CHAPTER IX
An Estimate of Hemingway's Achievement
as a Writer

Literary critics are notoriously fallible. Contemporary writers are lauded sky-high, only to be ignominiously let down later. Posthumous disparagement should perhaps be accepted as the inevitable consequence of early exaggeration. To be only fair to their fallibility, it may also be mentioned that they run down some of the living authors who come into their own after their death. Melville is a good instance. Moby Dick was reprinted only once in the forty years between its first publication and its creator's death. Today it is considered as one of the major classics of world literature. Hemingway's early style was overpraised, his apparent disinterest in social problems over-condemned and the presence of violence in his books over-denounced. Only a few years have passed since his death. Still one may try to evaluate him.

If a writer is the product of his age, then it is difficult to see how Hemingway could have written anything different from what he has. He was born and bred at a time when the States were a regular meltingpot of races, White, Red, Black and Yellow. J.T. Adams, in his The Voice of America, writes that the 'voice of America' is the multiple voice of...
"missionaries, drunkards, trappers, miners, farmers, planters, savages, slaves, gamblers, roustabouts, millionaires, prostitutes, lovers, Presidents; English, Swedes, Germans, French, Irish, Hungarians, Czechs, Italians, Poles; Methodists, Catholics, Mennonites, Quakers".¹ Political ideologies were influenced by William James's Pragmatism, John Dewey's Instrumentalism, and the American's innate love of democracy. Pragmatism laid stress on the standard of workability as against abstract theories. Authoritarianism was replaced by representation. This individualistic philosophy was one which appealed to the heart of an American who usually has the tendency to rely upon himself than on others for all the good things of life. "Practical, democratic, individualistic, opportunistic, spontaneous, hopeful, pragmatism was wonderfully adapted to the temperament of the average American".² The Instrumentalism of Dewey is both related to, and different from, Pragmatism. Both James and Dewey were equally insistent upon human experience as the pabulum of philosophy, but Dewey's "individual was not the individual celebrated by James — wrestling with his soul, fighting his way to some course of conduct, some decisive action, which would reveal

¹ Quoted in American Literature 1880-1930 by A.C.Vard, p.93.
² The American Mind by H.S.Commager, p.97.
the meaning of truth. He was rather an individual operating within a network of associations, seeking, in common with his fellow men, some truth that had meaning to the community. The emphasis of philosophy was thus shifted from the salvation of the individual to the reconstruction of society.

Meanwhile, new discoveries in the different branches and fields of science turned the human being into an insignificant creature. Physics unveiled the illimitable size of the universe. Matter was no longer solid. One of the tenets of the Victorian creed had been the faith in the benevolence of a Supreme Power which piloted man's triumphant march towards progress. This too had been questioned. "...Biology found the source of life itself in a series of apparently fortuitous chemical reactions; ...psychologists reduced the most profound reflections, the most dazzling flights of genius, to mechanical impulses and uncontrollable reactions." To these was added the reaction to Victorian prudery. Mechanical inventions like the car and the motor-boat gave young men and women an opportunity to come together, away from the supervision of their elders. The whole idea of conventional morality went by the board.

4. Ibid., pp. 103–4.
Hemingway's apprenticeship was an arduous, if not a long, one. He had received sound training as a newspaper reporter. He read intensively in Turgenev, Chekhov, Tolstoi, Dostoevski, Stendhal, Salzac, Flaubert, Twain, Stephen Crane, Henry James, Thomas Mann, Conrad and James Joyce. "The good writers are Henry James, Stephen Crane, and Mark Twain. That's not the order they're good in. There is no order for good writers", he wrote in Green Hills. He praised especially the talent of Rudyard Kipling and the discipline of Flaubert and claimed for Huckleberry Finn: "All modern American literature comes from one book by Mark Twain called Huckleberry Finn."

There was nothing before. There has been nothing as good since. His estimate of his own work is not marked by humility: "I started out very quiet and I beat Mr. Turgenev. Then I trained hard and I beat Mr. De Maupassant. I've fought two draws with Mr. Stendhal, and I think I had an edge in the last one. But nobody's going to get me in any ring with Mr. Tolstoi unless I'm crazy or I keep getting better." This confident claim can only be explained by the circumstances under which he made the statement to Miss Lillian Ross. "Sloppily dressed and unkempt, the

5. Green Hills of Africa, p.15.
6. Ibid., p.16.
manuscript of *Across the River and Into the Trees* tucked under his arm in a dilapidated briefcase, Hemingway arrived in New York by plane from Havana in April, 1950, and was taken in tow by Lillian Ross of *The New Yorker* — but not before he had a few drinks before leaving the airport... For two days he drank constantly...  

