

SHIFTING FORM, TRANSFORMING CONTENT:
STYLISTIC ALTERATIONS IN THE GERMAN
TRANSLATIONS OF HEMINGWAY'S EARLY FICTION

By

Copyright 2009
Christopher Dick

Ph.D., University of Kansas 2009

Submitted to the Department of English and the
Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Kansas
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

James Hartman, Chair

James Carothers

Philip Barnard

Janet Sharistianian

Frank Baron

Date defended: 20 November 2009

The Dissertation Committee for Christopher Dick certifies
that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

SHIFTING FORM, TRANSFORMING CONTENT:
STYLISTIC ALTERATIONS IN THE GERMAN
TRANSLATIONS OF HEMINGWAY'S EARLY FICTION

Committee:

James Hartman, Chair

Date approved: 20 November 2009

Abstract

The general purpose of this study is to investigate the German translations of the early fiction of Ernest Hemingway. Unfortunately, the work of translators is too frequently minimized or ignored, and this dissertation seeks to highlight the inevitable shifts that occur as a text is moved from source language to target language. The end result of such a study is not a random list of translational anomalies but rather a better holistic understanding of the translated text. As Heidegger reminds us, “Every translation is . . . interpretation” (107), and in this study I look to explore how Annemarie Horschitz interprets (and ultimately diminishes) Hemingway’s important stylistic techniques.

These alterations in translation, as my study shows, are not “merely” stylistic adjustments. Hemingway’s stylistic choices—metaphors in *The Sun Also Rises* that represent post-war reality, repetition in the stories of *Men Without Women* that reinforces an ironic vision, understatement in *A Farewell to Arms* that is a reaction against traditional war rhetoric, and fragmentation in *In Our Time* that reflects a varied and order-defying worldview—are linguistic manifestations of Hemingway’s principal concerns. By modifying the surface-level linguistic features, Horschitz subsequently alters the conceptual framework of Hemingway’s fiction.

To accomplish this analysis, I ground my study in translation theory and stylistics. My investigation of the translated texts is supported by various translation theories, including Schleiermacher’s distinction between foreignizing and domesticating approaches to translation and Nida’s analysis of equivalence. In utilizing stylistics, I lean heavily on Halliday’s analysis of functional grammar and Lakoff’s work with conceptual metaphor.

I also aim to contextualize my study of Hemingway in translation by giving attention to Hemingway’s early literary career, his position as an interwar writer, and his relationship to Germany. The hope is that such a study might result in a deeper awareness of the translation process, a clearer understanding of the German translations of Hemingway’s texts, and a deeper appreciation of Hemingway’s stylistic choices.

Christopher Dick
English Department
University of Kansas
November 2009

Acknowledgements

Initial thanks go to colleagues, administrators, and students at Tabor College for flexibility, patience, and support as I have undertaken this long and worthwhile journey. Special thanks to my colleagues in the English Department—Deborah Penner and Sara Hill—who have had to compensate for my occasional absences.

Thanks also to family and friends. Thanks Mom and Dad for instilling in me a love of learning and a tenacious interest in language, literature, and history. I also am deeply appreciative to extended family members for words of encouragement along the way. Additional thanks go to a supportive group of friends who faithfully humored me by listening to my belabored explanations of my research.

My deep appreciation is also extended to my mentors at the University of Kansas. As I embarked on this project, many warned me that I would not be able to find professors who would work with me on such a unique topic. I feel very fortunate to have been able to match my research interests with a group of professors with unique talents and areas of specialization. Professor Sharistianian, your course on World War I literature provided the context for much of this dissertation. Professor Carothers, thank you for reintroducing me to Hemingway and giving me a great appreciate for his work. Professor Barnard, your interest in translation and translation studies helped me develop a theoretical framework for the paper. And Professor Baron, thank you for working with me on specific German translation issues and taking repeated interest in my work. And deep gratitude goes to my advisor, Professor Hartman, for not only your classes on grammar and metaphor that inspired this dissertation but also your tireless help in guiding me through the latter half of my doctoral studies. Thanks to all of you for your help as I have worked on this dissertation. Your suggestions and encouragement have been much appreciated.

Finally, profound thanks to my wife, Christine Crouse-Dick. Thank you for your patience, love, and support throughout my graduate school endeavor. Thank you also for your interest in my research and the numerous hours spent reading, editing, and commenting on my work. You have read more about Hemingway, stylistics, and translation than you ever cared to! Thank you.

Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter One Translation Analysis and Stylistics: Challenges and Opportunities	9
Chapter Two “A Representative Poet of Our Time”: Hemingway in German(y): 1922-1933	44
Chapter Three Shifting the Iceberg: Conceptual Metaphoric Loss in the Translation of <i>The Sun Also Rises</i>	80
Chapter Four <i>Men Without Women</i> and the Translation of Ironic Repetition	123
Chapter Five Transforming Frederic Henry’s Narrative: <i>In einem andern Land</i> and Translational Embellishment	172
Chapter Six Shoring Up the Fragments: The Cohesive Translation of <i>In Our Time</i>	216
Conclusion	263

Introduction

Jede Übersetzung ist aber schon Auslegung. (107)
—Martin Heidegger

In 1946 a letter written by Ernest Hemingway found its way from the peaceful Finca Vigía to publisher Ernst Rowohlt in war-ravaged Germany. It had been fourteen years since a Hemingway text had been published in Germany and thirteen years since Hemingway’s name had infamously appeared on Wolfgang Herrman’s list of un-German literature—a move that led to book burnings and bans. Hemingway, following the end of hostilities in Europe, was anxious to restart the publication of his works in German. After breaking the ice by engaging in some good-natured ribbing regarding the outcome of the war, Hemingway mentions the woman responsible for the German translations of his works to date: “Please write to Anne Marie (sic) Horschitz for me and tell her I look forward to having her translate my works again. She was the finest translator I ever had in any language” (*SL* 615).

What Hemingway was basing this glowing assessment on is unfortunately never specified. Hemingway’s grasp of German was limited compared to his knowledge of Italian, Spanish, or French, and so he was certainly unable to read and comment on the quality of the German translations of his work with any authority. Perhaps his remarks should be taken merely as the ever-strapped-for-cash writer’s attempt to ingratiate himself to Rowohlt in hopes of tapping into another source of funding, since in the same letter Hemingway mentions the financial advantages to renewed publication in Germany. Whatever the reason for the praise, Hemingway’s opinion, combined with the author’s popularity in German-speaking countries, seems

to have provided for several decades the definitive proof of the overall quality of Horschitz's German translations. This positive assessment persisted despite intermittent critical voices that cast doubts on the quality of her translations. Eighty years since the translations appeared, however, the basic question remains: Are Horschitz's translations of Hemingway's texts—the only authorized translations of Hemingway into German—"good"?

Unfortunately, this simplistic and misleading question is frequently the first and only one raised concerning not only Horschitz's translations of Hemingway but also most literary translations. The frequent pronouncements of translations as "good" or "bad" not only oversimplifies the act of translation but also tends to close the door on future research. If the translation is deemed "good," readers simply trust the translated text as true and faithful to the original. If the translation develops a negative reputation, it is dismissed by critics as inaccurate with the expressed hope that a future translator will eventually get it right. While questions about the quality of translations are valid, such evaluations of translations often appear without a careful study of the texts in question.

More often, though, readers, and even critics and scholars, completely ignore the fact that what they are reading in the translated text are not the author's words and assume that the translator is a personality-less conduit through which the source text passes unmodified. This misguided assumption has led to a phenomenon that Lawrence Venuti refers to as the translator's invisibility:

A translated text . . . is judged acceptable . . . when it reads fluently, when the absence of any linguistic or stylistic peculiarities makes it seem transparent, giving the appearance that it reflects the foreign writer's personality or intention or the essential meaning of the foreign text—the appearance, in other words, that the translation is not in fact a translation, but the “original.” (*TI* 1)

As Andre Lefevere reminds us, however, “Translators . . . are image makers, exerting the power of subversion under the guise of objectivity” (6-7). While some theorists might resist labeling translation as subversive, most would agree that translation is far from an unbiased activity. In fact, the very act of translation represents a particular reading of the text. Responding to those who see translation as an objective enterprise, Susan Bassnett argues that “it is absurd to see translation as anything other than a creative literary activity, for translators are all the time engaging with texts first as readers and then as rewriters, as recreators of that text in another language” (“Writing” 174).

In my dissertation I aim to highlight Horschitz's role as a recreator of Hemingway, to clarify her interpretation (whether intentional or unintentional) of Hemingway's texts, and to demonstrate the undervalued significance of the translation process. The end result of such a study is not a simple pronouncement of the translation as good or bad; it is, rather, an increased understanding of forces at work in language, in the text as a whole, and in source and target cultures.

In recent years, thanks to growth of translation studies, the critical focus has begun to shift away from unsubstantiated evaluations of translations (such as Hemingway's own comments about Horschitz's work) to careful examinations of shifts that inevitably occur in translation. My dissertation provides such an examination of translation shifting by analyzing the German translations of Hemingway's early fiction. I argue that an understanding of this shifting is important for three primary reasons: 1) it reveals the linguistic and cultural complexity of the translation process; 2) it highlights the importance of stylistics for literary analysis; and 3) it allows for a reassessment of interpretations of Hemingway's early fiction—the original English versions and the German-language iterations.

For Hemingway's prose, these translational modifications are significant. While not discussing the art of translation specifically, Hemingway himself in *Death in the Afternoon* indicates the importance of such transformations. In a passage frequently quoted in stylistic analyses of Hemingway, the author outlines his now-famous iceberg theory:

If a writer of prose knows enough about what he is writing about he may omit things that he knows and the reader, if the writer is writing truly enough, will have a feeling of those things as strongly as though the writer had stated them. The dignity of movement of an ice-berg is due to only one-eighth of it being above water. (192)

Providing his own metaphoric take on T.S. Eliot's objective correlative, Hemingway indicates that if the right words are chosen, the reader will be able to construct

accurately the hidden material underneath, what Carlos Baker refers to as the “substructure of symbolic meaning” that is evident in Hemingway’s early novels (*Writer* xiv). This precise style of writing may even be more evident in Hemingway’s short fiction. In an analysis of *In Our Time*, Linda Wagner refers to Hemingway’s “tight writing,” which demands that readers “value every word, every scene, every character . . .” (126). So what happens when Hemingway’s carefully chosen words are translated into another language? How does the inevitable distortion of Hemingway’s “tight writing” alter the “substructure of symbolic meaning” that is so crucial for a reading of the texts?

These questions provide the foundation upon which my dissertation is built. After outlining key issues in translation and stylistics in Chapter 1, I devote a chapter to a general discussion of Hemingway’s early connections to Germany and the translation of Hemingway’s texts into German. I then turn to translation issues that emerge in German translations of Hemingway’s early major works: *The Sun Also Rises* (1926; translated 1928), *Men Without Women* (1927; translated 1929), *A Farewell to Arms* (1929; translated 1930), and *In Our Time* (1925; translated 1932).

My claim is that the German translations of Hemingway’s early fiction represent a surprising and important loss in complexity, texture, depth, and content. In his insightful study of translation, John Sallis observes that there is a high probability that translations will “have the effect of flattening the text, of closing off possibilities, of resolving multiplicities that remain intact as such in the original” (76). I seek to uncover how this flattening occurs in Horschitz’s translations and what the

implications are for textual interpretation as the important multiplicities in Hemingway's prose are resolved.

An examination of *The Sun Also Rises*, for example, reveals significant metaphoric loss, which alters the symbolic underpinning of the original text. In other instances, Horschitz, while attempting to remain faithful to Hemingway's syntax, falls prey to a common temptation in translation as she subtly embellishes Hemingway's prose. The outcome in *A Farewell to Arms* is the unfortunate and significant loss of Hemingway's understatement, which Michael Reynolds refers to as one of the hallmarks of Hemingway's style in the 1920s (PY 26). This results in an altered portrayal of Frederic Henry—both as main character and narrator. The shifting continues in translations of Hemingway's short fiction. In *Men Without Women* the German translation fails to represent Hemingway's ironic repetition, and in *In Our Time*, arguably the most experimental of Hemingway's fiction, Hemingway's fragmented structure is lost due to Horschitz's tendency for cohesion.

My aim is not to lambaste Annemarie Horschitz and her translations as some critics have been quick to do. Translation criticism that simply quantifies translation errors is of little value. While there are certainly mistakes and mistranslations in the German versions of Hemingway, Horschitz's work at a basic level is satisfactory. As Friedrich Schlegel reminds us, however, "The best is what gets lost in generally good or excellent translations" (15, translation mine). My primary interest is to highlight, through careful analysis, the cumulative effect of various translation choices, even in cases where there are no obvious translation mistakes.

The need for such a study is great. One significant weakness in translation studies is that while there have been many proposed theories of translation, there have not been enough studies to test these theories. Additionally, those studies often fail to explain the significance of translation loss, gain, and shift. For example, Milton Azevedo's study of the translations of Hemingway's *The Fifth Column* into various romance languages has promise. In attempting to cover multiple translations (French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese), however, he attempts to handle too much material and does not offer any conclusions about the ways in which various translation strategies affect textual interpretation.

In the conclusion to *Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context*, Lefevere takes the academy to task for intentionally or unintentionally marginalizing translation scholarship and calls on the academy to overcome these institutional obstacles by encouraging more research, specifically theses and dissertations, that look at literature in translation through stylistic analysis. My study, in a small way, attempts to provide a corrective to the trend of ignoring translation issues. I see my research as not only providing a counterpoint to certain assumptions about translations but also crossing some of the traditional boundaries that have been set up within and outside of the academy. Translation studies, far from being a fringe discipline, actually sits squarely in the middle of academic inquiry, bringing together various disciplines (literary history, linguistics, cultural history, and literary theory), countering the tendency to compartmentalize, and forcing one to think broadly about language, literature, and cognition. And with its connection to

stylistics, translation studies involves the fusion of literature and linguistics, a synthesis that is long overdue.

The role of the translator and the translation process need much more scholarly attention. And although a shift in attitude is taking place, from seeing translators as glorified copyists to viewing them as co-creators in a generative writing activity, not enough scholarship has examined the product of the translation process. Quoting from Coleridge, Matthew Arnold states that the “union of the translator with his original, which alone can produce a good translation, . . . takes place when the mist which stands between them—the mist of alien modes of thinking, speaking, and feeling on the translator’s part—‘defæcates to a pure transparency,’ and disappears” (10-11). The reality, though, is that the mist does not disappear, even in a “good translation,” and the task of the translation scholar is to refocus attention on the texts—both original and translated—and on the often obscured translation process.

Chapter One

Translation Analysis and Stylistics: Challenges and Opportunities

There is no *signatum* without *signum*. (138)
—Roman Jakobson

[O]ne thinks differently in every language (100)
—Arthur Schopenhauer

The major: “Why, then, do you not take up the use of
grammar?” (CSS 208)
—Hemingway, “In Another Country”

I.

At the beginning of *A Farewell to Arms* Frederic Henry gives us a glimpse of his surroundings as they have been disturbed by the war. His description includes the following simple observation about the transformed forest near the town: “now there were the stumps and the broken trunks . . .” (6). Then, turning to the German translation of the novel, we encounter Annemarie Horschitz’s description of the same landscape: “*nun war nichts übrig als geborstene Stümpfe und zerspaltene Stämme . . .*” (12) [now nothing was remaining except burst stumps and shattered trunks].

After reading Hemingway’s brief passage and then Horschitz’s version, we notice that while these two passages are ostensibly communicating the same message, they are, in fact, quite different. We are thus confronted with a series of questions. Stylistically, what kind of narrative is Hemingway constructing? What lexical, grammatical, and syntactic elements compose this style? And, perhaps most significantly, how crucial is this style to the larger narrative? In considering Horschitz’s translation, we must also face several crucial questions. How does

Horschitz modify the original passage? What is lost, gained, or altered in translation? Are there linguistic, literary, or cultural reasons for her to do this? And, perhaps most significantly, why are these modifications in translation important to the larger narrative?

As we will see throughout this study, answers to these questions are provided by two important academic fields: stylistics and translation studies. Surprisingly, these two disciplines have been underdeveloped and underutilized within the academy. With translation, a disturbing anomaly emerges when one examines the disparity between the significance of the translation act and its perceived worth. Translation has been and continues to be vital not only for scholarship but also for cultural exchange. Considering Western civilization's indebtedness to translation, L.G. Kelly bluntly claims in *The True Translator: A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West* that "Western Europe owes its civilization to translators" (1). Despite the importance of translation, however, the role of the translator and the position of translations themselves have been historically too often either marginalized or completely ignored. While issues surrounding translation and translatability have been discussed for centuries, beginning perhaps with early Roman efforts to Latinize the works of Homer, Sophocles, and Aeschylus, intentional studies of translations and the translation process have emerged only recently as critics have highlighted the various problems involved in shifting a text from source language to target language.

The increased interest in translation in recent decades has led to the development of translation studies as a legitimate academic discipline. Problems persist, however, and among the various disciplines, translation studies often remains at the bottom of the academic hierarchy. One possible reason for this marginalization is that translation studies does not fit nicely into the highly compartmentalized academic system. As a result the translated text finds itself in a virtual no man's land. Does the German translation of Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises*, for example, belong within the category of American literature or German literature? Efforts to position translation studies in the realm of comparative literature have also met resistance as some scholars feel uncomfortable in considering a German translation of a Hemingway novel as a German literary text. For some the comparison of the original text with the translated version does not fit the criterion of comparative literary analysis between two national or cultural groups. The status of translation studies as a discipline without an academic home has led to a wide range of opinions as to what the scope of translation studies actually is. James Holmes, in attempting to assess the current state of translation studies, laments "the lack of any general consensus as to the scope and structure of the discipline" ("Name" 183).

Stylistics has also been an underdeveloped and ambiguous discipline. While contemporary stylistics is, many would argue, less than 50 years old, examinations of style in language date back to the ancient world where both Greek and Latin scholars include stylistic concerns as central in general discussions of rhetoric. As Edward Corbett and Robert Connors note, for Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, style was

much more than “the dress of thought.” These rhetoricians “taught that there is an integral and reciprocal relationship between matter and form” (338). During the following centuries, however, style was deemphasized in favor of content, and form became simply the necessary vehicle for thought. In the Renaissance, style was seen as mere adornment, window dressing that could be added or removed with no change to the content of the message. Beginning in the eighteenth century, style emerged primarily as an issue of correct usage, and texts, like George Campbell’s *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, provided prescriptive rhetorical guides for proper communication. Language usage became, in some sense, a necessary evil for the conveyance of ideas. As Sharon Crowley observes in her survey of the current-traditional theory of style, in the post-Lockean world “it had become increasingly clear that the acquisition of knowledge was inevitably bound up with language. However, it was equally clear that man’s access to knowledge might be partially or wholly blocked by the imperfectability of language as a representative medium” (233).

Thanks to the early-twentieth-century work of the Russian Formalists, Saussurian linguistics, the Prague Linguistic Circle (especially Roman Jakobson), and New Criticism (especially I.A. Richards), discussions of stylistic concerns began moving beyond this simplistic and skeptical view of language. As stylistics has developed as a legitimate discipline, however, some of the old notions about style and stylistic analysis have remained. Surprisingly, those most reluctant and even hostile toward stylistics have been literary critics. This tension manifested itself in the infamous Fowler-Bateson controversy during the 1960s, which highlighted the

traditional gulf between literary criticism and stylistic analysis. Writing in defense of the work of the literary critic, F.W. Bateson claimed that literary criticism's subjectively qualitative approach runs counter to the objective, quantitative approach of linguistics. Linguists, in Bateson's opinion, do not possess the sensitivity needed to perform helpful literary criticism. For his part, Fowler argued for the necessity of careful textual analysis as an aid for interpretation and evaluation. Although this debate occurred over forty years ago, these issues are still very much a part of the discussion of the merits of stylistics within the academy. While English departments in recent years have become more amenable to linguistics as an interpretive tool, there is still, unfortunately, a divide between linguistic and literary analysis in many departments and a lack of understanding of the goals of stylistic inquiry.

II.

Language Function

Stylistics, however, when applied correctly, can prove very instructive in literary analysis. While modern stylistics encompasses a wide range of issues, three central concepts are significant for my study: language function, foregrounding, and cognitive stylistics. The focus on language function has helped stylistics move beyond the helpful, but sometimes limited, field of traditional grammatical analysis. The emphasis of functional grammar is not on an analysis of grammatical forms as an end in itself. As Michael Halliday notes in his highly influential *Explorations in the Functions of Language*, the focus is instead on "how the form of language *has been determined* by the functions it has evolved to serve" (vii, emphasis mine). To this

end, Halliday attempts to simplify the complexity of language by outlining three primary “macro-functions” of language use: ideational, interpersonal, and textual.

The ideational function is concerned with the content of language—the way in which language informs. Language represents experience (both external and internal) through transitivity, the study of which highlights semantic roles such as agents, processes, and goals. Transitivity also affects content since different verb types (as well as different modal auxiliaries) suggest different mental processes. Language thus becomes an expression of logical relationships. Halliday writes that these relationships are “encoded in language in the form of co-ordination, apposition, modification and the like” (*EFL* 98). A grammatical analysis of Hemingway’s and Horschitz’s prose, therefore, becomes the means by which important relationships are made explicit.

Interpersonal language function refers to the way in which language plays the mediator role between speaker and hearer. While a number of issues related to this function refer specifically to oral communication, interpersonal function also addresses the way in which authors insert themselves into their texts. Although not utilizing Halliday’s terminology, Wayne Booth in *The Rhetoric of Fiction* highlights a similar language function by examining questions about authorial involvement in fiction. Booth observes that while modern fiction ostensibly frowns on any type of authorial intrusion in the text, the assumption that modern writers do not insert themselves into their fiction is absurd. “[T]hough the author can to some extent choose his disguises,” Booth writes, “he can never choose to disappear” (20).

Questions of authorial presence, Booth asserts, “force us to consider closely what happens when an author engages a reader fully with a work of fiction; they lead us to a view of fictional technique which necessarily goes far beyond the reductions that we have sometimes accepted under the concept of ‘point of view’” (8-9). Language thus functions as mediator between author and reader.

One key concern for my study is Hemingway’s presence in his narratives. Focusing on the interpersonal language function allows us to consider more explicitly the importance of Hemingway’s stylistic technique (and its translation into German) as key to understanding Hemingway’s position in his fiction. We will see this especially in the analysis of Hemingway’s irony in Chapter Four. When the man in “Hills Like White Elephants” calls the proposed abortion “perfectly simple” (CSS 213), for example, we sense very quickly Hemingway’s presence behind these words, which causes us to question a literal interpretation of this expression and explore alternative meanings.

Finally, the textual function, in Halliday’s words, “fills the requirement that language should be operationally relevant—that it should have a texture, in real contexts of situation, that distinguishes a living message from a mere entry in a grammar or dictionary” (EFL 34). In Saussurian terms, stylistics takes as its focus of study *parole* as opposed to *langue*. Attention is given to language used in a particular rhetorical situation. A central term in considering the textual function of language is cohesion—how well language holds together. Cohesion is an important stylistic factor for all writers. For Hemingway, however, it becomes even more crucial as

syntax is manipulated specifically to weaken cohesive bonds. Horschitz's treatment in translation of Hemingway's experimental modernist style, therefore, deserves very careful study.

Halliday is quick to note that although one of the macro-functions may be more prominent than the others in a sentence, most sentences embody all three functions. Highlighting a specific function, though, helps a critic consider the ways in which language function is affected by language structure. This is where grammatical analysis can help illuminate *how* language means. Every time we use language, we are faced with linguistic options. Our grammatical choices, then, reflect complex relationships. As Halliday observes, "What we know as 'grammar' is the linguistic device for hooking up together the selections in meaning which are derived from the various functions of language, and realizing them in a unified structural form" (*EFL* 34). The task of stylistics is to begin unpacking the various functional aspects of language that are embedded within the grammatical structure of the utterance.

Foregrounding

While Halliday focuses his attention on these three macro-functions, other theorists have proposed additional language functions. One especially helpful addition to Halliday's list is the poetic function as identified by Roman Jakobson. The poetic function of language, according to Terry Eagleton, results "in language being placed in a certain kind of self-conscious relationship to itself" (98). Also referring to this type of language function, Geoffrey Leech and Michael Short write,

The Prague School of poetics has distinguished the “poetic function” of language by its foregrounding or deautomatization of the linguistic code. This means that the aesthetic exploitation of language takes the form of surprising a reader into a fresh awareness of, and sensitivity to, the linguistic medium which is normally taken for granted as an “automatized” background of communication. (28)

The operative word when considering the poetic function of language is foregrounding. Although a difficult term to pin down, foregrounding, as John Douthwaite defines it, is “the deployment of a set of techniques to draw the reader’s attention to a certain part of the text so that the reader will pay special attention to it” (37). Specifically, for most theorists, a linguistic feature is foregrounded through some type of “stylistic distortion” by means of various techniques, whose purpose is, in a Shklovskian sense, to defamiliarize something linguistically so that it can be perceived in a new, fresh way. The linguistic feature achieves, within the text as a whole, some level of prominence—a term that Halliday defines “as a general name for the phenomenon of linguistic highlighting, whereby some feature of the language of a text stands out in some way” (*EFL* 105). Halliday stresses that this need not be departure from some norm but can be simply the establishment of a certain pattern. Many critics have echoed this dichotomy and stressed the distinction between positive prominence (establishing of the norm) and negative prominence (departing from the norm).

Discussions of prominence inevitably raise the difficult issue of establishing a definition of “the norm.” What, in other words, is the baseline against which a linguistic feature is analyzed? For a reader to pay special attention to a part of the text, this part must differ in some discernable way from standard usage. As Paul Simpson observes, foregrounding theory “presupposes that there exists a notional linguistic yardstick against which a particular feature of style can be measured” (51). This is far from an exact science, though. Leech and Short write, “[D]eviation is a matter of degree, and at some indefinite point it becomes significant not that a writer has chosen x rather than y or z, but that he has chosen x at all” (139).

Negative prominence, or deviation, can occur solely within a text—what Simpson refers to as a “deviation within a deviation” (51). Most often, however, theorists discuss the phenomenon of deviation when it occurs between comparable texts/authors. A linguistic feature is considered deviant when one observes a “difference between the normal frequency of a feature, and its frequency in the text or corpus” (Leech and Short 48).

Hemingway’s use of understatement in *A Farewell to Arms* is an example of foregrounding through negative prominence. As Jay Winter argues, World War I inspired many to fall back on “the enduring appeal of many traditional motifs—defined as an eclectic set of classical, romantic, or religious images and ideas . . .” (5). This provided comfort as people grieved loss on an unimaginable scale. Hemingway’s technique achieves prominence through his rejection of these

traditional motifs (and a corresponding traditional language). His understatement thus stands out because of his departure from the norm.

Positive prominence, in contrast to negative prominence, is a more helpful intratextual term. The focus is on linguistic repetition, and importance is placed on patterns as one looks for repeated linguistic formulae within a text. This type of tracking has, unfortunately, led to simplistic assumptions that stylistic analysis is merely the counting of nouns and verbs. G.W. Turner, however, provides a helpful distinction between grammarians and stylisticians. While both grammarians and stylisticians look for schemes and variation in language, “[t]he grammarian is interested in each scheme separately and for its own sake; the stylistician is interested in comparing schemes, relating them to their *contexts* and observing the intricate *patterns* emerging from the interference of one with another” (17, emphasis mine).

Turner here identifies the key concepts in any discussion of foregrounding: contexts and patterns. It must be emphasized that discussions of language function and foregrounding are not ends in themselves, and stylistic analysis should not simply stop with the identification of interesting, prominent linguistic phenomenon. As Simpson observes, “Stylistic analysis is not the end product of a disorganized sequence of *ad hoc* and impressionistic comments” (4). Stylistic analysis, when done properly, demands that these findings lead to conclusions about *why* certain linguistic choices were made.

In order to determine the significance of linguistic choice, consideration must be given to issues of context. A.E. Darbyshire, at the beginning of his study, notes

that “style in the use of language is a deviation from a norm and that there are good social reasons why such deviations should exist” (7). Stylistics attempts to provide possible reasons for linguistic choice and to contextualize linguistic choice. David Crystal and Derek Davy write,

[T]he aim of stylistics is to analyse language habits with the main purpose of identifying, from the general mass of linguistic features common to English . . . , those features which are restricted to certain kinds of social context; to explain, where possible, why such features have been used, as opposed to other alternatives; and to classify these features into categories based upon a view of their function in the social context. (10)

What is the significance or purpose of certain linguistic features that are foregrounded, either through deviation or through repetition? And why are these foregrounded features important within the context of the larger text?

For literary analysis, a consideration of context often relates to issues of literary relevance. This is what Halliday refers to when he defines foregrounding as “prominence that is motivated” (*EFL* 104). Similarly, Simpson discusses “artistically motivated deviation” (48) and links foregrounding with “textual patterning which is motivated specifically for literary-aesthetic purposes” (50). Simpson’s comment again reinforces two essentials for stylistic analysis: patterning and purpose. There must be recurring stylistic elements. Random stylistic features, while potentially interesting, lead to little more than passing comments. The identification of linguistic

patterns begins to speak to significant stylistic devices. And these recurring stylistic elements must have intention—they must be significant within the larger context. They must have, to borrow a famous phrase from Halliday, “value in the game” (*EFL* 108).

An understanding of the context of Hemingway’s stylistic choices is essential. I will argue that an example of prominence in Hemingway’s fiction is his use of repetition—a relevant linguistic feature that has “value in the game.” A reader’s attention is drawn to certain repeated patterns—the word “machine” in “In Another Country,” for example. As we will see in the analysis of *Men Without Women*, Hemingway’s fiction is rich with this type of foregrounding. Repetition in these stories is not random or coincidental, but is certainly motivated by a desire to highlight an important ironic vision.

The charting of deviance and repetition often leads to generalizations about a writer’s style. As Crystal and Davy observe, “To talk of studying the ‘style’ of an author does not usually imply a study of everything in the language he has used, but only an attempt to isolate, define, and discuss those linguistic features which are felt to be peculiarly his, which help to distinguish him from other authors . . .” (77). Stylistic foregrounding, however, must achieve significance beyond simply an author’s specific quirks. Such a focus often leads to a reductive approach to an author’s style that results in oversimplification and misguided assumptions. As we will see with Hemingway, generalizations about his hard, athletic, and simplistic

prose, while sometimes helpful, can often lead critics to underestimate the significance of Hemingway's sophisticated stylistic choices.

Cognitive Stylistics

The final notable area of importance within the field of stylistics is cognitive linguistics. Cognitive linguistics, or cognitive stylistics, has emerged as a helpful tool in explaining the significance of stylistic choices. Elena Semino and Jonathan Culpepper provide a useful definition for this emerging branch of stylistics: “Cognitive stylistics combines the kind of explicit, rigorous and detailed linguistic analysis of literary texts that is typical of the stylistics tradition with a systematic and theoretically informed consideration of the cognitive structures and processes that underlie the production and reception of language” (ix). Importance is given to the bond that exists, to borrow Chomskian labels, between the deep structure of cognition and the surface structure of linguistic expression. As Geoff Thompson notes, a fundamental purpose of the analysis of language function “is that we can in principle use even individual lexico-grammatical choices in context to understand something of the way in which language, and thus language users, construe the world” (161).

Cognitive stylistics has emerged as significant due in part to the shift from logical positivism to relativism in language study. In his introduction to *Metaphor and Thought* Andrew Ortony outlines the implications of this shift for linguistics. In positivism, Ortony writes, “reality could be precisely described through the medium of language in a manner that was clear, unambiguous, and, in principle, testable—

reality could, and should, be literally describable” (1). In the relativist view, on the other hand, “the objective world is not directly accessible but is constructed on the basis of the constraining influences of human knowledge” (2). As Ortony goes on to explain, this view sees language and thought as intimately linked. Language usage thus achieves an elevated level of significance as it becomes the means by which thought can be understood.

The main vehicle through which this mystery has been explored in recent years has been metaphor theory. At the beginning of his discussion of metaphor in *A Philosophy of Rhetoric*, I.A. Richards quotes from Aristotle’s *Poetics*: “The greatest thing by far is to have a command of metaphor” (89). While Aristotle did not have an understanding of the discipline that became cognitive stylistics, his intuition about the significance and complexity of metaphor was accurate. During the twentieth century several theorists expanded our understanding about the way metaphor works, and a cursory survey of texts reveals the increased importance given to cognition in the analysis of metaphor.

Richards, for his part, reintroduced the academy to the study of metaphor and stressed the importance of language study in general: “How words work,” Richards writes, “is a matter about which every user of language is, of necessity, avidly curious . . .” (8). Richards laments that rhetoric has proven to be the most unproductive area of English studies. Specifically, he is critical of the prevalent treatment of metaphor “as a sort of happy extra trick with words . . .” (90). Richards makes two important points to help stimulate the contemporary discussion of metaphor. First, he divides

metaphor into two parts (tenor and vehicle), which allows him to explore the way in which a metaphor *means* in greater detail. And second, rather than dismissing metaphor as rhetorical flourish, he stresses the ubiquity of metaphor and the close relationship between metaphor and thought. While he does not explore these issues in great detail, these two contributions provide the framework for much subsequent twentieth-century work in the area.

Max Black's 1962 work *Models and Metaphors* continued the research begun by Richards. In his discussion of metaphor, Black highlights the limitations of the substitution and comparison views of metaphor, which do not give adequate import to the power of metaphor to affect cognition. Instead, he promotes an interactive understanding of metaphor. When a metaphor is in play, Black asserts that "the reader is forced to 'connect' the two ideas. In this connection resides the secret and the mystery of metaphor. To speak of the 'interaction' of two thoughts 'active together' . . . is to use a metaphor emphasizing the dynamic aspects of a good reader's response to a nontrivial metaphor" (39).

I will argue in Chapter Three that *The Sun Also Rises* is full of nontrivial metaphors. One category includes metaphors in which the domain of decay is used to conceptualize a spiritual or emotional state. When characters refer to themselves (as they often do) as feeling "rotten," interaction occurs as readers bring together the domain of human emotion with the domain of decay. The power of metaphor, according to Black, resides in language's power to combine these two domains.

Paul Ricoeur further develops the connection of language and thought in *The Rule of Metaphor*. Beginning with a useful survey of research on metaphor, Ricoeur encourages looking beyond the word by connecting discussions of metaphor within the framework of the sentence and the larger discourse. He also merges metaphor and cognition, providing more evidence that metaphors are much more than rhetorical window dressing: “the issue is no longer the form of metaphor as a word-focused figure of speech, nor even just the sense of metaphor as a founding of a new semantic pertinence, but the reference of the metaphorical statement as the power to ‘redescribe’ reality” (6). One additional helpful point that Ricoeur develops in his study is the complex and paradoxical activity of metaphor in creating similarity and dissimilarity simultaneously.

In an overview of contemporary metaphor theory it is difficult to overstate the significance of George Lakoff. *Metaphors We Live By*, co-written with Mark Johnson and published in 1980, is cited by almost every subsequent study of metaphor. At the beginning of this text, the authors note, “Since metaphorical expressions in our language are tied to metaphorical concepts in a systematic way, we can use metaphorical linguistic expressions to study the nature of metaphorical concepts and to gain an understanding of the metaphorical nature of our activities” (7). Metaphor, for Lakoff and Johnson, is thus much more than a linguistic phenomenon. In general, Lakoff’s scholarship has sought to link language with thought and action. Lakoff throughout his work is critical of objectivism and expands on notions of experientialism that he introduced in *Metaphors We Live By*. In *More than Cool*

Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor, Lakoff and Mark Turner provide yet more evidence for the ubiquity of metaphor not only in imaginative literature but also in everyday life.

Lakoff's work with metaphor has proven helpful for cognitive stylistics in general. In *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things* Lakoff outlines the primary task of cognitive linguistics: "to hypothesize about the nature of cognition in general in order to account for the phenomena of natural language" (486) and "to show how aspects of form can follow from aspects of meaning" (491). Another important contribution from Lakoff in this text is his detailed examination of idealized cognitive models and categorization, which directly link cognition with language usage.

In general the main goal of cognitive stylistics is to emphasize the intimate connection between language, cognition, and our world. As Mark Turner argues in *Death Is the Mother of Beauty*, "Imagination is . . . not unfettered; it is governed by principles. These principles are automatic and below the level of consciousness." Turner goes on to explain that creative expression "is constrained by our knowledge, our experience, and our modes of cognition" (16). Raymond Gibbs provides another study of language and cognition in *The Poetics of the Mind* as he argues "that how we speak about our experiences is closely tied to ways we figuratively conceptualize our lives" (15).

The consideration of the interplay between language and thought seems especially important in the study of modernist texts. Critics have been quick to point out that stylistic issues were indeed primary concerns for modernist writers. Faced

with the daunting task of defining the modernist movement, Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane describe modernism as “less a style than *a search for a style* in a highly individualistic sense . . .” (29, emphasis mine). While this searching resulted in a range of linguistic manifestations, primary importance was placed by modernist writers on the means of expression. In *S/Z* Roland Barthes identifies the shift from a nineteenth-century readerly text, which is controlled by an author who fixes meaning, to the twentieth century’s fondness for the writerly text, which presents “a galaxy of signifiers, not a structure of signifieds” that must be interpreted by the reader (5).

Hemingway’s signifiers, I will argue, are not simply random linguistic units; they are significant for the way in which we conceptualize the story being told. When these units are altered, when the lexical network is modified (as in translation or even paraphrase, for that matter), there is a loss of content. Linguistic manifestations are linked to cognitive domains, so altering linguistic expressions has the potential to alter the ways in which cognitive domains are activated, thus significantly affecting an interpretation of the text. Changing Hemingway’s decay metaphors in the translation of *The Sun Also Rises*, for example, is not simply a linguistic issue. It is a cognitive issue that affects how we understand the novel.

The demand on the critic is to pay special attention to these signifiers, which, as G.W. Turner observes, often embody a “metalinguistic language function.” When language embodies this function, the complexity is staggering. Connecting stylistics with translation analysis, Turner writes that in such language use, “words have complex reference, back to themselves as well as outward to situations.” This leads us

into a consideration of translation issues because, as Turner concludes, “Metalinguistic uses of language are seldom translatable . . . because to translate is by definition to change the vehicle of expression, and this vehicle of expression is itself the reference of a metalinguistic use of language” (225).

III.

As Turner’s comment suggests, the study of stylistics and the study of translation share similar concerns, although, in one obvious respect, translation studies has an advantage over its counterpart. One of the issues that has plagued stylistics has been the seemingly limitless potential alternatives against which the actual text can be analyzed. Whereas stylistics often is forced to deal with hypothetical constructions (what could have been written as opposed to what is written) in order to ascertain the significance of foregrounded linguistic constructions, translation analysis provides an actual textual alternative version (albeit in a different linguistic code) to the original. While the issue of hypothetical constructions, of course, remains (i.e., alternative translational choices), the existence of the translated text provides a concrete basis for analysis.

Theories of translation analysis tend to be grounded in theories of the translation process itself. This activity is more complicated than one might initially expect. In addressing the breadth of translation, Roman Jakobson, for example, expands the typical notion of translation by outlining three main types of translation: intralingual (rewording, paraphrase), intersemiotic or transmutation (e.g., the use of sign language instead of spoken language), and interlingual (translation proper) (139).

While intralingual and intersemiotic translation are ubiquitous and are certainly deserving of scholarly attention, interlingual translation has received the most consideration.

In its most basic form, interlingual translation concerns the transfer of a source text (ST), written in a source language (SL), into a target text (TT), written in the different target language (TL). The simplicity of this definition, however, obscures the myriad obstacles encountered in this transfer process. While translators face a series of issues that they must (whether consciously or not) work through, three concerns are primary: the translator's view of his or her role in the translation process, the translator's understanding of equivalence, and the translator's view of the relationship between the source text and the target reader/culture.

The role of the translator

Any discussion of translation begins with a careful consideration of the translator's role in reproducing the SL text. The position that a translator takes is often motivated by his or her view of language, and theories of translation have often been formed around either a scientific or an artistic conception of language. The first view, mainly a linguistic approach, sees language as instrument. Applied to translation, the emphasis tends to focus on the technical aspects of translation and to see translation as the transmission of data. Theorists in this tradition are often very optimistic about precise translation. Jakobson, for example, boldly states, "All cognitive experience and its classification is conveyable in any existing language.

Whenever there is deficiency, terminology may be qualified and amplified . . .” (140). Taken to an extreme, this practical approach to language tends to view the translator as a (slightly) glorified copyist, whose function is to transmit content from one language to another.¹ While this approach often provides a pragmatic explanation of translation, it not only ignores the human element in the translation process but also fails to give adequate attention to the complexities encountered when one is faced with the overall textual *Gestalt*.

The second approach elevates the translator to the role of interpreter and emphasizes a hermeneutic translational strategy in which language is viewed as a creative force. This romanticized notion of translation emphasizes the secret and mystical aspects of language in expressing meaning. Translation thus is primarily concerned with communicating the underlying spirit of the text. With this approach translation becomes an overt act of textual interpretation, and the translator, according to Goethe, becomes “a prophet among his people” (*Schriften* 39). Stylistic concerns also receive more attention as the translator is aware that language is more than simply a representational system that reflects an underlying, universal reality. While the strength of the hermeneutical approach is in its attention to the end result of translation, it tends to be somewhat ambiguous in its explanation of the actual human activity that takes place during the translation process.

Equivalence

The second key issue for the translator to consider is equivalence, a term that has generated a good deal of debate among translation scholars. In attempting to pin down a concise definition of equivalence, Sandra Halverson identifies three key components to this crucial term: “a pair (at least) between which the relationship exists, a concept of likeness/sameness/similarity/equality, and a set of qualities” (209). One of the key points of debate, though, concerns the degree of likeness/sameness between pairs (whether these pairs be words, larger grammatical units, or concepts). James Holmes in “Poem and Metapoem” identifies what he calls the “root problem of all translation”: “that the semantic field of a word, the entire complex network of meanings it signifies, never matches exactly the semantic field of any one word in any other language” (9). Eugene Nida is not alone among translation scholars when he observes that “there can be no absolute correspondence between languages” and thus “no fully exact translations” (153).

Faced with this dilemma, the translator must grapple with the general issues of translatability. On a macro-level, the translator must consider whether a translation can or should even be attempted. Some languages and cultures are so distant and the transfer between systems so cumbersome that the translation project is ultimately abandoned. More often, however, the translator will run into various elements (e.g., metaphor) in the ST that prove problematic for transfer. This occurs even in situations of generally high translatability.

While German and English are closely related languages, issues of untranslatability inevitably arise. Horschitz encountered this problem, for example, with the Hemingway title *A Farewell to Arms*. Critics have often cited the double meaning of “Arms” as it is emblematic of the novel’s dual focus: as war story and love story. German, however, does not have a word to accomplish this double meaning, so the translator must look for other options. When the novel appeared in Germany in 1930, it came out under the very different title *In einem andern Land* [In Another Country].

