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Fighting the American Civil War in the 1930s: Sentimentality and Manhood in *For Whom the Bell Tolls*

Introduction

On July 3, 1938, Franklin D. Roosevelt made a speech at Gettysburg. It was the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, and the veterans of both the Blue and the Gray were provided with an occasion for reunion. In his speech, the President employed the term “new unity,” referring to Abraham Lincoln: “Lincoln also understood that . . . a democracy should seek peace through a new unity.” Indeed, Roosevelt defined the current situation as a “conflict,” which was “as fundamental as Lincoln’s” (“Throng at Gettysburg” 10). At the time of the economic depression, when the President’s policy was disputed over its inclination toward socialism, the allusion to the Civil War must have played a crucial role to underline the importance of national unity and domestic interests in the turbulent circumstances of world affairs. Undoubtedly, one of the grave concerns for the U.S. government was the outbreak of the Civil War in Spain in 1936.

The Spanish Civil War sparked a heated debate in the United States over its handling of foreign affairs. As a matter of fact, the principle of the Neutral Act in the U.S. “dealt with wars between nations and had nothing to say about civil wars” (Burt 10). Although the government maintained neutrality by renewing the Act, “a total of 2,700 American men and women traveled to Spain illegally.” While FDR
employed the image of the American Civil War to place a higher priority on
domestic affairs, the same image persuaded the volunteers from the U.S. to be
engaged in another country's civil war. Interestingly, those volunteers who fought
against the rise of fascism in Spain came to be "called collectively the Abraham
Lincoln Brigade" (Brasket 12). Despite the distinct difference in their civil war
campaigns, both the President's speech and the volunteers' overseas operation
embodied a two-way effect of the same mindset. Keeping in mind this influential
image of the American Civil War in the 1930s, I will pay particular attention to its
analogy with the Spanish Civil War in For Whom the Bell Tolls (1940).

Ernest Hemingway publicly expressed support for the struggle against fascism
in Spain and published the novel about the Spanish Civil War in 1940. As the
reunion gathering in 1938 gave honor to the Civil War veterans, Hemingway's
protagonist shows respect to his grandfather, who fought in the American Civil
War. The analogy between the two civil wars indicates that the author partly
shares the image of the American Civil War employed by FDR, to describe the
protagonist who bends every effort to combat an imminent threat. In the case of
Hemingway, the urgent crisis erupted concerning his idea of manliness. As I will
show in what follows, the financial crisis in the 1930s produced a sense of anxiety
in men about their gender identity. As a matter of course, the economic crisis,
regarded as a "conflict as fundamental as Lincoln's," urged Hemingway to depict
the protagonist's involvement in the Spanish Civil War, in which the hero attempts
to perform a gallant deed as his grandfather did in the American Civil War.

It is noteworthy, therefore, that the Civil War in Spain simultaneously reminds
the protagonist, Robert Jordan, of his dead father. According to Jordan, his father
committed suicide with a Civil War gun, which was bequeathed to the latter by his
own father. Jordan regards his father's conduct as unmanly, and is not willing to
talk about him. Actually, the Spanish Civil War puts Jordan in a dilemma between
the grandfather's virility and the father's cowardice. Nevertheless, it will turn out
that his participation in the war helps Jordan to resolve his familial gender trouble.
Not surprisingly, he becomes concerned with the way in which the legacy of the
American Civil War was passed from his grandfather to his father, and with the
reason why it resulted in the tragic incident. Through his engagement in the
Spanish Civil War, Jordan inevitably comes to be confronted by what the
American Civil War left to him as a legacy: the death of his father. In other
words, the battlefield in Spain provides him with a psychological arena, an arena
in which to take over the legacy of the American Civil War, which means that Jordan eventually becomes capable of mourning his father's death.

