stays at his post despite the snow. He is the meek elder who serves a violent cause despite his ethic of peace. He is the tenderhearted soldier who weeps upon killing the sentry at the bridge. Winsome though he is, he is also, like Jordan's father, weak and submissive to more dominating, self-assertive people: "'I will do as thou orderest'" (410), he tells Jordan, just as Mr. Jordan took orders from the woman who bullied him (339). Anselmo's failure to flatten himself behind the high stone road marker that has been hiding him lets a fragment of steel kill him when the bridge is blown. But since he pulls one of the detonating wires, perhaps, like Mr. Jordan, he dies by his own hand. Jordan, however, has a hand in Anselmo's death, and not just because he pulls the other wire. Rather he has not told or ordered Anselmo what to do after they pull the wires. And he has been around Anselmo long enough to know that the old man needs orders. Whereas Jordan directly shot the anxious and weak father, Kashkin, here then he indirectly slays the benevolent, meek father, Anselmo.

Jordan's relationship with his father is displaced in other characters too, as consideration of Fernando, Primitivo, or El Sordo
would show. But it is Pablo who makes most visible Jordan’s effort to deal with his suicidal father. A warrior turned soft, a revolutionary gone domestic, a leader who leads now only to the wine bowl, Pablo is the clearest counterpart to Jordan’s father—a disgrace. His sullenness and resistance to Jordan’s mission are shameful to the band and prompt Pilar to become the maternal, domineering force in this adopted family of Jordan’s. Pablo’s theft of the caps and detonators and his murder of the band of men who help him overcome the soldiers at the mill below the bridge amplify our moral outrage toward him. But Jordan refuses to kill him. The father figure most deserving of Jordan’s parricidal impulses, Pablo rides out of the novel unscathed. To be sure, there are good reasons for Jordan’s refusal to shoot Pablo. If he is to be shot, the band should do it. If he is so “inutile,” there is little need to kill him, for he will not hinder the band’s plans. If Jordan were to shoot him, Jordan might alienate the guerrillas and jeopardize the mission.

But these are rationalizations. Jordan refuses to kill him because he wishes instead to redeem a disgraced man, both Pablo and the man Pablo represents, Jordan’s father. Jordan’s redemptive role is visible, I think, in several ways. His relationship with Maria shows it. His romantic act of loving her and figuratively making the earth move, the first miracle, renews her self-esteem, shattered, disfigured, and dishonored as she has been by her parents’ death, her shaved head, and her rape. Jordan’s mission also shows his redemptive role. His revolutionary act of blowing the bridge and literally making the earth move, the second miracle, renews hope for the republican cause, disgraced as it is by the cynicism of Gaylord’s, by its poor leadership, and by such brutalities as Pablo’s execution of the Fascists. But Jordan’s redemptive role serves his filial wish to make the earth move beneath Pablo, to redeem him by reigniting his manliness, self-esteem, and leadership. Jordan’s success is testified to by the third miracle, Pablo’s return. He brings five men to replace El Sordo’s band and to help accomplish Jordan’s mission. Later he shoots those same men to provide the horses his “family” needs for their escape to Gredos. And he leads the remainder of the band away from the pass where the wounded Jordan awaits Berrendo’s cavalry. Pablo thereby honors Jordan’s wish, confirmed as it is when “their two hands gripped in the dark. . . . Pablo’s hand gripped his hard and pressed it frankly and he returned the grip. Pablo had a good hand in the dark and feeling it gave Robert Jordan the strangest feeling.
he had felt that morning" (404). The handshake, which partly precipitates Jordan’s recall of the first time he went away to school (405) and of his father’s good-byes, again identifies Pablo with Mr. Jordan, Jordan as redemptive son.

That Jordan’s mission of redeeming his father is of primary importance to him and to his author is also seen in Jordan’s willingness to remain at the pass at the novel’s end. I grant that Jordan’s leg injury may be mortal. But no external evidence, neither blood nor agony, verifies that it is. And the guerrilla band is not a mercenary lot who would ride away from an injured comrade. Their rescue of Maria has borne that out. They could have put a splint on Jordan’s leg, dumped the supplies from the pack horse Rafael had caught, and secured Jordan so that he would not seriously hamper their escape, even were he to lose consciousness. But Hemingway ignores these alternatives. Instead, Jordan, seeing Pablo shake his head, nods at him (461), apparently signaling that death is too certain for any rescue attempt.

I would like to suspend my disbelief and be confident that Pablo and Jordan have the medical savvy to size up Jordan’s situation at a glance. And when Jordan tells Pablo, “‘Listen. Get along. I am mucked, see?’” (462), I would like to believe that his rapid and decisive resolve argues his heroism. But in the exchange between them Jordan implies that he should not go with the band, now that the father has been restored to his rightful role. And Pablo tacitly accepts Jordan’s offer. After the band has ridden off, Jordan is confident that Pablo has a sound plan, is certain that Pablo has left him nothing to worry about (466). Jordan’s confidence in Pablo, in short, leaves him no further reason or wish to live, his real mission accomplished. Pablo makes no gesture of gratitude or praise to commend the son’s sacrifice. But his stand-in, Agustín, does. The “old one,” reluctant to leave Jordan, stays behind with him for a few minutes, offering to shoot him if he suffers, weeping, making sure that he has what he needs, cursing the war and respectfully bidding him farewell. Coming as this display of paternal approval does from a character who has been portrayed as a tough, obscene soldier, Jordan’s redemptive influence seems amply confirmed.