In general, however, as Raymond van den Broeck observes, translatability is high when languages are closely related (i.e., they exhibit a high degree of lexical and syntactic correspondence), there is contact between languages, and the cultures of the languages have developed along parallel lines (84).² When translation involves such closely related languages and cultures, literal word-for-word translation is often possible. The translator may also simply borrow a source-language expression and use it in the translated text. In “A Methodology for Translation” Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet note that if translation involved only this type of exchange, translation “would lack an intellectual challenge since it would be reduced to an unambiguous transfer from SL to TL” (131). Problems with clear-cut equivalence invariably arise, however, even in closely related languages. Translators often encounter gaps, or, to use Vinay and Darbelnet’s term, “lacunae,” which require the translator to employ various methods “so that the overall impression is the same for the two messages” (128).

The basic job of the translator, faced with the impossible task of “exact” translation, becomes one of finding equivalent linguistic units in the target language to match those in the source language. To that end, Nida identifies two basic approaches to equivalence: formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence. While other theorists have proposed more elaborate models, Nida’s analysis remains the standard approach in the discussion of equivalence.

The concern in formal equivalence, according to Nida, is that “the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible [in content and form] the different elements in the source language” (156). The best example of this type of translation is a gloss translation, which produces a very close approximation (both in form and content) to the SL text, thus helping the TL reader to understand “the customs, manner of thought, and means of expression” of the SL text (156). A formal-equivalent translation consistently reproduces the following:

- 1) Grammatical units (maintaining word classes, syntax, punctuation)
- 2) Word usage (rendering “a particular term in the source-language document by the corresponding term in the receptor document”)
- 3) Meanings (not adjusting idioms, but reproducing “such expressions more or less literally, so that the reader maybe able to perceive something of the way in which the original document employed local cultural elements to convey meanings.” (161-162)

Dynamic equivalence, according to Nida, “aims at complete naturalness of expression, and tries to relate the receptor to modes of behavior relevant within the

context of his own culture; it does not insist that the reader understand the cultural patterns of the source-language context in order to comprehend the message” (156). Nida notes that the trend in recent decades has been toward dynamic equivalence—a recognition that “adherence to the letter may indeed kill the spirit” (158). In dynamic-equivalent translation, “the focus of attention is directed, not so much toward the source message, as toward the receptor response” (162). Nida describes a dynamic-equivalent translation as “the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message” (163).

As one might ascertain, there is a correlation between the translator’s view of his or her task (which, as we have seen, corresponds to a certain approach to language) and a view of equivalence. A translator who chooses the linguistic view of language will often gravitate toward formal equivalence. Such a translator will have a great deal of faith in the ability of the target language to reproduce the source text without deviating too far from the original’s grammatical and semantic fields. A translator who takes a hermeneutic view of language will often favor a more dynamic approach to equivalence. He or she will probably take a looser approach to translation in attempting to capture the spirit of the source text. The interplay between these two positions has led to what may be the quintessential debate in translation—the translator’s historic predicament that George Steiner calls the “radical tension between impulses to facsimile and impulses to appropriate” (235).

The key question is how much liberty will the translator take with the source text. Will the translator choose formal equivalence and thus opt for a translation that

replicates the source text as much as possible? Or will the translator take a freer approach and adjust the source text so that the “spirit” of the original is more clearly received by the target-language reader?

As we will see, Horschitz clearly faced this tension in her translation of Hemingway’s fiction. While she generally opted for a formal-equivalent approach and tried to avoid obvious departures from Hemingway’s syntax, she clearly made some adjustments in an interpretive attempt to make Hemingway conform to German standards. Ironically, though, both approaches lead to unfortunate translational shifts that affect a reading of the texts.

Target audience

The reader is ultimately left to grapple with the final product, which leads to the third major concern for the translator: a consideration of the reader’s position as it relates to the translated text. When conceptualizing the target reader, the translator has two options: 1) Domesticate the foreign text, bringing the SL author/culture toward the TL reader; or 2) Foreignize the text, bringing the TL reader toward the SL author/culture. Friedrich Schleiermacher, in his 1813 essay “On the Different Methods of Translating,” considered by many to be the first significant expression of translation theory, argues for the foreignizing approach, stating that the goal of the translator should be “to impart to the reader the same image, the same impression that he himself received thanks to his knowledge of the original language . . . , thus moving the reader to his own position, one in fact foreign to him” (49).

Despite Schleiermacher's appeal, Venuti argues throughout *The Translator's Invisibility* that the dominant approach in English-language translation has emphasized the opposite strategy by promoting domestication. While the resulting fluency of translation may seem initially positive, there are two significant concerns. First, the domestication of a foreign text results in an imperialistic appropriation of the SL text, giving TL readers a sense that the author is speaking directly to them and obscuring the SL culture. Additionally, as previously mentioned, the resulting fluency of domestication results in the invisibility of the translator and the translation process, further marginalizing the already peripheral position of the translator in the literary landscape.³

More often than not, a translator, when faced with extreme positions, will find a middle ground. Referring to Stein's "radical tension," Kelly argues for a balance between the linguistic and hermeneutic approach to translation in developing a comprehensive theory of translation: "Purpose without technique means groping, technique without clear purpose, sterility" (65-66). Similarly, with the question of foreignizing or domesticating a translation, a middle position is often taken. To be sure, the translator almost always (except in obscure situations) embarks on a translation project with the hope of making the ST accessible to the TL reader. As Gideon Toury claims, the needs of the target culture should be primary. Translators, Toury writes, "operate first and foremost in the interest of the culture into which they are translating . . ." (12). This position taken to an extreme, however, would seem to promote the taking of excessive liberties with the ST—an approach that, in respect to

textual fidelity, must certainly be rejected. In the end, some faith must be bestowed on TL readers and their ability to grapple with the strangeness of the foreignized text. One of the reasons, after all, to read a translation is to encounter the unfamiliar.

Role of the translation critic

Whatever the translator's positions in respect to these complex issues, the translation critic is left to sift through all of these translational challenges in providing a comprehensive description of the end result: the translation itself. In his seminal essay "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies," Holmes provides a framework for translation analysis by outlining the organization of descriptive translation studies (DTS). Holmes sees three primary types of research: product-oriented DTS, which examines existing translations and attempts to provide descriptive and/or comparative studies of translations; function-oriented DTS, which examines the position of the translation in the context of the target-language culture, looking at the choice of source-language texts and the forces affecting the translator's choices; and process-oriented DTS, which examines the complex process that "takes place in the 'little black box' of the translator's 'mind'" (185). While there is a certain degree of impossibility in process-oriented DTS, complicated by the fact that translators rarely get a chance to explain their choices, the translation critic's job is to examine the textual evidence as a means of recreating the translator's thought process. In examining the product, process, and function of translation, the critic's primary focus is on translational shifting. Translation analysis focuses its attention on those points in

the TL text that mark a distinct shift from the SL text. It is, in the end, not a question of *if* but *how* the translation changes the original text. There will be loss, gain, and shifting during the translation process. Translation analysis thus becomes a powerful critical lens by helping to reveal those moments in the text that do not carry over so easily into the TL.

While I envision my project primarily within the product-oriented framework, as Toury observes, product, function, and process are interrelated and must be examined together. The earlier divisions in translation studies have given way to a more holistic approach to the study of translation. This shift has led Susan Bassnett to remark, “The apparent division between cultural and linguistic approaches to translation that characterized much translation research until the 1980s is disappearing” (*TS* 3).

Bassnett’s comment addresses two central areas of concern within contemporary descriptive translation analysis: linguistic and cultural issues. The recognition of the interrelatedness of these two areas is paramount. As Juri Lotman notes, “No language can exist unless it is steeped in the context of culture; and no culture can exist which does not have at its center, the structure of natural language” (qtd. in Bassnett, *TS* 22). As a result, the study of a text in translation must be framed by both linguistic and cultural issues. For literary translation analysis especially, however, I would argue for the necessity of analyzing the translation based on a third frame: narrative issues. A translation scholar must not only consider the linguistic and cultural issues at play in a translation but also analyze the significance of translational

shifting at the narrative level by considering the impact of the translational choices on the text in general (similar to the approach taken in stylistic analysis). What do the repeated translation patterns indicate about the kind of translation that emerges? The concern again lies not with the clichéd notion of something being “lost in translation.” The important concern is what is lost and what is gained and how this loss affects the text in its entirety.

An examination of Horschitz’s translation of *In Our Time*, for example, reveals an overall loss of Hemingway’s technique of fragmentation. The corresponding gain is a more fluid, more cohesive target-language text. What is important, however, is not simply identifying loss and gain but exploring the effect that this translation strategy has on the text as a whole. Chapter Six will address this specific issue.

Just as translators must avoid extreme positions and find helpful middle ground on certain issues, translation scholars must also find a balanced approach in examining the translation process. This task involves considering linguistic, cultural, and narrative issues together when investigating a translation. This blended approach to descriptive translation analysis leads to more nuanced conclusions. Unfortunately, studies of translation often emphasize one approach over another. This is especially true in the linguistic approach-historical approach debate that has raged in translation studies. Those scholars who are concerned with linguistic equivalence become so intent on linguistic aspects that they lose sight of larger contextual issues. And

translation scholars who take a broad historical-descriptive approach often fail to account for specific linguistic issues.

Writing about the supposed simplistic origins of the word “translation,” Michael Hanne writes, “The English word translation derives from the Latin *translatus*, past participle of the verb *transferre*, meaning ‘to carry across,’ which is echoed also in the English *transfer*. In translation, this etymology suggests, meaning is picked up bodily from one country and culture, transported across a frontier . . . and deposited (unaltered) on the other side” (208). The etymology of the word, however, belies the complexity of translation. As Bassnett observes, “[T]ranslation is not just the transfer of texts from one language into another [;] it is now rightly seen as a process of negotiation between texts and between cultures, a process during which all kinds of transactions take place mediated by the figure of the translator” (TS 6). The job of the translation scholar is to reject a simplistic approach to translation and to investigate the scope of these complex transactions.

IV.

Both translation studies and stylistics share storied histories; both, however, have suffered in recent decades from oversimplification and mis/disuse. The marginalization of these areas of study seems to be coming to an end. Modern literary stylistics, rather than focusing on prescriptive formulae for the creation of text, instead provides tools for descriptive analysis to account for the way in which literary language functions and links language to a broader cognitive framework. And translation studies is moving beyond the knee-jerk pronouncements of translations as

good or bad to a more thorough description of the inevitable linguistic and cultural transformations that occur as texts are moved from one language system to another.

While the focus of the disciplines differs, translation studies and stylistics both concern themselves with the core issues of language, meaning, and reality. Both seek to foster a renaissance in thinking about the relationship between form and content by moving beyond the archaic notion that style can be cleanly divorced from thought. Both draw our attention to language and language function and ask us to consider carefully not only how grammar systems work but also, in a Whorfian sense, how these systems shape thinking. The concern of both disciplines is the connection between language and thought. This, however, goes beyond some simplistic form of linguistic determinism in which language shapes and reflects cognition; rather, language becomes a mediator between experience and cognition. Language and thinking are always-already shaping each other. Form and meaning are interacting in complex and intimate ways, and language becomes a means by which cognition is expressed and reality created. Conversely, cognition and reality are repeatedly shaping language choice. This connection is why style matters. This is why translating a text into a different lexical code matters. By studying a writer's style and examining texts in translation, one understands more fully the connection between language and thought and, as a result, begins to recognize form *as* meaning.

The end result of this deeper consideration of form and meaning is a firmer foundation for interpretive assertions. An important goal of both stylistics and translation studies is to make explicit what might simply be interpretive hunches—to

provide linguistic evidence for claims and to test intuition, to move beyond unsubstantiated interpretations that are never tested at the linguistic level. This is done by examining foregrounded linguistic units—both stylistic and translational patterns—that call attention to themselves and require interpretation within the larger frame of the text.

As my study of the German translations of Hemingway's early fiction aims to demonstrate, combining translation studies with stylistics creates a powerful method of literary analysis by drawing us back to careful textual examination. Both disciplines, in essence, re-center our focus on the foundational elements of communication. As George Steiner observes in *After Babel*, "A study of translation is a study of language" (47). Paul Simpson expresses a similar sentiment about stylistic analysis: "To do stylistics is to explore language . . ." (3). This careful consideration of language, of *how* a text means, leads us to a greater understanding of the profound interrelatedness between form and content.

Such textual analysis, however, must be contextualized. Before seeing how stylistics and translation studies help us analyze the form and content of not only Hemingway's fiction but also Horschitz's translations, we turn first to a discussion of Hemingway's relationship to Germany.

Notes

¹ To be fair, Jakobson does indicate that “poetry” may prove untranslatable, echoing Robert Frost’s famous remark that “poetry is what gets left out in translation” (qtd. in Bayley 103).

² Given van den Broeck’s assertion, the translatability of Hemingway’s texts into German should be quite high. As we will see, however, translation issues plague even these supposed simple translation projects.

³ It should be noted that Venuti’s concern for the translator’s invisibility speaks, in part, to a self-consciousness of translators and translation studies throughout the centuries, which leaves the translator to wrestle with his or her marginalized position in literary production.

Chapter Two

“A Representative Poet of Our Time”: Hemingway in German(y): 1922-1933

“It’s damned funny that Germany is the only place I can sell anything.” (71)

—Hemingway, *A Moveable Feast*

“If only I could speak German,” I lamented. (B-L 39)

—Hemingway, *The Toronto Daily Star*, 5 September 1922

I.

At the beginning of his fictionalized memoir *Green Hills of Africa*, Hemingway recounts an exchange with a “bandy-legged man with a Tyroler hat” along the side of a road:

“Will you have a drink?” I held out the flask. “Hemingway is my name.”

“Kandisky,” he bowed. “Hemingway is a name I have heard. Where? Where have I heard it? Oh, yes. The *Dichter*. You know Hemingway the poet?”

“Where did you read him?”

“In the *Querschnitt*.”

“That is me,” I said, very pleased. (6-7)

An established writer and an international figure by the mid-30s when *Green Hills of Africa* was published, Hemingway could look back with a hint of nostalgia to 1924—a time when his future success seemed anything but preordained. During that year he was a struggling writer, living in a small Parisian apartment without electricity next to

a sawmill with Hadley and Bumby. Frustrated with his job and the lack of time to focus on his own writing, he had just quit his job with the *Toronto Star* and returned with his family in January to France, where he began working on Ford Madox Ford's *transatlantic review* in February to pay the bills. Hemingway had high hopes that 1924 would provide plentiful opportunities to further his literary career, and with Bill Bird's publication of *in our time* by Three Mountains Press in March, Hemingway had reason to expect that his fledgling reputation would continue to develop.

His obligations to *transatlantic review*, however, proved more time-consuming than he imagined. When Ford returned to America to raise money for the struggling magazine, the bulk of the editing responsibilities fell to Hemingway. "That summer," as James Mellow notes, "Hemingway had begun to think of himself as a victim" (262). In a letter to Pound, Hemingway sounded especially despondent: "I am going to have to quit writing because we haven't any money. The Transatlantic killed my chances of having a book published this fall . . ." (*SL* 119).

In addition to the demands of the magazine, 1924 proved frustrating on other fronts as his short fiction continued to be rejected (most painfully by *The Dial*). If one sets aside his self-included *transatlantic review* material, Hemingway had just eight literary pieces published between February 1924 and July 1925. "Mr. and Mrs. Elliot" was published late in 1924 in the *Little Review*, and *This Quarter* printed "Big Two-Hearted River" in the spring of 1925. The other six appearances of Hemingway's work (poems initially and then short fiction) occurred, surprisingly enough, in various issues of *Der Querschnitt* (Hanneman 142-144).

An avant-garde publication based in Frankfurt with a reputation of promoting modern literature, art, and photography, *Der Querschnitt* [The Cross-Section] was a relatively new publication, having been founded in 1920 by Alfred Flechtheim. According to Nicholas Gerogiannis, Hemingway's poetry appeared in the magazine through the efforts of the American composer George Antheil, who had been tapped by Alfred Wedderkop, the magazine's Paris representative, to serve as a contributing editor. Antheil knew the key literary players of the Paris scene, including Ezra Pound and Sylvia Beach, who put Antheil in contact with Hemingway (xvi).

While the poems themselves are certainly not important as great works of art (Baker lumps them in with "the rest of his puppy-doggerel" (*LS* 134)), their publication seems to have bolstered not only Hemingway's pocketbook but also his morale, which was certainly at a low point. And at a time when his short stories were being rejected, *Der Querschnitt* published "The Undefeated,"¹ several months before its publication in English in *This Quarter* (Hanneman 144).

German periodicals continued to play a key role in promoting Hemingway over the next several years with *Frankfurter Zeitung*, *Europäisch Revue*, and *Berliner Tageblatt* all printing Horschitz's translations of his short fiction between 1927 and 1930. Although the success of *In Our Time* (1925) and *The Sun Also Rises* (1926) meant that Hemingway would no longer need the support of German literary magazines, the appearance of his work in these periodicals helped pave the way for Hemingway's eventual enthusiastic, but short-lived, reception in Germany during the early 1930s. (Ultimately, Hemingway's interwar popularity in Germany would be

brief, ending for all practical purposes in 1933 with Hemingway's public statements against national socialism and the banning of *A Farewell to Arms* by the Nazis.)

That his literary career was buoyed in the mid-20s by German periodicals is one of the many unexpected twists and turns in the Hemingway story. The eleven-year story of Hemingway in Germany during the Weimar years is full of such unexpected moments and sudden developments. Within German borders during this time he remained "*Der Dichter*," but he was transformed from the avant-garde poet found in the snobbish pages of *Der Querschnitt* into "*ein repräsentativer Dichter unserer Zeit*" [a representative poet of our time], according to Klaus Mann's bold pronouncement in 1931 (277).

The positioning of Hemingway as both literary bohemian and populist chronicler not only characterizes the paradox of Hemingway in Germany but also helps explain the breadth of his popularity. In order, however, for Hemingway to move from obscure poet to widely translated author to, eventually, the poet of the times in Germany, Hemingway would need help. This came in the form of a highly productive translator, a supportive publisher, and a cadre of enthusiastic German critics. Most important, though, was the zeitgeist of Weimar Germany, which created fertile ground for the reception of Hemingway's work.

II.

While Germany would eventually embrace Hemingway's fiction enthusiastically (more than any other European nation), Hemingway's own attitude toward the country during this period could be characterized as one of disinterest. In

fact, during Hemingway's early years in Europe his contact with the German zeitgeist, which would ultimately make his literary success in the country possible, was quite limited. Other major nations on the continent played much more significant roles: France as his European home, Spain as the locale for bullfighting, and Italy as the country of Hemingway's most transformative experience. Even Austria and Switzerland figured prominently as frequent vacation destinations. Germany, however, appears conspicuously absent during much of his early career.²

Although Hemingway took several trips to Germany during this time, these excursions left less-than-positive impressions on the young writer. His first foray into Germany occurred in 1922, a four-week vacation that Kenneth Lynn describes in negative terms: "The Black Forest was too tidily maintained to suit a man who was used to the wilds of Michigan; fat German tourists with loutish manners threw their weight around everywhere; and bureaucratic red tape made obtaining group fishing licenses frustratingly difficult" (179). In a dispatch for the *Star* that appeared on 5 September 1922, Hemingway recounts two instances of "German nastiness" as he, traveling with Hadley and friends, encounters Germans at inns who are openly aggressive to "auslanders" (sic) (*B-L* 36-40).

In an article that ran two weeks later, Hemingway takes on the effects of German inflation. The picture that Hemingway gives of Kehl, the German city across the Rhine from Strasbourg, is extremely negative: the river is "yellow and muddy"; the water "sucks at the concrete abutments of the long, iron bridge"; the city itself is "ugly" and "dreary" (*B-L* 45). The condition of the population matches this

dreariness. While inflation puts goods out of the reach of German citizens, due to the favorable exchange rate the French stream into the city to take advantage of inexpensive German food. Hemingway leaves the reader with the powerful contrasting images of an elderly German man unable to buy an apple while scores of French youth gorge themselves on German pastries. “It gave you a new aspect on exchange,” Hemingway writes in his article (*B-L* 48).

Another official visit for the *Star* occurred in 1923. Hemingway spent six weeks in Germany, having been sent by managing editor John Bone to cover tensions in the Ruhr area caused by French occupation and clashes between German nationalists and communists. Four years later, under much more positive circumstances after the publication of *Men Without Women*, Hemingway spent several days in Germany with hopes, as he indicated in a letter to Fitzgerald, of watching the Berlin bicycle races, drinking beer, and seeing his German publisher (Mellow 358).

While Hemingway also found himself in Berlin for a few days in 1929, it was his visit to the German capital two years later that would prove more noteworthy. In 1931, having established himself as a major literary figure in Germany, he returned to Berlin for the premier of Carl Zuckmayer and Heinz Hilpert’s theatrical adaptation of *A Farewell to Arms*, “Kat,” which ran during the first three weeks of September (Kvam, “ZHH” 194). In his memoir, Zuckmayer remembers Hemingway on that evening: “Hemingway came to the opening from Paris, where he was then staying. He was drunk by the time he arrived. . . . He understood no German, and it was not

clear whether the scenes he saw on the stage reminded him of anything in his book, or of anything at all” (qtd. in Kvam, “ZHH” 194).

Hemingway, in these brief interactions with Germany and her people, comes across as acutely disinterested in and unimpressed with the country. And to be fair, Germany during this period did not present a pleasant picture—to foreigners and Germans alike. Ironically, as we will see, this negative post-war reality in Germany would provide the appropriate climate for the development of a receptive reading audience for Hemingway’s fiction.

As Hemingway reported in the *Star*, Germany’s situation in the twenties was precarious at best. With its defeat in the war, the German monarchy had crumbled and a fragile republic, with threats from every side, was formed. War had caused severe hardships for all but a handful of Germans, and peace proved to be a struggle as well. In his study of Weimar Germany, Peter Gay chronicles the significant events of the period. “The first four years of the Republic,” Gay writes, “were years of almost uninterrupted crisis, a true time of troubles.” He then provides a partial list of the hardships that greeted the new democracy:

[t]he bloody civil war, the re-emergence of the military as a factor in politics, the failure to discredit the aristocratic-industrial alliance that had dominated the Empire, the frequency of political assassination and the impunity of political assassins, the imposition of the Versailles Treaty, the Kapp Putsch and other attempts at internal subversion, the French occupation of the Ruhr, the astronomical inflation (10-11)

The failed revolutions of 1918 and 1919 and the multiple attempts at political reform created an exhaustion among the population that soon gave way to apathy. Feelings of helplessness and alienation surfaced following an exhausting war that appeared to have been fought for no reason. Average Germans felt that they were being threatened by the victors outside, as well as by the power struggles gripping the country inside. In the 1920s the weak democratic government of the Weimar Republic, prolonged gloomy economic conditions, and growing threats from within the country did little to convince average Germans that anything positive had come from the war.

As a result, anti-establishment, and especially anti-war, backlash in Germany was strong, and many novels and plays highlighted the brutality of war and the difficulties faced by survivors. Numerous pieces of post-war fiction took up themes of war, hardship, and hopelessness. Adrienne Thomas' *Die Katrin wird Soldat* and Ernst Glaeser's *Jahrgang 1902* addressed the lingering memory of the war by debunking the myth of war as glorious struggle. One of the most widely read chroniclers of the war and post-war period—Erich Maria Remarque—examined the war experience and its aftermath in his trilogy (*Im Westen nichts Neues* [1928], *Der Weg zurück* [1931], and *Drei Kameraden* [1937]). In these novels Remarque portrays not only the brutal reality of war but also the intense struggles that faced soldiers and citizens following the “War to End All Wars.” Soldiers returning from the front in Remarque's novels must cope not only with the lingering memories of horror but also with the difficulty in reintegrating back into society. These so-called *Heimkehrer*

[homecoming] novels show repeatedly the dehumanizing effects of war on both soldiers and citizens.

More broadly, literature written in German during and after the war often emphasized isolation, apathy, and angst and incorporated new forms to express these emotions. Franz Kafka, for example, presents the reader with protagonists who are often alienated due to cruel and unfeeling societal systems. Published during the war, *The Metamorphosis*, whose outline sounds like a blueprint for *The Sun Also Rises* as Gregor Samsa must cope with the aftermaths of a changed body and altered relationships, encapsulates this feeling of anxiety. In *The Trial* (1925), Joseph K. is at the mercy of a cold and distant justice system. Kafka's fiction also signaled a shift in literary form. His avoidance of lyrical language and his utilization of a style "of realist precision and terseness" (Stoehr 61) to describe a cold and fragmented world would also help set the stage for Hemingway's fiction.

Hemingway's positive reception in Germany was aided not only by a pessimistic post-war outlook and an aesthetic turn toward New Objectivity but also by a growing interest in America. While the war understandably put a halt to budding pre-war fascination with American culture and resulted in a strained relationship between the two countries, German curiosity about America quickly regained its footing after the war. This interest grew as American investment in Germany increased. As Karl Leydecker notes, "German culture became more open to influences from other cultures, most notably the United States, as financial credits went together with cultural influence . . ." (9-10).

The 1920s witnessed a flood of cultural studies about America as well as a rise in the number of American studies departments in German universities. While some German intellectuals eyed with concern America's lack of culture and over-emphasis on democratic ideals and materialism, as Anne Springer observes, "after World War I Germany looked with renewed interest and expectancy towards the trans-Atlantic nation which had emerged as a world power. . . . For the Germans, above all, it was important to get to know America better . . ." (20-21).

One primary vehicle for getting acquainted with the United States was American literature, and several American authors achieved noteworthy success in Germany. While Upton Sinclair enjoyed support among the country's socialist groups and Sinclair Lewis and Theodore Dreiser each had his share of admirers, the writer with the most widespread popularity in Germany before the Great War and then again in the interwar period was Jack London. London's appeal was partly the result of his reputation as teller of exotic tales. The attraction in Germany went deeper, however. As Springer notes, "In a nation worn out by war, inflation, and political disintegration, London came to be linked with the elementary forces of a New World that had overtaken an old and tired continent" (32). Hemingway's work would soon appeal to similar interests among German readers.

While London, Sinclair, Lewis, and Dreiser realized continued success throughout the 1920s, they represented an older generation of writers. Attention was slowly being diverted to a new generation of American writers—"Die Jüngstens" [The Youngest Ones]—Dos Passos, Hemingway, Faulkner, and Wolfe. While

Faulkner and Wolfe would not appear on the German scene until later in the thirties, Dos Passos helped set the stage for Hemingway's popularity in Germany with the translation of his war novel *Three Soldiers* in 1922.

Germans were able to connect with Dos Passos and Hemingway primarily because of their shared involvement in and critical evaluation of the pivotal event of their generation: the Great War. The ensuing "lost-generation" cynicism also resonated with the German public. Helmut Papajewski argues that Hemingway's success in Germany in the early 1930s was clearly tied to his creation of characters struggling to make sense of their precarious place in a post-war world:

The idea of a lost generation was not entirely new to German intellectuals. They had realized that State Feudalism under the Kaiser's rule had involved the individual in an unparalleled political tragedy without asking his opinion or arousing in him any desire to take a personal political decision. Those who had come to understand and express this now emphasized the sphere of the personal and private life which attracted them in Hemingway's writing (75-76)

The stage was thus set for Hemingway to assume a leading role as the new voice of American literature in Germany.

III.

It was in this climate that Hemingway appeared on the German literary scene. By the end of the twenties Hemingway had distanced himself from Dos Passos, and

by the early 1930s, thanks to the success of *A Farewell to Arms*, Hemingway stood near the top of the list of American writers. Critics quickly paid attention.

An early appraisal of Hemingway in Germany, however, was not flattering. In one of the first critical acknowledgements of his work, Leo Lania attempts to introduce Hemingway, as well as a corresponding expatriate subculture, to German readers after the 1928 translation of *The Sun Also Rises*: “The U.S.A. is today cultured enough that it can afford a bohemian society—at least abroad. Paris is their dominion. And Ernest Hemingway their biographer” (2178).³ Unfortunately, Lania gets almost every aspect of Hemingway’s own biography wrong, from misrepresenting his war experience to lumping him in with the mass of American soldiers who came to Europe in 1917 and stayed when the war ended. In general, Lania is at a loss as to what to make of Hemingway the man, the fragmented structure of the book, and the cast of characters and their alcohol-fueled dialogue.

Germans would have to wait over a year for a more complete picture of Hemingway to emerge from critics. In his study of Hemingway in Germany Wayne Kvam states that “Hemingway was well known in Germany after the publication and translation of his early short stories and *The Sun Also Rises* in the 1920s . . .” (*HG* 91). “Well known,” however, is a matter of degree. For their part, German periodicals in 1928 and 1929 are conspicuously silent about Hemingway’s translated works. Given the critical lack of recognition before 1930, it seems that Hemingway’s reputation was rather limited. Beginning in 1930, however, articles focusing on Hemingway and his work began appearing with ever-increasing frequency.

The title of Alfred Polgar's 1930 article for *Das Tagebuch*—"Der neue Hemingway" [The New Hemingway]—is somewhat ambiguous—an indication of either Hemingway's new persona or his relative anonymity in Germany. Although Polgar gives *Fiesta* and *Männer* a favorable passing comment, he saves his greatest praise, expressed with German romantic flair, for *In einem andern Land*: "An astounding book. 368 subdued pages. From the music of the incomprehensible life" (1647). What seems to appeal to Polgar most is Hemingway's focus on action: "Psychology or something similar is completely missing. Deep insight is only done seldom and then briefly" (1646). This tendency—of positive but reductive criticism, even from seemingly astute readers—appeared in numerous German studies of Hemingway during this period.

In the same year, Hans Joachim included Hemingway as one of several authors featured in his article "Romane aus Amerika" [Novels from America]. Joachim focuses heavily, as many of his contemporaries do, on Hemingway's style: "Ernest Hemingway," Joachim writes, "is an extreme Stylist; his Style, which is obsessed with reality, leaves behind it what still smacks of style. . . . What he writes is often banal; however, it has that in common with life" (405).

Although critics were intrigued with Hemingway's style, they were perplexed by it as well. Early critics often struggled to find ways to describe it, sometimes falling back on cinematic terminology to explain his technique. Hemingway's style was called strange, weird, bizarre, and, from the non-committal critics, "interesting." Others were kinder with their words, although they too were unable to characterize

the art of Hemingway's prose. *In Our Time*, in particular, created special problems for German critics. This confusion, however, could be attributed in part to German unfamiliarity with the short story form, which, as Klaus Doderer notes, was seen by many, in comparison to the novella, as an inferior type of literature, relegated to pages of magazines and newspapers (423). It was clear, however, that Hemingway's style was leaving its mark, with a critic like Polgar using the term "*Hemingwaysches*" [Hemingway-ish] to describe a powerful treatment of the material that relied on showing rather than telling to produce the intended effect (1647).

In addition to stylistic concerns, numerous critics focused on Hemingway's treatment of war and death. In an article entitled "Mr. Hemingway und der Tod" [Mr. Hemingway and Death], Irene Seligo emphasizes Hemingway's preoccupation with death—first with the war and then with bullfighting. Seligo melodramatically writes that as a result of this obsession, "the American Hemingway came to Europe in search of death . . ." (969).

Critics usually move quickly from a discussion of Hemingway and death to an analysis of Hemingway's specific interest in war. Due in part to repeated misinformation about his involvement in World War I (e.g., that he served as a soldier in the Italian army), many critics attribute to Hemingway a profound and comprehensive understanding of war in general and the Great War in particular. Max Dietrich praises Hemingway additionally for his portrayal of the life of the soldier after the war is over. *In Our Time*, according to Dietrich, "portrays in almost epic breadths the life of a soldier after the war down to the last details and emotions" (90).

Almost all reviewers, as they are highlighting Hemingway's treatment of the war, quote at length and discuss Frederic Henry's famous statement concerning his embarrassment from words such as glory, honor, courage, and sacrifice in *A Farewell to Arms*. Even critics who reject Hemingway as a significant literary voice make reference to this important passage.

It is clear from critical responses that the sentiment expressed in Frederic's famous statement struck a chord in Weimar Germany, so much so that reviewers sometimes embellish Hemingway's anti-war message. Part of this comes through the elevation of Frederic Henry's involvement in the war. Dietrich, for example, turns Henry into an army field doctor (90). Frederic Henry's greater investment in the war creates a corresponding intensification of cynicism, which leads Pohler, for example, to state that "he despised the war" (1646). Although it is unclear whether the antecedent in Polgar's statement is Hemingway or Frederic Henry, either would be an embellished misrepresentation. (The blatant blending of Hemingway and his protagonists clearly occurred in Germany as it did in America.)

This reading of the book—as an unequivocal anti-war novel—caught on in Germany. Papajewski specifically links the popularity of the novel with its perceived anti-war message: "The pacifistic beliefs of many individuals—so very widespread in Germany after the First World War—were of course a fertile ground for the message of the novel. The moral of the story was readily accepted by the general reading public" (74).

Critics often extended their discussions of Hemingway's treatment of the war into a more general discussion of his characterization of brutality, the coldness of life, and its meaninglessness. Dietrich, while discussing Hemingway's novels, describes the life that the author portrays as "blatant truth, as unrelenting events, as brutal phenomena" (90). Another influential review from the early 1930s was Hans Fallada's article "Ernest Hemingway oder Woran liegt es" [Ernest Hemingway or Why Is It].⁴ In addition to praising Hemingway as "a new exhilarating island" (672), Fallada reinforces Hemingway's overarching brutality. Writing at length about *A Farewell to Arms*, Fallada points to the harsh context of the German title—*In einem anderen Land* (what Fallada claims as Hemingway's preferred choice for the novel's title)—which is taken from Marlowe's *The Jew Of Malta*: "I have committed fornication but that was in another country and besides the wench is dead." This apparent attitude of detachment leads Fallada to conclude that Hemingway's matter-of-fact storytelling "is egregiously primitive" (674).

Part of the primitive comes from the emphasis on the individual. Dietrich writes that "one feels continually in the unconscious that the personal fate of the individual plays a far more excellent role than the fate of a victory or a defeat" (91). This fate is often described by critics as unrelentingly gloomy. Fallada remarks that in Hemingway's stories, through all the exhausting details, "sadness, . . . loneliness of life, our purposelessness, [and] helplessness in fate [increase]" ("Ernest" 674). And in another review of Hemingway's work, Fallada examines the 1932 translation of *In*

Our Time, focusing heavily on Hemingway's treatment of what he calls the "Sinnlosigkeit des Lebens" [meaninglessness of life] ("Gespräch" 23).

In addition to the heightened attention paid to Hemingway's writing, Hemingway the man was achieving larger-than-life status in the German press. During the early 1930s many German critics began discussing him first and foremost as an artist, not simply as another in the line of American literary figures. The Hemingway legend—as swaggering adventurer (reinforced repeatedly by embellished biographical material) and writer for a new generation—had certainly begun to catch on following the German publication of *A Farewell to Arms*, which German critics of the 1930s repeatedly refer to as his strongest book.

In an exuberant 1931 overview of Hemingway's work to date, Klaus Mann, son of Thomas Mann, spoke for a growing number of Germans in his closing description of the author: "He is a typical American, but with all the inner experience of a European. He sees this world with the freshness of his young race, and simultaneously with the slyness of our elders . . ." (227). The idea that Hemingway represented some type of Amero-European hybrid is common in this early criticism. German readers were thus reassured that Hemingway's dual sensibilities would grant them access to an American experience without overwhelming them with a wholly foreign perspective.

The growing Hemingway legend was solidified in 1933, according to Papajewski, by the translation of Clifton Fadiman's influential article "Hemingway—an American Byron," published in the journal that was so important to Hemingway's

early career: *Der Querschnitt* (75). Fadiman positions Hemingway in impressive company:

He [Ernest Hemingway] and his characters appear to us in a similar manner as Dorian Gray, as the young Goethe, and especially . . . as Lord Byron appeared to their contemporaries. Hemingway's brilliant style obviously only partly accounts for his success. Even if he wrote only half as well . . ., his power over intellects would be the same.

(235)

This larger-than-life opinion of Hemingway was becoming widely shared by many Germans, and Hemingway by 1933 was well on his way to establishing a formidable literary reputation. While probably not overtaking Jack London in popularity, Hemingway had certainly achieved dominance among the new group of American writers. In a 1934 article reporting on the recent reception of American literature in German, Henry Lüdeke concludes, "The great discovery in Germany in the past year or two is Hemingway . . ." (174).

IV.

Lüdeke's passing remark gives the impression that the critical "discovery" of Hemingway was blind luck. Hemingway's growing reputation in Germany, however, was not accidental. While some German critics make mention of the English versions of Hemingway's novels, it is clear that they are basing their assessment of Hemingway on the German translations of his work. Two individuals deserve credit for the production and dissemination of these translations in Germany: Ernst Rowohlt

and Annemarie Horschitz. Hemingway's reception in Germany was certainly due in part to the zeitgeist and the support of critics; his ultimate success, however, would not have been possible if not for the work of these two people who would help transform Hemingway into a German cultural icon.

As an important publishing figure in the twentieth century, Ernst Rowohlt's story has been widely chronicled. His first venture into the publishing business before World War I lasted only a few years; his second publishing house established in Berlin in 1919 experienced early success and soon amassed an impressive list of writers, including Emil Ludwig and Kurt Tucholsky. In addition to German writers, Rowohlt published (and in several cases befriended) a growing number of American authors in the twenties and thirties: Sinclair Lewis, Thomas Wolfe, William Faulkner, and Ernest Hemingway. In his informative but blatantly biased biography *Mein Freund der Verleger: Ernst Rowohlt und seine Zeit* [My Friend the Publisher: Ernst Rowohlt and His Times], Walther Kiaulehn recounts Rowohlt's introduction to Hemingway's work through a conversation that the publisher had with Edgar Mowrer, who is reported to have said, "I have a terrific, vital young American author for you! Just read his novel *The Sun Also Rises*—and you will be amazed how much whiskey is drunk on every page" (123).

Unlike other German publishers who developed a reputation for promoting a certain type of literature, Rowohlt brought together a wide range of aesthetic and ideological perspectives under the Rowohlt label. "Here wrote the conservative Rudolf Borchardt," Kiaulehn notes, "alongside the expressionistic lyricist Johannes

R. Becher, the bard of the Communist Party” (121). First and foremost, Rowohlt was a business man who looked for talent. This is why, prodded repeatedly by his son Heinrich Maria Ledig-Rowohlt and sensing the growing interest in American literature, he expanded his list of American authors throughout the twenties and thirties.

Rowohlt’s personal connection to Hemingway also played a key role in his promotion of Hemingway in Germany. Writing about his father’s relationship to the American author, Ledig-Rowohlt asserts this friendship had more to do with the publication of Hemingway’s works than did profitability during the interwar period in Germany: “At that time in Germany neither [*The Sun Also Rises*] nor his other books were great successes” (“Old” 69). While Ledig-Rowohlt’s claim is somewhat dubious given the obvious success of *A Farewell to Arms*, his point concerning the personal connection between Ernst and Ernest is certainly valid.

Rowohlt’s easy-going nature (his authors called him “*Väterchen Rowohlt*” [Daddy Rowohlt]) translated into an uncanny knack for survival. Hitler’s rise to power in 1933 certainly created hardships for the publisher as an ever-growing list of his authors were placed on the list of banned writers. Rowohlt survived Nazism in Germany, however, by eventually joining the NSDAP and serving in the *Wehrmacht* during the war even though he was not a supporter of the national socialist agenda.⁵ In a letter to Hemingway in June 1933, Rowohlt’s survival instinct drew disdain from Horschitz. After noting that *A Farewell to Arms* had been placed on the index of banned books, Horschitz remarked, “Rowohlt wrote a very unmanly letter in which

he declared that he was and has always been the best and bravest of all teutonic (sic) knights etc.”

As for Horschitz, her background is much more difficult to trace. Susan Bassnett notes that translators are often “invisible beings whose literary skills are obliterated by the reputation of the writer whose work they translate” (“Writing” 173). The same and more could be said about Annemarie Horschitz, whose literary skills, as well as her life story, have become obscured over time. Unfortunately, little is known about her early years, her education, her employment with Rowohlt, and, perhaps most pertinent for this study, her relationship with Hemingway.⁶

This lack of information perhaps explains why writers and critics who address the issue of Hemingway and Germany mention Horschitz only briefly. Jeffrey Meyers, for example, gives Horschitz a sentence in his biography of Hemingway only to comment on her “unfortunate” name (459). Arno Heller remarks mysteriously, and only in passing, about Horschitz’s “congenial translation” of *The Sun Also Rises* (27). Even Kvam’s book-length study of Hemingway in Germany includes surprisingly little about the life and work of the woman who would propel Hemingway to literary stardom in Germany.⁷

How Horschitz became Hemingway’s translator is unknown. Helmut Frielinghaus writes that Horschitz “met Hemingway and had an affair with him, and he gave her the exclusive right to translate his work into German” (79). Frielinghaus, however, provides no evidence for this dubious assertion—a claim that is not substantiated in any Hemingway biography and is in any event difficult to reconcile

with known events of Hemingway's life in the 1920s. As already indicated, Hemingway was in Germany only twice before Horschitz became his translator—on vacation with Hadley in the Black Forest in 1922 and in the Ruhr area in 1923. That he would have met Horschitz (whose home was in Berlin) randomly on either occasion and had an affair with her seems very implausible.

It is, of course, possible that Hemingway met Horschitz outside of Germany, but there is no record of this or evidence that Hemingway had a casual affair with any woman. While Hemingway attracted and was attracted to numerous women (most famously Duff Twysden) during his first marriage, Reynolds claims that Hemingway remained faithful in the beginning (at least in deed) to Hadley (*PY* 318). The eventual dissolution of his marriage in the mid-20s, the result of his affair with Pauline Pfeiffer, tormented Hemingway. It is difficult to imagine that there would have been room in Hemingway's life for another woman—especially a random German translator—during this stressful period of separation, divorce, and eventual marriage to Pauline.

What is known is that beginning in April 1927, Horschitz's translations of three Hemingway stories—"Indian Camp," "The Battler," and "The End of Something"—appeared in various issues of the *Frankfurter Zeitung* (Hanneman 146). Her first translation of a Hemingway novel was *Fiesta (The Sun Also Rises)* in 1928. Over the next four years, Horschitz would work at a fast clip, translating *Men Without Women* (1929), *A Farewell to Arms* (1930), and *In Our Time* (1932).

In addition to her work as Hemingway's translator, Horschitz's activity during this period was quite varied. One of her more interesting projects was a translation of *This American World*, a scathing critique of unsophisticated American culture by Edgar Mowrer, the American who had introduced Rowohlt to Hemingway's work. Since Horschitz was translating Mowrer's book for the Rowohlt label, and Mowrer knew both Hemingway and Ernst Rowohlt, Mowrer emerges as a possible link in explaining how Horschitz came to translate Hemingway's work.⁸

In the early 1930s, as she was continuing to translate Hemingway's work, Horschitz was involved in other various projects. In 1931 her short study of Thomas Edison—*Edison Sucht einen Nachfolger: Schilderung und Kritik* [Edison Searches for a Successor: Description and Critique], co-written by the well-known German educator Paul Oestreich, was published. A year later it appeared in English under the title *Edison and His Competition: A Critical Study*.