1. Two Civil Wars in the 1930s

It is generally acknowledged that the Great Depression caused anxiety in men: unemployment made them "fe[el] humiliated and ashamed" (Stieglitz 195). Significantly, Hemingway published a war novel in these circumstances with a number of references to the American Civil War. In particular, Robert Jordan follows the image of his grandfather, who was engaged in the American Civil War. Jordan says to himself: "Your grandfather fought four years in our Civil War and you are just finishing your first year in this war" (336). The parallel between the two civil wars is quite evident in his thought. In fact, Jordan's grandfather mentioned the Civil War as "the War of the Rebellion," which denotes that he was in the Union Army: the Union regarded the war as a rebellion of the Confederacy (337). Similarly, Jordan is in favor of the Spanish Republicans, against which the Nationalists rebel. The analogous circumstance of the two civil wars certainly makes Jordan feel a strong identification with his grandfather: "I wish Grandfather were here instead of me. Well, maybe we will all be together by tomorrow night" (338). Jordan's admiration for his grandfather showed itself in his deep respect for a Civil War gun, which belonged to the grandfather. When he was a boy, Jordan "asked Grandfather if he had ever killed any one with it" (336). The grandfather answered, "Yes. . . . In the War of the Rebellion and afterwards" (337).

Obviously, Jordan's preoccupation with the American Civil War testifies to his eagerness to go through his grandfather's experience. For Jordan, however, the American Civil War also awakens a perplexing memory since his father, the direct inheritor of the war experience, killed himself with the Civil War gun. Concerning the incident, Jordan simply remarks that his father "misused" the gun (338). When he got the gun back from a coroner, Jordan went to a lake and dropped the weapon in it. Clearly, the suicide of his father was an embarrassing incident for Jordan: "I'll never forget how sick it made me the first time I knew he [the father] was a cobarde. Go on, say it in English. Coward" (339). In this manner, the Spanish Civil War reminds Jordan not only of his grandfather's bravery, but also of his father's cowardice. While those two characteristics seemingly stand opposed to each other, Jordan's fight in Spain reveals that there is a causal relationship between them. Indeed, focusing on Jordan's ambivalent feelings aroused in the
Spanish Civil War, the novel describes how the inheritance of the American Civil War legacy from the grandfather to the father caused such a grotesque outcome.

It is frequently said that the 1930s was an unproductive era in Hemingway’s literary career. His major works in the decade are Death in the Afternoon, Green Hills of Africa, and To Have and Have Not. Though it is true that those works have been paid less attention, there is a common trait in them. To put it briefly, they consistently depict the practice of masculine abilities: bullfighting, hunting, and an exchange of gun shooting. From a biographical viewpoint, Hemingway’s masculine identity was seriously disturbed during the 1930s by his father’s death. In quite the same way as Robert Jordan, Hemingway lost his father, Clarence Hemingway, by suicide. Clarence killed himself in 1928 “with a Civil War ‘Long John’ revolver he had inherited from his father” (Lynn 378). The remarkable point of the incident is that Clarence’s suicide represents the vital link between the financial crisis and loss of masculinity. A biographical study on Hemingway’s gender details the cause of his father’s death in this context:

He [Clarence Hemingway] would also assume control of the family’s finances, in keeping with the lines of patriarchal succession; and in fact his loss of control during the Florida land bust of 1928, when he could no longer meet payments on his real estate investments, contributed to his decision to commit suicide. (Spilka 22)

Just a year before the Great Depression set in, Clarence Hemingway demonstrated that the failure in “keeping with the lines of patriarchal succession” could make the inheritor so desperate as to kill himself. The incident badly affected the son, Ernest, and impelled him to prove his manhood.

Hemingway’s reaction to the incident accounts for the author’s obsessive desire to fictionalize his dead father. His continual attempt to narrate the father’s suicide had been unsuccessful until the publication of For Whom the Bell Tolls. In his short story, “Fathers and Sons,” Hemingway insists on Nick Adams’s psychological needs to write about his father: “If he [Nick] wrote it he could get rid of it” (Complete Short Stories 371). The act of writing seems to be the last phase of his attempt to get the incomprehensible incident straight. It is “too early” for Nick to write it down, yet at least he remembers his father’s “sentimental” character: “[Nick’s father] was sentimental, and, like most sentimental people, he
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was both cruel and abused" (370). This partial description of Nick’s father gives us a promising clue for investigating Hemingway’s idea of manhood in correlation with sentimentality. As the following argument makes clear, the focus on sentimentality foregrounds the author’s affinity with his father, instead of his grandfather. Before going into details, it needs to be confirmed that Hemingway’s pursuit of manhood, and his need to depict his father’s death culminate in the suicidal identification of Robert Jordan with his father.