It would be instructive to compare Hemingway with Sherwood Anderson who influenced him much in the early stages. It is interesting to note the similarity between Anderson and Hemingway as boys. Both were sensitive boys who came into contact with rough life early — Anderson by choice and Hemingway because of his vacations spent in Northern Michigan. Anderson, in *A Story Teller's Story*, said of himself, "Having made a few bicycles in factories, having written some thousands of rather senseless advertisements, having rubbed affectionately the legs of a few race horses, having tried blunderingly to love a few women and having written a few novels that did not satisfy", he settled down to edit two weekly newspapers. In his novels his main theme is the conflict between love and the cramping conditions of a materialistic society.


Sexual love resists this suppression with an energy dynamic enough to cripple the woman or man. Even more important was his belief that "women still could supply the secret knowledge that man had lost, that they held the key to the ultimate mysteries". On the other hand, love in Hemingway remains on the physical level, though a source of great satisfaction. With Robert and Maria it becomes mystic in its intensity, but there the mysticism ends.

The Anderson hero suffers from a sense of dumb confusion that is America, in spite of materialistic success. The life of the Whites is thin. As a contrast, therefore, he paints the full and instinctive life of the Negroes in Dark Laughter. "Primitivism" appears to be his solution to the American sense of smugness which prevents their striving on the intellectual and spiritual levels. Here he falls short of the values to which Hemingway gave such prominence.

Anderson's style is typically American in the sense that he consciously avoided English prose style and formed one out of the vocabulary and rhythms of the speech of his home-town folk. It is a mannered style and monotonous. Even at the beginning of Anderson's great success Hemingway

was vocally critical of the former's style: "You couldn't
let a sentence like that go." II But Hemingway nevertheless
showed the influence of Anderson in his short, declarative
sentences, which he happily later outgrew.

Anderson sometimes tells his stories backwards, as
in his *Many Marriages* and *Dark Laughter*, — a method of
retrospection used by James Joyce and Virginia Woolf.*
Anderson was not a scientific psycho-analyst but *Dark
Laughter* is given through the impressions, musings and
retrospections of the characters. On the other hand,
Hemingway rarely tells a story from the subjective point of
view of the characters.

Hemingway is definitely a greater writer than Anderson
in his style, in his positive approach to life, in the
larger values he places before the reader, and in his
objective treatment of the subject.

Hemingway remained almost unaffected by the stream-of-
consciousness method, (except at certain points in *To Have
and Have Not* and *The Bell*) which had swept the new writers
off their feet, and had reached its high-water mark with
James Joyce and Dorothy Richardson. But it had started
ebbing. Anderson had been influenced by this method in
*Dark Laughter*; it was consistently used by Faulkner in the

11. *The Apprenticeship of Ernest Hemingway* by C.-A. Fenton,
p. 89.
first half of *The Sound and the Fury*, but was given up later. In *As I Lay Dying*, the story is told by fifteen different people. In *Sanctuary*, the effect is "almost like watching a movie wherein the action is photographed three or four times, from different angles, with different lightings, at different speeds". But now the more classical methods have again come into their own. Hemingway's objective method, therefore, would seem to be justified. "But the stream-of-consciousness epidemic will have left its stamp upon fiction in English. It represents an enlargement of technical procedures which is too precious to be altogether abandoned".

Hemingway is what may be called a single-hero novelist. As contrasted with Balzac or Dickens or Tolstoi, who created an immense number of characters of as diverse a nature as Nature herself, Hemingway created but a handful of characters. Only a few of the minor characters have been individualised. It is only when he came to write *The Bell* that they appear to be human beings in flesh and blood. *Frostovski*, too, created a very small number of characters, but it is a galaxy of really fascinating persons. They are repeated in novel after novel, but each one of them is fully alive and convincing.