In 1933 she returned to translation work with a German version of Anthony Berkeley's *The Picadilly Murder* (German title: *Ich Könnte Schwören, Dass . . .* [I Could Swear That . . .]). The year 1933 proved significant for other, more important, reasons. Hitler's rise to power had immediate professional implications for Horschitz. As Lillian Leigh Westerfield explains,

In September 1933, the Hitler regime passed the *Reichskulturkammergesetz* (Reich Culture Chamber Law), which required anyone working in the arts to belong to the *Reichskulturkammer* (Reich Culture Chamber). The cultural

department intended for writers was the *Reichsschrifttumskammer* (Reich Literature Chamber), and membership in it permitted authors to write as long as they adhered to Nazi dictates. (79)

As a Jew, Horschitz clearly had no chance to continue her work.

Horschitz's *Berufsverbot* [employment ban] had obvious implications for not only her life and livelihood but also the publishing of Hemingway's work in Germany. According to Kiaulehn, the publisher had wanted to bring out Horschitz's translation of *Death in the Afternoon* just when the employment ban was being imposed (184). Horschitz, however, faced with these extreme difficulties, did not simply play the role of helpless victim. In a letter to Hemingway on June 15, 1933, she explored the possibility of going behind Rowohlt's back in order to find a different publisher: "As I don't see much chance that he will bring out 'Death in the Afternoon'—and why let it ly (sic) about years and years?—my [crossed out] I propose to offer it to some Swiss editor for instance Orell and Fussli Zürich, if [double underline] you haven't sold the rights to Rowohlt."⁹

Although nothing came of these efforts, the proposal exemplifies Horschitz's shrewd business sense that would needle the Rowohlt publishing house for decades to come.¹⁰ Rifts in the Horschitz-Rowohlt relationship appear to have formed early. In a September 1935 letter to Hemingway, Horschitz takes a swipe at the Rowohlt Verlag when she mentions that she has been approached by S. Fisher Verlag, a Berlin publisher looking to establish a base in London, to translate Hemingway's work:

“They were the best publishing firm for fiction in Germany and are going to go on with the old tradition here; in addition, they pay correctly.”

Horschitz’s negative feelings toward Rowohlt were perhaps somewhat justified. Kiaulehn intimates that Rowohlt, faced with the impossibility of employing Horschitz, had explored the possibility of procuring a different translator for Hemingway’s work in 1933 but that Hemingway’s loyalty to Horschitz made that impossible (183).

The situation in Germany continued to worsen, eventually forcing Horschitz to emigrate, and in 1934 she found herself staying in an apartment belonging to friends on Holland Park Avenue in London. Despite the abrupt cessation of Horschitz’s translation work, the translator continued to maintain contact with Hemingway, even acting as literary agent in sending him money as payment for his story “A Day’s Wait,” which appeared in *Die Sammlung*, a German periodical being published in 1934 in Amsterdam (Personal Letter, 21 Sept. 1934).

Hemingway’s loyalty to Horschitz, even with the *Berufsverbot* hanging over her, seems unwavering. In an October 1934 letter, Horschitz thanks Hemingway for translation rights that he had recently granted her. Horschitz writes, “I am looking forward eagerly to your next book and hope to do satisfying (sic) work in translating and selling.” Given the success of *A Farewell to Arms*, Hemingway had reason to be loyal to Horschitz. The blacklisting of his works in Germany, however, rendered the possibility of pursuing another translator irrelevant. Hemingway would have to accept that German sales, which had generated a steady stream of income, had dried up. He

would have to wait until after World War Two to realize additional income from sales in Germany.¹¹

V.

Despite the importance of Annemarie Horschitz in forging Hemingway's interwar reputation in Germany, critics during this period devoted almost no attention to translation issues. Although some reviewers make mention of Hemingway in translation, their focus is on the translation of Hemingway's titles. It would not be until after the war that critics started to turn a more critical eye to Horschitz's work, although most still took Hemingway's approving words about Horschitz (expressed in his 1946 letter to Ernst Rowohlt) as evidence of the accuracy and quality of Horschitz's translations.

In the late-50s and early-60s some German critics began looking more closely at Horschitz's work. Even then, however, these studies were mainly interested in "error hunting." An example is Herbert Kaiser's "*Hemingways 'The Sun Also Rises' in Deutscher Übersetzung.*" Although Kaiser does explain the difficulty in translating Hemingway's style into German, he is much more interested in listing Horschitz's mistakes and melodramatically questioning at the end of his article why the work of a Nobel Prize winner would be treated with less care than one would give a newspaper (26). The value of this type of scholarship that simply catalogues the translator's random mistakes without considering the patterns of these mistranslations seems rather limited.¹²

Other scholars kept up the critique of Horschitz's work but with a similar shallowness of analysis. Marcel Reich-Ranicki, in a remark from the mid-60s, raises the important issue of Horschitz's influence on the German reception of Hemingway: "Hemingway exerted a style-shaping influence on a generation of German writers. Who in reality exerted the influence—Hemingway or his German translator Annemarie Horschitz-Horst?" (72). Reich-Ranicki, however, provides no evidence to substantiate his suspicion.

In the 1970s an increased interest in stylistics led to a more quantitative approach to not only Hemingway's style but also Hemingway in translation. Christopher Roudston Longyear's 1971 study on Horschitz's translation of "The Snows of Kilimanjaro," for example, is impressive in its detail. Longyear's linguistic focus and lack of sensitivity to literary issues, however, preclude him from drawing conclusions about the importance of the translational shifts within the text.

In general, there has been a palpable lack of interest in exploring Horschitz's translations of Hemingway's works. While this may partly be attributed to the long-standing marginalization of translation studies and, in recent decades, to Hemingway's declining reputation in Germany,¹³ some of the lack of attention comes from the assumption that the translation of Hemingway into German should not create many difficulties. On first consideration, the translatability of Hemingway's prose into German should, in fact, be quite high and any translation shifts should be minor and insignificant. This assumption is driven by four main factors.

First, Horschitz is working with prose, not poetry. According to conventional wisdom, poetry, with its heavy reliance on form (specifically rhythm, rhyme, and sound effects) creates extreme difficulty for the translator. Additionally, with its reliance on compression, each word in a poem is infused with various nuances of meaning. Language in poetry, according to I.A. Richards, “utters not one meaning but a movement of meanings” (48). This has led numerous theorists to conclude that poetry is simply untranslatable. The potential for the translation of prose, however, is much greater.

Second, Hemingway’s use of English is often characterized as lean, sparse, and simple, which should ostensibly result in a straightforward rendition into a target language. Hemingway’s fondness for basic sentence structure and simple diction, so the theory goes, should present a translator with fewer challenges than one would find in attempting to translate Faulkner, for example. However, as we will see, these assumptions about Hemingway’s style are reductive and misleading.

Complications are also seemingly avoided in translating Hemingway into German since the work involves shifting a twentieth-century text written in English by an American into a twentieth-century German context with only several years at most separating original and translated texts. The translator in this case is working with closely connected languages and cultures and must not contend with difficulties that arise in translation between two distant languages (e.g., English into Swahili) or reinterpret the source-language text for a historically and/or culturally distant target-language audience.

Finally, Horschitz's philosophy of translation would seem to preclude significant translational alterations. Horschitz favors literal translation (Nida's formal equivalence) rather than freer translation (Nida's dynamic equivalence). Writing about Horschitz's translation strategy, Rudi Keller notes, "The principle of the translator was obvious: no unnecessary alteration in comparison with the author's chosen language structure; therefore, also no alteration in the linearization of the sentence members" (81). The assumption then is that one would not find many textual anomalies. There might be some awkwardness, due to attempts to retain the language structure of the original, but there should not be any significant modifications to form and meaning.

Horschitz's preoccupation with recreating Hemingway's syntactic structure, however, can create problems. In *A Farewell to Arms*, for example, Catherine Barkley chastises Frederic Henry with the line, "Don't be sacrilegious" (285). Horschitz's translation attempts to copy Hemingway's structure: "*Sei nicht so ruchlos*" (318) [Don't be so heinous/nefarious]. It is clear that she wants to mimic Hemingway by providing an imperative sentence with an adjective as subject complement. The problem, though, is that "*ruchlos*" is not the best word, even though it allows Horschitz to create a similar sentence type. (Horschitz in a revision of this line in a later edition of the novel provides an alternative version by translating the line as "*Das ist Gotteslästerung*" (331) [That is blasphemy], thus utilizing a word with stronger religious overtones but altering the sentence type.) As we will see,

Horschitz's general approach of formal-equivalent translation does not preclude translation anomalies.

There are, in fact, countless translational dilemmas that Horschitz must work through. Critics should perhaps heed the words of Hans Bütow, who in a 1934 article (the last German article to mention Hemingway until after the war) remarked that “[t]here is . . . hardly a newer author in English who would be more difficult to translate [than Ernest Hemingway]” (335).

VI.

That Hemingway's texts are altered in translation should be, of course, a given. The question of *how* Hemingway's texts are altered in Horschitz's German versions and why these changes are important will be addressed in the subsequent chapters through textual analysis. The specific issue of *why* these alterations happened is certainly more difficult to answer. One could start by considering the speed at which Horschitz produced these texts (four in five years). Haste and human error, however, do not explain Horschitz's general approach to Hemingway's works.

Horschitz's task, understood at a basic level, is to allow a German reader access to Hemingway's fiction. As discussed in Chapter One, however, this notion of simply bringing Hemingway across the German frontier and depositing him unaltered into a German context is quite naïve. Given Schleiermacher's distinction between domesticating and foreignizing a translation, a basic question is whether Horschitz foreignizes Hemingway, thus forcing a German reader to confront an unusual text, or if she domesticates Hemingway by Germanizing the American author.

The choice is clearly a false dichotomy as Horschitz's approach encompasses elements of both. The response of critics clearly indicates that Hemingway presented Weimar Germany with a new and different literary experience. Frequently, translations are motivated by the desire of target cultures for the foreign. As Gideon Toury reminds us, "[C]ultures resort to translating precisely as a major way of filling in gaps" (27), and the translations of Hemingway certainly filled gaps in German literary culture. At the same time, Hemingway's fiction obviously resonated with the German reading public by appealing to what they already knew. Klaus Mann's identification of Hemingway with a European literary tradition clearly points to this. While Horschitz's role in fitting Hemingway into this tradition is difficult to assess, my analysis in subsequent chapters will attempt to propose some hypotheses.

Hemingway's reception in Germany, however, provides a preliminary answer. As Springer remarks in the conclusion to her brief examination of Hemingway in the Weimar era, the success of Hemingway's texts in Germany was precipitated by two main factors: "a decline of interest in the reportorial novel of social protest and a desire for a new style and technique in novel writing . . ." (84). These two factors together may also serve as a framework for understanding Horschitz's modifications of Hemingway's work in a German context.

One assumption that runs throughout German criticism is that Hemingway is simple. The subject matter is banal life, as Joachim observes. There is no great social protest. There is, as Polgar points out, no "psychology," and style mirrors this simplicity. There is no nuanced treatment of material—it is simply the retelling of

events—“the way it was” to use a famous Hemingway expression. Form and content thus work together to produce a simple, straightforward text.

While, as Springer suggests, Germany was embracing this new kind of literature, the German culture was still perhaps not ready for pure Hemingway. Horschitz, as a study of her translations will show, attempts to mitigate certain aspects of his unique style. As a result, she infuses Hemingway’s text with a degree of traditional literariness, moving Hemingway’s works into the realm of what Pound might condescendingly refer to as “literchure.” Hemingway’s roughness (so it seems from Horschitz’s perspective) is in need of some polishing.

Horschitz’s alterations are also the result of a general trend—reflected in the German criticism of the early 1930s—that oversimplifies Hemingway’s art and underestimates the importance of his style as it affects the whole. Her lack of understanding of Hemingway’s technique leads her to alter Hemingway’s texts—to “correct” them—to perhaps move Hemingway back into the nuanced world of “*Der Dichter*.”

The motivations for these changes—to produce texts that are perhaps not so shocking to a German reader—are innocent. In the process of domesticating Hemingway’s texts, however, Horschitz inadvertently shakes their very foundation. This begins with her lack of understanding of Hemingway’s use of metaphor as we will see in the following chapter, but continues with her treatments of repetition, understatement, and fragmentation.

Translation is, in effect, a complicated process of negotiation, and Horschitz's translations are no exceptions: negotiations between Hemingway the bohemian and Hemingway the "poet of our time"; negotiations between Hemingway's realistic, stripped-down style and German expectations for something more clearly "literary"; negotiations between Hemingway and Horschitz, between America and Germany, and between two closely related but distinct linguistic systems. Although what we know about the figure of Annemarie Horschitz is very limited, what we do have are her translations—the ultimate results of these complex negotiations and the focus of the following chapters.

Notes

¹ “The Undefeated” was translated under the unfortunately simplistic and reductive title “*Stierkampf*” [Bullfight] by B. Bessmertny and published in the summer of 1925 (Hanneman 144).

² Despite his limited time in country and apparent early lack of interest in Germany, Hemingway eventually developed, according to Hans-Joachim Kann, a fairly respectable knowledge of German culture. In addition to the classics of German literature in translation, Hemingway also owned numerous German-language books and seems to have developed a special affinity for Remarque and Thomas Mann over the years (19).

³ All translations of critics’ comments are mine unless otherwise noted.

⁴ Fallada was also a rising star writing for the Rowohlt label. His critical reputation was firmly established after the publication of *Kleiner Mann, was nun?* in 1932.

⁵ The story of Rowohlt’s wartime experience has generated some recent controversy concerning why he returned to Europe and took part in Germany’s war effort instead of remaining in Brazil. See Hage, Volker, et al. “Hauptmann der Propaganda.” *Der Spiegel* 26 May 2008: 156-59.

⁶ Correspondence with the Rowohlt Verlag and the German Literary Archives revealed a complete lack of biographical information on Horschitz. Both organizations cited the only source of information they had on Horschitz: a brief unsigned, undocumented entry on Wikipedia Deutschland, indicating that she was born Annemarie Rosenthal in Berlin in 1899, married Walter Horschitz in 1921, was divorced during the 1920s, and immigrated to England in 1933. She died in Vienna in 1970.

⁷ The lack of commentary about Horschitz is especially unfortunate in light of a fire in October 1970 that destroyed the Rowohlt Archive in Reinbek. Many of the records from those early years that might have provided a clearer picture of Horschitz and her relationship with Hemingway and Rowohlt were lost.

⁸ In what could be taken as one of the book’s principal arguments, Mowrer writes, “In a great many things we [Americans] are, of course, really childlike” (9). The book achieved a broad readership as it highlighted America’s growing economic power and expanding American influence, especially in Europe. Coincidentally, in the first critical evaluation of Hemingway in Germany, Leo Lania quotes from Mowrer’s book in the epigraph to his article. In another coincidence linking Hemingway to Mowrer, Mowrer’s older brother, Paul Scott Mowrer (newspaper man and poet), married Hadley Richardson Hemingway in 1933.

⁹ The German translation of *Death in the Afternoon*—*Tod am Nachmittag*—would not appear until 1957 (Hanneman 184).

¹⁰ The story of the publication of German translations of Hemingway is, at a basic level, a story of money, not literature. Correspondence in the German Literary Archives in Marbach, Germany, reveals a long-running dispute between Horschitz (and her daughter) with the Rowohlt company. After World War Two, the Rowohlt Verlag found itself in a predicament. Horschitz had negotiated a very good deal early and exploited her understanding with Hemingway and Hemingway's (and others') reluctance to go with different translators. Rowohlt attempted repeatedly to renegotiate her deal (which she eventually did) for lower compensation. Other complaints about money are frequent in the correspondence. In a letter to Alfred Rice in February 1959, Ledig-Rowohlt complained about the cost of the "corrections" that Horschitz made to the translations, "so thoroughly that we had to reset the whole and that was repeated quite a few times." While Ledig-Rowohlt ultimately seemed generally dissatisfied with the translations, the thought of spending a huge amount of money on new translations of all of Hemingway's works was out of the question.

¹¹ Horschitz went on to translate numerous Hemingway novels and short stories after the war, moving Hemingway to, what Arno Heller calls, "the very centre of interest . . . [as] the most popular American author in the German-speaking world since James Fenimore Cooper and Mark Twain" (27). The following is a list of her major Hemingway translation projects after World War II with dates translated: *Haben und Nichthaben (To Have and Have Not)*—1951, *Über den Fluss und in die Wälder (Across the River and Into the Trees)*—1951, *Der alte Mann und das Meer (The Old Man and the Sea)*—1952, *Die Grüne Hügel Afrikas (Green Hills of Africa)*—1954, *Die Sturmfluten des Frühlings (The Torrents of Spring)*—1957, *Tod am Nachmittag (Death in the Afternoon)*—1957, *Der Sieger geht leer aus (Winner Take Nothing)*—1958, *Paris—ein Fest fürs Leben (A Moveable Feast)*—1965 (Hanneman 183-185).

¹² As we will see, there are numerous cases where Horschitz clearly makes what we could easily label as a translation mistake. In "Ten Indians," for example, a clear reference to a baseball game becomes a reference to a football game in the German version. The seriousness of such a mistake is debatable.

¹³ See Arno Heller's "The Fading of a Legend: Hemingway's Reception in Germany and Austria." *Hemingway Review* (Special European Issue, Summer 1992): 27-35. Heller argues that a noticeable decline in Hemingway's popularity in Germany began soon after his suicide, when critics started to dismantle the über-macho Hemingway myth and identify weaknesses in his writing. During the late-60s and early-70s, readers "were put off by the lack of social dimension or of a political engagement in Hemingway's works. They found his work one-dimensional, too private, anti-

intellectual, basically very conservative or even crypto-fascist” (31). The poor reception of Hemingway’s posthumously published work in Germany furthered this decline.

Chapter Three

Shifting the Iceberg: Conceptual Metaphoric Loss in the Translation of *The Sun Also Rises*

Brett: “I won’t be one of those bitches.” (247)
—Ernest Hemingway, *The Sun Also Rises*

“*Ich will nicht so ein Frauenzimmer sein.*” (308)
—Annemarie Horschitz, *Fiesta*

“I do not want to be such a wench.”
—Rendition of translation

Metaphor . . . is not fanciful embroidery of the facts. It is a way
of experiencing the facts. (69)
—Terence Hawkes

Bill: “Wonder who translated? Was it me?” (77)
—Hemingway, *The Sun Also Rises*

I.

In chapter 16 of *The Sun Also Rises*, Jake Barnes sits at a table in a hotel dining room with the young Spanish bullfighter Pedro Romero and a Madrid bullfighting critic. During the course of the conversation, Jake remarks in his narration that Romero is bashful about his English but curious about English equivalents for Spanish expressions: “He was anxious to know the English for *Corrida de toros*, the exact translation. Bull-fight he was suspicious of. I explained that bull-fight in Spanish was the *lidia* of a *toro*. The Spanish word *corrida* means in English the running of bulls—the French translation is *Course de taureaux*. The critic put that in. There is no Spanish word for bull-fight” (177).

Intentionally or not, Hemingway in this very brief passage foregrounds the power of metaphor and the precariousness of metaphor translation. In conceptualizing

the activity of the matadors and the bulls, how do the characters around the table understand metaphorically the spectacle that takes place in the bullring? To use the language of the cognitive linguists, what source domain is being utilized in order to understand the target domain? Is it a race, as the Spanish and French expressions suggest? Or is the activity a fight and thus conceptualized in terms of a battle between man and bull?

These questions about translatability may initially seem unimportant as the narrative of Jake Barnes moves on to a discussion of Pedro Romero's bullfighting prowess and an assessment of the bulls for the next day. As we will see, however, the lack of equivalence among metaphors, such as the metaphors in the preceding example, raises significant questions about metaphors, their importance in Hemingway's text, and the shifts that occur as they are translated from one language to another. Unfortunately, these shifts are all too often ignored. Pedro Romero is right to be suspicious of metaphoric translation, and we should be as well.

While the translation of "literal language" poses numerous problems for the translator, the translation of metaphor creates even more complications. Unfortunately, it has been only in the last several decades that scholars have attempted to propose theories of metaphor translation. Even fewer studies have applied these theories to metaphoric translation in literary texts. And almost no work has linked an analysis of metaphors in translation with the recent scholarship on conceptual metaphors. A study of literature in translation must not only examine the inevitable shifts that occur as specific metaphors move from source language to target

language but also analyze the ways in which these shifts affect conceptual metaphors and the text as a whole.

In this chapter I examine the metaphoric expressions in Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises*. First, I address the issue of Hemingway and metaphor. After providing a framework for the discussion, I turn to the specific metaphors in the novel and their translation in *Fiesta*, Annemarie Horschitz's German translation. Hemingway's metaphors, far from being random occurrences of figurative language, are linguistic manifestations of deeper conceptual metaphors that are central to an interpretation of the text. By examining the modifications that are made to these original metaphoric expressions as they are translated into German, one can begin to appreciate the shifts involved with metaphor translation. The translation of Hemingway's metaphors into German represents significant metaphoric loss that subsequently shifts the foundational conceptual metaphors in the novel.

II.

A topic of initial concern is Hemingway's use of metaphor. To be sure, there has been no shortage of studies on Hemingway's style; critics, however, have almost completely ignored Hemingway's use of metaphoric expressions. In general critics have done little to connect Hemingway with any of the literary tropes. Those critics who have associated Hemingway with the use of traditional tropes tend to concentrate on litotes and irony—tropes that will be examined in subsequent chapters. Addressing Hemingway's use of metaphor, Harry Levin, in "Observations on the Style of Ernest Hemingway"—one of the most important early studies of Hemingway's prose—

seems to express the conventional scholarly wisdom in stating bluntly that “Hemingway is sparing in his use of metaphors” (145). More recently, a 2008 article by J.T. Barbarese on Hemingway’s style in *A Farewell to Arms* continues in the long tradition of undervaluing Hemingway’s use of metaphoric language (53). In their occasional discussions of Hemingway and metaphor, critics use the term broadly as a synonym for symbol. Some scholars see fishing, for example, in Hemingway’s prose as a metaphor for the writing process. Or, more specifically, Scott Donaldson observes that in *The Sun Also Rises* “money and its uses form the metaphor by which . . . moral responsibility . . . is measured” (“Morality” 406). Although certainly helpful, the term “metaphor” in such studies is often divorced from an examination of specific linguistic metaphoric expressions in Hemingway’s writing.¹

It is difficult to understand the general lack of attention to Hemingway’s use of metaphoric expressions; two potential reasons, however, stand out. First, although generalizations about any writer’s style are at best reductive and at worst flatly inaccurate, Hemingway’s early reviewers and critics nevertheless quickly developed assumptions about his style that proved antithetical to a consideration of his use of metaphor. After Hemingway’s early publications both proponents and detractors agreed that there was something distinctive about his art. And in the following decades, studies sought to provide labels for Hemingway’s unique writing style. Generalizations soon emerged. In 1950 James T. Farrell observed that Hemingway’s prose is marked by a “true and simple treatment of subject matter and in the use of ordinary speech” (201). Ten years later John Graham asserted that Hemingway’s

writing is characterized by “concrete detail” and “simple, direct narration of activity” (307). And in a 1980 study Ahmad Ardat described the style as “hard and lean . . . and thinly textured” (11). Recent criticism has continued with such pronouncements. The consensus developed early and was reinforced throughout the decades that Hemingway’s prose is carefully and intentionally structured around the ideas of truth, simplicity, and “discipline.” In critical discussions there has simply been no room for consideration of Hemingway’s use of metaphor (given the very limited traditional view of metaphor) within this narrow description of his stylistics.

Secondly, Hemingway’s own comments about writing and language seem to deflect attention away from an approach to writing that would embrace metaphoric language. In *Paris Was Our Mistress* Samuel Putnam records Hemingway’s famous self-directed imperative about his writing: “Put down what I see and what I feel in the best and simplest way I can tell it” (129). At other points Hemingway, sometimes with a sense of paranoia, remarks about the necessity of avoiding the artistic language of the literati. He habitually expresses his distaste for mystical, emotion-laden poetic abstraction, what he calls “erectile writing”—the method of choice of the literary poseurs whom Hemingway encountered throughout Europe—in which all objects appear “slightly larger, more mysterious, and vaguely blurred” (*DIA* 53).

Hemingway, in the same text, contrasts this “erectile writing” with his early attempts at composition:

I was trying to write then and I found the greatest difficulty, aside from knowing truly what you really felt, rather than what you were

supposed to feel, and had been taught to feel, was to put down what really happened in action; *what the actual things were* which produced the emotion that you experienced. In writing for a newspaper you told what happened . . . (2, emphasis mine)

Additionally, critics arguing for Hemingway's personal distaste for figurative language often point to the words of Frederic Henry in *A Farewell to Arms* who remarks, "Abstract words such as glory, honor, courage, or hallow were obscene beside the concrete names of villages, the number of roads, the names of rivers, the numbers of regiments and the dates" (185).

Although it would be wrong to take Frederic Henry's statement as a direct expression of the author's writing philosophy, it is probably safe to say, given the author's own comments about writing, that Hemingway favored a style that presented "what really happened" using concrete language in a clear, direct, and straightforward manner. The assumption, though, that Hemingway would thus not use metaphor is based largely on a definition of metaphor that sees metaphor as either "patently false," to borrow an expression from Donald Davidson (258), or simply ornamental, and thus at best unnecessary and at worst obfuscatory. This traditional understanding of metaphor, which dates back to the writing of Aristotle, would be incongruous with Hemingway's approach to writing given the long-established assumption that "figurative language is unusual, perhaps ornamental, whereas literal language is basic and better suited to talking about our experience and the objective world" (Gibbs 121).

George Lakoff and Mark Johnson note at the beginning of *Metaphors We Live By* that such an attitude about metaphor is widespread: “Metaphor is for most people a device of the poetic imagination and the rhetorical flourish—a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language” (3). If we operate under this traditional definition of metaphor, critics are perhaps justified in dismissing Hemingway’s use of metaphor. As John Atkins observes, “The real Hemingway contrives a flatness of tone that excludes emotion, gush, romanticizing and fantasy” (78). Near the end of *Death in the Afternoon* Hemingway again emphasizes his preference for real writing as opposed to ornamental writing when he states, “Prose is architecture, not interior decoration . . .” (191).

This statement, which seems to dismiss the role that metaphor plays in Hemingway’s style of writing, is obviously metaphoric in its own right. Ironically, for all of Hemingway’s supposed distaste for metaphoric writing, when he comments on his own writing, he almost always employs metaphor. “Everything changes as it moves,” Hemingway remarked in a 1958 interview with George Plimpton. “That is what makes the movement which makes the story. Sometimes the movement is so slow it does not seem to be moving. But there is always change and always movement” (Cowley, *WW* 223). Whether he uses the source domains of building, motion, music, or icebergs, Hemingway’s fondness for metaphor as a means of concretizing the writing process is readily apparent.

In fact, it is precisely Hemingway’s partiality for the tangible and the real that points the way to his broader use of metaphor in his writing. As the cognitive

linguists have observed, metaphors draw upon a concrete source domain in order to understand a more abstract target domain. What we get with Hemingway's prose is a heavy reliance on tangible objects and thus extensive material for a variety of source domains as he constructs functional, not decorative, metaphors. Hemingway's metaphors are not typically original. He relies instead on conventional metaphors and so-called "dead metaphors" repeatedly in his writing.²

This does not mean, however, that his metaphoric usage is unimportant. The assumption that dead metaphors are of little scholarly interest has been rejected by contemporary metaphor theory. M.B. Dagut dismisses the false dichotomy between living and dead metaphors in noting that "every metaphor . . . is by definition 'original' and 'live,' so that 'dead metaphor' becomes a contradiction in terms" (22). Hemingway's interest in working with ordinary speech results in his extensive use of the idiom, a sub-type of the dead metaphor. Addressing the topic of idiomatic expressions, Raymond Gibbs prepares the way for the study of Hemingway and metaphor by arguing that idioms "are ubiquitous in discourse and . . . are not simple dead metaphors but actually retain a good deal of their metaphoricity" (22).

I maintain that Hemingway's metaphors not only retain their metaphoricity but also point the way to central themes in his writing. Lakoff and Mark Turner note in the Preface to *More than Cool Reason* that "[f]ar from being merely a matter of words, metaphor is a matter of thought It is indispensable not only to our imagination but also to our reason" (xi). And Zoltan Kövecses asserts that linguistic metaphoric expressions "make explicit, or are manifestations of, the conceptual

metaphors (i.e., ways of thinking). . . . [I]t is the metaphorical linguistic expressions that reveal the existence of the conceptual metaphors” (6). *The Sun Also Rises* contains hundreds of these metaphorical linguistic expressions, often in the form of idiomatic slang. While certainly not all of these underscore conceptual metaphors that are essential for a reading of the text, an analysis of the linguistic metaphors in the novel reveals several crucial conceptual metaphors. These metaphors are certainly not decorative adornment; they are, in fact, essential for the architectural framework of the novel.

The framing of my discussion of Hemingway’s important conceptual metaphors in *The Sun Also Rises* comes from perhaps an unlikely source: Hemingway’s *Death in the Afternoon*, a text that Carlos Baker calls the writer’s “non-fictional bible of the bullfight” (WA xiv). Published six years after *The Sun Also Rises* and seen by many critics as closing off Hemingway’s early stage of writing, *Death in the Afternoon*—often read as a companion piece to the novel—proves helpful in two ways. While the primary focus of *Death in the Afternoon* is obviously bullfighting, the text also provides important clues throughout about concepts Hemingway considered important during his early stage of writing. To be sure, the text needs to be a starting point for anyone interested in Hemingway’s prose style, and careful studies of Hemingway’s style invariably fall back on his comments in *Death in the Afternoon* about the craft of writing. Just as important for this chapter, however, are passages in *Death in the Afternoon* that focus attention on central conceptual metaphors—metaphors that provide the symbolic underpinnings of *The Sun Also Rises*.

III.

The importance of conceptual metaphors in the novel is highlighted through an examination of linguistic metaphors in translation. As alluded to earlier, not enough scholarly work has examined metaphor translation. Dagut identifies “an almost grotesque disproportion between the importance and frequency of ‘metaphor’ in language use and the very minor role allotted to it in translation theory” (21). One of the most helpful and comprehensive studies of metaphoric translation comes from Peter Newmark, whose article, “The Translation of Metaphor,” outlines seven options, in order of preference, that the translator has when confronted with a metaphor in the SL:

- 1) Reproduce the SL image in the TL.
- 2) Replace the SL image with a standard TL image.
- 3) Translate by using a simile.
- 4) Translate the metaphor by use of simile plus sense [i.e., a gloss].
- 5) Convert the metaphor to sense.
- 6) Delete the metaphor.
- 7) Reproduce the SL image combined with sense. (95-97)

The first option is, in most cases, the best. In another study of the translation of metaphor Raymond van den Broeck refers to this type of translation as the “*sensu stricto*” approach, in which the SL image appears unaltered in the target text (77). In the second approach, a suitable and familiar TL image is used in place of the SL image. The third approach retains the image of the metaphor but renders it as a simile,

thus, as Newmark indicates, “modifying the shock of a metaphor” (96). This is also done in the fourth approach, although a gloss is added to make sure that a TL reader will be able to understand the metaphor. The fifth approach eliminates the SL image and provides a paraphrase of the metaphor, a tactic that Horschitz employs quite frequently. The sixth approach removes the metaphoric expression completely if the metaphor is redundant and not necessary for the intended effect. And finally, the last approach retains the SL image in the target text but provides a gloss “to ensure that it will be understood” (97).

Although Newmark provides these options as a prescriptive guide for translators, these seven approaches prove helpful in explaining how Horschitz treats specific metaphors in the novel. I will discuss these options more within my analysis; it should be noted, however, that my focus will be on occasions of metaphoric loss—instances in which Horschitz is not able to or chooses not to reproduce the SL image in her German translation (specifically, options 2, 5, and 6). In these cases, even if the translation achieves an adequate paraphrase of the original (e.g., the fifth approach), the image from the symbolically important source domain is lost, resulting in an overall diminishment of the conceptual metaphor. Also of concern is the third approach—translating the metaphor as a simile—since a reduction in the force of the metaphor can also prove problematic in establishing or reinforcing the conceptual metaphor.

While an analysis of metaphor in translation needs to focus on specific linguistic metaphors, it is the larger conceptual metaphoric loss, as opposed to the

individual metaphoric loss, that is ultimately more significant. Christina Schäffner observes that the translation of metaphor takes on a different focus when metaphor is examined from a cognitive linguistic perspective: “Translatability is no longer a question of the individual metaphorical expression, as identified in the ST, but it becomes linked to the level of conceptual systems in source and target cultures” (1258). We must nevertheless focus attention on individual metaphors, for it is through an examination of specific metaphors in translation that we begin seeing shifts in the broader underlying conceptual metaphors. Such examination not only reveals the difficulty in metaphor translation but also highlights the important role that metaphor plays in language, reinforcing Dagut’s claim that “it is translation theory that holds the key to a deeper understanding of metaphor” (32).

IV.

Living in the Wasteland

One of the central conceptual metaphors that is activated in *The Sun Also Rises* through metaphoric language is THE WORLD IS A WASTELAND, and one of the key devices for creating this source domain is the sun. Although not strictly a metaphoric expression, Hemingway’s most prominent reference to the sun appears in the title and in the subsequent epigraph from Ecclesiastes: “One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh; but the earth abideth forever The sun also ariseth, and the sun goeth down, and hasteth to the place where he arose” The rising sun might at first seem to carry positive connotations. As Paul Fussell observes, however, the tendency to see the rising sun as a symbol of great hope is a holdover

from the nineteenth century. In *The Great War and Modern Memory* he writes, “Dawn has never recovered from what the Great War did to it” (63), and in *The Sun Also Rises*, the rising of the sun each day does not bring the promise of fruitful endeavors. Linking the sun from the title with the action of the novel, Robert Martin observes a “metaphoric connection between the characters and the events. As Jake, Brett, Mike, Bill, and Cohn pursue a round of meaningless activity day after day, the sun simultaneously rises and sets . . .” (100).

The second epigraph, Gertrude Stein’s “You are all a lost generation,” reinforces this ironic contrast between the sun’s constancy and the behavior of the members of the “lost generation.” An examination of metaphoric loss in *Fiesta* could begin with an examination of this epigraph. Horschitz’s version reads, “*Ihr gehört alle einer hoffnungslosen Generation an*” [You all belong to a hopeless generation]. Not only is the directness of the original lost through the removal of the copula, but metaphoric loss occurs as the figurative “lost” becomes the more literal “hopeless.” Despite the negative metaphoric imagery that runs throughout the novel, I would argue against a reading of the characters as hopeless. They might be lost at the moment; however, they are certainly not without hope that a way out of the wasteland might be found.³

While this particular metaphor (and its treatment in translation) is indeed important, more significant is the foregrounding of the sun in the first epigraph, which establishes a crucial metaphoric pattern. While the “metaphoric connection” between the sun and the characters that Martin observes is not actually supported by

linguistic metaphoric expressions, Hemingway does utilize metaphoric language throughout the novel to highlight the sun's heat and thus the subsequent barrenness of Jake's landscape descriptions. By doing this, Hemingway counters the notion of the sun as a life-giving force. Lakoff and Turner note that in several conceptual metaphors, life is connected with light and heat: "People who are alive are warm, and people who are dead are cold Plants derive life from sunlight and die in sustained darkness" (87). With Hemingway, however, the sun and its heat reinforce a sense of dryness and desolation.

The juxtaposition of heat and coolness is important in a number of Hemingway texts, and for Hemingway coolness often has positive connotations. Richard Peterson points out that in *A Farewell to Arms* "a great number of valued things are clean, clear or cool" (27), a pattern that *The Sun Also Rises* establishes. It is important to note that the most peaceful scenes in the novel take place when Jake and Bill are by themselves up in the cool mountains fishing. This contrasts with the desert-like descriptions of the Spanish countryside, reminding the reader of T.S. Eliot's picture from *The Waste Land* of a "heap of broken images, where the sun beats, / And the dead tree gives no shelter . . ." (38). While Philip Young may have overstated the case when he called *The Sun Also Rises* "Hemingway's *Waste Land*" (87), it is difficult to deny the parallel imagery between the two modernist masterpieces.

Hemingway reinforces the heat and sterility of this land with a series of metaphoric expressions, and an examination of these metaphors in translation reveals

their importance. As Jake comes out of the church, he states, “The sunlight was hot and hard” (103). Horschitz translates this description as “*heiß und grell* [hot and glaring].⁴ Jake begins chapter 11 by remarking how “baking hot” (109) [“*kochen heiß*” (132)] it is. As they travel by bus Jake describes the hills as “hard-baked” (111) [“*zusammengebackenem*” (135)]. And as they pass into more fertile land he notes, “These were not like the brown, heat-baked [“*sonnengerösteten*” (138)] mountains we had left behind” (114). The conceptual metaphor that Hemingway develops through this series of metaphoric expressions is the UNIVERSE IS AN OVEN, with the entailments of the sun as a heating element and the earth as an over-baked loaf of bread (or people as roasting meat).

There are a number of important things happening in Horschitz’s translation of these metaphors. First, Hemingway’s unusual description of the sunlight as “hard,” a metaphor in which the sunlight is described as a physical object, creates problems for the translator. While she easily handles “hot,” the translation unfortunately loses the aspect of hardness as the sunlight is described as “glaring.” This substitution is important to note because of the conceptual metaphor that Hemingway develops throughout this section as he transitions from a discussion of the hardness of the sunlight to the description of the hardness of the land.⁵ Jake repeatedly reinforces the arid condition of the land as a result of the baking sun. There is again the loss of hardness in the second landscape description: “*zusammengebackenem*” [baked together]. Although Horschitz maintains the baking references, what Jake’s description reinforces and what the translation minimizes is not the sun itself or its

heat but the sun's effect on the land in creating the hard, desert-like environment. Finally, it should be noted that Horschitz's translation in this sequence reveals her fondness for variation—translating the same or similar SL expression in several different ways—something we will see at numerous points throughout this study.

The barrenness is not simply limited to landscape descriptions, and, more importantly, the wasteland imagery spills over into the characters, who reinforce their own barrenness metaphorically in the text. These metaphors are even more unsuccessfully retained in the German translation. After another evening encounter with Brett, Jake, at the end of chapter four, states how easy it is in the daytime “to be hard-boiled about everything . . .” (42). There is a metaphoric shift here in the translation, as Horschitz opts for Newmark's second approach, using an UP IS GOOD/DOWN IS BAD conceptual metaphor in the translation: “*über alles erhaben zu sein . . .*” (47) [easy to be above everything]. Later in the text, noticing that Jake is brooding once again, Brett asks him, “Do you feel rocky?” (61). With “*Fühlst dich elend?*” (72), Horschitz opts for Newmark's third choice in deleting the metaphor and using a paraphrase: “Do you feel miserable?”

In Book III after the party has broken up in Pamplona, Jake, Bill, and Mike rent a car to go to Bayonne. Mike, a self-proclaimed bankrupt, is unable to pay for his share of the car. He declares, “I'm stony,” in reference to his lack of cash (233). The German translation—“*Ich bin blank*” (289)—conveys the literal sense of being without money, as well as some of the metaphoric sense of emptiness; however,

without the landscape imagery, which reinforces the idea of desolation, the extent of Mike's barrenness is lost.

Nothing is more powerful in the text in repeatedly reinforcing the characters' conception of themselves as living in a hot, barren wasteland as their excessive metaphoric use of "hell." Larry Grimes argues convincingly that the use of "hell" in the novel's conversations is not simply "casual cursing" but rather "serious religious discourse. The hell that is life in the lost, secular world of postwar Paris is palpable and scary, especially when the religiously resonant words are surrounded by infernal images . . ." (157).

The cumulative effect of "hell" in conversation is powerful—something again that gets lost in the German translation. The use of "hell" as intensifier—as in Bill's statement to Jake, "You're a hell of a good guy . . ." (121)—is prevalent. More interesting, though, are the uses of "hell" by characters to conceptualize their current condition. The focus in such expressions is hell as location. Venting about Cohn to Jake after Cohn mentions that he hopes that he is not bored with the bullfight, Bill says, "Oh, to hell with him!" Jake replies, "He spends a lot of time there" (166). Horschitz in this case provides a literal translation. Earlier in the novel Brett, in talking about being in love, states, "It's hell on earth" (35). The German version again is an exact translation: "*Es ist die Hölle auf Erde*" (37). Later in the novel Brett again uses hell metaphorically in commenting, "I feel like hell" (186). Horschitz translates this expression as, "*Ich fühl mich maßlos*" (231) [I feel excessive]. This translation not only loses the metaphoric reference to hell but fails to convey the sense of

emptiness and despair that Brett feels at this point in the novel as she realizes that she is falling in love with Romero.

Another example appears near the end of the book as Bill asks Jake if he feels low. Jake responds that he feels “Low as hell” (226), activating the UP IS GOOD/DOWN IS BAD conceptual metaphor in intensifying the reference to hell. Twice more in the same conversation he says simply, “I feel like hell” (226). A metaphoric shift occurs in the translation as Horschitz translates “Low as hell” as “*Deprimiert bis dorthinaus*” (281) [Depressed as anything], substituting the domain of mental health for that of hell. The two occurrences of “I feel like hell” become “*Gott, geht’s mir dreckig*” (281) and “*Maßlos*” (282). Of particular interest is the metaphoric shift in the translation of the first expression as Jake metaphorically characterizes himself as “dirty.” While this is an adequate metaphoric substitution—as Horschitz employs Newmark’s second approach—the reliance on a different source domain weakens the conceptual metaphor of the wasteland.

Characters also use references to hell in numerous heated exchanges with “Go to hell!” as the expression of choice. This is typically translated by Horschitz as “*Geh zum Teufel!*” While this translation—“Go to the devil!”—is an equivalent expression in German, there is an important metonymic CHARACTER FOR PLACE shift occurring, a translation option that Newmark does not include in his seven approaches. The domain of hell is maintained, but we are distanced from a sense of place—something that is crucial in supporting the overarching conceptual metaphor. Instead, we have access to the domain of hell indirectly through a reference to the

devil. Utilization of the expression “*Fahr zur Hölle!*” [Go to hell!] would perhaps be more appropriate at points in the narrative and would certainly provide a more direct reference to hell.

Of course the title of the German translation, *Fiesta*—taken ostensibly from the title under which the novel was published in England—sets the precedent for metaphoric loss in wasteland imagery.⁶ This is just the beginning, however, as metaphoric expressions that reinforce a sense of barrenness are deemphasized throughout the text. This conceptualization begins with landscape descriptions, but quickly extends into character portrayals. This picture of dry lifelessness is grounded in the LIFE IS FLUID conceptual metaphor. Describing this conceptual metaphor, Lakoff and Turner write, “At full maturity we are brimming”; as we age “life drains out until we dry up” (88). The irony is that although these characters are in the prime of their lives, they conceptualize themselves as all dried up. While they should be engaged in productive, life-giving activities, they instead spend the novel roaming through this figurative desert, living a barren, fruitless existence.⁷

Critical debate will remain as to the role of wasteland imagery in the novel with some seeing the novel as reinforcing the wasteland theme (e.g., Young and Spilka) and those who reject this negative view (e.g., Baker and Stoneback). An examination of the linguistic evidence, however, reveals repeated foregrounding of wasteland descriptions. Hemingway’s metaphoric expressions, although easy to overlook, draw heavily on source domains that emphasize this desolate imagery. The German translation, while often providing adequate paraphrases of Hemingway’s

language, fails to reproduce the intensity of this imagery with the resulting loss of important symbolism.⁸

Living with Disease

At the beginning of chapter 3 Jake, feeling “a vague sentimental idea that it would be nice to eat with some one” (24), picks up Georgette, a prostitute⁹ who happens to walk by a table where he is sitting. After exchanging some pleasantries, Georgette asks,

“What’s the matter? You sick?”