At the end of the novel, when Jordan gets wounded in his leg and makes his company leave him, he is tempted by the idea of committing suicide. As he waits alone, determined to counterattack the pursuers, the pain increases and disturbs his resolution: “Oh, let them [the pursuers] come, he said. I don’t want to do that business that my father did” (469). At the pinnacle of his pain, the idea almost dominates him: “Then do it. Do it. Do it now. It’s all right to do it now. Go on and do it now” (470). For some reason, Jordan’s Spanish Civil War brings forth the identification with his father. In other words, Spain is a place where Jordan not only undergoes the experiences of the American Civil War, but also apprehends the cause of his father’s suicide with the Civil War legacy. Through his involvement in the war, Jordan acknowledges a controversial aspect of masculinity. In a way, the father’s use of the supposedly masculine heritage was not an unmanly conduct; it was a desperate attempt to overcome his failure in the “paternal succession” of the property.

2. Another Aspect of the American Civil War Legacy

As we have seen above, Nick Adams thinks of sentimentality as a peculiar characteristic of his father. In For Whom the Bell Tolls, the sentimental character of Jordan’s father is depicted in his recollection. When he exchanges farewells with the novel’s heroine, Maria, to launch his operation, Jordan’s memory suddenly floods back to his childhood: he is standing on a platform with his father, about to leave for school for the first time: he “had been afraid to go,” which he tried to hide from anyone’s noticing, yet his father, in contrast, expressed openly his emotion: “his moustache had been moist and his eyes were damp with emotion and Robert Jordan had been so embarrassed by all of it” (405). Obviously, young Jordan was ashamed of his father’s undisguised sentiment, feeling that an overtly emotional expression should be avoided. To measure the depth of his quarrel with the sentimental father, it is helpful to look into the social construction of manhood
in a period when the experience of the American Civil War was transformed into a public memory.

According to Alice Fahs, the scene of an annual attendance to the cemeteries of the Civil War soldiers on Memorial Day underwent a remarkable change in the late 1880s and the 1890s. In the 1870s, the flowers were brought by the bereaved women, whereas in the late 1880s, "Harper's Weekly's Decoration Day illustrations no longer represented women as the bearers of the war's memory" (1485). Fahs goes on to argue:

Its full-page 1891 Decoration Day illustration instead reflected the realities of GAR [Grand Army of the Republic] ceremonies by showing aged veterans decorating the graves of their fallen comrades. Sentimental illustrations and poems depicting aging veterans also characterized the Weekly's portrayal of Decoration Day in 1892 and 1893. (Fahs 1485)

The sentimental representation of the veterans gives us an insight into the making of the ideal of strenuous masculinity at the turn of the century. Significantly, the conceptualization of masculinity assumed a crucial role in uniting the nation: "[A] new veteran-oriented war literature . . . assert[ed] that the central meaning of the war was the shared bravery of Union and Confederate veterans." "The culmination" of this reunion, Fahs maintains, "came in the Weekly's poem 'Memorial Day: May 30, 1899,' which linked the Civil War and Spanish-American War . . ." (Fahs 1485). Fahs clearly indicates that masculinity was engendered at a point where the sentimental reunion was connected with imperialism. In this respect, it is necessary to point out that sentimentality was highly efficient in unifying the nation, but was repressed in delineating the ideal of strenuous masculinity. The public display of sentiments was only permissible between men as long as the emotional expression enhanced a sense of manhood. Therefore, it is easily understood that young Jordan's embarrassment derives from his loyalty to the idealized concept of a socially constructed norm.