For all its presumed romance, Jordan’s relationship with Maria better reveals the primacy of his relationship with Pablo-as-father. Had Jordan truly loved Maria, he would have made some effort to escape at the end of the novel. Had he truly loved her, he would have let her remain with him at the pass where they could
have died together in a romantic finale. It is not Hemingway’s or
Jordan’s realism that rejects both options. Rather Jordan does
not want any sustained heterosexual involvement. His bachelor’s
status and his military commitment bear this out, declaring as
they do his unwillingness to court female favors or domestic en­
tanglements. And his acts of becoming only briefly involved with
Maria and then casting her off also bear it out. Having been sure
all along that his mission will be fatal to him, Jordan’s leg injury
propitiously and honorably gratifies his secret suicidal wish, a
wish that allies him with his father. But the leg injury also gives
him an honorable way to terminate his romance. The phallic im­
plications of his wound suggest not only Jordan-as-son’s willing
relinquishment of both the sexual and leadership roles to the res­
urrected Pablo-as-father, but also repudiation of Maria-as­
daughter-sister, for whom the two men have tacitly competed.

There are other reasons Jordan rejects Maria. Despite his pro­
testations of true love, his love is for a woman whom none of the
men in the band have sexually known. Obviously her recent
traumas have kept any of them from trying her favors. And it is
fortuitous that Jordan arrives just when enough time has elapsed
for her to be over the shock of her experiences and for her hair to
have grown out enough to make her attractive, especially to an
American who would not be bothered by her short hair. But her
specific traumas make her repugnant to the band, however lovely
she is to their eyes. Not only has she been massively deflowered of
hair and virginity, but as she tells Jordan, it is probable that she
will never bear him a child, no issue having come from her rape
(354). And her traumas have affected her personality. Her infan­
tile innocence and unrestrained love for Jordan clearly suggest
that to me. So, sexually dishonored and sterile, psychologically
regressive and dependent, she is a woman to be avoided, not a
dream maiden to be desired. Flanked as she is by the dominating,
aggressive Pilar, the two might threaten even a normal male and
cause him to desire only a temporary relationship with them and
then to redirect his amorous desires into homerotic channels.9

Even more, to Jordan, Maria is ultimately loathsome. Beneath
his apparent ardor lie feelings of self-congratulation for sharing
his bed with a ravaged girl. Beneath that lie feelings of repug­
ulance for her easy surrender, for the experiences that have deeply
soiled her body, and for the incestuousness of their love, Pilar hav­
ing said early that they looked like brother and sister (67). And
beneath that lie feelings of guilt for having taken what belonged
to Pablo, if not to the rest of the band, whose rescue of her revealed
their erotic desire for her. Jordan’s unconscious contempt for Maria surfaces in his rejection of her when they part. Magnanimous to appearances, its wound is more savage than all her earlier experiences. For though the triple trauma of seeing her parents executed, being shorn, and being raped is inflicted by enemies, here it is her lover who rejects her. Hemingway does not ask us to consider the effect this will have on Maria. But I find no reason to be sanguine about her psychic condition after Jordan, the dynamiter, sends her riding off with the explosive force of that rejection in her mind. At the novel’s beginning Pilar had declared, “ ‘I do not want her crazy here after you will go. I have had her crazy before and I have enough without that’ ” (33).10

Despite Hemingway’s parricidal wish in To Have and Have Not and For Whom the Bell Tolls, his contrary wish to redeem his own father outweighs it. And whereas the two nonfiction works of his previous phase express filial allegiance by commemorating his father’s values, the novels of this phase sustain it by projecting Hemingway’s willingness to sacrifice his life for him. Like Harry Morgan, mortally wounded by one of the Cubans, Robert Jordan will be shot by Lt. Berrendo’s cavalrymen who survive his machine gun. Firing upon and being slain by their brothers, both men essentially immolate themselves for a father, whether he is the formerly disgraced Pablo or the wife-nagged, weak Albert whom the Cubans have ruthlessly slain. The other fictitious heroes of this period further bear out Hemingway’s wish. Hemingway’s decision to have Philip Rawlings in The Fifth Column abandon Dorothy Bridges for the certain death of an espionage agent mirrors it. His choice in “The Snows of Kilimanjaro” of letting Harry die reveals it too. After all, Harry’s failure to nurse the slight wound that eventually causes his death expresses Hemingway’s analogous guilt, his failure to heed a set of values summed up as “the doctor’s orders.” The clearest instance of Hemingway’s wish is “The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber.” What makes Francis’s life happy is not his brief adulthood but his endorsement by the story’s father figure, Wilson. Even more deeply gratifying to Hemingway’s unconscious would be the paradox of pleasure derived from allowing Francis to die at the hands of the mother, Margot. That immolation puts her under Wilson’s thumb and gratifies Hemingway’s wish of helping his father acquire what he most lacked, masculine domination of a woman.