12. The *Novel of Violence in America* by W. E. Frohock, p. 146.
13. The *Twentieth Century Novel* by J. A. Beach, p. 517.
primarily as a result of penetrative, psychological study. Hemingway has not created one outstanding character which the world would not willingly forget, though Robert Jordan comes near it. He has no Parson Adams, with his courage and innocence, his strength of mind and muscle and his unshakable faith in universal goodness. He has no Tom Jones, Henry Esmond or Michael Henchard. He could not have imagined a heroine like Elizabeth Bennett (Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*) who is only too human with her pride and prejudice, her charm and wit. A woman of Eustacia's type (Thomas Hardy's *The Return of the Native*) was beyond his comprehension — Eustacia who was irresistibly beautiful, intensely emotional, lawlessly whimsical, highly romantic, and made to command not to obey — a woman, in short, who "had the passions and instincts which make a model goddess, that is, those which make not quite a model woman".\(^{14}\) We get the matronly Pilar but miss Becky Sharp.

This lack of distribution of interest over a large number of persons makes Hemingway's world a small one, with God's myriad variety shrunk into a few typical persons. His range of character is narrow and the depth rather superficial. It is the background of the action which is marked by the tensions of war that creates an impression.

\(^{14}\) *The Return of the Native* by Thomas Hardy, p.73.
of depth of character which is not there: "... in the midst of death, any hint of life becomes all life; in the midst of unfeeling, the barest feeling becomes complex and sublime." 15 In Dostoevski it is the psychological analysis of character, and in Arnold Bennett, the long space of years that we live through with the characters, that give us a sense of intimacy with them. In Hemingway, the action of his novels covers short periods — *Farewell*, about a year, *The Sun*, two months, *The Bell* and *The Old Man and the Sea*, less than four days each. Besides, Hemingway confines himself rigorously to things said and done, and leaves severely alone the things of the mind.

Like Norris, Crane and Jack London, Hemingway was influenced by Nietzsche, and in a more intrinsic manner than the others. Jack London had been influenced by Darwin's theory of the "struggle for existence", with which Nietzsche did not agree. "The cold-blooded determinism of his (Crane's) belief" 16 had not had its source in Nietzsche. Norris's "belief in the raw power of primitive nature" 17 might have come from Nietzsche, but his was a scientific naturalism, where the individual

15. After the Lost Generation by J.W. Aldridge, p.112.
is subordinated and determined by the background. On the other hand, the Nietzschean Superman is an all-conquering hero. It is perhaps only in the context of the Nietzschean Superman that Hemingway's idea of morality could be explained, if not defended.

Hemingway is not interested in the ethics of an action. "Hills Like White Elephants" is not an occasion to discuss the ethics of abortion; "The Undefeated" is not about exploitation in the world of sport; "The Killers", not about gangsterism, or "A Simple Enquiry", about sex aberrations. Hemingway's real interest has been about qualities that are brought forth by certain situations. Hemingway has stated, "So far, about morals, I know only that what is moral is what you feel good after and what is immoral is what you feel bad after..." 18

"Nietzsche, as witnessed by his evergrowing admiration for the Romans, to whose temperament stoicism was so well adapted, was by his classical training a pagan, by his intellectual distinction an aristocrat, and by his fundamental genius an individualist, for whom morality was always an individual matter to be achieved by combat, self-discipline and pain". 19

18. Death in the Afternoon, p.11.
He had been opposed to the Christian faith, the Christian God and Christian morality. He felt the religion of love had been built upon the fear of pain. So was the commandment "Love thy neighbour as thyself". Sympathy involves fellow-suffering. He had contempt for, and rejected outright, the negative virtues of "Thou shalt not..." Negative morality has to surrender to the instincts of life. Zarathustra spoke: "... He, however, who belongeth unto me must be strong of bone and light of foot, — joyous in fight and feast, no sulker, no John o' Dreams, ready for the hardest task as for the feast, healthy and hale.

The best belongeth unto mine and me; and if it be not given us, then do we take it: — the best food, the purest sky, the strongest thoughts, the fairest women! 20

The morality of the slave has to give way to the morality of the master. He did not accept the Darwinian theor/ of the "struggle for existence". Nietzsche held that the struggle is only an exception in nature; it is exuberance, an even reckless superfluity, which rules. He did not accept that the "struggle for existence" implied the "will to live", for, according to him, "all living entities, whose perpetual battle with one another is

20. Thus Spake Zarathustra by F. Nietzsche, p.319.
the basic fact of life, want something much more exciting
than just merely to remain alive, something much more
active than the seeking of nourishment and the propagation
of their species. They want, all these living things, to
assert themselves, to exhibit themselves, to attack, to
dominate. Not the "will to live", but the will to power
is the moving force of the world". 21 Besides, "the natural
healthiness of a strong, brave, fighting spirit demands
an element of the pure joy of destroying, of the will to
destruction". 22 Read against this background, Hemingway's
love of violent sport does not sound so inhuman after all.