Nevertheless, the confrontation with his father in the Spanish Civil War betrays another aspect of Jordan's feeling. Indeed, the historical overview of the correlation between masculinity and sentimentality testifies that the decision of Jordan's father faithfully reflects the nation's patriotic turn. His act of committing suicide, that is, an act of defeminizing sentimentality by the Civil War gun,
exemplifies a supposedly virtuous conduct demanded for the establishment of masculinity. To put it another way, the suicide of Jordan’s father demonstrates that he patologically internalized the value of manhood of the 1890s, in which the new generation of Americans after the Civil War lived. Therefore, Jordan’s sense of embarrassment possibly denotes that his antagonism does not stem from the unmanliness, or cowardice of his father, but from the violent nature of the pursuit of masculinity displayed by his father’s death. Jordan now “underst[ands],” “forg[ives],” and “pitie[s]” his father, and yet is still “ashamed of” him (340). To better understand this sense of shame, it is important to reconsider Jordan’s embarrassment in the context of three generations from the 1860s to the 1930s. In fact, if we look into the traumatic influence of the American Civil War on the veterans, it becomes clear that, through his struggle with a feeling of embarrassment, Jordan becomes ready to receive the war’s legacy.

With regard to the Civil War’s aftereffects, Gaines M. Foster mentions the “destructiveness” of the war and the veterans’ “shame in their embrace of it.” In redefining the war, they had to “deflect the shame, defend their actions, and render intelligible the savagery and destruction” (589). If we consult Hemingway’s biographical background again, it is noteworthy that his maternal grandfather, Ernest Hall, remained reticent about the war. The grandfather, Hemingway says in his letter, “never allowed the war to be mentioned in his presence.” The author also relates what he was told by his paternal grandfather, Anson Hemingway. Anson “always made the speech at the funeral” of the members of the Grand Army of the Republic, but would say on the way home, “Ern, don’t believe a damned word of what I said” (Baker 811).^2 What the grandfathers taught Hemingway was that the experience of the Civil War must be inherited without a color added to it. In other words, a sharing of the war experience should be done without giving way to misguided patriotism.\^3 While the idea of masculinity was socially constructed in the reunion assembly at the cemeteries as Alice Fahs contends, Hemingway’s paternal grandfather carefully kept himself from “render[ing] intelligible the savagery and destruction” of the war at the funeral of the GAR members. In consequence, the grandfather’s reserved manner, a sign of his shame about the war’s destructiveness, unfortunately made his direct successor, Clarence Hemingway, mishandle the gun. Ironically, Clarence’s death overtly demonstrates the violence of virility, which Anson, his own father, evaded cautiously.

When a friend of Jordan’s who went with him to the lake to abandon the gun,
says, "I know why you did that with the old gun," Jordan replies: "Well, then we don't have to talk about it" (337). Given the fact that the father's suicide so plainly represents the internalized value of manhood, Jordan's embarrassment denotes that his reserved behavior in burying the Civil War legacy appears to be quite similar to the reticent manner of Hemingway's grandfathers. In other words, only through the sense of shame could Jordan comprehend the "destructiveness" of the Civil War and the "shame in [the veterans'] embrace of it." The gun was certainly "misused" by his father, as Jordan says, yet, Jordan's reconsideration of the incident totally renews his understanding of the relationship between manhood and sentimentality. The double-edged sense of shame, with which Jordan at first accused his father, affords him a foothold to comprehend his father's sentimentality. Consequently, the ultimate meaning of his engagement with the Spanish Civil War reveals itself. As Jordan demonstrates at the end of the novel, his fight ends in reconciling with his father.

In order to confirm such a change in his notion of masculinity, I examine a grotesque scene envisioned by Jordan, which he once witnessed in his childhood. When Pilar, a female leader of the guerrilla band, tells Jordan about a mass execution at the beginning of the Spanish Civil War, Jordan remembers a lynching in Ohio State. Pilar's narrative is one of the most controversial parts of the novel, mainly because it is a detailed account of a ruthless massacre of the fascists in a town, but also because the tale offers a profitable viewpoint in grasping Jordan's notion of manhood.