“Yes.”

“Everybody’s sick. I’m sick, too.” (23)

While Jake’s physical health is obviously an issue since he has been left genitally damaged by an unspecified war wound, during the course of the novel he is not literally ill. He and the other characters, however, repeatedly use the domain of physical sickness, along with the related domains of death and decay, to talk about the spiritual sickness they are feeling, an emptiness that works in tandem with the barrenness associated with the wasteland metaphors.¹⁰ Commenting on the metaphoric wounding that haunts the characters in the novel, Mark Spilka observes, “In some figurative manner these artists, writers, and derelicts have all been rendered impotent by the war” (128). Jake seems incapable of achieving any sort of spiritual peace. Brett, still suffering from the death of her “true love” in the war, is powerless to commit to a relationship. Cohn is afflicted by a juvenile romanticism, which

prohibits him from developing and sustaining healthy relationships. And all of the characters are suffering from a general case of disempowering malaise, which they attempt to treat through food and alcohol.

It is important to note that Hemingway himself noticed a strong connection between the metaphor of the wasteland and the metaphor of illness. In *Death in the Afternoon*, Hemingway directly identifies the hot Spanish environment as a cause of a frequent disease that plagues matadors: tuberculosis. The intensely hot day causes the matador to perspire. Then the matador must stay around in the amphitheatre while the other bullfighters finish. Hemingway observes, “Spain is a mountain country and a good part of it is African and in the fall and end of summer when the sun is gone the cold comes quickly and deadly for any one who must stand in it, wet with sweat, unable even to wipe himself dry” (101). Hemingway’s fascination with death and decay climaxes in *Death in the Afternoon* with the section “A Natural History of the Dead,” in which he takes a “naturalist” perspective in describing death and decay on the battlefield, going into extensive detail about types of injury and the stages of decay in corpses left to rot.¹¹

Just as it is the context of the bullfight and the battlefield that allows for sickness, death, and decay to occur, it is the decadent world of post-war Europe that is the breeding ground for diseases of the spirit. Brett establishes this fact early on as she figuratively describes Paris as a “pestilential city” (80). Unfortunately, in the German translation Horschitz foregoes the direct translation [*pestilenzartigen*], opting instead for “*verpesteten*” (95) [polluted]. While this choice maintains a sense of

dirtiness, the force of the metaphor is diminished and the connotations of disease and death associated with “pestilential” are lost.

The most obvious types of metaphoric expressions in this category come from characters who simply, as in the conversation between Jake and Georgette, describe themselves as sick. For example, at the end of a late night get-together at Jake’s apartment, Brett remarks to Jake, “You make me ill” (42). The German translation in this case is handled directly: “*Du machst mich krank*” (46) [You make me sick]—a word-for-word translation that maintains the metaphor of sickness. Another example of this direct statement can be found in a comment by Bill to Jake about Cohn: “He makes me sick” (108)—which Horschitz translates as “*Der ist absolut zum Kotzen*” (131). This is one of the rare cases in the novel in which the metaphor is not only retained but also intensified. In this case the more generic term “sick” is made more graphic with “*zum Kotzen*” [to vomit], which is additionally intensified with “*absolut.*”

Other occurrences of sickness metaphors, however, result in metaphoric loss. Early in the novel, as Cohn is dealing with one of his many bouts of restlessness, he states, “I’m sick of Paris, and I’m sick of the Quarter” (19). Horschitz’s translation reads, “*Mir hängt Paris und das ganze Quartier zum Halse raus*” (19) [Paris and the entire Quarter have become wearisome]. While the gist of Cohn’s statement is certainly maintained with this German idiom, the sickness metaphor is lost, and metaphoric shift occurs. Horschitz chooses a different TL image and shifts the focus away from Cohn. In the original the focus of the metaphor is Cohn—he is the subject

of the sentence, the one who is sick. In the translation, the focus is Paris and the Quarter, which are conceptualized as objects coming out of Cohn's neck.

Another example of metaphoric shift occurs later in the text as the group is in Pamplona and Brett complains to Jake that she is fed up with Cohn continually stalking her. She says bluntly, "I'm so sick of him!" (185). Cohn's childish fascination with Brett has become oppressive, and she is agitated because of the tensions that his behavior is causing. The German translation reads, "*Er ist mir so über*" (229). This German idiomatic expression does not translate easily back into English. A literal translation would be, "He is so over to me," although this does not convey the appropriate meaning. A rough English idiomatic equivalent would be, "He has the edge on me." Not only is there a loss of the sickness metaphor with this translation, but again we see a shift in focus as the translation centers on Cohn and his power over Brett rather than Brett's sickness in Cohn's persistent presence.¹²

Other metaphoric expressions in which the domain of physical ill health is used to understand emotional states are also common in the novel. A favorite word in conversation is "sore" as the characters describe their hurt feelings, typically after tense exchanges with each other. Often the word "sore" is used either by Cohn or about Cohn. After a disagreement between Cohn and Jake concerning where they might go for a vacation, Cohn tells Jake, "Don't get sore," to which Jake replies, "I'm not sore" (14). This exchange is translated as "*Sei doch nicht so*" [Don't be so] and "*Ich bin gar nicht so*" (13) [I am entirely not so]. Horschitz opts for grammatical ellipsis in this case, deleting the metaphor while not replacing it with an equivalent

metaphoric image or even a literal adjective. Later Cohn uses “sore” again after a heated exchange with Jake in which he pushes Jake for information about Brett. After Cohn cools down, he says, “I was just sore for a minute” (47). In this case the translation retains the ill-health metaphor: “*Ich war nur im Moment gekränkt*” (53) [I was only hurt in the moment]. The results, however, are different in a later passage. Cohn uses a similar expression a few pages later after he has been insulted by Harvey. He remarks to Jake, “He always gets me sore” (51). The German version reads, “*Er verstimmt mich immer*” (59). This translation—[He always disgruntles me]—although an adequate paraphrase, loses the physical metaphor of soreness. In other places in the text “sore” is translated as “*wütend*,” (88/105) [cross] and “*böse*” (107/129) [furious]. Overall we see Horschitz’s tendency toward occasionally retaining the metaphor, but more often opting for variation, diminishment, a change of focus, and ultimate metaphoric loss.

At points characters opt for a stronger metaphor of ill health, referring to themselves or others as “dead.” When Jake refers to feeling dead at certain points in journeys (48), Horschitz retains the metaphor, translating this as “*tot*” (55). Metaphors using death are also maintained when Brett says to the count, “You’re dead, that’s all” (67) [“*Sie sind einfach tot*” (80)] and when Bill figuratively describes the passed-out Robert Cohn during the fiesta as “dead” (162) [“*gestorben*” (200)]. The translation is not as successful in retaining the death metaphor during an important conversation between Jake and Brett in chapter 16, when Brett informs Jake that she has become infatuated with Pedro Romero. Four times within one page

she uses the idiomatic expression, “I’m a goner” (187), thus employing the death metaphor to conceptualize how sick she is and how hopeless her situation has become due to this sudden turn of events. Horschitz translates this expression twice as “*Ich bin erledigt*” [I am done], once as “*Ich kann nicht mehr*” [I can’t any more], and once as “*Mit mir ist es sowieso aus und vorbei*” (231-232) [With me it is in any case over and done]. These expressions certainly convey a sense of giving up; however, they again not only lose the force of the original expression but also fail to keep the bodily metaphor—an important means to conceptualize Brett’s desperate situation.

One final notable metaphoric subclass uses the source domain of decay to reference the human condition. Once the group finally gathers in Pamplona and the fiesta gets underway, tension erupts early and often. The joyous celebration of the fiesta ironically contrasts with the in-fighting of the group. These characters are here to have a good, care-free time—a “life without consequences” to use a Hemingway expression. Tension, however, threatens to disrupt the party-like atmosphere. The plea—to not spoil the fiesta—is uttered by Brett (148) and by Bill (192), in a futile attempt to ignore the awkwardness of the situation and refocus the group’s attention on the celebration at hand. The German word for “spoil” [*verderben*] is used by Horschitz on both occasions (182, 237), thus maintaining the decay metaphor.

Other linguistic metaphoric expressions of decay, however, are not as smoothly transferred into the German version. An examination of the language of the characters reveals a repeated, some might argue excessive, recurrence of the various forms of “rot.”¹³ Although Brett is especially fond of this word, Jake notes that the

Americans in the group quickly adopt British English expressions, including variations of “rot.” For Hemingway rottenness goes hand-in-hand with decadence as revealed in a discussion of modern bullfighting in *Death in the Afternoon*, where he writes, “It is a decadent art in every way and like most decadent things it reaches its fullest flower at its rottenest point, which is the present” (68).

Metaphorically it is through Hemingway’s use of the source domain of rottenness that the decadence of these characters is revealed. “Rot” and its variations are quite flexible, appearing in a number of grammatical roles throughout the text. “Rotten” appears once as an adverb as Cohn responds to Jake about how his writing is going (45). Horschitz’s translation—“*Verdammt schlecht*” (51)—represents another case of metaphoric loss as Horschitz weakens the expression with the vague “bad” intensified with “damned.”

While other forms of “rot” appear more frequently throughout the text, the ability of the German language to allow for the transfer of the SL image into the TL is somewhat limited, and metaphoric loss occurs often as Horschitz attempts to provide paraphrases for these expressions. One common use of “rot” occurs in a variety of dismissive responses to comments from others. One of Brett’s favorite expressions—“Oh rot!”—gets translated consistently as “*Ach Unsinn!*” [Oh nonsense!] A similar expression—“What rot!” (139)—an exclamation that is used three times in seven lines of dialogue in chapter 13 is translated once as “*Welcher Unsinn*” (170) and twice as “*Was für Quatsch*” (169, 170) [What kind of nonsense]. Brett uses variations on this form of “rot” throughout the novel in different expressions. For example, she

remarks to Jake, “Now you’re not talking rot” (80). The German version reads, “*Jetzt sprichst du ein vernünftiges Wort*” (95). The negation is lost here and “not talking rot” becomes “speaking a sensible word.” Later, Brett says to Jake, “Darling, don’t let’s talk a lot of rot” (185). Metaphoric loss occurs again with the translation, “*Liebling, wir wollen nicht so viel dummes Zeug reden*” (229). “Rot” in this case becomes the disappointingly vague expression “*dummes Zeug*” [dumb stuff].

The most prevalent form of “rot” occurs as the adjective “rotten”—a word of choice for many of the characters as they describe themselves, their behavior, and their situations. The translation of “rotten” in this particular grammatical role proves apparently difficult for Horschitz. With no word is her tendency for variation as extensive as she tries out a wide range of German possibilities. The chart below provides a general overview of her efforts with this problematic word:

Hemingway	Horschitz	Translation rendition
“rotten time . . . in college” (16)	“ <i>unerfreulichen Universitätsjahre</i> ” (15)	unfriendly year at the university
“rotten dream!” (20)	“ <i>verrückter Traum</i> ” (20)	crazy dream
“rotten habit” (21)	“ <i>niederträchtige Manier</i> ” (21)	vile habit
“a rotten way to be wounded” (38)	“ <i>eine gemeine Art von Verwunderung</i> ” (42)	a nasty kind of wounding
“rotten luck” (54)	“ <i>Wahnsinniges Pech</i> ” (62)	crazy bad luck
“a rotten shame” (55)	“ <i>eine Gemeinheit</i> ” (63)	nastiness
“I felt tired and pretty rotten” (61).	“ <i>Ich fühlte mich müde und zerschlagen</i> ” (72).	I feel tired and broken up.
“You’re a rotten dancer, Jake” (69).	“ <i>Du tanzt zu schlecht</i> ” (82).	You dance too badly.
“My nerves are rotten” (186).	“ <i>Meine Nerven sind kaput</i> ” (230).	My nerves are shot.
“It’s rotten here in the hotel” (249).	“ <i>Hier in Hotel ist es furchtbar schlecht</i> ” (310).	It is terribly bad here in the hotel.

“*Schlecht*” [bad] is the easiest and most frequently used term to handle “rotten.” While “*schlecht*” is strengthened by a number of intensifiers—“*verdammte*” [damned] and “*furchtbar*” [terribly]—it remains a generic choice, obviously failing to express the appropriate degree of emotion and losing the metaphoric reference to decay. Other terms also result in metaphoric loss. “*Gemein*” [nasty], obviously a stronger term than “*schlecht*,” is also a common choice, as is “*niederträchtig*” [vile]. Although all of these equivalents do an adequate job of rendering the general sentiment, none of these terms is completely suitable, and all miss the mark in terms of conveying the sense of decay that is important in the text.¹⁴

As Reynolds notes in *The Young Hemingway*, Hemingway as a boy was fascinated with the natural history of living beings—an interest that he inherited from his paternal grandmother, his father, and Theodore Roosevelt (30). This absorption carries over into Hemingway’s metaphoric expressions that draw on the source domains of sickness, death, and decay to reinforce the emptiness, loss, and decadence of his characters. Figurative sickness is rampant in the “pestilential” post-war environment of the novel, and this setting becomes the breeding ground for all sorts of psychic diseases. Ultimate decay is preceded only by spiritual death, and, if Hemingway’s comments about physical death are any indication, this is not a peaceful passing. Hemingway’s blunt simile in *Death in the Afternoon* that “most men die like animals, not men” (139) points to this. Reynolds observes that the young Hemingway eventually came to realize “that man too was an animal whose natural

history needed writing” (YH 30). This brings us to a final important conceptual metaphor for Hemingway in *The Sun Also Rises*: PEOPLE ARE ANIMALS.

Living as Animals

In one of the most detailed sections of the novel, Hemingway describes first Belmonte’s and then Pedro Romero’s bullfighting work. During Romero’s encounters with his two bulls, Hemingway writes that, immediately before the kill, “for just an instant he and the bull were one” (222) and “he became one with the bull” (224).

While some writers reinforce the difference between humans and animals,

Hemingway continually blurs this distinction throughout *The Sun Also Rises*.

Hemingway infuses his prose with animal metaphors and similes in which people are referred to as being animals, as exhibiting animal-like qualities, or as behaving like animals. Frances describes the girls who will follow Cohn around as “chickens” (55).

Harvey and Bill both refer to themselves as behaving “like a cat,” (49, 79) and in Jake’s description of the bullfight, he mentions Belmonte’s “long wolf jaw” (216), “his wolf smile” (217), and his “wolf-jawed smile” (218).

While some of the animal metaphors are neutral and even occasionally positive, the implications in the text of linking humans with animals are overwhelmingly negative. Animal metaphors are used by Hemingway to reinforce two basic characteristics: instinct and cruelty. In a statement alluding to the prominence of instinct throughout history in chapter 12, Bill says, “Sex explains it all” (121). While this comment is intentionally hyperbolic and reductive, and, hence,

ironic, with these characters, in the context of this story, the instinct of sex (along with the other basic needs of food and drink) explains much of the motivation behind these characters' behavior as human emotions are pushed to the side in favor of animalistic urges.

As the characters are governed by their instincts, cruel behavior often follows. Chapter 17, perhaps the low point of the novel in terms of the characters' actions, presents us with scenes of embarrassingly bad, alcohol-fueled behavior: Cohn's calling Jake a "pimp" and knocking out Jake and Mike, Mike's repeated reference to himself as a "bankrupt," and Cohn's pathetic apology. This bad human conduct is shown alongside the brutality of animals as the waiter comments to Jake about the vicious animal behavior exhibited by the goring that took place at the *encierro*. In referencing the behavior of Hemingway's characters, John Atkins writes, "When a man foregoes those qualities which are supposed to distinguish him from animals, he shares their supposed oblivion" (10).

And oblivious these characters certainly are as they behave quite cruelly to each other at times. Hemingway again provides a window into his thinking in *Death in the Afternoon* as he links people, animals, and cruelty:

From observation I would say that people may possibly be divided into two general groups; those who . . . identify themselves with . . . animals, and those who identify themselves with human beings. I believe, after experience and observation, that those people who identify themselves with animals . . . are capable of greater cruelty to

human beings than those who do not identify themselves readily with animals. (5)

Throughout the novel, characters describe each other and themselves as animals, reinforcing not only instinctual behavior but also the cruel ways in which they interact with each other.

Several specific animal metaphors deserve close attention. One of Hemingway's favorite animal metaphors occurs frequently as characters refer to each other as asses. Horschitz treats this metaphor in several ways. Brett's admonition to Jake—"Don't be an ass" (41)—is translated directly: "*Sei kein Esel*" (46). "*Esel*" is used several other times in the text for "ass"; however, this straightforward approach is not continued with other occurrences later in the text. For example, Brett uses the same expression with Count Mippipopolous—"Don't be an ass" (67)—and Horschitz, perhaps feeling that the animal reference would not be appropriate in addressing the more-distinguished elder, removes the animal metaphor, opting for the paraphrase, "*Seien Sie nicht so dumm*" (80).¹⁵ Brett's statement to Mike—"Don't be an ass" (139)—is demetaphorized and diminished in becoming "*Sei nicht so dämlich*" (165) [Don't be so silly]. And when Mike refers to Cohn as an ass in chapter 16, Horschitz opts for a literal substitution in using the word "*Idiot*" (213).

One final use of the "ass" metaphor deserves note. In commenting to Brett about Cohn's behavior, Jake defends Cohn by saying, "I'd be as big an ass as Cohn" (185). The German version reads, "*Ich würde genau so eselhaft sein wie Cohn*" (229). With this expression, Horschitz utilizes Newmark's third approach to metaphor

translation—translating the metaphor as a simile—which tempers the force of the expression. While the SL image, “ass,” is maintained, the expression “*eselhaft*” [ass-like] modifies the force of the metaphor. As Max Black remarks in *Models and Metaphors*, a simile may suffer “from a vagueness that borders on vacuity [because] likeness always admits . . . degrees” (37). In other words, with reference to Jake’s remark, there is a qualitative difference between being an ass and being *like* an ass.

Robert Cohn is on the receiving end of many of these animal metaphors, which reveal not only Cohn’s weaknesses but also other characters’ attitudes toward him. Hemingway establishes early in the novel that he behaves and is treated as a passive animal as Jake notes that Frances “*led* him quite a life” (15, emphasis mine) and that he had been moulded by the two women who had *trained* him” (52, emphasis mine). So it comes as no surprise when, in Pamplona, Cohn is again linked with a passive animal. After observing the spectacle in which a steer (a castrated bull used to keep the bulls calm) is gored by a bull in the ring, Cohn remarks, “It’s no life being a steer” (145). Mike, tired of observing Cohn’s juvenile obsession with Brett, plays off this metaphor by saying, “I would have thought you’d loved being a steer, Robert” and asking, “Why do you follow Brett around like a poor bloody steer? (146). Horschitz’s translation at this point is successful in retaining the SL image of the steer. The strength of this metaphor, however, is lost due to the earlier cases that diminish the Cohn-animal link.

One final animal metaphor to note is Brett’s reference to herself as a bitch. Throughout the novel Brett is repeatedly linked to the animal world. When Brett pays

Jake a late-night visit in Chapter 4, the concierge calls up to Jake, “There’s a species of woman here . . .” (39). In the German translation “species of woman” becomes “*Sorte person*” (43), thus losing the animal reference. Later when Cohn is asking Jake about Brett, Cohn attempts to put his finger on the cause of Brett’s unique quality. He asserts, “I suppose it’s breeding” (46). Horschitz renders this sentence, “*Wahrscheinlich eben die Kinderstube*” (52) [Probably precisely the up-bringing]—another instance in which the animalistic connotations get lost in the translation.

As the novel continues, animal metaphors are used specifically to reinforce Brett’s sexuality. As Lakoff notes in *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things* one of the conceptual metaphors used to understand lust is that “A LUSTFUL PERSON IS AN ANIMAL” (410). Although unfairly exaggerated in early studies of the novel, Brett’s sexuality is undoubtedly foregrounded in the text. As Nancy Comely and Robert Scholes observe, Brett’s highlighted sexuality comes in part from the fact that she usurps “the male prerogative of promiscuity on her own terms” (43). Whatever the cause or our assessment of Brett’s behavior, the bitch metaphor undoubtedly helps reinforce her sexuality. During her conversation with Jake about Pedro Romero, Brett remarks once, “I’ve never felt such a bitch” and twice, “I do feel such a bitch” (188). Horschitz translates these expressions as “*Ich habe mich nie so hurenhaft gefühlt*” [I have never felt so whore-like] and “*Ich fühl mich so hurenhaft*” (233). [I feel so whore-like]. Horschitz makes two moves here to diminish the reference to instinct in this important animal metaphor. First, she replaces the SL metaphor (“bitch”) with a different TL image (“whore”). While “whore” is certainly a powerful metaphor, the

instinctual element is lost in the shift. And then she modifies the impact of the new TL metaphor by transforming it into a simile: “*hurenhaft*” [whore-like]. This is another case in which a stronger metaphor is replaced by a simile to soften the effect. This is a crucial diminishment of the powerful metaphor since, immediately before these lines, Jake’s responses to Brett about her infatuation with Romero reveal that he is trying to get her to go against her animalistic urges, encouraging her to say no and reject her instinctual inclinations.

Brett’s use of the word “bitch” also occurs at the end of the novel, as Brett has informed Jake that she has let Romero go; she says that she is “not going to be one of these bitches that ruins children” and repeats this line on the same page as she asserts that she “won’t be one of those bitches” (247). This is another important use of the word because Brett at this point has intentionally rejected her instincts in dismissing Romero. It is not that she is no longer attracted to him; rather, she recognizes that it is wrong to be with Romero—not just because he is just a boy but also because she is engaged to Mike. Horschitz translates “bitch” as “*Frauenzimmer*” (307-308), a very mild term roughly equivalent to “dame” or “wench.”¹⁶ Again we see a de-emphasis in the strength of the metaphoric expression and the loss in support of a larger conceptual metaphor.¹⁷

Hemingway certainly knew the power of the word “bitch.” In a letter to his editor, Maxwell Perkins, from Valencia, Spain in July 1926 regarding possible revisions to the manuscript of the novel, Hemingway argues against the deletion of this word. While he is open to rewording Mike’s statement, “Tell him bulls have no

balls,”¹⁸ he defends his use of “bitch”: “But in the matter of the use of the word Bitch by Brett—I have never once used this word ornamentally nor except when it was absolutely necessary and I believe the few places where it is used must stand” (*SL* 211).

All the examples of metaphoric loss in regard to the animal metaphors diminish the link that Hemingway sees between cruel, instinctual animal behavior and human behavior. Over the years, critics have sensed the importance of animal metaphors, although they have focused an inordinate amount of attention on trying to figure out who is more of a steer in the novel: Cohn or Jake. Responding to what he calls the “frenzy of symbol mongering,” H.R. Stoneback reacts with a palpable degree of frustration at the critics’ attention to this specific metaphor: “It is high time to bury all the imaginary steer metaphors that exist, not in the novel, only in the criticism . . .” (234). There is some validity to the criticism; however, what Stoneback seems to underestimate is the human inclination to see people as animals—a deeply embedded cognitive metaphor that is shared by Hemingway and his critics.

Commenting on this tendency, Lakoff and Turner observe that animal metaphors are used often to highlight the quintessential quality of a particular animal and to map that quality onto a human target. They write, “Animals act instinctively, and different kinds of animals have different kinds of instinctive behavior . . .” (196). While these qualities can be positive (e.g., a dog’s loyalty or a lion’s bravery), in *The Sun Also Rises*, the mapping from animal to human has almost universally negative implications for the particular characters. Additionally, the removal of animal

metaphors in translation distances the characters from the instinctual and cruel behavior that Hemingway foregrounds.

V.

This chapter has addressed three important issues. First, contrary to critical sentiment, Hemingway does indeed use metaphoric expressions in his writing. And while the vast majority of these metaphors are not original (in the traditional sense) and certainly do not draw attention to themselves, they nevertheless serve an important function in *The Sun Also Rises*. The importance of such metaphoric expressions in all literary texts, although often overlooked, is significant. For example, metaphoric expressions, and especially conventional metaphors and idioms like Hemingway uses, help a text achieve a heightened sense of verisimilitude—something that is essential for Hemingway’s realistic and reportorial technique. These common linguistic expressions also are highly effective in conveying emotion. Additionally, the use of metaphor in conversation establishes a specific level of social interaction among characters. As Gibb notes, “Metaphoric talk often presupposes and reinforces intimacy between speaker and listener” (134).

Secondly, although these above functions of metaphoric language are indeed important within Hemingway’s novel, more significant is the way in which Hemingway’s surface-level metaphoric expressions point the way to a substructure of symbolically significant and interrelated conceptual metaphors. This is Hemingway’s famous iceberg theory in action, and the theory serves as a perfect model for what is happening metaphorically in *The Sun Also Rises* as surface-level linguistic metaphors

give the reader access to hidden conceptual metaphors that are central to Hemingway's vision.

An important part of this vision concerns a conceptualization of life in post-war Europe. Fussell observes that every war is ironic in that each is always worse than expected and that the activity of warfare is “so melodramatically disproportionate to its presumed ends.” Fussell goes on to note that the irony of World War I was greater than any other in that it shattered the very thing it was seen as preserving: “It was a hideous embarrassment to the prevailing Meliorist myth which had dominated the public consciousness for a century. It reversed the Idea of Progress” (7-8). Ostensibly, the War to End All Wars was necessary to preserve the onward march of civilization. After four years of bloodshed, however, a feeling of loss and regression prevailed as Europe, the bastion of culture, had been turned into a literal and figurative wasteland, and the reason for fighting now seemed ludicrous. Human nature, seen at the beginning of the twentieth century as inherently noble, now appeared as animalistic and inherently flawed as men had killed each other by the millions. The landscape and characters of *The Sun Also Rises* reflect this pessimistic post-war attitude, and metaphoric language helps reinforce this three-part vision of sick characters who act instinctually and cruelly as they attempt to survive in a post-war wasteland. In the novel Hemingway repeatedly draws upon these three source domains—the wasteland, sickness, and animals—in constructing metaphors to characterize life in 1920s Europe.

Finally, this chapter has highlighted the power of metaphor by examining metaphor in translation. The translation of metaphors into German in the novel creates problems as Hemingway's particular vision is unfortunately diminished in translation. Overall, in Horschitz's translation the conceptual metaphors are still there but are weakened, in some cases significantly. This loss of force is due to a number of factors, as we will see throughout the examinations of her translations. While linguistic disparity between German and English and cultural differences account for some of the metaphoric loss, Horschitz in many cases is able to choose a German metaphoric expression that utilizes the similar conceptual metaphor in English but decides not to, which points to Horschitz's lack of understanding of the importance of these conceptual metaphors. However, whether the metaphoric loss is due to linguistic variance, cultural difference, or Horschitz's fondness for variation, the end result is a de-emphasis in these important conceptual metaphors.

In the end, problems with metaphor translation tie directly back into Hemingway's use of conceptual metaphors to support themes in the novel. As Kirsten Mason observes, issues of metaphoric translatability need to be addressed in conjunction with textual interpretation:

Any problems we may have when encountering a metaphor are located at the level of interpretation, and these have to be overcome before we can begin to consider a translation of the metaphor in question

[T]he text as a whole is the unit to translate [A]ny metaphors that

occur in the text must be interpreted within the context of the whole text and translated accordingly. (141-142)

The translator, when encountering a metaphoric expression in literary text, must look beyond the individual expression to the important conceptual metaphor activated by that expression. Max Black is right in encouraging us to consider in metaphor analysis not only the focus of the metaphor but also the frame of the metaphor. His definition of the metaphoric frame—"the remainder of the sentence in which the word [the focus of the metaphor] occurs" (28)—is, however, much too narrow. The frame, as Mason accurately observes, is the whole text, and one must first interpret holistically before considering the translation of individual metaphors. Taken individually, Hemingway's metaphors might seem unimportant. Considered within the frame of the entire novel and the culture which shaped it, however, these metaphors take on important significance in highlighting Hemingway's vision. Their transference, or lack thereof, in *Fiesta*, results in significant metaphoric shifts that alter the conceptual underpinnings of the novel.

Notes

¹ One notable exception to the lack of attention to Hemingway and metaphor is Fern Kory's insightful article "What We Talk about When We Talk about Drinking in *The Sun Also Rises*," in which she discusses the implications of the various ways in which drunkenness is metaphorically described.

² Kövecses notes that "dead metaphors" have been traditionally defined as "metaphors that may have been alive and vigorous at some point but have become so conventional and commonplace with constant use that by now they have lost their vigor and have ceased to be metaphors at all." Examples include the following constructions: "a local *branch* of this organization" and "*cultivating* business relationships that can lead to major accounts" (ix).

³ On the topic of varying linguistic systems, one should also note that, according to Baker, Stein gave Hemingway the line in French as it was uttered by her mechanic: "*une generation perdue*" (WA 80). While "lost" is certainly an equivalent term for "*perdue*," each word certainly conveys unique overtones.

⁴ All citations of the German translation are from the first German edition (1928). Numerous German editions of *Fiesta*, as with Hemingway's other novels, were published over the years (especially during the 1950s and 60s), although Horschitz's original translation has remained largely unaltered. Textual examination, however, reveals efforts to update and/or correct Horschitz's original work in later editions. In a letter to Alfred Rice dated Sept. 15, 1962, Ledig-Rowohl confirms that Horschitz was responsible for updating her translations: "Annemarie Horschitz-Horst has frequently corrected her translations in the course of the years so that they have become by now more acceptabel (sic). She has done such revisions of most of the books lately again." These revisions, while correcting some blatant mistakes and updating the language, still do not address the issue of metaphoric loss.

⁵ Hemingway exhibits a fondness for the metaphorical usage of the word "hard" throughout the novel. Robert Cohn, as a result of his unhappy first marriage, "hardened into a rather unattractive mould" (12). Frances' face hardens when Jake mentions the girl he knows in Strasbourg. In reference to the painter Zizi, Brett remarks to the count, "He is rather hard" (70). During the fiesta, Jake describes the "hard-eyed people" (191) of the crowd and their "hard-voiced singing" (159). While the German translation at times retains the hardness metaphor or provides near equivalents (e.g., "*rauh*" [rough]), metaphoric loss occurs repeatedly throughout the novel.

⁶ Hemingway considered numerous titles for the novel, including *Fiesta*. As Michael Reynolds notes in *Hemingway: The Paris Years*, however, Hemingway "needed to

focus the novel and find a better title than *Fiesta*, which was misleading unless you had been to Pamplona” (326).

⁷ The sterility of this world is, of course, reinforced most obviously through Jake’s war wound, which has removed the potential of his becoming a father. More broadly, though, the entire world of the novel is childless, leaving one to wonder whether the next generation referenced in Ecclesiastes will actually come to pass. Perhaps not surprisingly, since there are no actual children in the novel, the adult characters act like children, and the ADULT IS A CHILD conceptual metaphor appears throughout the text. Writing about Hemingway and Fitzgerald in the 1920s, Michael Reynolds describes both writers’ worldview: “the post-war world, at home and abroad, was sick at heart, its values defunct and its over-age children at a loss for purpose” (*TH* 17). The character most frequently described as an over-age child is Robert Cohn. Frances treats Cohn like a son when he doesn’t come home for dinner (53). Harvey Stone notes Cohn’s “arrested development” (51). Later, Jake mentions that Cohn is wearing his polo shirt similar to his college days (198). In his insightful study of the novel, Stoneback notes that Robert’s wanting to shake Romero’s hand is “a sign of some never-outgrown attribute of a schoolboy code of sportsmanship . . .” (261). Jake, however, is also implicated as a child, and his narration unknowingly reveals childish regression (e.g., his juvenile prayer in the chapel in chapter 10 and his later remembrance of a high school football game after Cohn has knocked him down).

⁸ The wasteland concept was certainly known in Germany in 1928 when *Fiesta* appeared. The first German translation of Eliot’s *The Waste Land* (*Das Wüste Land*) was published in 1927.

⁹ In reference to the prostitutes, Hemingway opts for (and Horschitz utilizes as well) the metaphoric French expression “*poules*,” literally “hens.”

¹⁰ *The Sun Also Rises* continues to develop Hemingway’s fascination with the sickness-injury-death-decay pattern that was first established in the vignettes from *In Our Time*.

¹¹ The composition of “A Natural History of the Dead” preceded the publication of *Death in the Afternoon* by several years. Reynolds notes that Hemingway began writing the story in 1930 and later worked the story into the larger text specifically “as counterpoint for his ‘Old Lady’ to consider (*1930s* 51, 85).

¹² While German does not allow for an exact translation of “I’m so sick of him,” there are a number of alternatives to Horschitz’s translation. “*Er ist mir zuwider*” [He is revolting to me] would convey the strength of Brett’s assertion. Even the milder expression, “*Ich habe ihn satt*” [I am fed up with him], although losing the sickness

metaphor, would focus attention more helpfully on Brett's feelings of frustration than Horschitz's translation.

¹³ Maurice H. Weseen's 1934 *A Dictionary of American Slang* includes the following definition for "rotten": "Inferior or worthless, as 'That was a rotten show.' Unfair or unjust, as 'They gave me a rotten deal'" (387). There is no definition of the Britishism "rot."

¹⁴ Forms of "rot" do occur sporadically throughout Hemingway's other early fiction. In *A Farewell to Arms*, for example, the war is described several times as "rotten" and Catherine characterizes her early relationship with Frederic Henry as "a rotten game we play" (31). Horschitz's success at capturing the metaphoric essence is equally low in her translation of this novel. However, occurrences of forms of "rot" are much more prevalent in *The Sun Also Rises*. This deviance from normal usage certainly gains prominence as a case of linguistic foregrounding.

¹⁵ An additional decision for Horschitz in translating from English to German is what form of "you" to use. While she almost always uses the informal "du," in this case she chooses to use the polite form, "Sie," in reference to the count.

¹⁶ "Frauenzimmer" (206) is the translation used for "wench," when Mike says admiringly of Brett, "She's not a sadist. She's just a lovely, healthy wench" (170). In the translation the positive connotations associated with Mike's use of "Frauenzimmer" make the latter use of the word as the translational substitution for the very negative "bitch" even more problematic.

¹⁷ Horschitz does strengthen Brett's final use of "bitch" as she says to Jake, "You know it makes one feel rather good deciding not to be a bitch" (249). Horschitz's translation reads, "Weißt du, man fühlt sich irgendwie wohl, wenn man beschlossen hat, keine solche Hure zu sein" (310) [Do you know, one feels somehow good, when one resolves not to be such a whore.] Of course, the animal metaphor is lost in this translation as well.

¹⁸ Regarding this line, Hemingway writes to Perkins: "I have thought of one place where Mike when drunk and wanting to insult the bull fighter keeps saying—tell him bulls have no balls. That can be changed—and I believe with no appreciable loss to—bulls have no horns" (SL 211). The first edition of the novel contains this line, although all subsequent editions have reflected Hemingway's desired sentence: "Tell him bulls have no balls." Horschitz's translation reads, "Sag ihm, daß Stiere keine Hörner haben" (216), an accurate reflection of the first edition of the novel, which Horschitz clearly used for her translation. Horschitz's translation of this line persisted throughout the decades, despite the change in the English editions. Most recently, however, the Taschenbuch edition of the novel reads, "Sag ihm, daß die Stiere keine

Hoden haben" (198). While this is closer to Hemingway's intended sentence, with "balls" now translated as "*Hoden*" [testicles], the poetic crassness of Mike's humorous expression is, unfortunately, lost.

Chapter Four

Men Without Women and the Translation of Ironic Repetition

Manuel: “I was going good.” (CSS 205)
—Ernest Hemingway, “The Undefeated”

“*Ich war gut.*” (*Männer* 59)
—Annemarie Horschitz, “Der Unbesiegte”

“I was good.”
—Rendition of translation

“You are a beautiful boy,” I said.
“Who says so?” Guy asked, “you or her?”
“She does. I’m just your interpreter.” (CSS 226)
—Hemingway, “Che Ti Dice la Patria?”

If I at any time seem to repeat myself I have a good reason for doing so. (*SL* 154)
—Hemingway, in a letter to Horace Liveright

I.

In the section “Miss Stein Instructs” from *A Moveable Feast*, Hemingway recounts a series of exchanges with Gertrude Stein during visits to Stein and Alice Toklas’s Parisian studio apartment at 27 rue de Fleurus. Interspersed among Hemingway’s recounting of Stein’s remarks on painting, publishing, and sex is his conspicuous statement about Stein’s unique stylistic technique: “She had also discovered many truths about rhythms and the uses of words in repetition that were valid and valuable and she talked well about them” (17).

Stein’s experimentation with lexical repetition appears throughout her writing. In “Melanctha,” a story from *Three Lives* that Hemingway particularly admired, we see numerous examples of repetition. During one of many conversations with Jeff,

Melanctha says, “I certainly do say Jeff Campbell, I certainly don’t think much of the way you always do it, always never knowing what it is you are ever really wanting and everybody always got to suffer” (108). While easy to notice, the significance of this kind of linguistic repetition has escaped many readers. Writing about Stein’s method, Linda Wagner-Martin cautions against a simplistic reading, describing the technique as “insistence, not mere repetition” (10). This manner of “repeating the same general information by varying it slightly, appropriately, makes the reader pay attention” (11). Michael Hoffman offers a similar assessment of the effect of Stein’s repetition. According to Hoffman the restatement “assumes an almost incantatory significance that forces its way into the reader’s consciousness by the sheer weight of repeated usage” (30).

By reading Stein, Hemingway certainly became aware of the foregrounding effect achieved through reiteration. As Hemingway’s remark in his posthumously published memoir suggests, Stein’s experimental repetition had a lasting impact throughout his career. When one examines his work, however, it becomes clear that the technique of repetition figures most prominently in the mid-1920s as Hemingway was developing his craft.

In contrast to their lack of attention to Hemingway’s use of metaphor, many critics have rightly observed that repetition serves as a frequently used device in Hemingway’s stylistic tool chest. While Hemingway does not utilize repetition to the extent that Stein does, his repetition, in a fashion similar to Stein’s, demands that the reader “pay attention” to the repeated pattern. Eugene Peterson notes the significance

of repetitions in Hemingway's prose that "add to the torrential effect; they may be viewed as means for achieving intensity, but they are plainly a kind of overstatement or hyperbole" (118). In comparing Hemingway to Henry James, Sheldon Grebstein writes that an

important technique common to both is incremental repetition, or repetition-plus variation, a type of stichomythia. In this rhetorical scheme each speaker will pick up a word or phrase from the other's speech and utilize it as the basis for his own remarks, but adding, subtracting, or changing, so that the dialogue continuously rehearses itself yet evolves as it proceeds. (96)

Grebstein continues by observing that "the incremental method tends to deepen and sharpen *emotional* response, feeling, or attitude" (98, emphasis in original).

Less common in Hemingway criticism, though, are examinations of the significance of the linguistic repetition in Hemingway's writing. Repetition might create a "torrential effect," but to what end? Repeated lexical units, for example, are clearly evident in "As I Lay Me," the final story in *Men Without Women*, as Hemingway's utilization of the words "sometimes" and "always" (clearly a nod to Stein) elevates the story to what Joseph Flora calls "prose poetry" (166), a term that appears intermittently in other critical discussions of Hemingway and repetition.

Flora, however, does not define the term "prose poetry"—a label that Hazel Smith describes as "a diverse and loose category" (183)—or explain the significance of this kind of language in Hemingway's story.¹ Is it ultimately important that

Hemingway foregrounds specific words and phrases in his writing through repetition? And, conversely, is it significant that in her German translation Annemarie Horschitz does not follow through with this repetition? Is the consequence of a lack of repetition in Horschitz's translation simply a diminishment of the "prose-poetry" quality (however one might define the term) in the text? Or are there larger implications to Horschitz's translational choices? As Halliday observes, "a feature that is brought into prominence will be 'foregrounded' only if it relates to the meaning of the text as a whole" (*EFL* 104).

In this chapter I argue that Hemingway's linguistic reiteration is certainly foregrounded—that his repetition is significant for "the text as a whole." After a brief introduction to *Men Without Women*, I discuss an important unifying trope in the text that is enhanced through repetition: irony. To bring together a discussion of repetition and irony, I turn to Halliday, whose analysis of Hemingway's use of irony helps us consider five distinct categories of Hemingway's ironic vision. These categories, in turn, lead us to consider the significant role that repetition plays not only in individual stories but also in the collection as a whole.

As in the previous chapter, an analysis of Hemingway's stylistic technique is enhanced when the original is examined alongside a translated version of the text. As we will see, the counterpoint to Hemingway's use of repetition is Horschitz's tendency toward variation in her German translation, a tendency that we noticed occasionally in her attempts in *Fiesta* to translate Hemingway's crucial conceptual metaphors. Horschitz's translational strategies in *Männer* not only fail to reproduce

Hemingway's repetition but also, as a result, compromise Hemingway's utilization of irony.

II.

When *Men Without Women* appeared in October 1927, Hemingway, riding a wave of popularity from the recently published *The Sun Also Rises*, had already established himself as an important American writer. Maxwell Perkins, Hemingway's editor at Scribners, felt it was important to come out with a collection of stories to keep the author's name in front of the public in anticipation of the next novel (Flora ix). The main question was not if a collection of short stories would be published but which stories would be included. Letters between Perkins and Hemingway in early 1927 reveal that Hemingway, writing from Gstaad, already had a preliminary notion of the stories he wanted to appear in the volume. In a letter dated February 14, Hemingway listed ten stories, nine of which would find their way into the final version (SL 245).² When the volume finally appeared in October 1927, the book contained 14 stories, a mixture of previously published work and recently written material.

Despite the negative reaction of some critics, the volume received widespread initial praise and firmly solidified Hemingway's place as a master of short fiction. Over the years, however, the lack of a unifying theme in the stories has led to *Men Without Women* being the least discussed of Hemingway's four major early works. While critics analyze individual stories (most frequently "Hills Like White Elephants"), the volume receives little attention as a unified work.

Those attempting to find a unifying principle in the collection often focus on its title, with disappointing results. Explaining his choice, Hemingway, in a letter to Maxwell Perkins, asserted, “In all of these [stories], almost, the softening feminine influence through training, discipline, death or other causes, [is] absent” (SL 245). Five days later, however, in another letter to Perkins, Hemingway downplays the significance of the title and, by extension, the controlling idea of the work: the title “may have struck you as a punk title and if it did please cable me and I’ll try and work for another one” (SL 246). (Further complicating a consideration of the title’s significance is the fact that these statements appeared before the actual line-up of stories was established.)³

My goal in this chapter is not to propose some grand unifying design for the volume of stories; my aim, rather, is to highlight how stylistic techniques (i.e., repetition and irony) serve as unifying principles, providing connections among numerous stories. As we will see, repetition serves as an important device not only within specific stories but also among the stories throughout the collection. Frequently, this repetition highlights various facets of Hemingway’s ironic vision.