Nietzsche was the first man to coin the word Superman.
But this Superman is quite different from, and even the
opposite of, Sri Aurobindo's Divine Man. No two
conceptions in fact could have been so distinctly
different. Nietzsche's Superman has the "asurik" (demonic)
qualities — Herculean physical strength, invincible will,
and utter ruthlessness. He must have the courage to fight,
the power to conquer and the ability to rule. Sri Aurobindo's
Divine Man is one imbued with Supramental consciousness,
one who excels in the things of the spirit. It is the
individual man raised to the level of the Divine Man.

22. Ibid., p. 543.
heightened and enlarged till the barriers between them disappear. Sri Aurobindo says, "The rule given by the Cita is the rule for the master man, the superman, the divinised human being, the Best, not in the sense of any Nietzschean, any one-sided and lop-sided, any Olympian, Apollonian or Dionysian, any angelic or demoniac supermanhood, but in that of the man whose personality has been offered up into the being, nature and consciousness of the one transcendant and universal Divinity and by loss of the smaller self has found its greater self, has been divinised".23 In Life Divine Sri Aurobindo gives us the characteristics of the Divine Man: "He would feel the presence of the Divine in every centre of his consciousness, in every vibration of his life-force, in every cell of his body... All beings would be to him his own selves, all ways and powers of consciousness would be felt as the ways and powers of his own universality... His own life and the world life would be to him like a perfect work of art: it would be as if the creation of a cosmic and spontaneous genius infallible in its working out of a multitudinous order. The gnostic individual would be in the world and of the world, but would also exceed it in his consciousness...

and live in his self of transcendence above it; he would be universal but free in the universe, individual but not limited by a separative individuality. 24

Both Nietzsche and Sri Aurobindo believe that if the whole world is to be raised to a higher level, a superior race of men is essential. But Sri Aurobindo's Divine Man is a far cry indeed from Nietzsche's Superman. The distinction is here important. We find that Hemingway's hero started being Nietzsche's Superman. But led by Tolstoi, he journeyed towards being Sri Aurobindo's Divine Man. This does not mean that Hemingway had read Sri Aurobindo. It only means that Hemingway himself was ripening inwardly towards such a consummation. At the same time he begins with, and retains until the end, boundless courage, great physical strength, a capacity to enjoy wine and women. Above all, he remains a stoic. Reason and morality take the place of impulse and egoism. As time passes, a sense of duty, sympathy, understanding and a love of humanity grow. Hemingway however, nowhere reaches the spiritual heights of the Divine Man. But the progress achieved is nevertheless illuminating.

The growth and change is probably due to the influence of Tolstoi, whose greatness Hemingway very much admired.

and whose influence he always admitted. He was neither the first nor the only modern American novelist to be influenced by Tolstoi. Howells said of Tolstoi, "As much as one merely human being can help another I believe that he has helped me; he has not influenced me in aesthetics only, but in ethics, too, so that I can never again see life in the way I saw it before I knew him." Stephen Crane was another who had intensely admired him. Nietzsche and Tolstoi had spiritually dominated Europe during the last third of the nineteenth century, but had reacted to contemporary morality in different ways and had offered diametrically opposite solutions to the ills of the world. Nietzsche considered that the Christian virtues were the virtues of the poor and the oppressed, while courage and self-reliance were those of the ruling class. He represented the individualistic group of ideas and advanced a pagan solution. Tolstoi, on the other hand, felt that true religion (and not dogmatic orthodoxy) was very valuable. To him, all forms of violence were equally wicked. He believed in Christianity, without the encumbrances of church organisation, the priests and the rituals.

The Hemingway hero is a pagan, not a primitive. He has a virile, military, organic view of life. To Homer the "bad" meant base and cowardly, and the "good" meant the beautiful and the valiant. The Hemingway hero, in this sense, is good. In Hemingway it is not pity for the weak but admiration for the strong that counts.

The Hemingway hero is a materialist and an atheist in his early stages. But he has not lost faith in human nature, as the heroes of Dostoevski, for example, have. Having lost their faith in God they logically deduce that all things are lawful. Raskolnikov and Ivan Karamazov have erected for themselves a Nietzschean ideal of the Superman. Raskolnikov believes that in order to prove himself such a Superman he has to commit a murder. Hemingway was no doubt a champion of the body against the soul, of the spirit of adventure against the life hereafter. But he still remained human.