The massacre of the fascists occurred in a town before Jordan came to Spain. The fascists were gathered in a city hall, and the other people of the town were organized by Pablo, an ex-leader of the guerrilla band. They stood in two lines and held farming implements in their hands. In Pilar's narration, the killing begins with some bewilderment among the people: they even wonder what they should wear on the day of killing. The fascists are brought out one by one from the hall and forced to walk between the lines of the people to be attacked by the implements. Whether beaten to death or barely alive, they are thrown away from the cliff at the end of the lines and, with the killing of a few fascists, the villagers show a change in their state of mind: they are transformed into an uncontrollable mob and surround the hall, "mak[ing] a noise now like an animal" (121). Pilar, standing on a chair, sees them rush into the hall, pursue the priest, who has had the last prayers with the rest of the fascists, and at the very moment of the priest's
murder, the chair brakes and she loses sight of it.

As Pilar asks Jordan what incident in his country could be comparable to the incident, Jordan recalls a lynched black man, whom he witnessed when he was attending a wedding with his mother.

"In this town a Negro was hanged to a lamp post and later burned. It was an arc light. A light which lowered from the post to the pavement. And he was hoisted, first by the mechanism which was used to hoist the arc light but this broke—" (116)

Pilar thinks that his answer appears beside the point. However, the association of his thoughts reflects his awakened skepticism on the violent incident caused by an obsession with masculinity. Connecting the brutal execution with lynching, Jordan reveals his preoccupation with the gendered relationship of the conflict between the Union and the Confederacy. The conflict was between the “the rational, royal—masculine, adult—North” and the “emotional, treacherous—feminine, childlike—South” (Mitchell 46). The Union Army embraced the cause of the abolition of slavery, and the fight for the domestic union was regarded as a manly conduct. Nevertheless, the simple dichotomy underwent a drastic change at the turn of the century due to a strong urge for manhood: “Northerners, like Southerners, were drawn to lynching’s forceful representations of white men’s power.” In actuality, the rate of lynching kept increasing after the war, and “reached its apogee” in 1892 (Bederman 47). At first, the emotional sympathy for the slave laid the basis for “the War of the Rebellion,” yet, at the end of the century, it played a mediating role to unite the Union and the Confederate veterans by forging the concept of masculinity, which was shared exclusively among them, that is, white male Americans.

In the Spanish Civil War, it strikes Jordan that the blind pursuit of the virile cause itself would blaspheme the experience of the American Civil War. Hemingway suggests that the significance of the Spanish Civil War in the 1930s should not be found in the glorification of the memory of the American Civil War, but in recognition of the legacy passed from his grandfather’s generation. For Jordan, it means to bear the burden of what his father left to him. To put it differently, it is a long delayed mourning for his dead father.
3. "Roll Jordan, Roll!” and Sentimental Mourning

For Jordan, to untie himself from the obsession with masculinity is concurrent with his bidding farewell to his father. In examining Jordan's lament for the death of his father, it is instructive to refer to the argument by Pamela Boker. In The Grief Taboo in American Literature, Boker analyzes the effects of protracted mourning in the works of three male American writers: Mark Twain, Herman Melville, and Ernest Hemingway. She focuses on the particular trait of "the repression of loss and grief" (3) in their works, arguing that they "reflect the repressions and common defense of an entire adolescent patriarchal culture" (5). Actually, her "ultimate goal" is "to dismantle the myth of an American male canon by exposing the feminine/maternal principle, which serves as a central impulse in the formation of works of fiction hitherto purported to be constructed exclusively by a masculine imagination" (3). My focusing on Jordan's sentimentality basically follows the same direction as Boker's, except that I intend to emphasize that sentimentality offers Jordan a means by which to redefine the patriarchal heritage, not to repudiate it.

A close examination of the lynched man throws fresh light on Jordan's consciousness about sentimentality. Indeed, while it actually points to the period of racial violence after the Civil War, the lynching incident discussed in the previous section curiously corresponds to the antebellum circumstances, which stirred up anti-slavery sentiments. In order to explore this incident's correlation with the American Civil War, it needs to be confirmed that Jordan's sentimental awareness is shored up by the peculiar context in which the State of Ohio was historically placed.