While irony, like repetition, is mentioned frequently in Hemingway criticism, it is a difficult term to define, both in terms of general linguistic/literary theory and Hemingway criticism. Wayne Booth laments in *A Rhetoric of Irony* that “irony has come to stand for so many things that we are in danger of losing it as a useful term altogether” (2). The ambiguities of the term combine with its complexities to create a confusing state of affairs. Connecting irony with metaphor, John Searle identifies a

root problem of both tropes: “how it is possible to say one thing and mean something else, where one succeeds in communicating what one means even though both the speaker and the hearer know that the meanings of the words uttered by the speaker do not exactly and literally express what the speaker meant” (84). As a result the distinction must be made between “sentence meaning” and “utterance meaning” in interpreting what a speaker intended. For Ellen Winner and Howard Gardner, the notion of deciphering intention makes irony a much more difficult device to understand than metaphor. In metaphor one must understand only two domains (source and target). With irony, one needs somehow to understand the speaker’s unstated beliefs and intentions (425).

The complexity of irony, however, is greatest when the unit in question appears in isolation. The benefit of examining irony in a narrative is that the ironic utterance is clarified when viewed within the context of the entire text. One need not venture into the perilous and murky world of authorial intention to begin to notice irony in Hemingway’s fiction, as the energies of the ironic unit work against the momentum of the larger narrative. One becomes aware that the lexical unit, read in context, implies something quite different than a literal interpretation would suggest. It is this juxtaposition between appearance and reality—highlighted through Hemingway’s use of repetition—that demands readerly attention.

Examples of this ironic contrast, Hemingway’s famous sleight-of-hand technique, can be found throughout the stories of *Men Without Women*. The restaurant in “Che Ti Dice la Patria” looks simple and innocent, but the situation

inside actually is quite complicated. The American lady in “A Canary for One” claims to have “terrific presentiments about things” but doesn’t realize that the couple with whom she is traveling is separating (261). In “Fifty Grand” the reader is so focused on Jack’s plan for cashing in on his defeat that the double-cross that almost ruins his plan comes as a complete surprise. And in “An Alpine Idyll” the peasant claims to have loved his wife even though he had treated her corpse as a lantern hook.

Such examples of Hemingway’s irony have led critics to propose schemas for categorizing the scope of his ironic vision. The most helpful analysis has come from Halliday, whose article “Hemingway’s Ambiguity: Symbolism and Irony” provides five specific ways to think about Hemingway’s ironic vision: “The ironic gap between expectation and fulfillment, pretense and fact, intention and action, the message sent and the message received, the way things are thought or ought to be and the way things are—this has been Hemingway’s great theme from the beginning; and it has called for an ironic method to do it artistic justice” (65).

Halliday’s five categories of irony provide a helpful framework to examine not only the breadth of Hemingway’s ironic vision but also the importance of repetition as a means used to achieve these ironic effects. While not all of the stories in *Men Without Women* utilize repetition in this way, I maintain that an important component of Hemingway’s “ironic method” is linguistic repetition, which forces the reader to confront central concerns in the stories. Horschitz’s reluctance (due to translational choice) or inability (due to linguistic differences between English and

German) to reproduce this repetition alters Hemingway's irony and thus takes away from key elements of these stories.

III.

A. Between expectation and fulfillment

The first story in the collection, "The Undefeated," tells the story of Manuel Garcia, an aged, ailing, and doomed matador, who vainly attempts one more bullfight. The beginning of the story consists of Manuel's attempts to convince first Retana, the businessman in charge of the bullfights, and then Zurito, Manuel's chosen picador, that he has what it takes to perform in the arena. The remainder of the story describes Manuel's futile attempt to pull off a successful return in front of a disinterested public. The story concludes with Manuel, seriously and perhaps fatally wounded, lying on the operating table.

The story is often cited by critics as a quintessential example of Hemingway's use of the tragic formula. While Hemingway employs elements of tragedy throughout his fiction, "The Undefeated" is the only story in *Men Without Women*, according to Wirt Williams, that rises to the level of true tragedy. The story "not only has the demanded magnitude, statement, and impact of authentic tragedy, but it offers also one of the noblest tragic conditions: the fatal flaw of the aging matador . . ." (90-91). As we will observe, Hemingway's "authentic tragedy" is a bit more complicated than one might expect.

One prerequisite for tragedy is the Aristotelian notion of tragic necessity—the fact that the hero's fate is sealed and that the story will progress to its inevitable

conclusion. From Manuel's perspective, he seems fated by the gods to return to the ring: he is a bullfighter and simply must pursue his profession. When Zurito asks him, "What do you keep on doing it for?" Manuel matter-of-factly responds, "I've got to do it" (189). Manuel also foreshadows his final catastrophe. Early in the story, as he is trying to convince Retana to put him on the schedule for the following week, Retana claims that he will not draw a crowd. Manuel counters, "They'd come to see me get it" (185).⁴

The German translation, even at this early stage, begins to alter the tragic structure of the story. While Horschitz easily handles Manuel's response to Zurito ("*Ich muß es machen*" (22) [I must do it]), the translation is less successful in replicating the coming doom in his response to Retana. Horschitz's translation simplifies Manuel's statement: "*Sie würden schon kommen, um mich zu sehen*" (12) [They would surely come to see me], thus omitting "get it" and weakening the foreshadowing of Manuel's demise.

As Williams suggests, though, the overriding tragic element in the story is Manuel's Aristotelian fatal flaw—his hubris, his overwhelming sense of pride in his bullfighting ability that leads him back into the ring when the wise move would be to walk away. Hemingway focuses attention on Manuel's self-evaluation through the latter's insistence that as a bullfighter he is/has been "going good" and "going great," expressions that Manuel uses repeatedly and that Zurito echoes on two occasions. In total, Hemingway repeats these phrases eleven times, clearly elevating them to a level of prominence.

The significance of this phraseology is highlighted early in the story as Manuel tries to convince Zurito to *pic* for him and Zurito counters that Manuel needs to stop bullfighting. Manuel, however, insists and uses repetition to build his case. Within half a page there are five uses of Manuel's self-description that he has been/is "going good" or "going great." Manuel claims, "I've been going good lately," as a response to Zurito telling him he should "get out and stay out." Manuel follows this with, "I was going great when I got hurt." Seeking complicity from Zurito, Manuel then says, "You know when I get going I'm good." Several lines later he repeats, "I was going great" and finally, "I'm going good now" (189).

Horschitz provides various alternatives in translating this repeated phrase. In the first two cases she opts for similar phrases by using "*in sehr guter Form*" [in very good form] and "*ganz groß in Form*" [very grand in form]. The third instance results in a strikingly different option: "*wenn ich erst im Zug bin, dann bin ich wirklich gut*" [when I am only well trained, then I am certainly good]. The fourth utterance becomes "*Ich wurde besser und besser*" [I became better and better] while the fifth results in "*ich werde jetzt ganz große Klasse*" (22-23) [I am now becoming really first class].

The intensity of this early repetition in the story foreshadows the more significant repetition of "going good/great" that appears again at the end of the story. While Manuel puts up a valiant fight, he struggles to kill his bull, is gravely wounded in the process, and must finally be carried out of the arena. It is at this point that Hemingway returns to his previously established pattern of repetition. On the

operating table Manuel says twice to Zurito, “I was going good,” followed by, “I was going great.” Then he asks Zurito, “Wasn’t I going good,” followed by Zurito’s answer, “You were going great” (204-205).

Horschitz explores several different options in translating this phrase during this climactic scene. In the first instance Horschitz chooses to translate Manuel’s repeated lines—“I was going good”—with simply “*Ich war gut*” [I was good]. His following claim—“I was going great”—becomes “*Es ging glänzend*” [It went brilliantly]. Manuel’s question to Zurito is translated as “*War ich nicht wirklich gut?*” [Was I not really good?], while Zurito’s answer is ellipsed in the German in becoming simply “*Glänzend*” (59) [Brilliantly].

While there are numerous analyzable shifts in the translation of this key phrase during these two scenes, one initial point is worth noting. While translational variation sometimes creates little disturbance in the target text, as we will see throughout *Men Without Women*, Hemingway often uses repetition to highlight key passages. This is certainly the case in “The Undefeated.” Due to Horschitz’s linguistic variation, one is hard pressed, for example, to see in the translation the correlation between the two scenes—a connection that Hemingway has clearly established through repetition. As a result Horschitz’s variation diminishes the overall attention placed on the intentionally foregrounded phrase “going good/great.”⁵

Before exploring the important semantic differences between “going good/great” and the German alternatives, we would do well to consider what Manuel actually means by this repeated phrase. It does not take the reader long to begin

reading the line as a prime example of irony. While the statement initially establishes high expectations for Manuel in the ring, one soon realizes that performance will be vastly different and that Manuel will apparently fail miserably. Manuel's claim does not seem to mesh with both past and present realities.

It seems odd, though, that Manuel would claim greatness (or even something less grand) as a bullfighter. The question of Manuel's skill in the arena certainly appears throughout the story. Retana's man, while watching Manuel work, says, "Why that one's a great bull-fighter." Zurito's curt response, "No, he's not," closes the door to questions of Manuel's greatness (200). The juxtaposition between Manuel and the younger and more talented Fuentes also highlights Manuel's mediocrity. After watching Fuentes's work, Zurito states unequivocally, "He's good" (197).

So does Manuel believe (in spite of the evidence and assessments from others) that he is really skilled in the arena? The text suggests that he does not. The most direct evidence comes from another appearance of the story's key phrase. During the break before the final third and after Manuel's initial efforts have led to an unenthusiastic response from both the crowd and the bullfighting critic, Zurito leans forward and encourages Manuel: "You're going good" (197). Horschitz tries another translation: "*Du machst deine Sache gut*" (40) [You do your thing well]. The bullfighter's response is telling: "Manuel shook his head" (197). As James Plath observes, Manuel shakes his head because he "is not taken in" (39). While Plath claims that this is due to "his sense of potential," Manuel seems to understand his diminished skill level. Earlier in the story, as he is trying to convince Zurito to *pic* for

him, Manuel says, “I figured if I had just one good pic, I could get away with it” (189). Those are certainly the words of a realist.

So if Manuel is not claiming that he is a good bullfighter, what is he claiming? How do we read the statement that we initially labeled as ironic? Writing about “Fifty Grand,” another Hemingway story in *Men Without Women*, Williams notes that “irony and reversal are followed so swiftly by counter-irony and counter-reversal . . . that one has a problem telling which is which” (96). The same could be said for interpreting Manuel’s repeated phrase as the literal becomes ironic and then, as we will see shortly, literal again. The German translation of the story’s key phrase, surprisingly, serves as a helpful counterpoint in examining this shift back to a literal interpretation by considering what Manuel actually means by the phrase “going good/great.”

German’s lack of a progressive tense—something that will also be explored in Chapter Six—has significant consequences in the translation and begins to bring the original statement into focus. First, the present participial form of the verb “go” works to produce a qualified statement. As Sidney Greenbaum and Randolph Quirk observe, “The progressive (or ‘continuous’) focuses on the situation as being in progress at a particular time. In consequence, it may imply that the situation has limited duration, and that it is not necessarily complete” (53). Manuel’s original statement thus becomes a statement of limited scope—not an overarching statement of himself and his ability. The past progressive form indicates honesty as Manuel realizes that at some point he perhaps wasn’t going good. If this is a statement of

Manuel's pride in his ability, as most critics claim, it is surely not an indication of hubris.

More importantly, the dynamic nature of the English expression, highlighted by the progressive aspect, becomes static in the German. The participle in this construction is crucial in this statement because it reflects action. While Horschitz attempts to provide a sense of action, mainly through her use of "*werden*" [become], her translation fails to communicate the appropriate sense of Manuel's striving. In the scope of a tragedy, such as Manuel's calamity, action is extremely important. The doomed hero does not roll over and die but acts (perhaps foolishly and vainly) even in the face of imminent death. This sense of action—the insistence on "going"—is unfortunately lost in German.

One reason that Horschitz's repeated translation of "going good" as simply "*gut*" is troubling is that the story actually turns on the contrast between the dynamic "going good" and the static "good." The original highlights Manuel's agency—his action in the story. This is reduced greatly also in Horschitz's choice, "*Es ging glänzend*" [It went brilliantly], which not only removes the sense of action by moving the action into the past but also completely eliminates Manuel as agent.

In the end, the crux of the irony in the story rests on how we understand Manuel's line and what Manuel actually means by "going good." The expectation from the line is that Manuel will be skillful in the ring. This is certainly how Zurito initially understands Manuel's claim. Manuel's definition of going good, however, is quite different from what others are thinking. The repeated line, I would suggest, has

less to do with his ability—what kind of “form” he is in, as the German expresses it at several points—and more to do with his dedication to follow through with his destiny. Manuel fulfills his obligation—he goes good. That is why he is successful at the end. That is why he is the “Undefeated” despite his apparent defeat.

While the distinction between “going good” and “good” is never clarified in “The Undefeated,” Hemingway returns to this concept in “Today Is Friday,” Hemingway’s strange play about three Roman soldiers at a bar following their participation in Christ’s crucifixion.⁶ The most important exchange among the soldiers occurs at the halfway point in the play as they are discussing Jesus on the cross:

Second soldier: Listen, I seen a lot of them—here and plenty of other places. Any time you show me one that doesn’t want to get down off the cross when the time comes—when the time comes, I mean—I’ll climb right up with him.

First soldier: [H]e was pretty good in there today.

Third soldier: He was all right.

Second soldier: You guys don’t know what I’m talking about. I’m not saying whether he was good or not. What I mean is, when the time comes. When they first start nailing him, there isn’t none of them wouldn’t stop it if they could. (272)

While the repeated line in this story belongs to the first soldier—the significance of which will be examined shortly—Hemingway uses it to set up the

second soldier's more authoritative and nuanced statement. The second soldier's observation provides an important counter to the assessments of the other two soldiers, since the second soldier makes the important distinction between an intrinsic goodness and right action. Jesus was "good in there" because he did what he had to do (i.e., stayed up on the cross)—not because he did anything spectacular or was good in some type of arbitrary way.

Manuel's situation is similar in "The Undefeated." "Going good/great" does not mean either performing well or being good; rather, it is an indication of following through, of doing what a person must do—an essential element in tragedy. Whether Manuel is a good bullfighter or whether Jesus is a good crucifixion victim is not the point. They both "go good" because they carry out their fated roles.

Horschitz's varied treatment of Manuel's repeated "going good/great" has important implications for the translated text. On a basic level, Horschitz's lack of repetition removes the phrase from prominence in the story. More importantly, the scope of Manuel's statement is altered and his sense of action is removed. The German versions represent a profound shift in Manuel's self-assessment, increasing his sense of unwarranted pride and reducing his self-imposed need to act. Hemingway's irony in "The Undefeated" is a complicated scenario of irony and counter-irony, which is unfortunately oversimplified in the translation.

B. Between pretense and fact

As indicated by the second soldier's assertion, the notion of performance is repeatedly reinforced throughout "Today Is Friday." While the standard reading of the text is that this version of Christ's passion reads as a boxing match, an examination of Hemingway's style reveals that the source domain he repeatedly falls back on is not the boxing ring but the theater.⁷

In *Hemingway: A Life Without Consequences* James Mellow notes that as a teenager, Hemingway wrote a play titled "No Worst Than a Bad Cold." While Mellow focuses almost exclusively on the romantic content of the piece as a reflection of Hemingway's developing adolescent sexuality, of equal interest is the subject matter of the play: "Two Indians, a sixteen-year-old named Richard Boulton, and an older man, Albert, nicknamed Paw Paw Keewis, discuss an 'Indian Passion Play' they plan to perform in a natural setting" (30).

Mellow's description of this work as "perhaps his first and only effort at closet drama" (30) seems a bit surprising since "Today Is Friday" reads very much as a closet drama. The similarities between these two texts do not end there, however. The play-within-a-play formula about Christ's crucifixion that Hemingway used for his teenage piece would also be employed for "Today Is Friday," a fact that has been missed by the few critics who have chosen to discuss this obscure Hemingway piece. Metaphoric language ironically reinforces this point.

The metaphoric language of the theater is set up through the use of repetition. The most prominent line in the play belongs to the first soldier, who says six times in

reference to Christ on the cross, “he was/looked pretty good in there today.” The irony of the statement is readily apparent as the first soldier talks about the crucifixion of Christ as a recurring event—as if it is a dramatic performance in which Christ sometimes performs well, sometimes not. This contrast between pretense and fact, between imagination and reality, in describing the crucifixion is highlighted by this repeated line.

Horschitz’s translation of this line results in a loss of repetition as well as irony. While Hemingway alters the first soldier’s repeated line slightly throughout the play, Horschitz’s penchant for variation comes through again. Her standard translation is “*wie der sich benommen hat*” [how he behaved/conducted himself], although she also shifts the predicating verb unnecessarily between present perfect and simple past [“*benahm*”]. While this standard translation conveys an approximate equivalent meaning, the metaphoric implications (and thus the corresponding irony) are lost. (She also changes modifies the line by occasionally omitting “*heute*” [today].) The translation of the first soldier’s final use of the repeated line represents the most significant alteration: “*ich fand ihn schon recht ordentlich*” (228) [I found him really quite decent].

Hemingway builds on the first soldier’s emphasis on the performative by employing specific language to describe the play (i.e., the crucifixion) within the play. Horschitz’s translation occasionally maintains the metaphoric language. For example, when the second soldier questions why Jesus did not come down from the cross, the first soldier says, “That’s not his play” (272). Horschitz’s translation

maintains the source domain, translating the line as, “*Weil das nich zu seiner Rolle gehört*” (225) [Because that didn’t pertain to his role]. Metaphoric loss, though, is the rule. The first soldier later asks the wine-seller, “Didn’t you follow it, George?” referring to the action of the crucifixion. Horschitz translates this as “*Weißt du wirklich nich, worum sich’s handelt, Georg?*” (225) [Do you really not know what it’s about, George?], thus de-metaphorizing the question. In referring to Jesus, the first soldier later says, “I was surprised how he acted” (272). Here, metaphoric loss happens again as Horschitz surprisingly falls back on her stock translation for the first soldier’s repeated line (“he was/looked pretty good in there today”): “*Alle Achtung, wie der sich heute benommen hat*” (226). When the third soldier remarks, “The *part* I don’t like is the nailing them on” (272, emphasis mine), Horschitz chooses a literal approach: “*Das, was ich nich mag, is, wenn sie sie annageln*” (226) [That, what I don’t like, is when they nail them on]. Finally, near the end of the play, Hemingway draws again on the language of the theater as the first soldier refers to the disciples’ behavior following the crucifixion: “Oh, they faded out” (273). Horschitz’s translation becomes “*Na, die haben sich natürlich alle verdrückt*” (227) [Oh, they naturally all slipped away].

The irony of describing real life as drama can be found throughout Hemingway’s writing.⁸ Hemingway was certainly, though, not unique in this respect. Many writers of his generation, especially those exploring the greatest event of their lives—the Great War—relied heavily on the language of the theater to describe real-life events. Siegfried Sassoon’s *Memoirs of an Infantry Officer* and Robert Graves’s

Goodbye to All That serve as two good examples of the overt theatrical transposition of the war experience into drama. The main entailment in the WAR AS DRAMA conceptual metaphor is that the soldiers are actors who dress up in costumes and play certain roles.

Paul Fussell points out the prominence of the theater metaphor as a means to conceptualize World War I, a figure that, interestingly, is not utilized by German writers. The harsh realities of war, according to Fussell, result in a reliance on the dramatic metaphor:

It is thus the very hazard of military situations that turns them theatrical. And it is their utter unthinkableness: it is impossible for a participant to believe that he is taking part in such murderous proceedings in his own character. The whole thing is too grossly farcical, perverse, cruel, and absurd to be credited as a form of “real life.” Seeing warfare as theater provides a psychic escape for the participant (192)

Metaphor usage thus becomes a way to cope with the unfathomable horrors of war: “After all, just as a play must have an ending, so might the war; just as an actor gets up unhurt after the curtain falls on his apparent murder, so might the soldier. And just as a play has a structure, so might a war conceived as analogous to a play have a structure—and with it, a meaning” (Fussell 199).

While clearly not talking about war, the soldiers in Hemingway’s play are doing something quite similar by using the language of the theater to provide a

structure to make sense of the absurd violence that they have just witnessed and taken part in. The irony is that the event is real, yet the language used to describe the crucifixion of Christ gives the impression of an unreal play. This is a coping technique, one with perhaps limited success, as indicated by the third soldier's repeated line—"I feel like hell"—at the end of the play (273).

C. Between intention and action

Another of Halliday's ironic gaps in Hemingway's *Men Without Women* is the distance between intention and action. While the intention of the characters is often left unspoken, what speaks more clearly is the gaze, and repetition serves to bring this to the reader's attention. The importance of the gaze, highlighted through Hemingway's repeated use of the verb "look," is evident in numerous stories in the collection. In "The Undefeated," for example, the gaze is central in the initial exchange between Manuel and Zurito. In another example, the girl in "Hills Like White Elephants" is described as looking at various things: the hills, the ground, and the curtains.

While important in these stories, the gaze plays an even more vital role in several other narratives. As Paul Smith observes, "A Simple Enquiry" "is a story of perception, and one complicated as we witness, through the narrator, the major, a perceiver perceiving" (167). The act of looking, in the final assessment, makes the story anything but simple. The story concerns itself with a clumsy and indirect sexual proposition that is made by a major to his orderly during winter before fighting

resumes in the spring. While the story contains almost no action, the intentions involved are quite profound, and a key element in establishing this ironic juxtaposition between intention and action is the gaze. Hemingway's repeated use of "look" establishes this, but is altered in the German translation.

The major's gaze is foregrounded in numerous ways. At the beginning of the story the narrator highlights the major's eyes that "were two white circles where his snow-glasses had protected his face from the sun on the snow" (250). When the major asks Pinin to come into the room, Pinin enters to find the major lying on his bunk. The narrator observes that the major's "long, burned, oiled face looked at Pinin" (251). The initial use of "look" in this case gains prominence for the reader through the nonstandard construction as it is his face (rather than his eyes or the major himself) that is doing the looking.⁹ The phrasal verb "looked at/looking at" is then repeated six more times, thus gaining heightened value in the story.

While Horschitz successfully maintains the nonstandard construction of the above sentence, noteworthy and problematic in Horschitz's translation are the ways in which Pinin's gaze and the major's gaze are marked differently. When Pinin looks, as in the repeated sentence, "Pinin looked at the floor," (251) "look" is translated as the neutral "*sehen*" [see]. When the major looks, however, Horschitz translates this as "*betrachten*" [considered, regarded, beheld].

There are two concerns here. Again, by not following Hemingway's repetition, Horschitz diminishes the effect of the gaze by reducing the repeated insistence of the word, thus reducing the significance of "looked at." Secondly,

Horschitz overdetermines the symbolism of the major's gaze. The story hinges in part on the juxtaposition of the looks in the story. The irony is that while the action is the same—both are “looking”—the intentions are quite different. The major is looking at Pinin; Pinin is looking at the floor. The actual “simple enquiry,” as communicated by the gaze, is an unstated sexual proposition. Pinin's look at the floor is meant to reflect embarrassment and shame. By using the loaded “*betrachten*” for the major, Horschitz indicates that his gaze has different motives, which of course it does. While Horschitz's tendency to embellish Hemingway's understatement will be examined more fully in Chapter Five, it is important to see how her embellished translation of “look” affects this story. By overdetermining the significance of the major's look, Horschitz undermines the irony of Hemingway's understated use of “look.”

Hemingway's understated repetition of “look” ties into a general theme of the story, which hinges on the ironic juxtaposition between the simple and the complicated. While the story is titled “A Simple Enquiry,” there is nothing simple about the exchange, both stated and unstated, between the major and Pinin. This juxtaposition is signaled by the title as Hemingway oxymoronically brings together “simple” and “enquiry.” Unfortunately, Horschitz's title—“*Eine einfache Frage*” [A Simple Question]—results in another case of ironic loss. (“*Anfrage*” or “*Erkundigung*” would be closer equivalents for “enquiry.”)

The importance of looking continues in “Ten Indians,” the story following “A Simple Enquiry” in *Men Without Women*, as again the innocent act of looking communicates more than a reader might initially think. Nick, having returned home

from Fourth of July celebrations, eats while his father sits with him at the table. During their conversation, the narrator notes first, “His father sat watching him eat . . .” and then, “His father sat watching Nick eat . . .” (256). Horschitz translates the first sentence as “*Sein Vater saß da, guckte ihm beim Essen . . .*” (182) and the second sentence as, “*Sein Vater saß da und beobachtete Nick beim Essen*” (183). While Horschitz replicates some of the repetition, one notes again her tendency for variety as she chooses different verbs (the colloquial “*gucken*” [watch, peek] and the much more formal “*beobachten*” [observe], thus hitting below and above the equivalent term.

Hemingway uses these two sentences to set up the third and most important reference to the father’s gaze. After he tells Nick that Prudie and Frank Washburn were “having quite a time” in the woods, the narrator reports, “His father was not looking at him” (256). The pleasant suppertime conversation has now turned uncomfortable as Nick’s father reveals the painful news about Nick’s girlfriend that will break his heart. Rather than translating the statement in a straightforward manner, Horschitz chooses the following construction: “*Sein Vater sah an ihm vorbei*” (183). [His father looked past him]. Not only does Horschitz choose yet another verb (“*sah*” [saw]), thus weakening the intensity of the repetition, but she also loses the strength of the original by not providing a clear negation—for example, *Sein Vater sah ihn nicht an* [His father did not look at him]. The ironic power of the gaze (and its absence) is thus weakened.

A final story in which Hemingway uses “look” repeatedly is “In Another Country,” a story in which the word appears nine times. While the first use of “look” refers to the general pleasantness of “looking in the windows” on the street” (206), the other eight instances refer to the major and reflect his fragile state of mind as he deals first with a debilitating war injury and then with the death of his wife. Arguably the most important use of “look” occurs after he learns of his wife’s death: “And then crying, his head up looking at nothing, carrying himself straight and soldierly, with tears on both his cheeks and biting his lips, he walked past the machines and out the door” (209).

While Horschitz’s translation of “look” is generally effective throughout the story (except for some unnecessary variation at two places), the climatic use of “look” in the sentence quoted above creates problems in the translation. The German reads, “*Und dann ging er weinend mit erhobenem Kopf schweigend zur Tür hinaus; gerade in militärischer Haltung, mit Tränen auf beiden Backen und die Zähne zusammengebissen, durch die Apparate hindurch zur Tür hinaus*” (71) [And then he went out with raised head silently through the door; straight in military bearing with tears on both cheeks and teeth bitten together past the apparatuses and out the door].

While the translated sentence as a whole works well, the problem rests in the conspicuous omission of “look.” What becomes even more apparent upon further examination of the original sentence is that Hemingway foregrounds the major’s look through an unusual metonymic shift, similar to the shift in “A Simple Enquiry.” The major is not looking, or, in a literal sense, his eyes are not looking; rather, “his head

[is] up looking at nothing” (209). Colin Cass notes that this reference “in view of Hemingway’s insistence on nada in ‘A Clean Well-Lighted Place, probably means more than that the major is not looking at anything. He is looking at death, the blank wall, the nothing” (312). By excluding the gaze, the German translation misses the profundity of the sentence.

If the repetition of “look” highlights the human, passive, and fragile gaze of the major, Hemingway’s repetition of “machine(s)” provides a powerful ironic point of contrast. As Joseph DeFalco observes, the story “concerns itself with the effect of war upon individuals who really have no control over its machinations.” DeFalco asserts that “[t]he controlling image in the story to which everything refers is the ‘machine.’” The machines “become synonymous with hope, healing, and even a kind of divinity” (130-32).

While DeFalco’s point is well taken, I would extend his claim slightly and argue that the machines are more than the controlling image; the story is ironically about the machines. The story reads almost like science fiction as the machines have taken over from the humans. In a story with almost no human action, the machines are shown doing all the work. Hemingway, a master of the understated verb, gives them active, colorful verbs while the humans do nothing. The narrator’s machine attempts to bend the narrator’s knee but “lurched when it came to the bending part” (206). The straps of the major’s machine “bounced up and down and flapped the stiff fingers” (207). Later the narrator recounts how “the straps thumped up and down” (209). While the doctor makes appearances in the story, he is not involved in the

healing process; it is actually the machines that are doing the curing: “there were large framed photographs around the wall, of all sorts of wounds before and after they had been cured by the machines” (210). By the end of the story, it becomes clear that the patients are guinea pigs, there to serve the machines (and the man who runs them) by proving the machines’ effectiveness.

The ironic importance of the machines is highlighted specifically through the repetition of “machine,” a word that along with its plural form is used 20 times. Horschitz’s strategy for translating Hemingway’s use of “machine” is varied. Only five times does she use the obvious German equivalent: “*Maschine*.” On one occasion, the translation takes the machine reference in the opposite direction. The narrator’s reference to a “machine course” (207) is translated as “*Heilgymnastikkurs*” (65), literally a healing gymnastic course, a far cry from the cold sterility evoked in the original.¹⁰ In one crucial scene Horschitz omits the word completely. Near the end of the story, the major yells at the narrator, telling him that a man must not marry. As the major returns to apologize, the narrator comments, “he came directly toward my machine” (209). Horschitz’s translation reads, “[*er*] *kam gerade auf mich zu*” (70) [he came directly over to me]. It is interesting to note how the German translation personalizes (and humanizes) the major’s move toward the narrator. In the original, the human presence is intentionally removed from the sentence through the reference to “my machine.”

Horschitz’s most frequent choice for “machine” is “*Apparat*,” a word used thirteen times. The main problem with this choice in a story that turns on the contrast

between humans and machines is the diminutive effect in using the equivalent of apparatus instead of machine. In one specific sentence Horschitz not only uses “*Apparat*” for “machine” but also subtly but significantly alters the syntax. The narrator notes the major’s dedication in coming for therapy: “I do not think he missed a day, although I am sure he did not believe in the machines” (208). The syntax of the sentence gives the machines an aura of the divine—of people believing (or not believing) *in* the machines. Horschitz’s translation diminishes this irony: “*er sicher nicht an die Wirkung der Apparate glaubte*” (69) [he surely didn’t believe in the effect of the apparatuses]. This transformation happens again in the following sentence of the translation as Horschitz treats the repetition of “believed in the machines . . .” (208) with the same German translation.

In addition to the repeated use of “machine,” Hemingway infuses the story with words and phrases that extend the industrial metaphor. Horschitz is sometimes successful, sometimes not, in drawing on the source domain of industry. In talking about the face of the young man who was wounded after being at the front less than an hour, the narrator twice in short succession uses the word “rebuilt” (207) in describing his medical treatment. While Horschitz’s word for the first use of “rebuilt” (“*rekonstruiert*”) maintains the metaphor, she does not repeat this word the second time, instead choosing the generic “*machten*” [made] (66).

Later in the story, Hemingway’s important industrial metaphor disappears yet again in the translation as the narrator mentions the same boy: “he would never know now how he would have *turned out*” (208, emphasis mine). Horschitz’s translation

reads, “*weil er ja doch nun nicht wissen konnte, wie er sich benommen hätte*” (68) [because he could not now know how he would have conducted himself].

In writing about the acclaimed World War I novel *Three Soldiers*, Evelyn Copley describes Dos Passos’s portrayal of war as an “industrial machine which suppressed individual self-expression by victimizing and brutalizing those caught in its wheels” (156). The same could be said for Hemingway’s “In Another Country.” The activity of the machines contrasts with the passivity of wounded soldiers who are bound together by, as the narrator casually remarks, “something that had happened” (208). A final irony is that the men who have been destroyed by the first fully mechanized war are asked to put their faith in the machines that will heal. By contrasting the passivity of the human gaze with the activity of the machines, Hemingway stresses the smallness of humanity in the face of the destructiveness of mechanization, the frailty of human intention in the face of the action of machines. Horschitz’s translation compromises both sides of this ironic juxtaposition.

D. Between message sent and message received

No story in *Men Without Women* better illustrates the gap between message sent and message received than “Hills Like White Elephants.” Conversation dominates in a story where very little happens. The story is a classic study of miscommunication as the American and “the girl” continually talk past each other. Pamela Smiley observes that the conversation between Jig and the American reflects

“the circular noncommunication of strong gender-linked language differences and the consequent existential limitations and creative power of language” (81).

While the story may in fact illustrate the limitations of language in interpersonal, cross-gendered communication, Hemingway, for his part, shows a mastery of language through his use of ironic repetition. In his fine stylistic analysis of repetition in the story, Alex Link highlights numerous repeated patterns in the story including the titular image that is echoed throughout the narration, the pronominal repetition of the exophoric “it” (used in reference to the abortion), and Jig’s repeated use of “please” in trying to get the man to stop talking. These and other repetitions, according to Link, “allow the story to portray a power imbalance [between Jig and the American] that appears total, and a struggle whose stakes take on universal proportions” (74).

An important instance of repetition that Link does not identify, however, is the repeated and ironic use of “perfectly.” Paul Smith recognizes the story’s overall “dependence on allusive dialogue . . .” (206), and the man’s use of “perfectly” is one of the most allusive words throughout the conversation between the American and Jig as they wait for the train to Madrid. The word is spoken five times by the man and is repeated sarcastically by Jig after his final usage. In all cases, “perfectly” is used in conjunction with the ubiquitous “it” (the unstated operation).

Hemingway sets up the ironic use of “perfectly” with a contrasting adverb used by the man in his first reference to the abortion. His comment—“It’s really an *awfully* simple operation” (212, emphasis mine)—utilizes a word that conveys the

double sense of “very” as well as “badly.” The man then proceeds to describe the state following the operation as “perfectly natural” (212). After Jig’s sarcastic remark about everyone surely being happy after the operation, the young man tries to convince her again: “But I know it’s perfectly simple” (213), a statement that he repeats eight lines later. Later in the conversation the American repeats the line only to have it bitingly echoed by Jig: “Yes, you know it’s perfectly simple” (214).

Hemingway plays brilliantly with the double meaning of this word, something that proves difficult in translation. “Perfectly,” of course, can mean “comprehensively, fully, utterly” as well as “[i]n a way that is perfect or faultless in form, style, or manner” (“Perfectly,” def. 1a, 2b). The former is apparently the primary intention of the man as he indicates repeatedly that the woman need not worry about the operation—that it is utterly simple.

The problem with the German translation is that the standard definition for “perfect,” as in something being faultless, is “*perfekt*.” This word, however, does not work as a possibility for “completely.” Horschitz’s translational choices demonstrate the effectiveness of Hemingway’s original word and the limitations of the German equivalents. Her first translation for “perfectly simple” is “*alles ganz natürlich*” (78) [everything entirely natural]. She then falls into a rhythm, opting for a noun phrase instead of the adjectival phrase with four uses of “*eine ganze Kleinigkeit*” (78-81) [a complete trifle].

While there is certainly a nice ironic twist to the use of “*Kleinigkeit*” to describe the abortion, the specific importance of “perfect” is not carried over. The

notion that the operation is somehow flawless is absurd. While the American is undoubtedly not considering this aspect of the word's meaning, Jig seems to be receiving this message, as her final comments of the story suggest. After she has insisted that the topic be dropped, the two continue to wait for the train. The story ends ambiguously with two lines of dialogue:

“Do you feel better?” he asked.

“I feel fine,” she said. “There's nothing wrong with me. I feel fine.”

(214)

Jig's penultimate statement—“There's nothing wrong with me” (i.e., I am perfect)—serves as the counter assertion to the American's contention that the abortion is perfect. Jig's mysterious claim begins to make more sense when read against the repeated notion of perfection. Her statement that *she* is perfect is in contrast to her interpretation of the American's repeated line referring to the abortion. The translation of Jig's important sentence fails to echo the earlier statement of “perfectly simple.” Horschitz's translation simply reads, “*Es geht mir großartig*” (82) [I am fabulous].

The ironic use of “perfectly” also makes an appearance in “A Pursuit Race,” a story about William Campbell, an advance man for a burlesque show who has a physical and emotional breakdown in Kansas City. The story focuses on the “interview” that takes place between Campbell and Mr. Turner, the manager of the show. Turner tries to convince Campbell to get help, first for what Turner thinks is alcoholism and then for a cocaine habit that Campbell admits he has. In a number of

ways, the story reads as a companion piece to “Hills Like White Elephants.” Both stories show characters in physical crisis while their companions attempt to reason with them about how the crisis can be solved. In both stories characters oversimplify complex situations, sex complicates human interaction, and miscommunication predominates.

In addition to these similar plot elements, the use of “perfectly” also links the two stories, a fact helpfully noted by Flora (140). The word is spoken twice by Campbell after Turner has told him that he needs to “take a cure.” Campbell responds, “I don’t want to take a cure at all. I am perfectly happy. All my life I have been perfectly happy” (268). This time Horschitz offers a different word for “perfectly” than she did in “Hills” as the repeated “perfectly happy” becomes “*restlos glücklich*” (216) [completely happy].

Here we see again how the German translation conveys one part of the definition of “perfectly” (i.e., the notion of fully/completely) but not the sense of “flawlessly.” While irony is maintained through the translation of “happy,” the lack of an exact equivalent for “perfectly” results in a loss of ironic force. The sarcastic remark is thus weakened in the German translation.

The irony is readily apparent in the context of the larger story. Campbell is certainly not “perfectly happy,” and the momentum of the story works toward reinforcing this overarching sense of pessimism. Campbell’s life has reached a low point, and Campbell uses a scatological reference to reinforce the fact that his life is anything but “perfect.” Again, repetition is important. The crucial word—“shit”—is

punningly set up throughout the story with the repeated use of “sheet.” As Turner enters and attempts to engage Campbell in conversation, Campbell is much more interested in his sheet. The narrator and then Campbell himself persistently note that Campbell is talking through his sheet. Campbell asks Turner,

“Did you ever talk through a sheet?”

“Don’t try to be funny. You aren’t funny.”

“I’m not being funny, I’m just talking through a sheet.”

“You’re talking through a sheet all right.” (268)

Later, Campbell grows increasingly fond of the sheet: “Pretty sheet. You love me, don’t you sheet?” A few lines later, the sheet becomes his lover: “Billy Campbell caressed the sheet with his lips and his tongue. ‘Dear sheet,’ he said. ‘I can kiss this sheet . . .’” (269).

The repetition during these bizarre and disturbing lines of dialogue sets up Campbell’s most poignant line of the story as in a moment of sudden clarity he gives Turner some advice: “‘Keep away from women and horses and, and—’ he stopped ‘—eagles, Billy. If you love horses you’ll get horse-shit, and if you love eagles you’ll get eagle-shit.’ He stopped and put his head under the sheet” (270). Campbell’s worldview is a hard dose of reality. While Turner seems to dismiss Campbell’s lines as alcohol or drug-induced nonsense, the latter’s statement of what life has to offer is an honest look into the heart of a broken man.

The German translation is not able to reproduce the importance of this crucial part of the story. First, the sheet-shit wordplay that sets up Campbell’s line is

completely lost in the translation. The German word for sheet (“*Laken*”)—a word that Horschitz uses consistently throughout the story—is not at all similar to *Scheiße*. More significantly, however, is Horschitz’s translation of Campbell’s climactic line: “*Wenn du Pferde liebst, kriegst du Pferde, und wenn du Adler liebst, kriegst du Adler*” (219) [If you love horses, you get horses, and if you love eagles, you get eagles]. Campbell’s whole point is that you don’t get what you want. The irony is that you not only do not get what you want, but you are left with the excreta, the dirty, the repulsive. Horschitz’s bowdlerized translation completely alters Campbell’s pessimistic philosophy and weakens Hemingway’s brutally realistic portrayal. Whether Turner ever actually receives Campbell’s intended message is never specified; what is true, however, is that the message is even cloudier for both Turner and the reader in the German translation.¹¹

E. Between the way things are thought or ought to be and the way things are

Hemingway implements a final type of repetition in *Men Without Women* to reinforce narrative perspective, turning texts into stories about storytelling. Perhaps a better way to frame this meta-fictional irony is as a contrast between the way things are and the way things are constructed in the narrative. The key issues concern the position and scope of the narrating subject, and Hemingway reflects modernism’s interest in exploring the unique, relativistic position of the narrator as opposed to the God-like sensibilities in Victorian-era narration. Writing about science’s influence on modernism, Peter Childs notes the influence of Einstein’s theory of relativity: “The

tendency towards narrative relativity, before and after Einstein, is perhaps the most striking aspect to Modernist fiction . . . in its use of perspective, unreliability, anti-absolutism, instability, individuality and subjective perceptions” (66). While Hemingway’s use of multiple voices will be explored more in Chapter Six, an examination of two stories from *Men Without Women* demonstrates how Hemingway uses repetition to highlight narrative perspective. This perspective in turn reflects not only the narrator’s relationship to what he is describing but also the narrator’s frame of mind. Hemingway relies on repeated syntactical constructions to emphasize the narrative perspective.

On the surface, “A Canary for One” is a simple story with limited action. A couple is on a train heading back to Paris. Their traveling companion is an American woman who has just “rescued” her daughter from a romantic relationship with a Swiss man. The story consists mainly of the narrator’s landscape description as he looks out the window and the American woman’s naïve observations to the narrator and his wife, most notably her repeated notion that “Americans make the best husbands” (260). After the train has pulled into the station and the couple exit the train, the narrator provides an O. Henry-esque surprise ending for the story, casually remarking, “We were returning to Paris to set up separate residences” (261).

While very little scholarship explores “A Canary for One,” one recurring theme in the criticism is the shifting point of view as the story seems to move inexplicably from third person to first person in the middle of the story. The narrator’s detached, objective perspective, established in the first paragraph, extends

throughout his early descriptions. At the halfway point the narrator reveals himself—“For several minutes I had not listened to the American lady . . .” (259)—and from that point on the story reads primarily as a first-person narrative.

While the shift at first glance could be taken for authorial error, Hemingway uses this shift to highlight the topic of narrative perspective. One technique that establishes this topic early in the story is Hemingway’s unusual syntax, a fact astutely observed by Scott Donaldson in his study of the changes Hemingway made while revising the story. The first indication of something out of the ordinary is the nonstandard and repeated use of “to be” verbs in the first three paragraphs. The first strange sentence comes at the end of the first paragraph: “Then there was a cutting through red stone and clay, *and the sea was only occasionally* and far below against rocks” (258, emphasis mine). The peculiar clause is then repeated in the third paragraph after the scene has been firmly established within a train compartment: “The American lady pulled the window-blind down *and there was no more sea*” (258, emphasis mine). Remarking on this construction, Donaldson writes, “The view from the compartment window is quite pleasant, but it recedes rapidly and the virtually ungrammatical ‘the sea was’ suggests that the Mediterranean will cease to exist” (“Preparing” 205). By suggesting that the sea will “cease to exist” once the shade is pulled, the narrator emphasizes his specific (and limited) perspective. As indicated by the theories of relativity, from the narrator’s narrow, limited perspective, the sea actually does cease to exist.

Horschitz's translation fails to relate the relativistic significance of these two lines. Horschitz translates the first reference to the sea as "*und man sah das Meer nur noch gelegentlich*" [and one saw the sea still only occasionally]. She repeats the formula in the translation of the second sentence: "*und man sah das Meer nicht einmal mehr gelegentlich*" [and one did not see the sea once more occasionally (189)]. While she clearly maintains repetition, her insertion of "*man sah*" minimizes the all-encompassing nature of the original clause. The second sentence, for example, loses the notion of the sea being totally gone. In the original the sea was no longer there. In the German it is only that one cannot see the sea.