Combat was idealised by Nietzsche. Human conflict is to be found in all fields, on various levels and in differing degrees of intensity. Man has to fight against Nature for existence; the rational man has to fight against instincts inherited from the beast; he has to fight against the force of habit, custom and tradition; and finally he has to fight for his ideologies, for what he believes to be true and good. Nietzsche believed that struggle, self-discipline and suffering are necessary for moral development.
Hemingway to a great extent limits himself to the description of conflict on the physical level. The moral conflict is not lacking, but the hero does not refer to it, or does so almost casually. Moral values are veiled behind physical injuries and psychological shocks. These moral values become guiding principles to the hero in the later stages of his career. Tolstoi condemned all forms of violence. The aim of man, according to him, is to achieve happiness, which can be done only by doing right, by loving all men, and by freeing oneself from the appetites of greed, lust and anger. "Art should cause violence to be set aside", Tolstoi had declared. But it is quite possible that violence may be forced upon us. According to Tolstoi love is the only answer. He reduced Christianity to five commandments, of which "Resist not evil" and "Wage not war" are two. But Hemingway has no such doctrinaire religion. He is not interested in metaphysical speculations, intellectual gymnastics, didactic parables or symbolic abstractions. He has a sense of good and evil. There is a divinity that stirs in all human beings. The divinity that Hemingway is interested in is the dignity of human beings. If the liberty and dignity of human beings is in jeopardy, what are the

weapons to be used and what is the spirit in which they are to be used? Are we justified in using violent means against evil? Tolstoi would say no; Hemingway apparently says yes. Any weapons are justified if the goal is a good one. A sense of personal responsibility with no self-excuses, no self-pity, no sentimental bosh, and no cant, is his attitude. The outward life is torn by violence, but he preserves an interior serenity and individual integrity, which is the result of his moral sense and the consciousness of his ethical obligation.

Another point where Nietzsche and Tolstoi were at variance was the importance of the individual. Nietzsche exalted the individual principle to the point of divinity, while Tolstoi arrived at an absolute negation of the individual. But it is an important point to note that Tolstoi did not make a distinction, as Nietzsche did, between individualism and egoism. Tolstoi appreciated personality only in so far as it sacrificed itself for the others. In *The Cossacks* Olenin discovers that the only possible happiness is to live for others. Possibly, Tolstoi was thinking of egoism when he was speaking of individualism. For individual good and general good are not mutually destructive or even exclusive, while egoism and altruism are. On the contrary, they support each other. A universal practice of love would bring in abiding
harmony, but it need not, and should not, destroy the individual personality of men. As he becomes less of an egoist, the Hemingway hero serves society better.

The sincerity of the artist in relation to his subject is the most important characteristic of a work of art. An artistic production cannot be made to order, for "a true work of art is the revelation (by laws beyond our grasp) of a new conception of life arising in the artist's soul, which, when expressed, lights up the path along which humanity progresses".27 A less sincere artist than Hemingway could have been less personal and could have concealed from the vulgar curiosity of the public the things that were nearest his heart if he had not found them popular. Hemingway has been such a sincere artist that it is difficult to separate his personal life from his life as a writer. His books, his life and his views have all been the target of attack. He has been called "yellow", an escapist, and an ungrateful creature towards those who taught him the art of writing. Critics claimed that his art was irrelevant to the interests of the times. A man with less integrity might have docilely fallen into line and written, to please the critics, sociological novels about the reconstruction of society.

27* Ibid., p. 61.*
But not Hemingway. He has never taken a course of action or written a line which has not come straight from his heart.

His novels are an indirect but a sad commentary on modern civilization, of which violence is still an integral part. This should not come as a surprise in a world where material wealth is to a very great extent the norm of respectability and success: "... even now we are not too far from the belief that a chicken in every pot and two cars in every garage, with a helicopter besides, in that post-war world of mechanical marvels which we so impatiently await, will set life right for us, within and without. Fortunately, not a few among us are not aware that we had been grasping after a fool's paradise." Material possessions have increased, but moral values, to a great extent, have decayed; the intellectual horizon has widened but the spiritual horizon has shrunk. The picture of Jordan of The Bell is the ideal of Western civilization — handsome, educated, resourceful, an epicurean, a lover of democracy, an honest atheist who keeps his mind open, a stoic, a pragmatist, and one who loves human beings. This is quite good by itself, but not good enough. It is only when we compare this picture with the spiritual ideals