Needless to say, the Ohio River was a deadly border dividing the nation, over which the slave imagined their freedom, and Jordan's racial memory reminds us of the controversial debate over the Fugitive Slave Act, which was enacted in 1850. Due to the Act, "Non-Southerners were now held responsible for Negroes who had fled from the South," and it is important to note that the Act gave birth to the best known sentimental novel, Uncle Tom's Cabin (Wilson 31). The author of the novel, Harriet Beecher Stowe, had "experiences with runaway slaves during a residence of eighteen years in Cincinnati." Through her experiences, she "made the image of Eliza running across the Ohio River on ice floes" (McPherson 89). Accordingly, the Ohio River became an evocative resource for the anti-slavery novel to engender its sentimental power. In this light, the scene of the lynched
black man in Ohio, by which Jordan's skepticism on masculinity is aroused, suggests that his sentimental consciousness could be situated in the historical context of the American Civil War.

Jordan's particular concern with the evocative setting assumes added significance in view of the fact that the Ohio River, at the time of the war, was called the River of Jordan. The significance of this coincidence is underlined when he engages himself in the military operation of the Spanish Civil War. All of a sudden, Jordan remembers a yelling— "Roll Jordan, Roll!"— thrown at him when he ran in a football game. He recalls: "They used to yell that at football when you lugged the ball" (438). While the shouting was uttered to cheer Jordan, his recollection of the phrase in the Spanish Civil War intensifies the particular significance of the Jordan River within the racialized context of the American Civil War. In fact, the yelling "Roll Jordan, Roll" is the exact name of a slave song, which was collected during the American Civil War, and is also counted as one of the ten "Sorrow Songs" in *The Souls of Black Folk* by W. E. B. Du Bois. The song, whose title words Jordan accidentally recalls, goes as follows:

My brudder sittin' on de tree of life,
An' he yearde when Jordan roll;
Roll, Jordan, roll, Jordan roll, Jordan roll!
O march de angel, march,
O march de angel, march;
O my soul, arise in heaven, Lord, for to yearde when Jordan roll.

(Allen 19–20)

The song first describes the "brudder": the fact that he hears the River of Jordan roll means that he is dying since the river represents a border between life and death. The song's focus on the "brudder" shifts abruptly in the last line to "my soul," suggesting that the vision of death is virtually haunting the singer.

The remarkable point of this song's symbolic presence in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is that there was probably no trace of sentimentality attached to the slave song and its racial theme of grief when the phrase of "Roll Jordan, Roll" was articulated to encourage Jordan's athletic performance in a typically masculine sport. His memory testifies to the fact that the song, strategically embedded in the novel's gendered scheme, was ironically appropriated to enhance the idea of
white masculinity. However, the song's reverberation in the Spanish Civil War does not reproduce the same effect. As a matter of fact, the song's grief over the Jordan River resonates with Jordan's remembrance of the miserable black man, which indicates that lynching in Ohio induces the sentimental reaction in Jordan, as in the Northern abolitionists during the American Civil War. If the flash of the lynching scene reveals Jordan's skepticism on the abusive aspect of masculinity, it is because Jordan's sentimental awareness resituated the theme of grief in the negro spiritual. As the collection of the slave songs by Lucy McKim, including "Roll Jordan, Roll," was meant to appeal to the sentimental mind of the Northern abolitionists (Bacon 6), Jordan's visual and aural recollections altogether reveal his sentimentally inclined mindscape. As a consequence, sentimental awareness, which makes Jordan perceptible to the repressed grief, becomes a means of acknowledging and mourning what constitutes, but is repressed in, his masculine identity. In fact, Jordan's sentimental awareness is shown conclusively in his mourning over his father.

As I have discussed earlier, Jordan remembers his father's emotional facial expression when he parts from Maria. Though it seems that he merely calls back an old memory, this recollection is not just to reconfirm his instinctive antagonism toward sentimentality; it now provides the scene of the present parting with Jordan's repressed tears. As Pamela Boker argues, the "sadness and anxiety Jordan feels when he says good-bye to Maria allows him to identify with his father's 'weakness': Jordan now understands that he also possesses a sentimental disposition (242). Actually, just a moment before he remembers his sentimental father, Jordan feels that his voice sounds "awkward," in saying good-by (405). Hemingway merely implies that there is some unexplainable reason for the change in the tone of his voice, but the inserted memory of his tearful father suggests that it is Jordan who is about to cry in the presence of Maria, though he represses his tears. Jordan's sentimentality, suggested in this parting scene, foreshadows his identification with the father, which reaches its culmination when he seriously wonders if he should commit suicide.