This question of perspective is raised later in the story as well. As the narrator describes the scenery as the train enters Paris, he remarks, "Nothing had eaten any breakfast" (260). There are two strange aspects to this sentence. First, the use of the indefinite pronoun "Nothing" draws our attention to the sentence. One soon realizes, however, that this is not the only problem. By this point in the story the narrator has clearly revealed himself as a first-person narrator. His definitive statement here again raises the question of how he knows what he claims to know.¹²

Horschitz's translation takes this strange sentence and normalizes it in two ways: first with the removal of the unusual indefinite pronoun and then with the clarification of narrative perspective: "*alles sah noch sehr ungefrühstückt aus*" (195) [everything still looked very "unbreakfasted"]. With the addition of "*sah . . . aus*" the peculiar omniscient statement is reduced again to mere observation.¹³

Hemingway's foregrounding of narrative perspective is important in these lines because a main concern of the story is perspective. As the American lady closes the blinds, the story becomes almost claustrophobic—perhaps a play on the lady's traveling companion—the canary in a cage. The narrator establishes the notion of confinement early in the story: “It was very hot in the train and it was very hot in the *lit salon* compartment” (258). Horschitz's translation unnecessarily manipulates the syntax by beginning the sentence with the prepositional phrase (“in the train”) and thus takes away from the repetition: “*Im Zug war es sehr heiß, und es war sehr heiß im lit salon-Abteil*” (190). The oppressiveness of the compartment is then reinforced through the following sentence, which also draws attention to itself through nonstandard grammar: “There was no breeze came through the open window” (258). Not only does Horschitz “correct” this sentence by using standard syntax but she also apparently mistranslates this sentence, turning the oppressiveness of no air movement to the presence of a breeze: “*Durchs offene Fenster kam ein Luftzug hinein* (189) [Through the open window came a draft of air inside].

As Paul Smith observes, one of the main issues of the story is “whether or not elements of the scene and action are functions of the narrator's selective perception and thus indicative of his mood, if not his impending separation from his wife” (162). While Smith is referring to certain random descriptions (e.g., a farmhouse ablaze, a railway accident), just as interesting are ways in which the narrator's mood is reflected by *how* he narrates the story. By foregrounding the issue of narrative perspective, Hemingway highlights the contrast between an objective reality and the

parallax effect of narrative position in telling a story—especially a story in which the perspective of all the characters is shown to be very limited.

Another story that foregrounds narrative perspective is the final story in *Men Without Women*, “Now I Lay Me.” The story focuses on Nick’s memories as he lies sleepless in a hospital bed. Smith notes that “[t]here are four major remembered episodes in the story that are central to any interpretation: the wounding, the fishing, and the two scenes in which Nick’s mother burns his father’s biology specimens and his Indian artifacts” (174). Nick’s remembering of these specific events reflects his present circumstances. As Kenneth Johnston observes, in addition to various personal experiences, “[t]he impermanence of people, relationships, and things is another thread which runs through his memories. Nick’s remembrances . . . reflect his own present sense of impermanence and mortality . . .” (140).

While the details of his memories are indeed important, the fact that Nick makes a point of informing the reader that he is remembering focuses attention on him as the remembering subject. As James Phelan observes, “Nick is remembering past nights spent remembering—in other words, offering a memory of his memories or a metamemory” (48). To put it simply, Nick’s narration in “Now I Lay Me” shows him remembering his earlier inability to remember. By foregrounding Nick’s remembering we are made acutely aware of the pitfalls of memory, the ways in which a memory is reinterpreted to fit the subject’s current conditions.

Hemingway’s choice of a repeated word in foregrounding Nick’s memories is an obvious one: “remember.” Within the space of one page, forms of “remember”

appear thirteen times, creating almost a sleep-inducing incantation with its repetition. Nick's first use—"I still remember" (277)—is translated as "*noch deutlich im Gedächtnis*" (242) [still distinct in memory]. The next three uses of "remember" (277) all become the standard equivalent: "*erinnern*" (242).

In the next paragraph, one of just 60 words, forms of "remember" occur four times. Horschitz provides four different translations: "*besinnen*" [bethink, reflect], "*zurückastete*" [grope, fumbled back] and "*zurückerinnern*" [remember back] for Hemingway's two uses of "remember back" and "*wiederholte*" (243) [repeated] for Hemingway's construction, "Then I would start there and remember this way again . . ." (277).

Another avalanche of "remembers" appears five paragraphs later:

Some nights, though, I could not *remember* my prayers even. . . . Then I would have to recognize that I could not *remember* and give up saying my prayers that night and try something else. So on some nights I would try to *remember* all the animals in the world by name . . . and then kinds of food and the names of all the streets I could *remember* in Chicago, and when I could not *remember* anything at all any more I would just listen. And I do not *remember* a night on which you could not hear things. (278-79, emphasis mine)

The first two uses of "remember" are translated with "*besinnen*." The next "remember" in reference to the animals is translated as "*alle die Tiere der Erde mit Namen aufzuzählen*" [enumerate all the animals of the earth by name]. The use of

“remember” in reference to the streets of Chicago is the standard “*erinnern*,” but the final two become “*einfiel*” [come to mind] and “*entsinne*” [recall] (245-46).

Horschitz’s tendency for variation again proves counterproductive as the weight of “remember” is lost. By stressing “remember,” Hemingway casts doubt on Nick’s specific memories. Nick reveals that at the point of the story, he is in a fragile state, having just been wounded in war. He does not want to fall asleep “because I had been living for a long time with the knowledge that if I ever shut my eyes in the dark and let myself go, my soul would go out of my body” (276). Nick’s precarious state of mind, combined with his sleeplessness, presents the reader with a very uncertain narrator. Nick himself admits to his faulty memory. As he tries to remember the streams he has fished, they become confused; as he tries to remember the girls he has known, they blur. The reiteration of “remember” causes the reader to further question the validity of what Nick is remembering, providing the ironic contrast between the way things actually were and the way in which they are being conceptualized.

That this ironic juxtaposition raises doubt about Nick’s memories is important because it focuses our attention squarely on Nick’s current state rather than on his past. We are less concerned about what he is telling us and more concerned about what those created memories say about his present situation.

The point is that Nick, as indicated by his repetition of “remember,” has become obsessed with his past. By repeatedly foregrounding the notion of memory, Hemingway focuses our attention ironically not on Nick’s past but on his current

condition. In his essay “Guilt, Bad Conscience, and Related Matters,” Nietzsche highlights the necessity of forgetfulness: “there can be no happiness, no serenity, no hope, no pride, no *present* without oblivion” (189, emphasis in original). Later, in the same essay, he remarks that “there is perhaps nothing more terrible in man’s earliest history than his mnemotechnics. ‘A thing is branded on the memory to make it stay there; only what goes on hurting will stick’ . . .” (192). The problem is that Nick is mired in the past. He is simply unable to forget. Horschitz’s failure to follow through with the insistent repetition of “remember” diminishes the hold that memory has on Nick.

IV.

Ironic repetition certainly appears in other stories in *Men Without Women*. In “The Killers” the phrase “bright boy(s)” is used ironically twenty-six times by the hit men in reference to Nick and George (Flora 64). (The use of “bright” is also conspicuous in “Hills Like White Elephants.”) In “Che Ti Dice la Patria” the repetition of “clean-cut young man” in reference to the pimp in the restaurant is also heavily ironic. At times, repetition is used in the stories for purposes other than highlighting an ironic vision. In “An Alpine Idyll,” the characters’ state of fatigue is emphasized through the repeated use of “tired” as well as the repeated assertion that it is not good to do anything “too long” (262-63).

It should be noted that Horschitz finds occasional success in replicating Hemingway’s ironic repetition. In “Che Ti Dice la Patria,” Hemingway’s

fictionalized account of his ten-day journey with Guy Hickock through Italy, Hemingway incorporates the word “suspicious” throughout the story to characterize the Italians’ reaction to the two American travelers. While on one level one reads this word as a literal description of Italian attitudes, the irony is that it is the narrator and Guy who actually have a right to be suspicious of the Italians’ strange behavior, not the other way around. Horschitz provides an arguably appropriate German equivalent for “suspicious—“*mißtrauisch*” (although one could debate the difference between distrustful [*mißtrauisch*] and suspicious [*verdächtig*])—on each occasion.

Overall, however, the German translation fails to replicate Hemingway’s repetition. As we have seen, this is sometimes due to a lack of a clear target-language equivalent, as is the case with her translation of “going good” in “The Undefeated.” Horschitz then utilizes a range of German possibilities, ostensibly hoping to cover the various nuances of meaning in the source-language expression. In many other instances, as with “remember” in “As I Lay Me,” she has a clear equivalent (i.e., “*erinnern*”) but chooses variety instead of repetition.

In both cases, though, the outcome is the same. By opting for variety rather than repetition, Horschitz does not place the appropriate weight on Hemingway’s repeated lexical units. The result is not merely a loss in the “prose-poetry” quality of the text but a much more significant loss in Hemingway’s ironic vision. This irony is not simply a stylistic gimmick, but rather has real value in the specific stories. Viewed in isolation, Horschitz’s moments of translational variation might simply seem to be isolated and harmless cases of the translator employing her right for

dynamic equivalence in making the translation read more fluently in the target language. The cumulative effect, however, is very significant as Horschitz alters Hemingway's prose style and, as a result, his use of ironic repetition.

Reviewing *Men Without Women*, Edmund Wilson writes, "Mr. Hemingway's feeling about this world, his criticism of what goes on in it, are, for all his misleadingly simple and matter-of-fact style, rather subtle and complicated" (*Shores* 341-42). This pronouncement is, in the end, an insightful way to understand Hemingway's style in the collection of stories. Linguistic structures that look simple are actually representative of complex ideas. In a similar fashion to the use of conceptual metaphors in *The Sun Also Rises*, Hemingway's utilization of ironic repetition in *Men Without Women* gives us another encounter with his iceberg theory. Hemingway's repetitions may initially seem like oversimplification or weakness, as perhaps they did to Horschitz. As we have observed, however, these repeated lexical units point the way to complicated critical issues that are central for a reading of the stories.

In considering the important role of the translation, the exchange between Guy and the narrator in "Che Ti Dice la Patria" cited in an epigraph to this chapter raises a fundamental question. Who is speaking—the originator of the line or the translator? The narrator's response is ironically telling: "I'm just your interpreter." As the broader exchange in the story reveals, the narrator is certainly much more than "just" Guy's interpreter. And as this examination of repetition in the translation of *Men Without Women* has revealed, Horschitz is much more than "just" Hemingway's

interpreter. Hemingway's narrator ironically reinforces Venuti's notion of the invisibility of the translator even as he makes his presence felt. Horschitz's presence is powerful throughout *Men Without Women* as she reshapes the text in subtle, yet significant, ways.

Mellow is perhaps partly right when he describes *Men Without Women* as "at best a piecemeal collection of stories, not the structured work, not the masterpiece that *In Our Time* was" (353). As we will see in Chapter Six, the experimental modernist techniques that Hemingway utilized in *In Our Time* create a fascinating text. The experimental structure of Hemingway's first major collection of short fiction is difficult to equal. Hemingway's ironic vision, however, provides some semblance of structure for the stories of *Men Without Women*, even if that structure is a mirage. If *In Our Time* gives us a fragmented world, as we will observe in Chapter Six, *Men Without Women* gives us an ironic world, a deceptive one as Wilson correctly observes, in which the gap between appearance and reality is wide. This is a world constructed carefully through intentional use of ironic repetition, an unfortunate casualty in the German translation.

Notes

¹ Smith outlines some of the characteristics of “prose poetry”: “[S]entences do not usually follow on continuously or logically. Rather each one is a world in itself, containing its own narrative, aphorism or image. Every sentence is equal in weight to the preceding and following one, but the sentences do not combine to form an overall narrative or exposition” (183-184). Randall Jarrell’s “1914,” in which the speaker describes a fallen soldier, can be seen as a prime example of “prose poetry.”

² The lone cut from this initial list was Hemingway’s pet story “Up in Michigan,” a work that Hemingway had wanted to get into *In Our Time* but couldn’t because of the “*inaccrochable*” (Stein’s term) treatment of a sexual encounter. Hemingway voluntarily withdrew the story from inclusion in *Men Without Women*.

³ Hemingway would also make a flippant remark to Fitzgerald dismissing the significance of the title, claiming that he had chosen it “hoping it would have a large sale among the fairies and old Vassar Girls” (*SL* 260).

⁴ Citations from the *Men Without Women* stories are from the 1998 Finca Vigia edition. Citations from *Männer* are from the German first edition, published in 1929 by Rowohlt.

⁵ It should also be noted that the original expression draws attention to itself not only because it is repeated with such force and frequency but also because of its nonstandard construction. Standard usage would call for the adverb “well” instead of the adjective “good.” By not replicating the nonstandard grammatical construction of the colloquial phrase in the German, Horschitz’s standard grammar diminishes the foregrounding of this phrase even more.

⁶ The notion of “going good/great” echoes in yet another story in *Men Without Women*. We encounter it in “Fifty Grand” as Jerry says to Jack, “You might go good” (242), which is translated as “*Vielleicht boxt du nachher fabelhaft*” (149) [Maybe you will box fabulously afterward].

⁷ Not that the language of drama and the language of boxing are mutually exclusive. In discussing the upcoming boxing match, Jack in “Fifty-Grand” says, “I’ll give them a good show” (242), implying that his plan is to take on the role of a boxer who is being legitimately out-boxed.

⁸ Consider Hemingway’s fondness for the metaphoric “show” in his two early novels. In a foul mood at a *bal musette* with the expatriate crowd, Jake remarks, “This whole show makes me sick” (27). In Pamplona after the fiesta has started, Jake asks Cohn, “Did you see the show?” (164). Robert Cohn in commenting on the bullfight, says, “I think it’s a wonderful show” (170). *A Farewell to Arms* also contains numerous

metaphoric uses of “show,” mostly in reference to war. In conversation with Catherine Barkley, Frederic Henry describes the Battle of the Somme as “a ghastly show” (18) and later departs “for a show up above Plava” (43). The most famous usage is after his desertion when in the narration he remarks, “But it was not my show any more” (232).

⁹ A nonstandard treatment of facial references appears intermittently in Hemingway’s stories. In “The Undefeated,” for example, Hemingway uses the strange phrase “it said” (185), with the mouth as antecedent for “it.”

¹⁰ When “*Heilgymnastik*” (88) is used in *A Farewell to Arms*, it is the translation for “mechano-therapy” (88). Later, Hemingway uses the terms “mechanical treatments” and “mechano-therapy treatments” (117), which are effectively translated as “*Mechanische Behandlung*” and “*mechanisch-therapeutischen Behandlung*” respectively (132).

¹¹ The omission of “*Scheiße*” in this story is somewhat puzzling. Horschitz was certainly not averse to or prohibited from using the word. In her version of *A Farewell to Arms*, for example, she uses “*Scheiße*” repeatedly, even though Hemingway had been forced to remove the English equivalent for fear of censorship.

¹² The notion of breakfast is mentioned earlier in another strange sentence: “All that the train passed through looked as though it were before breakfast” (259). Horschitz’s translation normalizes this sentence as well: “*Alles machte einen verschlafenen, ungefrühstückten Eindruck*” (192) [Everything made a sleepy, “unbreakfasted” impression].

¹³ Horschitz’s later revision of the *Men Without Women* stories corrects some mistranslations and alters (sometimes for the better, sometimes for the worse) her original translation. With this particular sentence, her revision is quite successful as she reinserts some of the original’s nonstandard syntax as well as reproduces Hemingway’s manipulation of narrative perspective: “*Niemand und nichts hatte Frühstück bekommen*” (289) [Nobody and nothing had gotten breakfast].

Chapter Five

Transforming Frederic Henry's Narrative: *In einem andern Land* and Translational Embellishment

The pain had gone on and on with the legs bent and I could feel it [the pain] going in and out of the bone. (83)

—Ernest Hemingway, *A Farewell to Arms*

Der Schmerz war in den gekrümmten Beinen schlimmer und schlimmer geworden, und ich fühlte ihn in den Knochen wühlen und zerren. (97)

—Annemarie Horschitz, *In einem andern Land*

The pain had become worse and worse in the contorted legs, and I felt it burrowing and tearing in the bone.

—Rendition of translation

[Y]ou could omit anything if you knew that you omitted and the omitted part would strengthen the story and make people feel something more than they understood. (75)

—Hemingway, *A Moveable Feast*

One might be inclined to believe that our [German] language is especially suitable for translations because of the beautiful tendency towards unadorned simplicity (95)

—Jakob Grimm

I.

In *Hemingway's First War*, Michael Reynolds notes that Hemingway, while working on *A Farewell to Arms*, took time out from Frederic Henry's tragic narrative to type an excerpt from a *New York Times* interview published March 21, 1915. On an unnumbered page in the manuscript, the following quotation from Henry James appears:

One finds it in the midst of all this as hard to apply one's words as to endure one's thoughts. The war has used up words; they have

weakened, they have deteriorated like motor car tires; they have, like millions of other things, been more over-strained and knocked about and voided than in all the long ages before, and we are now confronted with a depreciation of all our terms, or, otherwise speaking, with a loss of expression through an increase of limpness, that may well make us wonder. (60-61)

Even at an early date in the prosecution of the war, James astutely observed that things had profoundly changed, specifically that the language of the Victorian and Edwardian periods had lost its communicative power. Linguistic change in order to cope with this new reality brought on by the war had now become inevitable.

Language was not the only thing that was changing as a result of the Great War, and the decade following the end of fighting witnessed widespread transformations. For his part Hemingway was a very different person in 1929 than the injured war “hero” who had returned to Oak Park following his brief European adventure ten years earlier. In 1919 the swaggering “soldier” proudly paraded around town in his war uniform and Italian cape. Writing about this time, Reynolds notes that Hemingway, “[p]ressed by his peers and local expectations, . . . kept right on inventing his fantasy war he would have fought if only he had been given a chance” (*YH* 55). By 1929 Hemingway had developed into a pessimistic veteran who looked with growing cynicism on romanticized views of war. Even in 1926, according to Reynolds, Hemingway had become deeply suspicious of war heroes and their romanticized rhetoric (*TH* 94).

Fourteen years after James's observation, as Hemingway was in the midst of working on his war novel, the dilemma that he and other post-war writers were forced to confront was where, stylistically speaking, to go from this point. If the old language had become void and limp, what should one do? How should one write, especially about the pivotal event of their lives that now appeared to have been pointless sacrifice? The predicament for those continuing to work with words, to borrow a phrase from Frost's "The Oven Bird," was what to do with a language that had become quite simply "a diminished thing" (120). As we have already seen, part of Hemingway's answer to this linguistic dilemma was to concretize his language through metaphor and infuse his writing with irony; another impulse was toward understatement, a technique that achieves its highest degree of articulation in *A Farewell to Arms*.

Early critics of the novel were quick to pick up on Hemingway's fondness for understatement. Clifton Fadiman in an early review of *A Farewell to Arms* in *The Nation* wrote, "Understatement is not so much a method with him as an instinctive habit of mind" (81). Two decades later, Mark Schorer similarly noted Hemingway's "habit of understatement" as one aspect of his famous style (339). Over the years critics continued to make passing comments about Hemingway's use of this trope. In one such study, Richard Peterson in *Hemingway: Direct and Oblique* identifies "the severe understatement of his early work" (12). Peterson goes on to observe that an "[i]ndefiniteness, almost a refusal to specify, is a common denominator of many different aspects of Hemingway's style. His penchant for indefiniteness, akin to

indirection in statement, can be seen in his preference for the common, unspecific word, avoiding more particularized and ‘literary’ synonyms” (22).

While many others have also commented on Hemingway’s understated approach, most prefer to frame it within discussions of his iceberg theory or his “art of omission.” The major weakness of many of these studies, however, is that critics have been content to make general pronouncements about Hemingway’s use of understatement without cataloging the pervasiveness of this trope and examining its importance within the texts themselves. While Fadiman’s and Schorer’s early observations accurately note the prominent role that understatement plays in Hemingway’s writing, their statements indicate a trend in Hemingway criticism that unfortunately minimizes the artistic intentionality of Hemingway’s stylistic technique (including understatement), reducing it merely to “habit.” Hemingway’s understatement is certainly intentional in a novel that required careful consideration not only of what to say about the war but also of how to say it. The Jamesian marginalia in the manuscript of *A Farewell to Arms* reveal that Hemingway was acutely concerned with this intimate connection between form and content during the years he was writing his war novel.

Hemingway’s intentionally constructed understated prose in *A Farewell to Arms* is important for two primary reasons. First, the energy of the entire novel is directed against the embellished language of the nineteenth century, and understatement provides a powerful weapon against this outmoded style. Second, Frederic Henry’s utilization of narrative understatement is a profoundly significant

indication of his personal trauma. The way he narrates his story is indicative of his mindset after the action of the novel has ended as he is attempting to make sense of what has happened to him.

As with the previous chapters, the importance of Hemingway's stylistic decisions comes into clear focus as we examine Hemingway in translation. While understatement is clearly foregrounded in *A Farewell to Arms*, Horschitz's translational approach works against this stylistic strategy in her German version of the novel, *In einem andern Land*.¹ While Horschitz's translation of *The Sun Also Rises* undervalues the significance of Hemingway's symbolically significant metaphors and her translation of *Men Without Women* fails to replicate Hemingway's use of ironic repetition, her third major Hemingway translation project reveals yet another translational issue: her reduction of understatement in favor of embellishment.

In this chapter I explore the patterns of embellishment in the German translation of *A Farewell to Arms*. I begin by analyzing several grammatical categories in which Hemingway's tendency toward understatement and Horschitz's contrasting propensity toward embellishment are revealed. Next, I turn to the most significant area of Hemingway's understatement and Horschitz's contrasting embellishment, the language related to the war. Finally, I consider some possible causes for the translational embellishment in the novel and explore the significance of these changes. As with the translational shifts in Hemingway's other texts, Horschitz's deviation from target-language equivalents results in lexical incongruence

in *In einem andern Land*. These shifts, while seemingly insignificant when taken as isolated examples, reshape the text in important ways and diminish the effect of Hemingway's novel. Not only is the figure of Frederic Henry altered in the translated novel, but a key message of the novel—one that opposes “high” rhetoric and hyperbole—is compromised as a result of Horschitz's translation.

II.

In examining Hemingway's understatement and Horschitz's translational embellishment, I focus on two specific areas: lexical choice and syntax. The first type of extensive embellishment in the German text is the shift from a vague noun to a more specific one. Some initial, and one might argue harmless, embellishment occurs in the translation of Hemingway's famed descriptions in the opening chapters, in which “flashes” (3) becomes “*Mündungsfeuer*” (9) [muzzle flashes] and the generic “guns” (10) becomes the more specific “*Artillerie*” and “*Kanonen*” (16). Much later in the novel, as Bonello shoots the sergeant, Horschitz translates “head” (204) as “*Schläfe*” (228) [temple], thus giving the scene a heightened degree of specificity.

The issue of embellishment, though, becomes more apparent and more problematic when it concerns a central motif in the novel. Almost every general study of the novel highlights the pervasiveness of rain as a central symbol of doom, and rain seems to punctuate many of the dark scenes, most notably Frederic and Catherine's parting in Milan, the Caporetto retreat, and Fredric's walk back to the hotel in the rain after Catherine's death. It is a motif that often reinforces the miserable existence of the soldiers and is linked with Catherine's death. Wirt Williams goes so far as to

name rain as the primary image of destruction that grows in significance throughout the novel. Rain combines with plain and war imagery (as well as with sleep) into what Williams calls the “death key” (82). The symbolic import of rain appears immediately in chapter 1 as Frederic Henry describes the fall “when the rains came” (4). For Horshitz, this becomes “*Regengüsse*” [downpours] (10), a move that she makes again during the pivotal Caporetto retreat when “the rains” (182) are described in the German again as “*Regengüsse*” (203). This heightening is an example of Horschitz’s tendency to embellish, which overdetermines the symbolism and thus ultimately weakens the understated approach to this important symbol in the text. Horschitz’s embellishment in the translation of “rain” is emblematic of her translation strategy throughout the novel as she takes Hemingway’s general, some might argue imprecise, diction and increases the specificity and intensity of the original word.²

In Chapter Three we saw how assumptions about the “simplicity” of Hemingway’s style often preclude consideration of his important use of metaphor. Another often repeated generalization about Hemingway’s style is that he uses specific, concrete language. Milton Azevedo, in a recent study of *A Farewell to Arms* in Italian, French, and Spanish, issues a typical pronouncement regarding Hemingway’s diction: “Hemingway preferred concrete and specific nouns to abstract and generic ones” (26). Azevedo is partially right. As noted in Chapter Three, Hemingway relies heavily on concrete nouns—the building blocks for solid metaphors—and thus avoids abstractions. However, Hemingway certainly does not exclusively utilize specific language. Azevedo’s conflation of concrete/specific and

abstract/generic, although typical in Hemingway scholarship, is nevertheless unfortunate. An examination of Hemingway's prose, as Peterson rightly observes, reveals that he often chooses the generic word over the specific one. Thus, Hemingway's prose is paradoxically often concrete and generic. Sheldon Grebstein, in comparing Hemingway to Henry James, accurately points out Hemingway's tendency to employ the vague term—a predisposition “to refer obliquely to the subject under discussion rather than to name it outright” (96). As we will see throughout this chapter, Frederic Henry's entire narrative is loaded with generic, vague language. Horschitz changes this as she frequently takes these oblique terms and makes them more specific as when, for example, she transforms the generic “hospital” (75) to the more specific “*Lazarett*” (89) [military hospital].

Horschitz's embellishment takes a slightly different form in her treatment of modifiers as the intensity of adverbials is frequently amplified throughout the novel. For example, after Henry lies and tells Catherine that he loves her, the narration reads, “I had not said that before” (30). Horschitz, rather than use the obvious adverbial choice for “not”—“*nicht*”—instead uses “*nie*” (38) [never]. Additionally, Horschitz often seems dissatisfied with reproducing general intensifiers. This happens at numerous points with “very.” For example, Frederic's comment about himself to Count Greffi that he is “very dull” (260) becomes “*schrecklich langweilig*” (291) [terribly boring].

More noticeable is Horschitz's embellishment of Hemingway's adjectives. When Frederic uses adjectives in his narration, they are almost always general.

Again, Horschitz increases the specificity. Hemingway's use of "small," as in Frederic's description of the forward cars as "quite small" (44) becomes "*ganz winzig*" (53) [really tiny]. The word "bad" (73) turns into "*ungesund*" (87) [unhealthy] in reference to the danger of the girls in the Abruzzi hearing flutes at night. When "bad" becomes "badly," as in the case of Hemingway's non-standard hypercorrective description of the porter and the machine-gunner who "both felt badly" (159) about not being able to save him a seat on the train, Horschitz opts for "*gräßlich*" (178) [dreadful, awful] instead of simply "*schlecht*." Horschitz tries a different word for "bad" in translating Henry's line to Catherine, "you had a long bad night" (284), with the heightened "*schrecklich*" (317) [terrible].

Certain frequently used adjectives prove troublesome for Horschitz, and she tries out numerous possibilities. One of the most generic of Hemingway's words is "fine"—a non-descript adjective that Frederic Henry uses (along with "nice") repeatedly throughout the novel. While "fine" can have positive connotations, when Frederic uses the word, as in the frequent utterance, "I am fine," the sense is much closer to satisfaction than excellence. Horschitz's translations of "fine"—"*glänzend*" [brilliant], "*reizend*" [lovely/charming], "*famos*" [splendid], "*gut*," "*herrlich*" [glorious], "*großartig*" [magnificent], and "*hübsch*" [pretty]—all represent embellishment of varying degrees.

Frederic's other favorite understated expression in describing his current state—"all right"—becomes "*schön*" [good], "*gut*" [good], "*ganz gut*" [really good], and the infrequently used but more accurate "*passable*." The most equivalent

translation of “all right” occurs only once. In response to the proprietor of the bar who offers to help Frederic after his escape, he says, “I’m all right” (239). In the German this becomes “*Bei mir ist alles in Ordnung*” [Everything is okay with me] (267).

Frequently, though, Horschitz is not content simply to ratchet up the existing modifier; instead, she chooses to add modification where none exists in the original. This happens throughout with the addition of “*sehr*” [very]. For example, in Horschitz’s version the priest, when he finds out that Henry has not gone to the Abruzzi, is not “suddenly hurt” (13) but rather “*plötzlich sehr gekränkt*” (19) [suddenly very hurt]. In a passage that foregrounds Frederic’s role as narrator at the beginning of chapter 19, he remarks, “I do not remember much about the days, except that they were hot” (117). The understated “hot” becomes “*sehr heiß*” in the translation (131). At the end of chapter 20, in classic Hemingway fashion, Frederic sums up life in Milan: “We had a good time” (132). Horschitz again adds intensification by rendering this straight-forward sentence as “*Wir genossen die Tage sehr*” (156) [We very much enjoyed the days].³

The German translation also contains numerous additions of “*gar*”—another intensifier equivalent to “absolutely” or “really.” In chapter 15 the simple declaration that the doctor “said nothing” (95) becomes “*sagte gar nichts*” (114) [said absolutely nothing]. Later, before his surgery Frederic says to Catherine that under anesthesia, “Maybe I won’t talk” (104). Horschitz intensifies this statement with “*Vielleicht spreche ich gar nicht*” (123) [Maybe I won’t speak at all].

Horschitz also inserts additional adverbials throughout the narrative. Henry does not just hold Catherine’s hand during one of their initial encounters but holds it “*fest*” (33). Henry’s remark to Rinaldi that he and Catherine “are friends” (27) turns into “*Wir sind gute Freunde*” (35, emphasis mine). In chapter 21 after Catherine has informed Frederic that she is pregnant and they have begun to discuss future plans, the narration reads, “We were apart as when some one comes into a room and people are self-conscious” (138). The German translation becomes “*Wir waren weit von einander entfernt, so, wie wenn plötzlich jemand ins Zimmer kommt und man befangen ist*” (156) [We were widely separated from each other as when suddenly someone comes into a room and one is self-conscious]. Horschitz adds two adverbials to this sentence: “*weit*” [widely] and “*plötzlich*” [suddenly]. Catherine’s later promise—“But I’ll be with you” (257)—becomes “*Aber ich werde immer bei dir sein*” (286, emphasis mine) [But I will always be with you], as Horschitz inserts an “always” for good measure.

In other passages, when it comes to the use of words like “all” and “never,” Horschitz often seemingly feels the need to one-up Hemingway. If Hemingway has one “never” (13), Horschitz has “*nie, nie*” (19). When Hemingway repeats “all” three times in this same passage as Frederic continues to describe his time spent whoring—“sure that this was all and all and all and not caring” (13)—Horschitz repeats “*alles*” four times (20). In another case of one-upmanship, Horschitz translates “long trip” (113)—as Henry describes the feeling he has when Catherine returns to him after being briefly away—as “*langen, langen Ausflug*” (127).

As these examples show, Horschitz's approach to modification runs counter to Hemingway's early aesthetic philosophy. Malcolm Cowley notes that the young Hemingway, along with other American expatriates like Fitzgerald and Dos Passos, "wanted to redeem the language by getting rid of what they often called 'the big words'" (*SF* 16). Part of avoiding "big words" was simplifying. Describing Hemingway's developing aesthetic, James Mellow sums up Hemingway's philosophy this way: "the writer should know everything he needed to know, but he shouldn't use it" (159).

This was a lesson Hemingway learned early in his writing career. While working as a cub reporter on the *Kansas City Star*, Hemingway came under the tutelage of Pete Wellington, whose job it was to enforce the journalistic style sheet developed by William Rockhill Nelson. In addition to guidelines stressing writing short sentences and avoiding slang, the rule sheet stressed plain writing that avoided adjectives (Lynn 68). This lesson would be reinforced several years later by Ezra Pound, "the man," as Hemingway remarks in *A Moveable Feast*, "who had taught me to distrust adjectives" (134).

This philosophy—that less is more—pervades Hemingway's prose. We see Horschitz modifying this standard in yet another area of her translation—one often overlooked in translation analysis—graphological alteration. At times translators will manipulate spelling, capitalization, hyphenation, paragraphing or fonts for effect. While one interesting intensification in font happens in the German when the captain's line, "Must attack. Shall attack," is shifted from roman type to italic type for

emphasis, more prominent are punctuation adjustments that affect the original sentence type and subsequently strengthen the original utterance. For example, Catherine's remark, "And you call me Catherine?" (30) becomes "*Und sag Catherine zu mir*" (38), thus transforming a tentative interrogative sentence into a more forceful imperative.

Horschitz is also especially fond of the exclamation mark. Catherine's remarks to Frederic—"You've been away a long time" (30) and "But I don't care if you have" (105), in reference to the other girls whom Frederic has "stayed with"—are both punctuated with exclamation points. Horschitz also uses graphological embellishment as Frederic's sentences are turned into exclamations. In a conversation with Rinaldi after returning to the front, Frederic Henry's understated, noncommittal "Oh" (167) becomes "*Ach!*" (187). In chapter 38 when Frederic tells Catherine that he doesn't want to think about the war anymore, he says, "I'm through with it" (298), a remark that Horschitz embellishes with yet another exclamation mark (331).

Horschitz's embellishment continues as she works with Hemingway's verbs. While Hemingway often chooses non-descript predicating verbs, Horschitz frequently displays greater rhetorical flourish. Some of her choices are a bit unconventional, as when she translates "study" (22)—when the head nurse comments about learning Italian—with "*quälen*" [agonize/torture/struggle] (29). Other embellished verbs are clearly mistakes in the translation, as when she encounters Catherine's idiomatic question to Frederic: "Won't your family try and get hold of you . . . ?" (304). Here

her sentence is “*Wird deine Familie nicht versuchen, dich zu erwischen?*” (336) [Will your family not try to capture you?].⁴

Specifically, Horschitz is often not satisfied with Hemingway’s vague verbs of movement. This is clearly a place where Hemingway’s distrust of “big words” is apparent. While “disappeared” is certainly not a verb of choice for Hemingway, one of Horschitz’s favorite words in her translation is the German equivalent: “*verschwunden*.” This word appears throughout the German version in place of Hemingway’s generic verbs of movement: “gone,” (102, 139, 271, 324), “gone out” (152), and “gone away” (249).⁵ Horschitz seems generally reluctant to use German equivalents for “gone.” Frederic’s simple descriptive sentence, “The barn was gone now” (216) turns into the more elaborate “*Die Scheune existierte nicht mehr*” (242-243) [The barn did not exist any more].

One conspicuous passage that contains a series of understated verbs of movement is the description of Frederic Henry’s dramatic escape from the battle police. Hemingway resists the temptation, though, to render the event with attention-grabbing diction. Horschitz, on the other hand, attempts to adjust Hemingway’s understatement. When Frederic nonchalantly remarks that he “went in” the water (225), Horschitz uses the word “*plumpste*” (253) [plopped]. The description that Henry “went down again” (225) becomes “*tauchte wieder unter*” (253) [dove down again]. And as Henry is attempting to make it to shore, the narration states that “the current was taking me away” (227). Horschitz renders this as “*riß mich die Strömmung fort*” (255) [the current ripped me away].

The scene of Frederic's escape is a good example of Horschitz's pattern of embellishment in extended exposition sections. She often begins such long sections with standard equivalents, choosing lexically congruent words that match Frederic's understated reporting style. Then, as the narrative continues, the likelihood of translation embellishment increases.

Word choice is not the only point to consider when examining the translator's embellishment of Hemingway's verbs. Although Horschitz is often faithful (sometimes to an extreme) in reproducing Hemingway's syntactical structure, at times she manipulates the structure of her sentences and, in so doing, modifies the predicating verb with the result that the intensity is increased. In generalizing about Hemingway's prose, Millicent Bell highlights Hemingway's use "of the impersonal passive voice that presents events simply as conditions, as in the many sentences that begin with 'There were,' [which] suppresses not only the sense of agency but the evaluating presence of the observer" (146). Bell's comment, while unfortunately blurring the distinction between passive voice and the existential-there construction, nevertheless helpfully draws attention to the importance of these two forms in Hemingway's prose.⁶ Both of these transformations represent syntactical deviance through the alteration of prototypical English syntactical structure (S-V-O).

In her translation Horschitz frequently shifts from passive voice to active voice. A good example occurs in chapter 2 as Frederic describes the recent acquisition of Gorizia by Italian forces by remarking, "The town had been captured . . ." (5). Horschitz's version reads, "*Man hatte die Stadt genommen*" [They had taken

the city] (11). Later, before Frederic takes his plunge into the Tagliamento, he witnesses an Italian officer being interrogated by the *carabinieri*. The narrative reads, “He was not allowed to make an explanation” (224). Horschitz shifts this sentence to active voice: “*Man erlaubte ihm nicht die Sache zu erklären*” [They did not allow him to explain the matter] (252). This is an important placement of a passive-voice construction in the original since we are meant to see the powerless victimhood of those being shot and the pretense of powerless-to-do-otherwise on the part of the executioners.

Even more prevalent is Horschitz’s removal of the existential-there construction. As Bell correctly observes, Hemingway’s prose is dense with “there was/were” constructions. In the second paragraph of the novel, Frederic Henry reports, “There was fighting in the mountains . . .” (3). This is an alteration of the hypothetical base form of the sentence: “They fought in the mountains . . .” Transforming the sentence into an existential-there sentence results in several significant moves. First, agency is obscured since the agent (even a vague indefinite pronoun) is removed. Second, the predicating verb “fought” becomes a stative be-verb. The verb “fought” is then transformed into the gerund “fighting.” Harry Levin notes that this “tendency to immobilize verbs” is common in Hemingway’s prose (157).

What Horschitz does frequently is to re-infuse the story with a sense of agency by eliminating the existential-there construction. While German has a “there was/were” equivalent—“*es gab*”—Horschitz very rarely uses it. Instead, she shifts the

syntax in order to provide a more active verb. For example, “There were three doctors that I knew” (56) becomes “*Ich traf drei Ärzte, die ich kannte*” (56) [I met three doctors whom I knew.] Often Horschitz takes the subject of a “there was/were” clause and transforms the nominal into an active verb. During a scene of priest-baiting and joking in the mess, the narration reads, “There was great laughter from everybody” (39). In the translation the sentence becomes “*Alles lachte schallenden Beifall*” (48) [Everybody laughed with resounding cheer]—a sentence that clearly represents embellishment in addition to the switch from passive to active voice. A similar move happens before Frederic and Catherine’s escape into Switzerland in which “there was a storm” (264) becomes “*stürmte es*” (294) [it stormed], a transformation that is repeated on the following page. A typical Hemingway construction appears near the end of the novel as Frederic returns to the hospital after getting something to eat. He returns to Catherine’s room: “I knocked on the door. There was no answer” (315). While the translation for the first sentence is clear—“*Ich klopfte an die Tür*—the second sentence becomes “*Niemand antwortete*” [Nobody answered] (348).

The use of passive voice functions in an important way in the text as another technique of understatement. Hemingway’s use of both the passive voice and the existential-there construction allows him linguistically to reinforce the naturalistic determinism that is so prevalent in the novel. In considering Hemingway’s use of the existential-there formula, David Williams cites the following excerpt from the opening chapter: “there was not the feeling of a storm coming” (3). This construction, Williams claims, “suppresses any subject who might have had, or did have, ‘the

feeling of a storm coming'; the resulting impersonality of the voice contributes to our sense of passivity and underlying determinism in the scene" (317-18). Agency, in a sentence like this, is removed or obscured in order to highlight the passivity of the characters. While Wyndham Lewis in *Men without Art* fails to understand the purpose of Hemingway's technique, he is right in pointing out that Frederic Henry is a man "to whom things are done" (27). This is the world of the novel, that as Frederic observes, eventually breaks you. The human predicament is one of helplessness; we are like ants on a burning log as Frederic suggests near the end of the novel.

Catherine's ominous prediction at the end of chapter 18—"I suppose all sorts of dreadful things will happen to us" (116)—embodies this philosophy. While this is not a passive-voice sentence in the traditional sense, the sense of agency is certainly diminished as the agent ("us") is tucked away in a prepositional phrase at its end. It is important to note Horschitz's translation of this sentence: "*Ich fürchte, daß wir schreckliche Dinge erleben werden*" (130). More important than Horschitz's transposition of the understated "suppose" which becomes the more dramatic "*fürchte*" [fear] is the loss of the passivity of the original as things don't happen to us (in the sense of victimization) but we more actively experience ("*erleben*") terrible things. The translation of this sentence is representative of a general movement in the translation away from the naturalistic determinism essential to the novel.

III.

So far we have been looking at translational embellishment across various grammatical and linguistic categories. One specific content area in *A Farewell to*

Arms that deserves special examination is the language used to describe the war and its destructive results. While early critics and readers were sometimes not sure whether the novel was primarily a love story or a war story (and, hence, an anti-war story), the war plays a ubiquitous role in Frederic Henry's narrative. In Book One, the war provides the rhythm for Frederic's life. His injury, surgery, and convalescence are war-related events, as is his return to the front. Even after he makes his "separate peace," he is unable to put the war completely behind him, thinks of Rinaldi and the others after his desertion, and follows the war in the newspaper while he and Catherine are in Switzerland.

Frederic Henry's understated description of the war and its results are carefully constructed throughout the narrative. In fact, as Reynolds reveals in his study of the making of the novel, the manuscript shows that Hemingway was especially aware of the language he was using to describe the war. In commenting on Hemingway's alterations to his manuscript, Reynolds writes, "Usually these revisions move toward understatement, and they are found frequently in passages that had been done to death by the war novel genre" (*FW* 58). Reynolds continues, "There was always this temptation to slip into the overwritten prose of the popular [i.e., embellished, romanticized] war novel. Consciously aware of the pitfall, Hemingway wrote a note to himself [next to a description of a bombardment] and then circled it for emphasis: '*Watch out for this*'" (59). While Reynolds perhaps oversteps a bit in his analysis of Hemingway's private thoughts, he accurately highlights an area of concern for the author. The result of this awareness is the foregrounding in the novel

of understated descriptions of the war as a reaction against the language of the typical war novel. Conversely, Horschitz's embellishment in these sections is equally apparent. It is with her translation of war-related passages that Horschitz's tendency for embellishment reaches its high point in this novel.

To begin with, when characters talk about the war, Horschitz frequently opts for stronger descriptions. As we have seen, Horschitz is reluctant to replicate Hemingway's generic adjectives, a tendency that becomes more pronounced in discussions about the war. Passini, in referring to the war, begins, "When people realize how bad it is . . ." (50). In the translation, Horschitz, in keeping with her general trend to heighten vague adjectives, transforms "bad" into "*furchtbar*" [terrible] (61). Later, when Rinaldi says bluntly that "this war is a bad thing" (168), Horschitz translates "bad" as "*gräßlich*" [hideous, dreadful] (188).