of Indian philosophy that we discover how it falls short
of perfection. There is no intention here of denouncing
Western culture, detracting from its merits, disparaging
its achievements or decrying its advance. In fact its
marvellous progress in other fields only brings out by
contrast its glaring short-comings in the field of the
soul. This has been recognised, accepted, and expressed
by the fine and sensitive writer, Charles Morgan, "If our
parents were embarrassed by the things of the body, we are
embarrassed by the things of the spirit".29 On the other
hand, Indians have leaned too far to the other side. They
have been indifferent, if not averse, to material
possessions. For them "the other world" has been of greater
interest than the one in which they live, things spiritual,
more absorbing than things terrestrial. This
disinterestedness has given rise to problems of a different
sort. Sri Aurobindo has synthesised the best of the "est
and the East: "Sri Aurobindo makes a revolutionary change
in the conception of Yoga. He rejects the idea, to which
all the previous thinkers have held fast, namely, that
the object of Yoga is individual salvation. Against this
view runs his clear declaration: 'Our Yoga is not for
ourselves but for humanity'. Lest people should mistake
this view for the Western brand of humanism, he adds:

29 The Writer and His World by Charles Morgan, p. 46.
'Our Yoga is not for ourselves but for the Divine'.

That is to say, his Yoga is for the expression of the Divine in humanity. Sri Aurobindo may also be called a humanist, but his humanism is totally different from the European brand of humanism of Comte and Mill... The aim of Sri Aurobindo's Yoga is what may be called cosmic salvation, that is to say, the Divinization of the whole of mankind, leading ultimately to the Divinization of the whole universe, for even the physical universe must feel the thrill of a Divine life. Individual salvation, meaning freedom from the cycle of birth and death, is not for Sri Aurobindo a very great thing. Of far greater importance is a higher birth, a birth as a Divinized Being. 30

The first World War helped to make American literature internationally famous. After the war, some of the American writers went back to live in Paris. There was greater contact and consequently greater understanding. It was a brotherhood of democracy. Hemingway discovered a brotherhood between the American and the Spanish rebel. Between 1932 and 1940 there were 332 French translations of American books. Of the younger writers Faulkner led the list with five titles and Hemingway had four. The mere number of titles was in favour of the older writers, but the younger

generation had direct influence on the style and content of the new French writing. Hemingway was probably the most influential of them all, since he was considered more or less an European. He was popular in Germany too, though Thomas Wolfe's style was more to their taste.

Mr. O. H. Wieselgren, the chief librarian of the Royal Swedish Library says, "The 'hard-boiled' literature plays an important role for our younger authors. I think no literature has during the last decade been more important and more read here than the American". 31 So was it in Norway and Denmark. Hemingway has been discussed at an organised meeting of the Soviet writers. He is again one of those admired by the Argentinian and Brazilian intellectuals. About his influence on English writers Alan Pryce-Jones wrote, "Whether he knew it or not, there is not a living writer in England who has been unaffected by the laconic speed of his dialogue, the subtle revelation of character that lies behind a broken phrase". 32 Edward Seidensticker wrote from Japan, "Hemingway's influence on the matter of recent Japanese writing is beyond question... Japan is among his most loyal realms". 33 It may be mentioned that the type of

33. Quoted in Ibid., p.22.
influence has been mainly limited to style especially in France. Said one French critic, "American is not so much a nationality as a style." 34

It is not enough if a writer is a product of his age. With his deep feeling, intense thought and creative imagination, he has to rise out of the slime of his age and put before the public new values, or the old ones in a new and striking apparel. "If the true effect of art is to enable men to revalue their own experience in terms of absolute values — that is to say, in terms of Compassion, Beauty, and Truth — the artist himself must value life in those terms and must be able to communicate his valuation in a way that is not merely a statement of his opinion or even an account of his vision but is fertilizing." 35 Vitality, appreciation, tolerance, understanding, loving kindness for all life, and a sense of humour mark Hemingway's books.

Every great novel must reveal a genuine love of life. This is not everything. There are other things that go to make a great novel. But no novel can be great without it. Hemingway's novels, whatever their shortcomings, reveal a genuine and intense love of life.

34- Quoted in Literary History of the United States ed. by Spiller and others, p.1391.