In the final scene of parting, Jordan, wounded in his leg, resolves to be left alone to ambush the pursuers. The self-sacrificing decision touches the comrades. Not only Maria, whose "face [is] twisted as a child's contorts," but also Pilar is about to cry, though their tears are never depicted: "Her face had the same expression as Maria's" (462), and "Robert Jordan could see her shoulders shaking"
(463). It should be noted here that Pilar, who claims to be tired of emotion (140), is the last person to shed tears. The comrades’ surging emotion and Jordan’s resolution definitely sentimentalize his approaching death. After making his company leave, Jordan hopes that they managed to escape: “Think about them being away, he [Jordan] said. Think about them going through the timber. Think about them crossing a creek. Think about them riding through the heather. Think about them . . .” (470; emphasis added). Now that Jordan is to die, being unable to go “crossing a creek,” the scene of his comrades’ sorrowful farewell to him recreates the lament uttered over the symbolic river in “Roll Jordan, Roll.” The farewell scene, when considered in light of the slave song, indicates that Jordan’s identification with his father is achieved through his attitude toward death, a heightened awareness of his own sentimental imagination. Moreover, close attention to the song’s religious meaning in the scene allows us to detect the mourning effect in Jordan’s suicidal identification with his father. Since Jordan’s recollection of the song bespeaks his sentimental awakening and foregrounds the neglected theme of grief in the novel, it also sheds light on his psychological approach to his un-mourned father in an extreme situation, in which his identification becomes a ritual of mourning. To put it differently, in Jordan’s recognition of a man’s grief by means of his sentimental awareness, we could observe his acknowledgement of his own disregarded father.

While the novel’s final scene certainly depicts the imminent death of Jordan, it also foregrounds the protagonist’s sentiment toward his father. With his decision about self-sacrificing, Jordan puts himself in a sentimentalized setting. In such a self-conscious situation, the hero’s deadly identification with his father enables him to mourn the death of his father, whom Jordan could never “get rid of.” In this respect, Jordan’s hidden tears, which find their counterpart in his father’s wet eyes in Jordan’s memory, also give evidence of his protracted grief for his father.

Although his hostility toward his father expresses Jordan’s adherence to the idealized notion of masculinity, his symbolic engagement with the American Civil War makes Jordan modify his long conceived idea. He gradually detects the Civil War’s brutality and destructiveness, of which the veterans were ashamed. In consequence, a change in Jordan’s comprehension of his father’s death, which repeats most revealingly the war’s destructive impulse, enables him to accept his father’s “embarrassing” conduct. In his heroic decision of self-sacrifice, or self-consciousness, Jordan reveals that the arrangement for his own death is actually
made to deal with his father's death. Indeed, the task of sentimental mourning for his father constitutes Jordan's accomplished act of inheriting the Civil War legacy.

Conclusion

On one hand, Jordan's emotional identification with his father implies the hero's realization of his own sentimental sensitivity and, on the other hand, it is a proof of his psychological parting with his father. The identification establishes a sentimental bond between the father and the son, which would not fit the mold of idealized masculinity. Indeed, the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg redefined the meaning of the reunion gathering. It was reported with a strongly sentimental tone, and the emphasis fell on the fact that the anniversary would be the last occasion for reunion due to the "fading health" of the aged veterans. The fact gave a deeper significance to their farewells: "God bless you' and 'Good Bye' were spoken in the same breath time and again as the armies parted with sorrow. . . ." A newspaper article on the event indicates that the assembly provided the veterans with an opportunity of parting rather than that of reuniting, in which excessive sentimentality was not disguised: "Their knotted fingers have clasped the hands of other old men they once fought on these same fields . . ." ("Veterans Reunion" 3). Their farewells were exchanged with an eye to their own approaching departure.