In reference to the weapons of war, Horschitz frequently increases their intensity. The neutral description of the shell fragments as "enormous" (182) becomes "*ungeheuerlich*" (203), a word that carries very negative connotations and suggests outrageous, flagrant, or awful. ("*Riesig*" would be a much more neutral word.) In the same conversation, Gino says in a low-key reference to the shells that he doesn't suppose "they are so effective" (182). In the German, Gino's understatement becomes "*daß sie soviel Schaden anrichten*" [that they wreak as much damage] (204)—a move that not only emphasizes the damage done but also employs a much more powerful predicating verb. Finally, a strange apparent mistranslation in terms of weaponry occurs as Frederic is buying a pistol in preparation for a return to the front. After he

buys the pistol and cartridges, the narration reads, “Still, I thought, it was better to have a regulation pistol. You could always get shells” (149). Horschitz not only increases the specificity of “regulation pistol” by making it “*Selbstladepistole*” [self-loading pistol] but also exponentially embellishes “shells” by translating this as “*Handgranaten*” [hand grenades] (167). Given that hand grenades are not ammunition for pistols, this is also technically incorrect.⁷

The embellishment of the translation extends into other sections as well. An interesting passage occurs at the beginning of chapter 21 as Frederic, continuing to convalesce in Milan, informs the reader of the latest happenings on the war front and the home front. As autumn arrives, the situation at the front has worsened, and things in the cities are bad as well. An important event on the Italian home front has been the rioting that has broken out against the war. The German equivalent for the violent disturbance alluded to here is “*Aufruhr*” or “*Unruhen*.” Rather than choose one of these words, however, Horschitz decides on the stronger “*Meutereien*” [mutinies, revolts] (149). It should be noted that the historic reference for this specific riot that Hemingway uses here occurred in Turin in 1917 and was based on a shortage of food (Lyons 208). The riot by starving Italians was certainly not a revolt or a mutiny.

As a keen observer, Frederic Henry often provides a look at the landscape that has been disrupted by war. One of his early descriptions is especially representative: “but now there were the stumps and the broken trunks and the ground torn up” (6). Horschitz’s landscape embellishment is apparent even at this early stage in the novel: “*und nun war nichts übrig als geborstene Stümpfe und zerspaltene Stämme und der*

aufgerissene Boden” (12). Several items in this sentence deserve attention. First, Horschitz adds “*nichts übrig*” [nothing remaining] to the sentence, giving the scene a sense of total desolation. Horschitz also adds another word to her translation—“*geborstene*” [burst, shattered]—to describe the stumps. Next, Hemingway’s past participle “broken” becomes “*zerspaltene*” [split into pieces, fragmented, shattered]. And finally, perhaps the mildest embellishment occurs as Horschitz transforms “torn up” into “*aufgerissene*” [ripped up].

As the above description demonstrates, Hemingway relies heavily on understated words like “broken” to describe the damage of war. In chapter 27, in the paragraph immediately following Frederic Henry’s discussion of meaningless abstract words, Hemingway uses “broken” three times to describe the damaged houses. Each time Horschitz intensifies her translation with “*zerstört*” (207) [destroyed]. Hemingway’s other favorite adjectives—“smashed” and “wrecked” also frequently become heightened with the German “*zerstört*.”⁸ Frederic’s nonchalant description of the damaged houses that “had been hit” (163) becomes another case where Horschitz chooses “*zerstört*” (183). Clearly, a house that has been hit and a house that has been destroyed are not equivalent.

In addition to the understated reporting of the damage done to the landscape, Frederic also recounts the damage done to people. Hemingway’s use of the basic verb “kill” is prevalent throughout the novel; Horschitz, however, frequently chooses a more intense, colorful substitution than the standard “*umbringen*” or “*töten*.” In chapter 19, for example, in a conversation with various members of Frederic’s Milan

social circle, Ettore and Mac both use the verb “kill” three times in quick succession in discussing Ettore’s chances of being a casualty of war (123). Horschitz translates all three with the more graphic “*totschießen*” [shoot dead] (139).⁹

Then later in chapter 39, the German translation strays again from Hemingway’s use of “kill.” In the conversation between Bonello and Piani concerning Bonello’s killing of the sergeant wounded by Henry, Horschitz opts for more vivid verbs, bouncing back and forth between “*kaltmachen*” [make cold] and “*totmachen*” [make dead] (232). One of the most noticeable embellishments of Hemingway’s generic use of “killed” or “died” is when Horschitz uses a form of “*gefallen*.” When Catherine talks to Frederic about her fiancée who died in the Battle of the Somme, Horschitz translates both cases of “was killed” (18) with “*gefallen*” and “*fiel*” (25) [fallen/fell]. Later when Frederic Henry comments on the fate of Catherine’s fiancée, he simply says, “He died” (116). Horschitz opts for a more romanticized sentence: “*Er fiel*” (131) [He fell].

Horschitz’s embellishment of Hemingway’s generic “kill” takes on two forms. First, Horschitz often utilizes more graphic language (e.g., “*totmachen*” and “*kaltmachen*”) in describing death in war. Second, Horschitz alters Hemingway’s style through the utilization of the romanticized “*gefallen*.” In discussing the language in vogue at the beginning of World War I, Paul Fussell gives numerous examples of the “essentially feudal language” that helped maintain a general spirit of innocence. Examples of this language include “foe” for “enemy,” “peril” for “danger,” “vanquish” for “conquer,” and “the fallen” for “the dead” (21-22). While the

language used during and immediately following the war may have employed such romanticized language, *A Farewell to Arms* exhibits a strong reaction against such out-dated expressions. Horschitz's translation, however, relies much more on this nineteenth-century language.

Those who are not killed in the novel suffer as well. At the beginning of chapter 7, Frederic observes a group of soldiers heading up into the mountains. After describing them in some detail, he remarks simply, "Some looked pretty bad" (33). Horschitz chooses the following statement in her translation: "*Manche sahen recht jämmerlich aus*" (42). One might argue if there is a significant difference in this context between the qualifiers "pretty" and "*recht*" [really], since the qualifier "pretty" can function as either a downtoner or an intensifier depending on context. In this scene Henry has taken some time prior to the above statement to describe this group of soldiers as "sweaty, dusty, and tired" and as wearing helmets that don't fit. This is a ragtag group, so "*recht*" in this context seems to be a good equivalent. The same cannot be said, however, for Horschitz's choice of adjective—*jämmerlich* [miserable, pathetic, pitiful]—clearly a much stronger word than simply "bad."

The wounding of soldiers is also treated differently in translation. A case in point is Hemingway's brilliant description in chapter 9 of the attack in which Henry is wounded and Passini is killed. The first noticeable deviation happens with the description of a bomb strike. As the men are eating, Frederic reports in his typical low-key fashion, "Something landed outside . . ." (54). Horschitz transforms this into

“*Etwas schlug draußen ein . . .*” (65), choosing the more dramatic verb “*einschlagen*” [strike, smash] for the understated “land.”

When the shell hits that does the actual damage, Frederic uses a simile to describe the flash “as when a blast-furnace door is swung open” (54). Again, Horschitz is not content with lexical equivalents but chooses to transform “swung open” into “*aufgerissen*” [ripped open] (66). The embellishment continues with the description of Passini’s wounds. As Frederic looks over, he sees that Passini’s legs “were both smashed above the knee” (55). Rather than use “*zerschlagen*” for “smashed,” Horschitz opts for “*zerschmetter*” (66) [smashed to pieces, battered, shattered]. After Passini has finished screaming in pain and asking to be shot, Henry describes the scene: “Then he [Passini] was quiet, biting his arm, the stump of his leg twitching” (59). Horschitz translates: “*Dann war er still, biß sich in den Arm, während der Stumpf seines Beines krampfhaft zuckte*” (66-67) [Then he was still, bit himself in the arm, while the stump of his leg twitched convulsively]. Although the translation alters the syntax unnecessarily, changing the absolute phrase at the end of the sentence into a subordinate clause, the main problem comes with the artistic license that Horschitz takes with the addition of the adverb “*krampfhaft*” [convulsively, desperately], which intensifies the graphic nature of the injury. An additional point of embellishment occurs during the confusion after the attack. In recounting the event Frederic states, “I *thought* somebody was screaming” (58, emphasis mine). While an accurate translation should account for the uncertainty,

Horschitz leaves no doubt in her translation, instead having Frederic state explicitly, “*Ich hörte jemand schreien*” [I heard somebody screaming] (66).¹⁰

Frederic is, of course, injured in this attack as well. While Horschitz generally does a fine job in translating the episode of his wounding, embellishment creeps into her descriptions of his condition beginning in Book Two. For example, when Henry reports that “the pain was very bad” (81), Horschitz makes the pain “*furchtbar*” [terrible] (95). Two pages later, Henry again focuses on his pain: “The pain had gone on and on with the legs bent and I could feel it [the pain] going in and out of the bone” (83). Horschitz translates this sentence as “*Der Schmerz war in den gekrümmten Beinen schlimmer und schlimmer geworden, und ich fühlte ihn in den Knochen wühlen und zerren*” (97). There are three elements of embellishment in this sentence. First, for the participial “bent,” the most straightforward translation would be “*gebeugten*.” Horschitz, however, turns “bent” into “*gekrümmten*” [contorted, crooked, writhed]. Second, in the original, the pain exists and goes on and on—certainly not an enviable predicament. In the German, however, the pain is not simply existing but is becoming worse: “*schlimmer und schlimmer geworden*” [become worse and worse]. Finally, Frederic Henry notes that that he could feel the pain “going in and out of the bone.” Here again we see Horschitz’s reluctance to employ Hemingway’s generic verb of movement (i.e., go). In the German, Frederic Henry can feel the pain in the bone “*wühlen und zerren*” [burrow and tear].

Also of interest is the first captain’s description of Frederic’s wound. As the doctors bend the wounded leg, the first captain notes the “[p]artial articulation” of the

knee (96). This positive framing of the injury in English becomes negative in the German: “*Partielle Versteifung*” (111) [Partial stiffening]. This initial assessment of the injury is interesting since later, when Rinaldi examines Frederic’s knee, Rinaldi’s use of the word “articulation” (166) is translated more accurately as “*Beweglichkeit*” (187) [movability, flexibility].

Frederic Henry’s physical war-time suffering does not end when he recovers from his wounds and returns to the front. During the scene with the battle police at the Tagliamento, Frederic gets manhandled by a *carabiniere*: “[t]he other one grabbed me from behind and pulled my arm up so that it twisted in the socket” (222). Horschitz renders this sentence as “*Der andere packte mich von hinten und riß meinen Arm hoch, so daß er sich beinahe auskugelte*” (250). Horschitz’s fondness for the verb “*riß*” [ripped] is again apparent. Also, Hemingway’s low-key description—“so that it twisted in the socket” becomes “so that it almost was dislocated.”¹¹

Finally, a discussion of war language should address the most frequently quoted passage not only of the novel but also perhaps of all Hemingway’s works. After his comments about his embarrassment from “the words sacred, glorious, and sacrifice, and the expression in vain,” Frederic Henry remarks, “I had seen nothing sacred, and the things that were glorious had no glory and the sacrifices were like the stockyards at Chicago if nothing was done with the meat except to bury it” (185). The noteworthy moment in what is otherwise a fine translation is Horschitz’s choice for “stockyards.” The word appears later in Book Five in a much less heralded passage as Frederic and Catherine discuss the famous sites of America, including the stockyards

of Chicago, that they might visit (295). In this exchange stockyards is translated modestly as “*Viehhöfe*” (327) [corral]. (“*Stapelplätze*” would have also been an acceptable equivalent.) In Frederic’s earlier usage of “stockyards” in the midst of his critique of war rhetoric, however, “stockyards” becomes “*Schlachthöfe*” (206) [slaughterhouses]. Hemingway’s use of “stockyards” shows his preference for metonym, as stockyards are actually pens/sheds next to the slaughterhouse. Horschitz’s word choice, on the other hand, represents a trend throughout the novel for substituting a more graphic, violent word for Hemingway’s expression.

IV.

In *Translating Literature* Andre Lefevre cautions against rash judgments when it comes to translation analysis: “[A]nalysts need to suppress the knee-jerk impulse to label any slight or obvious deviation from the source text as a ‘mistake’ Isolated deviations are mistakes; deviations that can be shown to follow certain patterns indicate a strategy the translator has developed to deal with the text as a whole” (109). As the evidence has shown, Horschitz’s translational strategy of embellishment is apparent throughout the novel, especially when she deals with language related to the war. While there are occasional “mistakes,” what is more apparent is the pattern that emerges. Taken as a whole, when it comes to her treatment of Hemingway’s understated prose, one soon notices in the translation a “strategy of amplification,” to use a phrase from Lawrence Venuti (“Tarchetti’s” 214).

Before considering the significance of this pattern of embellishment, we should examine briefly some causes behind these changes. While I have already in Chapter Two alluded to some general explanations for the shifts in Horschitz's translations of Hemingway's early fiction and will revisit these issues later in the conclusion, the embellishment in her translation of *A Farewell to Arms* deserves several specific comments. While the loss of conceptual metaphors in the translation of *The Sun Also Rises* and irony in *Men Without Women* are often due to linguistic differences between English and German and Horschitz's lack of appreciation of the significance of these figures in the original texts, the translational adjustments in the German translation of *A Farewell to Arms* can partly be explained by considering a number of key cultural issues.

First, in addressing the heightened war language in the novel, one would do well to consider the state of post-war German society. As mentioned in Chapter Two, with its defeat in World War I Germany was a broken country. Due to massive casualties during the war and a tumultuous and chaotic post-war reality, 1920s Germany had become a violent land. In *Fallen Soldiers*, George Mosse chronicles what he refers to as a large-scale brutalization of German culture following the war. In the interwar years, people had "become accustomed not only to wartime brutality but also to a certain level of visual and verbal violence" (181). This brutalization of society, which led not only to increased violence throughout Germany but also to a rise in representations of violence in the media, serves as a potential explanation for the heightening of the war language in the novel.

While there might be some validity to this hypothesis, such an explanation to account for all of the embellished war language would be much too easy. To claim that the embellished war language of the translation was simply the result of German aggressiveness would be to fall for a similar line of propaganda prevalent especially in England before and during the war that portrayed Germans as innately imperialistic, aggressive, and militant. It would also, of course, be a gross oversimplification of the relationship between culture and literature to claim that a violent society such as post-war Germany would invariably produce violent literature, let alone more violent translations. Nevertheless, one cannot ignore this cultural trend toward violence in Germany during the 1920s.¹²

Perhaps a more fruitful explanation of the embellished language in the novel comes from the inevitable pressures on translators to make the translated text correspond to target-culture norms and fit within recognizable literary forms in the target culture. Translators are under real pressure from publishers to produce a text that sells. To that end translators sometimes seek to domesticate a translation in order to make it more appealing to a target audience.

In the context of our discussion of *A Farewell to Arms*, it is important to consider Horschitz's translation of the novel within the context of the Weimar war novel. The publishing of nationalistic writings immediately following the war by Ernst Jünger and others (mainly in the form of diaries and memoirs) gave way eventually to a wave of anti-war novels in the late 1920s. As Martin Travers observes, popular Weimar war writing changed dramatically during the 15-year period

following the end of the war: “if the military historiography published in the early years of the Republic supported a ‘positive’ view of the war, the majority of novels that appeared during the ‘*Blütezeit*’ of the genre (between 1927 and 1930) attempted to undermine that assessment” (195). While the earlier writing focused on the positive effects of war and laid blame for defeat on the liberal elements in society, Arnold Zweig’s *Der Streit um den Sergeanten Grischa* (1927) and Ludwig Renn’s *Krieg* (1928) exposed the injustices, chaos, and harsh realities of war. These two works paved the way for the publishing of the most famous and commercially successful World War I novel—Erich Maria Remarque’s *Im Westen nichts Neues*—in 1929, the same year as the English version of *A Farewell to Arms*.¹³

Hemingway himself was certainly aware of the German war novel boon, especially Remarque’s text. In a June 7, 1929, letter to Max Perkins complaining about the threat of censorship of his novel, Hemingway indicates a familiarity with both Remarque and Zweig: “The trouble Max is that before my book will be out there will be this All Quiet on the Western Front book and possibly at the same time the second volume of the man [Arnold Zweig] who wrote Sergeant Grischa—who knows his eggs also—and I hate to kill the value of mine by emasculating it” (*SL* 297).

If the American Hemingway was aware of the German war novel market, it is safe to assume that his German translator and publisher were also aware of the competition. It is also reasonable to conclude that Horschitz was hoping that her translation of *A Farewell to Arms* would compare favorably to Remarque’s novel, which contains more graphic descriptions of the destruction of war as part of a larger

anti-war message. Thus, Horschitz's amplification of the destructive force of war would help Hemingway's novel fit into the anti-war literature of the late-Weimar period.

An especially significant pattern in the Weimar war novels is the specific role of the protagonist. As previously mentioned, while the writers of German war texts were divided between a positive and a negative portrayal of the war experience, both sides typically viewed war as a learning, even purifying, experience. If he survives, the soldier/writer has developed and grown in important ways. The German war novel thus fits within the larger German *Bildungsroman* tradition—a literary model that charts the growth and development of a young protagonist. Luke Springman highlights this common *Bildungsroman* formula in Weimar war novels in which the focus is on the “*innere Wandlung*” [inner metamorphosis] of the innocent soldier. The war-time experience did not “damage men psychologically, but rather made them whole and created strength of character on which to build a new society (96). These positive outcomes of war are true not only of the characters in nationalistic texts like Jünger's *In Stahlgewitter* but also of those in supposedly anti-war texts.

Part of the protagonist's “*innere Wandlung*”—especially in first-person narratives where the main character is engaged in telling a retrospective narrative—is the development of his artistic ability. Although the protagonist must suffer hardship, that adversity becomes essential for the formation of artistic sensibilities—a typical formula in the German *Künstlerroman* tradition. The narrating protagonist, therefore, in a German Weimar war text, has often become a skilled artist through the trials of

battle. For example, a character such as Paul Bäumer, the first-person narrator of *Im Westen nichts Neues*, is shown developing his artistic sensibilities through his retellings of the horrors of war. By the end Paul's creativity in using dream-like apocalyptic imagery to describe the horrors of war is striking.

Within this framework, Frederic Henry's alteration in the German version of the novel is easier to understand. Frederic's embellished language becomes a marker for his transformation into a *Künstler* who, because of his trials, has developed his artistic voice. While Frederic Henry in the English version does not become the artist through his trials, Horschitz, in infusing Frederic's narrative with greater artistic sensibility through the use of embellished language, hearkens back to the traditional *Bildungsroman/Künstlerroman* formula so common in Weimar war literature. This modification significantly changes the way Frederic presents himself.

This is not to say, however, that Frederic Henry has been unchanged by his experiences. He is certainly a different person narrating the events than he was living them. He reveals this distinction at the end of chapter 3 as he discusses the priest's disappointment in his not going to the Abruzzi on leave: "He had always known what I did not know and what, when I learned it, I was always able to forget. But I did not know that then, although I learned it later" (14). One possible realization that Frederic points to in this ambiguous passage—the thing he did not know at the time, was finally able to learn, and then was "always able to forget"—is that decisions have consequences, that he is responsible for his choices. In this way, the novel could certainly be read as a kind of confession as Frederic begins to understand his

complicity in the events that have unfolded. Frederic has definitely been transformed. Despite this self-revelation, however, his style of narration reveals that he has certainly not become the German Romantic artist that Horschitz creates.

If we want to understand the translational transformations of Hemingway's protagonist further, we could consider an even more basic model in the German tradition. Horschitz, in her characterization of Frederic Henry, seems to revert in some ways to the archetypal German model of the romantic hero. This is the *Sturm und Drang* protagonist who is moody, passionate, and hypersensitive—an emotional individual who thinks and feels deeply. While these characteristics do not apply at all to Hemingway's modern, anti-romantic portrayal of Frederic Henry, in translating Frederic Henry into the German culture Horschitz seems to be interpreting Frederic Henry based on a familiar German heroic model—a model made popular by Goethe and Schiller.

A telling moment in the translation in this regard occurs during a conversation between Frederic and Rinaldi after Frederic has returned to the front. During their good-natured sparring, Rinaldi asks Frederic, “[T]ell me you're not serious” (168). Rather than providing a literal translation, Horschitz opts for the following metaphor: “[S]ag, daß du nicht unter die Philister gegangen bist” (189) [Say that you have not gone under the Philistines.] This is more than just an odd expression that is “corrected” in later editions (“Sag, daß du nicht seriös geworden bist” (Taschenbuch 196) [Say that you haven't become serious]). Of interest is the metaphoric way in which Rinaldi positions himself and Frederic Henry in contrast to the “*Philister*.”

This term is important because in the worldview of German Romanticism, the conservative Philistine is contrasted with the true artist. Horschitz's utilization of this metaphor reveals an underlying sensitivity to this archetype in German literature.

As we have seen earlier with the use of "*gefallen*" for "kill," Horschitz's tendency is to foreground romanticized language in the translation. Hemingway's generic language is repeatedly infused with Romantic German alternatives. For example, "half-light" (217) becomes "*Dämmer*" (244) [dawn]; "his girl" (147) becomes "*seinem Schatz*" (164) [his darling]; "sword" (149) becomes "*Säbel*" (166) [saber] rather than the neutral "*Schwert*" [sword]. The understated expressions "flat" and "flatness" (152) to describe Catherine's voice in the Milan hotel become "*niedergeschlagen*" (171/180) [gloomy, bleak, despondent], a romanticized term used again (201) as the equivalent for "depressed" (179). Additionally, in Milan the porter's line—"You are safe" (239)—turns into "*Sie sind gerettet*" (267) [You are rescued]. Frederic's description of the moon that "showed through the trees" (272) is described as shimmering through the trees [*durch die Bäume schimmerte*] (302). And finally, in Frederic's line to Rinaldi, "You are better when you don't think so deeply" (170), "think" becomes "*nachgrübelst*" (191) [muse, ponder, pore over], a significant verb for the dark, brooding hero.

In general, Frederic Henry appears much more emotional in the German version of the novel. In addition to the numerous examples of embellished language already cited, an examination of several lines is helpful to see the emotional intensity of his character in the German. After his escape, as the proprietor presses Frederic for

information about the front, Frederic responds, “I would not know” (237). The German reads, “*Woher soll ich das wissen?*” (265) [How am I supposed to know that?—a more passionate and defensive answer as the physically and emotionally exhausted deserter becomes angry and aggressive in the translation. In the same conversation, Frederic offers the proprietor a drink with the nonchalant line, “Have one” (238), which becomes the aggressive imperative, “*Los, trinken Sie!*” (266) [Go, Drink!]. Finally, but much earlier in the novel, Frederic’s reaction to Catherine’s famous slap in the garden after his aggressive advances elicits a different response in the German. In the original, Frederic simply reports, “I was angry” (26). Horschitz infuses Frederic with heightened emotion as he becomes “*wütend*” (33) [furious].

While the exact causes of textual embellishment are impossible to determine, the textual evidence of embellishment remains, and Frederic Henry emerges as not only the typical Weimar war-novel protagonist but also the archetypal Germanic romantic hero. This transformation is problematic, because in allowing Frederic Henry to develop into the artist, Horschitz inadvertently legitimizes the war. The subtext in the German translation is “War might be hell, but it is a necessary hell for the emergence of the artist.” Hemingway’s novel rejects such a conclusion.

V.

The romanticizing of Frederic Henry’s narrative and his resulting transformation into a Weimar veteran-cum-artist has additional profound consequences for the type of novel that emerges. Horschitz’s translation, more than supposedly violating Hemingway’s artistic credo, changes our very perception of

Frederic Henry and thus affects the story he tells. Frederic Henry is, after all, the center of consciousness through which the narrative flows. He is not only the main character of the novel but also the narrator, and understanding the text as a retrospective narration is crucial. All of the language of the novel is Frederic's language, and the understated approach in recounting the events of his life is what provides meaning and poignancy to the narrative. As Robert Lewis accurately observes, "Frederic is quite aware of the power of language," (131), but this understanding is not that of the self-aware artist. In fact, as Reynolds helpfully points out, in revising the novel Hemingway actually removed an entire section where Frederic as self-conscious author comes through strongly since this voice was much more Hemingway's voice as artist than Frederic Henry's voice as narrator (*FW* 33).

Frederic's understated retrospective narrative is crucial as a reflection of his damaged psyche. Throughout the action of the narrative, Frederic manages somewhat to keep himself distanced from emotional involvement. Linguistically, he positions himself outside of the war: it has nothing to do with him and is not his "show." His pronoun usage clearly positions himself outside of the conflict as he utilizes third-person pronouns in referring to both the Austrians and the Italians. And until he meets Catherine, he has managed to keep himself distanced from the complications of love. This distancing has been his coping mechanism. He gives in, however, to Catherine, moves beyond the "chess game," and throws himself into this relationship. Coming on the heels of his near-death experience during the bombardment and the trauma of his desertion and escape, Catherine's death finally breaks him.

Although it is easy to identify the time frame of these main events of the novel, it is impossible to pinpoint with certainty the distance between the events of the novel and Frederic's narrative. What is clear, though, is that he is still trying to make sense of what has happened, still reeling from the loss and trauma that he has experienced. His language reveals his damage; it does not, however, make him, as Wyndham Lewis in the 1930s suggested, a "dull-witted, bovine, monosyllabic simpleton" (29).

Thankfully, critics throughout the decades have worked to correct Lewis's flawed reading. In a fine article connecting the style of the narrative with its subject matter, Gerry Brenner notes that "[i]t is because Frederic is maimed, defensive, and still feeling vulnerable—not because he is hardened—that he tells his story in a 'curt,' 'laconic,' 'close-lipped' style: the secure can afford to be expansive. It is because Frederic is crippled that he tries to retaliate with ironic indignation, not sophistication, with understated emotion, not wit" (136). A similar argument is advanced by James Nagel: "It is understandable that the story he tells is rendered in language that is controlled and understated, since the pain of the memories is almost too much to bear . . ." (172). And more recently Gail Sinclair observes "that this simplistic, emotionless language vividly displays the aftermath of war's psychological trauma and its subsequent inertia" (62).

The reality that Frederic Henry has experienced—the confrontation of death and chaos in war and the loss of Catherine—leaves him dazed and confused, and his vague, understated language provides the linguistic evidence of this transformation.

The artistic diction used in Horschitz's translation is simply not consistent with Frederic Henry's damaged psyche. It is crucial to see Frederic Henry as a broken man, and his narrative (the English version at least) reflects this sense of profound loss. His understated, stripped-down narrative is a window into his spirit. His verb constructions (i.e., passive voice and existential-there) reflect his feeling of helplessness in the face of overwhelming forces. His prose thus becomes a linguistic expression of shell-shock, the condition common to many surviving World War I soldiers.

Horschitz's linguistic embellishment not only alters our perception of Frederic Henry but also works against the whole trajectory of the novel. *A Farewell to Arms* is, in part, a statement against hyperbole, and the strength of the novel rests, in large part, on what is left out. The irony is that in attempting to have Hemingway's novel conform to the Weimar anti-war novel, Horschitz actually weakens its statement against war. Thus, the effect of the novel as "an epic of weariness," as B.E. Todd observed in an early review, is lost (88).

World War I witnessed the clash of a nineteenth-century romantic sensibility with a modern twentieth-century reality. In World War I soldiers went to battle with a clear notion of what they were fighting for. They saw themselves as modern-day crusaders protecting civilization and making the world "safe for democracy." And propaganda promoted such an approach. The actual war, however, was anything but the romantic adventure that people had expected. What confronted them, in addition to epidemics such as influenza, was the first mechanized war. The nineteenth-century

cavalry charge gave way to barbed wire, poison gas, machine guns, and tanks. The mentality of the generals, however, was still mired in the previous century. The result was mass slaughter. During the Battle of the Somme, the British lost 60,000 soldiers on one day with no strategic gains whatsoever. At Verdun a total of a million men were killed, again with no significant military results.

The senselessness of war produced the crisis of language that Henry James recognized in 1915. This situation was noted by writers attempting to capture the experience of war. Commenting on language and war literature, Fussell notes that “the presumed inadequacy of language itself to convey the facts about trench warfare is one of the motifs of all who wrote about the war” (170), and Hemingway’s own response to the inadequacy of language in his war novel was to utilize understatement.

In fact, a large part of the critique of war found in *A Farewell to Arms* is the critique of language—the embellished language of the nineteenth-century that led nations into a conflict in which millions died. In one of the most famous passages from the novel, Frederic Henry deflates this lofty language used during warfare: “There were many words that you could not stand to hear Abstract words such as glory, honor, courage, or hallow were obscene beside the concrete names of villages, the number of roads, the names of rivers, the numbers of regiments and the dates” (185). Hemingway’s understatement in Frederic Henry’s narrative is a calculated reaction to the exaggerated embellishment and sensationalism of the past.

Unfortunately, the German translation works against Hemingway's linguistic and stylistic protest. In the end Horschitz appears to fall into the trap that, according to Hugo Friedrich, is common among many translators: "instead of maintaining the style of the original, they elevate it" (16). As we have seen, the elevation of Hemingway's style has significant results on the text that emerges as the character of Frederic Henry is transformed and the novel's critique of embellished language is weakened.

What we are ultimately left with in *In einem andern Land* is an adequate version of Hemingway's novel, but one that, due to embellishment, misses the mark. In *The Sacred Wood*, T.S. Eliot famously observes, "Poetry is not a turning loose of emotion, but an escape from emotion . . ." (33). Frederic Henry's understated poetic vision offers such an escape, and the strength of the novel comes from a style that expresses this escape.

In "Soldier's Home," a story in Hemingway's *In Our Time*, which will be examined in the following chapter, the veteran Krebs senses that the telling of exaggerated war stories has created numbness in the townspeople:

His town had heard too many atrocity stories to be thrilled by actualities. . . . His acquaintances, who had heard detailed accounts of German women found chained to machine guns in the Argonne forest and who could not comprehend, or were barred by their patriotism from interest in, any German machine gunners who were not chained, were not thrilled by his stories. (CSS 111-12)

Krebs himself is also left with an aching void. He “acquired the nausea in regard to experience that is the result of untruth or exaggeration . . .” (112). In a similar fashion, the embellishment in *In einem andern Land* results in a hollow, diminished text. While Hemingway’s understated approach in *A Farewell to Arms* creates more with less, Horschitz’s embellished translation creates less with more.

Notes

¹ Horschitz's German version of *A Farewell to Arms* was originally serialized in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* between May 8 and July 16, 1930, under the melodramatic title *Schluss damit. Adieu Krieg!* (Hanneman 148). Rowohlt came out with the novel in book form that same year. All citations, unless otherwise noted, come from the 1930 Rowohlt edition, which Horschitz revised over the years. The most recent edition, a 1999 Rowohlt Taschenbuch edition, contains these revisions, although a large number of typos and missing sentences make this edition very disappointing.

² One interesting subcategory of the movement toward specificity in the translation is swearwords. Due to pressure from Scribners, Hemingway was forced to bowdlerize his own novel by toning down his more explicit language, often replacing swearwords with dashes. Although Horschitz will sometimes provide ellipses in these spots, she frequently opts for German swearwords. For example, Piani's lines—"We may drink -----," "To-morrow maybe we'll sleep in -----," and "You'll sleep with -----" (192)—are all filled in by Horschitz with "*Scheiße*" (215-216), which is actually in keeping with what Hemingway had written in the manuscript (Reynolds, *FW* 63). In other cases Horschitz seems to diminish Hemingway's intention. Frederic's line, "It's -----ed" (206) becomes the mild "*Verdammt*" (230), and the omission in Bonello's line—"I killed that ----- of a sergeant" (207)—is filled in with "*Schwein*" (232). Finally, in Frederic's response to the accusation by the battle police that he speaks Italian with an accent, "So do you , you ----- " (223), the omission is rendered by Horschitz as "*Kacker*" [shit], a vulgar but rather childish barb. This is not nearly as strong as Hemingway's word in his manuscript: "cocksucker" (Reynolds, *FW* 63). While Horschitz's translations of Hemingway's desired expletives certainly represent some form of understatement, it is debatable whether Horschitz's specificity in translating the omitted words diminishes or strengthens the effect of these statements.

³ We also see in this sentence a move from the generic "time" to the more specific "*Tage*" [days], as well as the use of a more specific verb: "*genossen*" [enjoyed].

⁴ In later editions the verb "*erwischen*" is changed to the more accurate "*erreichen*" (Taschenbuch 350) [reached].

⁵ While these passages mostly apply to characters, Hemingway's description of the moon—"The moon was almost down now but before it went down . . ." (274)—also sees this embellishment: "*Der Mond war jetzt beinah verschwunden aber bevor er verschwand . . .*" (305-06) [The moon was now well-nigh disappeared but before it disappeared . . .].

⁶ Bell makes a common mistake in her use of the passive label. Passive-voice sentences are typically sentences with a be-verb followed by a past-participle

construction: “The national anthem *was sung* before the game.” An existential-there sentence will typically have a be-verb as the predicating verb: “There *are* many traditions in the United States.” Existential-there sentences cannot technically be in passive voice.

⁷ In subsequent editions Horschitz corrects her translation by changing “*Selbstladepistole*” to “*Armeepistole*” and “*Handgranaten*” to “*Patronen*” [cartridges] (Taschenbuch 175).

⁸ Arguably the most appropriate equivalent for “smashed” occurs once as “smashed-down town” (23) becomes “*zertrümmerten Stadt*” (30).

⁹ It is interesting to note that on the same page, as Frederic and Ettore are discussing Frederic’s chances for the silver medal, Horschitz infuses Ettore’s statement, “I heard you were going to get it alright” (123), with the death metaphor “*todsicher*” (139).

¹⁰ This form of hedging is used frequently by Frederic Henry in conversation and in his narration. Horschitz will often make it more definite. For example, Frederic’s line, “I guess I’m sleepy” (126) becomes “*Ich bin furchtbar schläfrig*” (142) [I am terribly sleepy]. (One notices also the addition of “*furchtbar*” [terrible] in this sentence.) Additionally, Horschitz has a tendency to diminish the hedging in the novel by frequently replacing “maybe” [“*vielleicht*”] with “probably” [“*wahrscheinlich*”].

¹¹ Frederic Henry is not the only one whose physical sufferings are embellished in the German translation. During Catherine’s protracted labor, her utterance, “That was a big one” (314), becomes “*Das war eine schlimme*” (346). “Big one” thus becomes “bad one.” This line is changed in the subsequent editions as “*schlimme*” becomes the more accurate “*große*” (Taschenbuch 360).

¹² For a good overview of the literature and zeitgeist of the interwar period in Germany, see *German Novelists of the Weimar Republic*. Ed. Karl Leydecker. Rochester: Camden House, 2006.

¹³ The literal translation of the title of Remarque’s novel would be *Nothing New in the West*, a much different title than the actual English title: *All Quiet on the Western Front*.

Chapter Six

Shoring Up the Fragments: The Cohesive Translation of *In Our Time*

and then with the dew all over everything and the sun just starting to get going, I'd help him pull off his boots (*IOT*, Boni and Liveright 153)

—Ernest Hemingway, “My Old Man”

und dann, wenn noch alles voll tau war, und die Sonne anfing, sich gerade in Bewegung zu setzen, würde ich ihm aus seinen Stiefeln raushelfen (IUZ 131)

—Annemarie Horschitz, “Mein Alter”

and then, when everything was still full of dew, and the sun began to set itself in motion, I would help him out of his boots

—Rendition of translation

[T]he production of aesthetic or narrative form is to be seen as an ideological act in its own right (64)

—Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious*

I.

On March 31, 1925, at the outset of his literary career, Hemingway wrote an important letter to Horace Liveright, the man who was bringing out the first American edition of *In Our Time*. Perhaps more important at the time than the actual letter were the enclosures: a signed contract and “The Battler,” the replacement story for “Up in Michigan,” which Liveright had rejected for fear of censorship. Of equal interest in hindsight, though, is the letter’s specific and forceful plea to his new publisher: “As the contract only mentioned excisions it is understood of course that no alterations of words shall be made without my approval. This protects you as much as it does me as

the stories are written so tight and so hard that the alteration of a word can throw an entire story out of key” (*SL* 154).

While Hemingway’s remark clearly focuses attention on potential editorial changes, his comment might apply equally to interlingual translation. Taken at face value, this statement would certainly preclude even the consideration of translation since with the exception of proper names, any translation would alter almost every word of the source text. The transition from source language to target language would most certainly produce (if we continue with Hemingway’s metaphor) a cacophonous text that would bear little resemblance to the original.

The stories of *In Our Time* were, of course, eventually translated into numerous languages, including German in 1932 by Annemarie Horschitz. Hemingway’s remark to Liveright should give us pause, though, as we consider the translation of this text. Specifically, how in tune is *In unserer Zeit* with *In Our Time* and at what points might the translation produce a disharmonious effect?

In the past three chapters, we have seen how Horschitz’s translations, even generally satisfactory ones, often obscure, shift, and diminish important features of the source text. While I have argued that Hemingway’s style matters to his other early fiction, *In Our Time* stands out as especially significant given Hemingway’s comments about the importance of the form of this text. Critics have agreed with the author’s assessment, frequently noting Hemingway’s utilization of “tight” writing in *In Our Time*. “The result of this extremely tight writing,” Linda Wagner notes, “is that the reader must value every word, every scene, every character in his reaction to

the fiction” (126). What happens, then, when this carefully constructed prose is moved into another linguistic system?

As with the examinations of other translations of Hemingway’s early fiction, an analysis of the shifting involved with Horschitz’s translation of *In Our Time* could focus on numerous issues. One could, for example, discuss translation and race while considering the implications of the shift from the inflammatory label “wop” (103, 154-158) to the generic “*Italiener*” or the unusual “*Maccaroni*” (87, 132-135).¹ Or one could mention the loss of humor in the German text. In the translation of “A Very Short Story,” for example, Horschitz cannot replicate the word play with the medical joke “friend or enema” (83). And in “Mr. and Mrs. Eliot,” the sexual pun “kept himself really straight” (111) is lost in the German as it becomes “*reingehalten*” (139) [held pure]. Or one might consider various shifts in the title of the stories. There is the important loss, for example, of the genitive case in “Soldier’s Home” as it is translated as “*Soldaten zu Hause*” [Soldiers at Home].²

While these and other issues certainly deserve attention, in this chapter I focus instead on a stylistic technique that is found throughout the stories and interchapters of *In Our Time*: fragmentation. My goal is to investigate Hemingway’s fragmentary technique through an examination of Horschitz’s translation of *In Our Time*. While Horschitz’s translation is generally successful at replicating certain aspects of the text’s fragmented style (e.g., the translation of Hemingway’s short, choppy sentences), her translation in several key ways works toward cohesion over fragmentation.

While the type of translational shifting analyzed in this chapter is perhaps the least noticeable of all the examples we have examined, I consider these subtle shifts important, as Hemingway's intentionally constructed stylistic fragmentation is compromised by Horschitz's efforts to create a more cohesive text. *In Our Time* is a confusing, disjointed work that is full of the unexpected. The translation, however, works against this by providing structure to this chaos through lexical and syntactic alteration.

II.

The content of *In Our Time* certainly brings the reader into contact with a world in fragments. Over the decades critics have repeatedly noted how the text presents the reader with a violent and chaotic post-war reality. The title of the collection, taken from the Book of Common Prayer ("Lord, give us peace in our time"), sets an ironic stage for moments of violence and confusion. The interchapters present vignettes of violence on the battlefield, in the bull ring, and in various settings of specious justice. The stories that separate these interchapters also give us glimpses of a violent world in which things are not what they seem. A story of birth in "Indian Camp," for example, becomes one of death as the expectant father commits suicide during his wife's protracted labor. In "The Battler" Nick Adams is ushered into a topsy-turvy world in which looks can be deceiving and love between two vagabonds manifests itself with a blow to the back of the head with a blackjack.

Confusion and violence thus become recurrent themes in *In Our Time*. As Robert Slabey notes, "The basic relationship of the material reveals that in both

peacetime America and wartime Europe, pain and brutality are omnipresent” (84). The result of this violent and confusing world is a society full of fragmented relationships. Krebs returns from the war unable to reconnect with those at home. Hubert and Cornelia Elliot’s relationship starts off strained and becomes more and more distant as their story develops. And Nick and George realize that their days of idyllic male bonding are coming to an end with Nick’s resentful realization that he will have to go back to America and assume the responsibilities of fatherhood.

The theme of individuals caught in the throes of a chaotic world is, of course, not unique to *In Our Time*, since this scenario can be found throughout Hemingway’s early fiction. Writing about *A Farewell to Arms*, Gerry Brenner argues that the ultimate thesis of the work is “that no institution, belief, system, value, or commitment can arm one against life’s utter irrationality” (131). *In Our Time* gives us an early look at Hemingway’s take on pervading irrationality brought about by World War I and the ineffectiveness of order-giving institutions (military, government, church, education) to reestablish a sense of order.

The form of *In Our Time* plays a crucial role in addressing this issue, and in this sense, *In Our Time* emerges as Hemingway’s most modern work in terms of stylistic experimentation. While this is perhaps surprising since *In Our Time* was Hemingway’s first major publication, as David Trotter remarks, “Ernest Hemingway, disciple of Gertrude Stein, started a lot closer to the center of Modernism than Faulkner, and moved away from it more rapidly” (89). Defining modernist stylistics, Michael Levenson notes its “common devices and general preoccupations: the

recurrent act of fragmenting unities (unities of character or plot or pictorial space or lyric form), . . . the refusal of norms of beauty, the willingness to make radical linguistic experiments, all often inspired by the resolve (in Eliot's phrase) to startle and disturb the public" (3). The result, as Peter Childs observes, is a mystifying reality: "Modernist writing 'plunges' the reader into a confusing and difficult mental landscape which cannot be immediately understood but which must be moved through and mapped by the reader in order to understand its limits and meanings" (4).

Readers of *In Our Time* certainly experience numerous moments of confusion as they are thrust into disjointed situations. The structure of the individual pieces reinforces this. Milton Cohen notes that the interchapters "present scenes that start in the middle, often lack an ending, and depend on description and dramatization rather than narrative summary" (5-6). The stories, as well, often provide little initial structure for readers as there is often no clarifying exposition.

In a macro-sense, the first thing that a reader quickly notices is the juxtaposition of the interchapters with the stories. In a letter to Edmund Wilson of October 18, 1924, Hemingway explained the connection between stories and interchapters in *In Our Time* as he was attempting "to give the picture of the whole between examining it in detail. Like looking with your eyes at something, say a passing coast line, and then looking at it with 15X binoculars. Or rather, maybe, looking at it and then going in and living in it—and then coming out and looking at it again" (Wilson, *Shores* 122-23).

The fragmentary nature of *In Our Time* is mirrored by its complicated publishing history. In the early 1930s, as Rowohlt was embarking on a translation of *In Our Time*, one of the key initial questions concerned the unusual predicament of which source text to use. In fact, four iterations of *In Our Time* were in existence in the early 1930s.³ The most logical choice of source text for translation would have been the most recent, and an initial examination of the copyright page of the first edition of *In unserer Zeit* seems to indicate that Horschitz used the recently published 1930 Scribner edition since Charles Scribner Sons is listed as the publisher of the American edition. Based on textual evidence, though, it is clear that Horschitz used the earlier 1925 Boni and Liveright edition.⁴ While Boni and Liveright standardized some of the more experimental technique of the 1924 *in our time*, the 1925 edition still presents the reader with a fragmented form.

As we will see, the text's complicated history and basic structure is just the beginning in a consideration of *In Our Time* as a "fragmentary novel," to use D.H. Lawrence's description (365). This is a text with gaps, many of which are created through lexical choice, syntactic structure, and interruptions that thwart a cohesive reading. The style of *In Our Time* becomes a metafictional representation of the fragmented world that Hemingway portrays. Horschitz's concern with cohesion alters in crucial ways not only the style of the text but also its controlling idea.