As if to focus on the sentimental atmosphere of the reunion convention, Hemingway describes Jordan's fight in the Spanish Civil War, in which the protagonist grapples with the meaning of what the American Civil War brought to his father as well as to his grandfather. In this respect, the author of For Whom the Bell Tolls suggested a way to deal with the American Civil War through the conflict in Spain, when the U.S. government had difficulty in handling it. Indeed, while FDR's speech employed the image of the American Civil War to fight the current crisis, Hemingway depicted Jordan's symbolical fight in the American Civil War to detach himself from his obsessive concern with masculinity. This contrast in their employment of the Civil War image clarifies the author's peculiar way of solving his familial gender problem. The epigraph to the novel, which Hemingway quotes from "Meditation XVII" by John Donne, represents his idea: "[A]ny mans death diminishes me, because I am involved in Mankinde; And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; It tolls for thee" (vi). In brief, the quote asserts that the death of another, which the ringing of the bell
signals, would also signify the passing of the one who hears the toll. Although the quote can be interpreted as Hemingway’s call for a political tie to fight against fascism, Jordan’s identification with his father embodies more precisely Donne’s statement; his sentimental mourning allows him to grieve over his father with the hero’s own death approaching.

Notes

1 A few years later, in *To Have and Have Not*, published in 1937, Hemingway wrote “a fictional account of finding his father’s dead body,” yet the passage was deleted afterwards (Reynolds 269).

2 “The soldier’s manhood required him to be a faithful father as well as an obedient son . . . Preserving the Union was the duty he owed both the generation behind him . . . and the generation to come” (Mitchell 51). Considering that the size of the organization denotes the intention of preserving the Union, it is quite natural that the number of its members “peaked in 1890 with 427,981 members” (Jones 586).

3 The maternal grandfather warned his grandson about of patriotism: “One of my grandfathers [Ernest Hall] always told me that patriotism is the last refuge of thieves and scoundrels” (Baker 811). That was, as the editor’s note points out, a misquoted statement of Samuel Johnson.

4 During the American Civil War, the Northern cause established the association between masculinity and the idea of union. John Stauffer points out their affinity: “With men under siege, those who betrayed feminine traits, and refused to fight, were traitors to their sex and to the Union” (Stauffer 123).

5 One of the most detailed accounts of Pilar’s tale, “Pilar’s Tale” by Robert Gajdusek, significantly argues “the shift from patriarchal authority to matriarchal power,” which partly corresponds to my argument about Jordan’s skepticism on masculinity (127).

6 Du Bois mentions the Port Royal experiment in 1862, in which “Miss McKim and others” collected the slave songs (242). As a secretary to his father, who “supported efforts to aid the newly freed slaves,” Lucy McKim visited South Carolina (Bacon 5). In 1864, McKim was engaged “to Wendell Phillips Garrison—third son of the abolitionist leader William Lloyd Garrison,” and achieved her work, *Slave Songs of the United States*, with two other compilers (James 24). In the collection, “Roll, Jordan, Roll” is listed as the first song.
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7 "The promotion of football during the 1880s and 1890s as a manly sport was part of the larger cult of masculinity that emerged in the United States in the late nineteenth century" (Rembis 174). While Hemingway was strongly influenced by Theodore Roosevelt as a model of manhood, criticism has come to acknowledge the author's ambiguous attitudes toward the ex-President: "Hemingway's 1923 poem, 'Roosevelt,' which appeared in Poetry, immediately established a certain skeptical distance from the heroic figure" (Clark 56).

8 The Stowe exhibit featured in the World's Columbian Exposition in 1893. "[T]hroughout the 1890s, Uncle Tom's Cabin was employed to support a self-congratulatory narrative of moral and social progress in U.S. culture." By exhibiting Stowe's novel as "an American 'classic,'" the cruelty of slavery was distanced as a historical past (Hochman 83). Indeed, "sentiment was no longer attractive" (86).

9 Lucy McKim Garrison considered the singing of "Roll Jordan, Roll" as "the grandest." It even sounded "like a triumphant anthem," and was also sung on the Fourth of July (qtd. in Bacon 7). If the song touched the Northern abolitionist, to whom McKim "ma[de] her plans to introduce the slave songs," it may be because they appealed to their aspiring mind for freedom (6).
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