III.

Hemingway's tendency toward linguistic fragmentation runs counter to the conventional wisdom that encourages writers to help readers make sense of discourse

through the use of lexical and syntactic structures to create “texture,” a term that Geoff Thompson defines as “the quality of being recognisably a text rather than a collection of unconnected words or clauses” (147).

There are, of course, many linguistic features that work to produce textual unity. In their extensive study on cohesion, Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan highlight different types of “cohesive tie” that fit under a five-category schema: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion (4). While lexical cohesion relates specifically to vocabulary, the other four categories are all grammatical classifications, some of which we will discuss in greater detail in reference to Hemingway. The key term in thinking about the cohesive relationship found in all of these devices, according to Donald Ellis, is dependency: “When one element of a message presupposes another, and this other element cannot be understood without referring to what presupposes it, then a cohesive relation has been established” (111).

These devices will often help a text achieve a level of coherence—a term that Ellis differentiates from cohesion: “*Cohesion* has to do with relations among surface linguistic forms whereas *coherence* refers to more general organizational patterns that lend order to a discourse” (111, emphasis in original). Ironically, it is the fragmentation of *In Our Time* that becomes one of its defining coherent features. I would argue that while *In Our Time* is a thematically coherent work due to its focus on fragmentation, chaos, and violence, Hemingway’s modernist technique, in an attempt to reflect this chaos stylistically, works against linguistic cohesion.

It is certainly the case that Hemingway's *In Our Time*, as is true with nearly every text, exhibits many moments of cohesion. As we observed in Chapter Four, Hemingway's use of repetition (an example from Halliday and Hasan's category of lexical cohesion), is a prominent and effective lexical tie. Hemingway's prolific use of the conjunction "and" also serves significant cohesive purposes. In Chapter IV of *In Our Time*, for example, the narrator utters a typical Hemingway sentence: "They rushed it, and officers came out alone and worked on it" (43).

Horschitz, for her part, very faithfully replicates these cohesive features in Hemingway's prose. Her tendency for variety, which we observed in her translation of *Men Without Women*, is curtailed significantly. Additionally, when Hemingway uses transitional devices, Horschitz is extremely conscientious in reproducing these lexical items. Her general approach in translating *In Our Time* again corresponds very closely to Nida's definition of formal equivalence: reproducing grammatical units, word usage, and meanings (162). Within this framework of "literal," word-for-word translation (as opposed to a looser sense-for-sense translation), however, some distinct patterns emerge.

My interest in this chapter lies in those linguistic patterns in the translation that alter the text and produce a coherence that runs counter to Hemingway's style. Specifically, I focus attention on Hemingway's and Horschitz's treatment of voice, pro-forms, and several standard devices used in cohesive writing. Finally, I examine Horschitz's tendency to overtranslate—a translation strategy that contradicts Hemingway's apparent intentions.

IV.

Voice

One cohesion-producing device is the use of a single voice. One often begins reading with the assumption that a text's narrative voice (whether from a dramatized or undramatized narrator) will be consistent throughout. An important part of the fragmentation of *In Our Time* comes from the multiple voices at work in the pieces, a literary technique that mirrors turn-of-the-century trends in the art world. What Hemingway meant when he wrote to Gertrude Stein that in "Big Two-Hearted River" he was "trying to do the country like Cezanne and having a hell of a time and sometime getting it a little bit" (*SL* 122) is not exactly clear. One aspect was surely the attention paid to the image. Something else, though, that he may have had in mind is Cezanne's fragmentation of perspective—a technique that attempts to capture multiple views. Writing about the importance of Cezanne in utilizing shifting points of view, Stephen Kern notes that "Cezanne was the first to introduce a truly heterogeneous space in a single canvas with multiple perspectives of the same subject," a technique that would have a profound impact on the Cubists (141-42).

While there is general agreement about Hemingway's use of multiple perspectives in *In Our Time*, one recurring debate about voice and *In Our Time* is whether the text reflects multiple narrators or whether Nick is the lone narrator of all the stories and interchapters. Cohen, for example, highlights Hemingway's use of multiple narrators in the interchapters. Elizabeth Vaughn, on the other hand, argues

that Nick is the only narrator in the text but that the presence of various voices is indicative of Nick's experimentation as a writer:

These other voices contribute to the investigation conducted throughout *In Our Time* of the ramifications of language that creates and comprises identity, the ways in which the linguistic reality of fictional characters engenders that of fiction and vice versa, and the role of voice in determining and communicating the relationship between fictional and historical realities. (137)

One need not take sides in this debate, however, to see that Hemingway, whether through multiple narrators or through Nick's writerly experimentation with voice, utilizes linguistic choice and syntactical structure to reflect different points of view. Horschitz's success at replicating this fragmentation of voice, though, is limited due to her tendency to standardize these distinct voices.

Not surprisingly, one of the most frequently used voices throughout *In Our Time* is one that exhibits a distinctly American dialect, marked by a heightened degree of colloquial casualness—a frequently cited aspect of American speech that became stylistically prominent in American literature beginning with the regional realists. Whether it is Bugs's down-home metaphor in "The Battler" ("they wasn't brother and sister no more than a rabbit" (77)) or the husband's off-hand remark in "Cat in the Rain" ("You look pretty darn nice" (104)), many of Hemingway's characters exhibit a uniquely American voice. One begins noticing very quickly a loss of casualness in the translation. Bugs's line in translation turns into "*waren sie so*

wenig Geschwister wie wir zwei beiden” (64) [they were as little siblings as we two], and the husband’s line becomes “*Du siehst eigentlich fabelhaft hübsch aus*” [You look actually fabulous].

Understandably, Americanisms present Horschitz with a unique challenge. Nick and George’s conversation in “The Three-Day Blow” about baseball is a case in point. There is no exact German equivalent for the American expression “dropped a double header” (47), so she provides a logical alternative: “*zwei Spiele verloren*” (41) [lost two games]. The proper noun “World Series” (49) becomes the understandable “*Weltmeisterschaften*” (42) [World Championships]. Her grasp of baseball, however, becomes a bit more dubious with Nick’s line: “I wonder if the Cards will ever win a pennant?” (49). This is translated as “*Ich bin nur gespannt, ob die Cards je in ihrem Leben ein Tor machen werden*” (42) [I am only anxious whether the Cards will ever in their life score a goal.]

While interesting reflections of cultural transmission, the translation of these American expressions is perhaps not that crucial. When the translation of American speech begins to alter portrayals of characters, however, the importance is suddenly heightened. One notices significant shifts in the German translation especially with representations of young American voices. Writing about Hemingway’s use of the vernacular, Cohen notes, “In Anderson, as in Mark Twain, Hemingway saw how colloquial American English could become a powerful narrative device, particularly in the first-person voices of young narrators, whose colorful expressions, broken sentences, and stammering repetitions betray a naive, unprotected sensibility” (7).

One of the most uniquely young American voices belongs to Joe, the narrator of “My Old Man.” The story is full of rambling prose, nonstandard grammar, and informal American colloquial speech that reflect Joe’s age, class, and level of education. The first sentence of the story reveals not only some unique American expressions but his rambling style: “I guess looking at it, now, my old man was cut out for a fat guy, one of those regular little roly fat guys you see around, but he sure never got that way, except a little toward the last, and then it wasn’t his fault, he was riding over the jumps only and he could afford to carry plenty of weight then” (153). Horschitz “corrects” this sentence first by breaking it up into more organized, standard units through the use of three semi-colons. Joe’s rambling conversational tone continues throughout the story. At the end, as Joe recounts that after his father’s death, he remembers that he was “crying and choking, sort of, and . . .” (174). Horschitz does not even attempt to render the conversational “sort of”: “*Weinen und Schluchzen, und . . .*” (149) [crying and sobbing, and].

Hemingway also infuses Joe’s narrative with various types of nonstandard grammatical constructions: adjective for adverb (“could run pretty good” (154)), subject-verb agreement (“two of them was after . . .” (157)), verb tense (“could have rode him” (167)) and pronoun case (“my old man me . . . had” (169)). In each of these instances, Horschitz provides grammatically standard alternatives:

could run pretty good → *ganz anständig laufen* (131)

[very decently run]

two of them was after → *alle Beide fielen her* (135)

[both were pouncing]

could have rode him → *hätte ihn reiten können* (142)

[could have ridden him]

my old man me → *mein Alter und ich* (144)

[my old man and I]

At numerous points, the language of Joe in translation is simply too elaborate. Joe's narration is full of colloquialisms, like his use of "nuts" (154, 156) to describe first his father and then himself, which becomes the standard "*verrückt*" (132, 134) [crazy]. His description of setting in the first paragraph sounds like it might come straight out of *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*: "and then with the dew all over everything and the sun just starting to get going . . . (153). Horschitz's translation, however, sounds much closer to Heinrich Heine: "*und dann, wenn noch alles voll tau war, und die Sonne anfing, sich gerade in Bewegung zu setzen . . .*" [and then, when everything was still full of dew, and the sun began to set itself in motion . . .].

Later, Joe's simple "early in the morning" turns into the poetic "*Morgengrauen*" (136) [dawn]. At another point, Joe describes a crush that he had on a girl by saying, "[S]he was awfully good looking" (168). Horschitz renders this: "*[S]ie sah süß aus*" (144) [She looked sweet]—an expression that is difficult to imagine Joe ever saying. His casual expression—"He'd busted away from his old gang"—becomes "*Er mied die ganze Clique*" [He avoided the whole clique]. At times, just like Huck, Joe can be poetic in his own gruff way, as when he describes Paris: "Paris is all balled up and they never do straighten it out" (154). Horschitz's

translation again comes up short in retaining the roguish qualities of Joe's language: "*Paris ist ganz zusammengeknäult und wird nie in Ordnung gebracht*" [Paris is entirely tangled up and will never be brought into order.]

The loss of a young American voice is also noticeable in other stories, especially those that highlight conversations between young people. In "Cross-Country Snow," George and Nick's conversation is peppered with slang, as exemplified by Nick's description of the expectant waitress as "knocked up" (146), which simply becomes "*schwanger*" [pregnant] (125).⁵ In "The Three-Day Blow," one of the most frequently used adjectives by both Bill and Nick is "swell," a word that is listed under the section "College" in the 1936 *Dictionary of American Slang* (Weseen 199). Horschitz's standard translation for this American expression common among the young is "*fabelhaft*" [fabulous], a word that does not carry the same link with youth.

One notices the youthful voice also in "The End of Something," a story that climaxes with Nick breaking off a relationship with Marjorie. Matthew Stewart describes the dialogue in this story as "laconic" and exhibiting an "inarticulate gracelessness" that reflects "teenage emotional confusion" (48). Part of the "gracelessness" and "confusion" comes from the inability of these two teenagers to communicate. Notice how Nick does not actually respond to Marjorie in this exchange:

"There's our old ruin, Nick," Marjorie said.

Nick, rowing, looked at the white stone in the green trees.

“There it is,” he said.

“Can you remember when it was a mill?” Marjorie asked.

“I can just remember,” Nick said.

Horschitz renders Nick’s first response as, “*Ja, da ist sie*,” [Yes, there it is] and the second, “*Ja, grade noch*” (32) [Yes, only just]. Hemingway’s dialogue in the story is not simply a good example of verisimilitude; rather, it serves an important narrative function as it reflects a youthful immaturity on the part of Marjorie, but especially Nick. Horschitz’s insertion of “*Ja*” is significant in these lines of dialogue at the beginning of the story, as Nick, in the translation, actually communicates with Marjorie. Hemingway’s understated point, however, is that they are not communicating, that they are talking past each other. We are witnessing, through their non-communication, the beginning of the end of the relationship. The excerpt is also a good example of Horschitz’s tendency to “correct” Hemingway’s fragmentation through cohesion.

This immaturity builds to Nick’s climactic line, in which he verbalizes the reason for breaking off the relationship: “It isn’t fun any more” (40). Clearly, the important word is “fun,” a word that through its triteness expresses a great deal about Nick’s maturity. Horschitz’s translation of Nick’s crucial statement reads, “*Es ist gar nicht mehr schön*” (35) [It is really not beautiful anymore]. “*Schön*” in this context is a very adult word, reflecting how an adult, and not a boy, might reflect on a relationship. The teenage voice is thus lost.⁶

Other voices are a bit more difficult to define but are nevertheless unique.

While numerous interchapters of *In Our Time* present scenes of bullfighting, it would be wrong to assume that these scenes are recounted by the same narrative voice. As Slabey observes, Chapter IX, the first in a series of bullfighting vignettes, gives us a description of the bullfight through the unique perspective of an excited American tourist witnessing the spectacle for the first time (78). Part of the excitement of the bullfight is represented by a lack of punctuation as the narrator lets loose a flurry of words. Hemingway strings words together, disregarding conventional punctuation: “the bull rammed him wham against the wall . . .” (107). Notice the effect on tempo (and hence excitement) with the insertion of two simple commas in an otherwise exact translation: “*der Stier rammte ihn, bums, gegen die Barriere . . .*” (91).⁷

The speaker’s excitement is also reflected through nonstandard grammar: “He couldn’t hardly lift his arm” (107). This “ungrammatical phrasing,” according to Wendolyn Tetlow, gives the passage “an anecdotal, conversational character that ironically heightens the very serious purpose of the piece” (22). Horschitz’s translation, however, standardizes the grammar: “*Er konnte kaum noch den Arm heben*” [He could barely even lift the arm].

Hemingway’s diction in this chapter also tends toward the more informal as exemplified by his use of “puke,” which Horschitz renders with the more formal “*erbrach*.” (The German verb “*kotzen*,” a word that Horschitz uses elsewhere in her translations of Hemingway, is a closer equivalent.)⁸ In the same sentence Hemingway’s informal “hollered” becomes “*tobte*” [blustered]. (The more base

“brüllen” [bellow] would perhaps have been a better choice.) Finally, the uninitiated speaker uses the extremely vague noun “things” to refer to what the crowd throws into the ring. Horschitz translates this more elaborately as “Gegenstände” [items]. It is not as if any of these translations are “wrong”; they simply fail to convey the appropriate voice of a neophyte whose language reflects the excitement of witnessing the spectacle of the bullfight for the first time.

Hemingway’s ear for speech extended well beyond the American vernacular, and at numerous points in *In Our Time* he captures the voice of non-Americans. The speakers in Chapters III and IV, for example, are distinctly British.⁹ One distinctly British word that appears in both interchapters is “potted” (33, 43). In Chapter III, “potted” is simply translated as the standard “*schossen . . . ab*” (29) [shot down], therefore failing to establish a unique identity for the speaker.

Horschitz is, however, successful in shaping the speaker’s voice away from the norm in Chapter IV as she translates “potted” with the slang term “*knallten . . . ab*” (37) [blown away, bumped off]. Additionally, the speaker in Chapter IV is marked as British by the clause, “We were frightfully put out . . .” (43). Horschitz attempts to capture the colloquial expression with, “*Wir waren wie vor den Kopf geschlagen . . .*” (37). There are two basic problems with this translation. First, and most importantly, it is incorrect. The idiom “*vor den Kopf geschlagen*” means “to be dazed, totally surprised, or to be shocked” (Schulz 111), certainly different from being “put out.” Second, the expression is very informal, which takes it in the opposite direction of the British expression. The ironic shock of Chapter IV is that a

group of British soldiers is taking target practice at a series of Germans who are trying to get over a “simply priceless” barricade. The shooting of the German soldiers is not what is shocking, however; it is the fact that the tale is recounted in a fine and proper British dialect, a variety of English to which “Americans . . . assign positive value” (Wolfram and Shilling-Estes 12). While Horschitz’s use of first the slang “*abknallen*” and then the idiom “*vor den Kopf geschlagen*” establish, in part, a distinct voice for the speaker of Chapter IV, she marks the speaker as more casual, which minimizes a key aspect of the interchapter.

Hemingway is also able to capture the non-English voice in his fiction. Sometime this comes through using other languages, but often Hemingway is able to alter his English slightly to represent a foreign flavor as he does in “Out of Season,” a story about a couple’s aborted fishing trip with Peduzzi, their talkative and enthusiastic Italian guide. We are informed in the middle of the story with Hemingway’s understated humor that Peduzzi is not speaking English:

Part of the time he talked in d’ Ampezzo dialect and sometimes in Tyroler German dialect. He could not make out which the young gentleman and his wife understood the best so he was being bilingual. But as the young gentleman said, ‘Ja, Ja,’ Peduzzi decided to talk altogether in Tyroler. The young gentleman and the wife understood nothing. (132)

Hemingway attempts to capture Peduzzi’s language through subtle syntactic manipulation. When Peduzzi asks the wife whether she would like a drink,

Hemingway renders the question, “Marsala, you like marsala, Signorina?” (129), removing the operator “do” to give a hint of non-fluency. The German reads simply, “*Trinken Sie gern Marsala, Signorina?*” (110) [Do you like to drink Marsala, Signorina?]. Later, Peduzzi uses simple diction and fragments as he tries to convince the couple that it is worth breaking the law since the fishing will be good: “Not a thing. Nothing. No trouble. Big trout, I tell you. Lots of them.” Horschitz’s version, although she leaves out Peduzzi’s “Nothing,” retains the fragments: “*Macht garnichts. Keine Unannehmlichkeiten. Riesenforellen, sage ich Ihnen. Massenhaft.*” She is less successful, however, in reproducing Peduzzi’s simple diction as “No trouble” becomes the complex “*Keine Unannehmlichkeiten*” [No unpleasantness], rather than, for example, the simplistic “*Kein Problem*” [No problem]. Additionally, the colloquial “Lots of” turns into “*Massenhaft*” [masses of]. Finally, with Peduzzi’s question to the man—“At what hour in the morning?” (135)—Hemingway clearly mimics the German syntax of “*Um wieviel Uhr*” with “At what hour.” Horschitz’s hands are tied: here is a line, delivered originally in German dialect, transcribed by Hemingway into non-fluent Germanized English. Her rendition is a logical one: “*Um wieviel Uhr morgen früh?*” (115). For a German reader, however, the foreignness of Peduzzi’s voice is nevertheless lost.

In analyzing the importance of voice, Andrew Bennett and Nicholas Royle write, “Literature, in fact, might be defined as being the space in which, more than anywhere else, the power, beauty and strangeness of the voice is . . . evoked . . .” (73). What we encounter in Horschitz’s translation are, for the most part, not cases of

mistranslation. Many of these are instances in which the translation is correct, but nevertheless misses the mark and fails to replicate Hemingway's fragmented but always specific points of view. While she chooses roughly equivalent target-language terms for source-language expressions, we are left with a homogenized voice. Hemingway's polyphony is thus greatly reduced if not lost altogether.¹⁰

Pro-forms

An additional fragmentation technique in *In Our Time* is Hemingway's creative use (and nonuse) of pro-forms—a common grammatical device for establishing cohesion.¹¹ One general pro-form category includes the adverbial pro-forms of time and place. While Hemingway often avoids these, Horschitz frequently reinserts them into her translation to provide added cohesion. One finds, for example, the insertion of the adverbial pro-form for time “dann” [then] throughout *In unserer Zeit*. Often “dann” is used simply to provide a logical sequential progression. The narrator in “Big Two-Hearted River” at one point remarks about Nick, “He remembered . . .,” which Horschitz modifies with “Dann fiel ihm ein . . .” (163) [Then it occurred to him], and Joe in “My Old Man” remarks, “and we'd start out” (153). Horschitz transforms this into “und dann würden wir starten” (131) [and then we would start].

Sometimes the pro-form “dann” is used to provide a clear bridge between two sentences as in “The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife.” In the original one reads, “Billy Tabeshaw went back and fastened it. They were gone through the woods” (28).

Horschitz links these two disjointed sentences: “*Billy Tabeshaw ging zurück und befestigte es. Dann verschwanden sie im Wald*” (26) [Billy Tabeshaw went back and fastened it. Then they disappeared in the woods].

Horschitz is also fond of the adverbial pro-form of place: “*da*” [there]. One sees a good example of Horschitz’s proclivity for cohesion in the two-sentence opening paragraph of “Indian Camp”: “At the lake shore there was another rowboat drawn up. The two Indians stood waiting” (15). Horschitz’s translation reads, “*Am Seeufer wurde noch ein Ruderboot heraufgezogen. Die beiden Indianer standen wartend da*” (15) [On the lake shore another rowboat was pulled up. Both Indians stood waiting there]. In “Cross-Country Snow” we see something similar: “George sat silent” (146) becomes “*George saß schweigend da*” (126) [George sat silently there], and in “Big Two-Hearted River,” “Nick sat smoking, looking out over the country” (182-83) turns into “*Nick saß da, rauchte und sah über das Land*” (156) [Nick sat there, smoked, and looked over the country].

Horschitz also utilizes “*dort*,” the other German equivalent for “there,” as a frequent substitute in Hemingway’s non-cohesive existential-there sentences. In Chapter Five, we saw how Horschitz’s tendency to manipulate the syntax of existential-there sentences results in stronger verbs as Horschitz removes the be-verb in favor of a more colorful alternative. An additional effect of the there-was/were construction is the creation of a gap in the text as the known-new contract (a device we will examine shortly) is suspended. When confronted with an existential-there in the original, Horschitz will often choose to substitute the adverbial pro-form of place

(“*dort war*”) instead of the existential German equivalent (“*es gab*”). So in “The Three-Day Blow,” “There was the cottage . . .” (45) becomes “*Dort war das Häuschen . . .*” (39) with the emphasis being placed on “*Dort*.” The same thing happens at the beginning of “Big Two-Hearted River,” as well as other places throughout the translation.

Horschitz sometimes inserts another pro-form of place in the German translation by including “*hier*.” In “Indian Camp,” for example, Nick’s father, when referring to the husband, says, “I must say he took it all pretty quietly” (20). Interestingly, Horschitz translates “he” as “*der hier*” [this one here], ostensibly to provide more clarification for the antecedent so that the reader will not think that the “he” might refer to Nick. In Part I of “Big Two-Hearted River,” the narrator recounts, “These were just ordinary hoppers . . .” (183), which becomes “*Dies hier waren alles ganz gewöhnliche Grashüpfer . . .*” (156) [These here were all entirely ordinary grasshoppers]. And in Part II, an adverbial of time in this sentence—“Now the stream was shallow and wide” (209)—becomes the clearer and more logical adverb of place in the German: “*Hier war der Strom flach und breit*” (179) [Here the stream was shallow and broad].

The use of adverbial pro-forms of place ties into Horschitz’s trend in her translation to establish clearly a sense of place in her sentences before moving on. Often she will accomplish this by moving adverbials of place to the opening sentence slot. In “Out of Season,” for example, Peduzzi’s comment, “Everybody in this town likes me” (131) becomes “*In dieser Stadt mögen mich alle*” (112) [In this town all

like me]. And in the same section, when the husband remarks, “Everybody in the town saw us going . . .” (132), Horschitz alters the syntax again: “*In der Stadt haben uns alle . . . gesehen*” (113) [In the town all have seen us]. We see two prominent examples of Horschitz’s establishment of place and removal of the existential-there construction at the beginning of “Cat in the Rain”: “There were big palms and green benches in the public garden” becomes “*In den öffentlichen Anlagen waren große Palmen und grüne Bänke*” (101) [In the public park were big palms and green benches].

More interesting, however, is the first sentence in the story, which contains a similar but arguably much more important transformation. The original reads, “There were only two Americans stopping at the hotel” (119). Horschitz’s version of this sentence becomes “*Im Hotel wohnten nur zwei Amerikaner*” [In the hotel only two Americans were staying (144). Again we see how the existential-there construction in the original withholds information, thus creating an interpretive gap. Horschitz’s translation, however, establishes early a clear sense of place. One also notices the interesting shift in Hemingway’s unusual verb as “stopping” becomes “*wohnten*,” which can be translated as “stayed” but more basically is the word for “lived.” This transformation is significant in the story since one of the most important words in the story is “stopped.” As we find out by the end, the story is primarily about a wife’s desire for permanence and stability. Hemingway’s careful use of “stopping” (which suggests the temporariness of their stay) reinforces the couple’s transient existence

and the wife's desire to stop for good. Horschitz's translation, however, connotes much more permanence and contradicts the story's theme.

The most commonly used pro-form, however, is the pronoun—a grammatical unit that can have very powerful cohesive properties. Although Hemingway certainly utilizes pronouns, his desire to produce a fragmented text leads him either to avoid pronouns at times or to obscure their antecedents. In numerous places, Horschitz provides a pronoun where Hemingway has left one out. In “Cross-Country Snow,” for example, Horschitz transforms Hemingway's sentence—“There was a low ceiling”—into “*Es hatte ein niedrige Decke*” (123) [It had a low ceiling], with “*Es*” linking back to the previously mentioned room. Another example occurs in “Soldier's Home,” as the narrator remarks about Krebs, “He couldn't tell her, he couldn't make her see it” (100). Horschitz slips an additional pronoun into the first clause: “*Er konnte es ihr doch nicht sagen; er konnte es ihr doch nicht klar machen*” (84) [He could nevertheless not tell her it; he could nevertheless not make it clear to her]. The pronoun “*es*” is small, but nevertheless powerful, causing the reader to look for and make connections. Hemingway's clause is, therefore, vaguer than Horschitz's. (Also significant is Horschitz's insertion of “*doch*” [nevertheless], a cohesive metadiscourse word that will be discussed in the following section.)

Elsewhere, Horschitz transforms a definite article into a pronoun for enhanced cohesion. Clearly, definite articles have cohesive properties. As Halliday and Hasan explain, a definite article “indicates that the item in question [the headword of the noun phrase] IS specific and identifiable; that somewhere the information necessary

for identifying it is recoverable” (71). The problem, though, is that the reader does not know where to find the information: “[i]t will be found somewhere in the environment, provided we interpret ‘environment’ in the broadest sense: to include the structure, the text, the situation and the culture” (74). A pronoun, however, frequently provides a more specific link.

The definite article in the following phrase—“In the pack . . .” (200)—from “Big Two-Hearted River” connects back to Nick’s previously mentioned pack. Horschitz, however, seemingly feels the need to clarify whose pack it is: “*In seinem Packen . . .*” (171) [In his pack]. In other instances, however, Horschitz is confronted with a new noun phrase that she must contextualize, as she is at the beginning of “A Very Short Story” when the narrator remarks, “Luz sat on the bed” (83). Horschitz again modifies the definite article with a possessive pronoun: “*Luz saß auf seinem Bett*” (69) [Luz sat on his bed]. Horschitz’s “*seinem*” clearly links to the “He” in the previous sentence. This is a case where Horschitz gets ahead of the text (the term “his bed” not appearing until the end of the second paragraph), implying more about the relationship between the man and Ag (“Luz” in the Scribner edition) than he has initially provided.

At times, Horschitz will substitute a possessive pronoun for a vague indefinite article. One of the most famous lines from *In Our Time*, mainly since it later appears in *A Farewell to Arms*, is Nick’s remark to Rinaldi in Chapter VI: “You and me we’ve made a separate peace” (81). Horschitz’s translation—“*Du und ich, wir haben unseren Separatfrieden gemacht*” (67, emphasis mine) [You and I, we have made our

separate peace]—provides not only a closer linguistic bond between subject and object but also expresses a closer relationship between Nick and Rinaldi than the original implies. (Also apparent in this translation is the shift in pronoun case and the more standard punctuation.)

Horschitz continues her translational tendencies (pronoun inclusion, avoidance of the existential-there construction, and clarification of place) in a line from Chapter XIV: “There was a great shouting going on in the grandstand overhead” (177). Horschitz’s translation reads, “*Über ihren Köpfen auf der Haupttribüne war ein Riesengeschrei*” (151). [Over their heads on the grandstand was a great clamor].

While pronouns typically create cohesion in a text by causing the reader to look back (anaphoric reference) or ahead (cataphoric reference) in the text, the antecedents of Hemingway’s pronouns are often vague, which clearly affects cohesion. Notice Hemingway’s confusing use of “they” and “them” in the following passage from “The Doctor and the Doctor’s Wife”: “But the lumbermen might never come for them because a few logs were not worth the price of a crew to gather them. If no one came for them they would be left to waterlog and rot on the beach” (25). The especially confusing portion of the passage is “. . . them they” In Horschitz’s translation of the second sentence she avoids this awkwardness and confusion by removing the pronouns completely: “*Wenn niemand kam, faulte das angeschwemmte Holz am Strand*” (23) [If no one came, the washed-up wood rotted on the beach].

Another vague pronoun appears in “A Very Short Story,” where the narrator talks around the story of the relationship between the man and Ag: “There were only a few patients, and they all knew about it” (83). Horschitz could very easily replicate the vague “it” with “*es*”; however, she chooses to clarify, albeit with a vague noun: “*sie wußten alle um die Sache*” (69) [they all knew about the matter]. We also see a heightened degree of specificity in “Big Two-Hearted River”: “**It** was brown and soft underfoot as Nick walked on **it**. **This** was the over-lapping of the pine needle floor . . .” (185, emphasis mine). Horschitz changes the vague pronouns in her translation: “**Der Boden** unter Nicks Füßen war weich und braun. **Der Kiefernadelboden** griff hier über . . .” (158, emphasis mine) [The ground under Nick’s feet was soft and brown. The pine-needle floor spread here].

Perhaps one of the most intriguing moments of endophoric confusion appears in “The Big Two-Hearted River,” the two-part story of Nick’s Michigan fishing trip. The tale is almost always read as Nick’s moment of therapy as he attempts to recover from the violence of war. An important early moment in the story occurs in Part I as Nick stares into the river and looks for an extended period at the trout. Writing about the importance of this opening scene, Philip Young notes, “The whole trip is seen as these first fish are seen. Nick goes about his business exactly *as if he were a trout* keeping himself steady in the current[;] the whole affair is seen sharply but is slightly distorted . . .” (44, emphasis mine).

One of the linguistic devices that Hemingway uses to establish the connection between Nick and the trout is the use of the masculine, singular, third-person pronoun:

a big trout shot upstream in a long angle, only **his** shadow marking the angle, then lost **his** shadow as he came through the surface of the water, caught the sun, and then, as **he** went back into the stream under the surface, **his** shadow seemed to float down the stream with the current, unresisting, to **his** post under the bridge where **he** tightened facing up into the current. (180, emphasis mine)

The use of this particular pronoun to refer to a specific trout creates confusion in numerous descriptive passages of Nick's fishing as Nick and the trout begin to coalesce so that a reader is sometimes unsure of the antecedent for the third-person pronoun. Consider the following passages from Part II:

Holding the rod, pumping alive against the current, Nick brought the trout in. He rushed, but always came, the spring of the rod yielding to the rushes, sometimes jerking under water, but always bringing him in. (208)

The line went slack and Nick thought the trout was gone. Then he saw him, very near, in the current, shaking his head, trying to get the hook out. His mouth was clamped shut. He was fighting the hook in the clear flowing current. (211)

He shifted the rod to his left hand, worked the trout upstream, holding his weight, fighting on the rod, and then let him down into the net. He lifted him clear of the water . . . (211)

While the antecedent of some of these pronouns is fairly clear, a reader is unsure, at least momentarily, if many of these pronouns are referring to Nick or the trout. This blending of humans and animals reminds one of Hemingway's description of the bullfight in Chapter XII in which man and bull "just for a moment . . . became one" (139). The lack of clarity in "Big Two-Hearted River" seems purposeful as Nick and the trout (as stand-in for nature) merge.

Hemingway had a choice of pronouns to use to refer to the trout; Horschitz did not. Hemingway clearly did not have to make the trout male. He could have described it with female pronouns or could have made the more conventional choice and used the neuter pronoun "it." When Horschitz encounters the pronouns in these passages, she must decide whether the pronoun refers to Nick or the trout. If the trout, then, in keeping with German usage rules, she must choose the gendered pronoun that ties back to trout, and since trout in German ("*Forelle*") is feminine, the pronouns referring to the noun will be feminine as well. The effect of this shift in the German is not only the clarification of Hemingway's ambiguous references but also the resultant diminishment of the connection between Nick and the fish (i.e., nature).

The Big Three

In her analysis of cohesion, Martha Kolln highlights three of the most common and important cohesion-creating devices: metadiscourse, parallelism, and the known-new contract (26). Horschitz's use and Hemingway's avoidance of these devices emerge as a pattern in a comparison *In Our Time* with *In unserer Zeit*.

Metadiscourse expressions are those lexical units that “act as guideposts for the reader that clarify the purpose or direction of a particular passage” (Kolln 36). These are often conjunctive adverbs that tell a reader how to read a sentence. For example, “however” serves as a contrast word, “furthermore” as a marker of addition, and “thus” as a signal of summary or conclusion. While these conjunctive adverbs are certainly found in Hemingway's prose, he often tends to avoid them. Horschitz, however, inserts these devices into her translation to provide more guidance for the reader.

In “A Very Short Story,” for example, Horschitz inserts “*zwar*” (70) [indeed] in the clause “*küßten sie sich zwar*” [they kissed indeed] where Hemingway simply has “they kissed good-bye. (84). The maid in “Cat in the Rain” says to the wife, “We must get back inside. You will be wet” (121). Horschitz version reads, “*Wir müssen wieder hinein. Sie werden sonst naß*” (103) [We must go back inside. You will otherwise be wet]. Peduzzi's line in “Out of Season—“You said you had everything” (135)—is modified to read, “*Sie sagten aber, Sie hätten alles*” (115) [You said, however, you had everything]. And in “Indian Camp,” the doctor's observation,

“Now . . . there’s some stitches to put in” (19) becomes “*Jetzt . . . muß ich noch ein paar Stiche machen*” (18) [Now . . . I must still put in a few stitches].

Sometimes Horschitz will retain Hemingway’s metadiscourse expression but foreground it by placing it at the beginning of the sentence. This happens, for example, in “L ‘Envoi,’” where the king says, “We have good whisky anyway” (215). Horschitz moves “*Immerhin*” [anyway] to the front of her sentence: “*Immerhin haben wir guten Whisky*” (185). Also at the beginning of the second paragraph in “Mr. and Mrs. Elliot,” we read, “She had seemed much younger, in fact . . .” (109). Horschitz provides a clear transition in the translation by beginning the paragraph, “*Tatsächlich hatte sie viel jünger ausgesehen . . .*” (93) [Actually she had looked much younger . . .]. By manipulating the sequence of items and thus modifying their salience, Horschitz tells us from the beginning how to read these lines. These two sentences are clearly to be read as statements of concession and reinforcement, respectively. Hemingway’s fragmentation, achieved through the deferment of metadiscourse units, is thus compromised.

One especially interesting case of syntactic alteration in the placement of metadiscourse expressions comes at the end of “The End of Something.” Nick has just ended the relationship with Marjorie. Bill, who has clearly been informed about the impending break-up, enters. Nick “felt Bill coming up to the fire. Bill didn’t touch him, either” (41). The “either” in this case is important as it links the lack of Bill’s touch to the lack of Marjorie’s touch; however, by waiting for the end of the sentence to include it, Hemingway suspends our interpretation. Horschitz, however, leads with

a connecting word: “*Auch Bill war ihm nichts*” (36) [Also Bill was nothing to him], again informing the reader too early.

Hemingway’s tendency to withhold information and thus create gaps in his prose occurs throughout *In Our Time*. Horschitz’s strategy is different. Her preference is for structures that stylisticians refer to as periodic sentences—ones that give the main information first and provide clarity for a reader. Hemingway’s general preference is for gap-producing sentences or loose sentences, which keep the reader in suspense.

Thus, the result for a reader of Hemingway in English is often a confrontation with an unexpected element at the end of the sentence. In “A Very Short Story, for example, one experiences an unexpected but significant add-on at the end of the first sentence of the last paragraph: “The major did not marry her in the spring, or at any other time” (85). Robert Scholes, in examining this line, remarks, “Something punitive is going on here as the discourse seems to be revenging itself upon the character” (37). The unexpected addition reinforces the bitterness experienced by the unnamed American. Notice, however, how the German translation sets up the last line, creating a cohesive effect and reducing the surprise: “*Der Major heiratete sie weder im Frühling noch zu irgend einer anderen Zeit*” (70-71). [The major married her neither in spring nor at some other time]. The sentence in translation is more fluent, but the unexpected tag is lost through the parallelism set up with the neither-nor construction.

Horschitz's tendency toward parallelism as demonstrated by the above example relates to one of Hemingway's most celebrated prose features, and one that repeatedly creates fragmentation in his fiction: the participial phrase. Writing about this form, Sandra Thompson notes that this unit "serves as a device that allows the speaker/writer to present certain material as background against which certain other material can be put forth . . ." (44). The sentence with the participial phrase, as Thompson goes on to note, is often unclear due to the ambiguous relationship between the foregrounded material and the background-providing participial phrase: "the detached participle does not explicitly express any logical or temporal relationship with the material for which it is the background . . ." (44-45).

Hemingway's use of the detached participial phrase fits into his general stylistic trend—a fragmentary style that, as we have seen, resists order-giving cohesion and clarity. One finds a participial phrase in this typical Hemingway sentence from "Indian Camp": "They walked up from the beach through a meadow that was soaking wet with dew, following the young Indian . . ." (16). Part of the fragmentation of this sentence comes from the distance between the participle and its subject. The subject, as a result, is not initially clear. One notices the clarity in the translation as the participle is removed and we, instead, are faced with a compound predicate with a clear subject for both finite verbs: "*Sie gingen von Strand hinauf durch ein tautriefende Wiese, und folgten dem jungen Indianer . . .*" (15) [They went up from the beach through a dew-dripping meadow and followed the young Indian]. The transformation of the participle into the second member of a compound predicate

becomes Horschitz's strategy throughout *In unserer Zeit*. We see this again, for example, in "The Three-Day Blow" as we read: "He stood on the porch looking out" (45). Horschitz's version becomes, "*Er stand auf der Schwelle und blickte um sich*" (39) [He stood on the threshold and looked around himself].

It is certainly not that the reader is unable to make sense out of Hemingway's sentence. The structure, however, again creates a gap as the subject of these clauses is distanced from the clauses themselves.¹² By using the compound predicate structure, Horschitz's versions have heightened parallelism and are thus more cohesive. Of course, this is another case where Horschitz's options are limited. She is not simply disregarding the participial form. German does not have a progressive aspect, and, therefore, Horschitz is unable to capture Hemingway's syntax. The result, though, is nevertheless translational loss.

While Hemingway's prose is peppered with participial phrases, one of the best examples of its use occurs in Chapter XII. In this vignette, the participle functions to give us a sense of raw, chaotic, and immediate action:

Then he cursed the bull, flopped the muleta at him, and swung back from the charge, his feet firm, **the muleta curving** and at each swing **the crowd roaring**. . . . **The bull looking** at him straight in front, **hating**. . . . **Villalta standing straight** . . . Villalta, his hand up at the crowd and **the bull roaring blood, looking straight** at Villalta and **his legs caving**. (139, emphasis mine)

Dann beschimpfte er den Stier, schlug nach ihm mit der Muleta und schwang von seinem Angriff mit geschlossenen Füßen und geschwungener Muleta zurück, und bei jedem Schwung brüllte die Menge. . . . Der Stier sah ihn haßerfüllt grade von vorn an. . . . Villalta stand grade. . . . Villalta hob die Hand zur Menge empor; der Stier keuchte Blut und sah Villalta an; seine Beine gaben nach. (119)

[Then he cursed the bull, struck after him with the muleta and swung back from his attack with locked feet and curved muleta, and by each swing the crowd bellowed. . . . The bull looked at him hatefully from the front. . . . Villalta stood straight Villalta raised the hand up to the crowd; the bull panted blood and looked at Villalta; his legs gave way.]

One notices several things about the translation. First, Horschitz does an admirable job in capturing accurately the sequence of events. This is, however, part of the problem. T.S. Eliot in “Burnt Norton” writes, “Time past and time future / What might have been and what has been / Point to one end, which is always present” (118). The participial phrase gives us this sensation of the immediate, of the chaotic, of events happening simultaneously, of—quite simply—the present: “curving,” “roaring,” “looking,” “hating,” “standing,” and “caving.” By using just the simple past, Horschitz is unable to recreate the emphasis on the present. Horschitz’s

substitutions all seem relegated to the distant past and the logic of sequential description.

The participial phrase also highlights the excitement of the moment. Part of this excitement is caused by fragments, which are created by the non-finite participles. By using tense-carrying verbs, Horschitz transforms the fragments into complete sentences, thus losing the sense of excitement. Also, as we observed in Chapter Four, Hemingway's use of the participle puts the emphasis on dynamic action. Horschitz's verbs appear quite static in comparison.

The third frequently used device to establish cohesion, in addition to metadiscourse expressions and parallelism, is the known-new contract. Writing about this stylistic strategy, Kolln states, "The writer has an obligation, a contract of sort, to fulfill expectations in the reader—to keep the reader on familiar ground. The reader has every right to expect each sentence to be connected to what has gone before by means of a known element" (30). The known-new contract is fulfilled when the writer utilizes an opening sentence slot to given the reader previously established information and then moves in the second half of the sentence to new information, thus allowing the reader to build on previously established material in a logical manner.

It should come as no surprise that Hemingway, in writing a fragmented text, often violates the known-new contract. Horschitz's tendency, however, is to bring Hemingway's syntax back into compliance by utilizing this technique. In this two-sentence excerpt from "Indian Camp" Hemingway begins the second sentence with

an empty-it construction, a usage that occurs “in those cases where there isn’t a semantically meaningful subject” (Berk 21): “Then they went into the woods and followed a trail that led to the logging road that ran back into the hills. It was much lighter on the logging road . . .” (16). The empty-it provides no cohesion—no anaphoric reference. Notice Horschitz’s alteration: “*Dann kamen sie in den Wald und folgten einer Spur, die auf den Holzfällerweg führte, der in die Berge zurücklief. Auf dem Holzfällerweg . . .*” (15) [Then they came into the woods and followed a trail that led to the logging road that ran back into the mountains. On the logging road . . .]. By repeating the reference to the logging road, Horschitz provides cohesion where none exists in the original.

Another representative example occurs in “The Battler.” After an extended section of dialogue in which Bugs has asked Nick if he is hungry, Hemingway begins the next paragraph with new information: “Into the skillet he was laying slices of ham” (72). Horschitz reorders the sentence in order to provide a smoother transition for the description: “*Er legte Schinkenscheiben in eine Pfanne*” (60) [He laid slices of ham into the pan]. (It is also interesting to note that Horschitz does not begin a new paragraph with this line but keeps it with Bugs’s previous line, therefore establishing even more cohesion.)

The following chart provides several more examples of Horschitz’s tendency to utilize the known-new contract that Hemingway has weakened or disregarded:

Hemingway	Horschitz	Translation rendition
“There was a big fire in the fireplace. The wind made it roar.” (“TT-DB” 46).	“ <i>Im Kamin brannte ein großes Feuer. Es heulte im Sturm</i> ” (39).	In the fireplace burned a large fire. It howled in the storm.
“It was not even very important. The wind blew everything like that away” (“TT-DB” 61)	“ <i>Es war nicht einmal sehr wichtig. Sowas blies der Wind alles weg</i> ” (51).	It was not even very important. Something like that the wind blew all away.
“‘Signorina,’ Peduzzi called tenderly, Everyone they met . . . Peduzzi greeted elaborately” (“OOS” 128).	“‘ <i>Signorina,</i> ’ rief Peduzzi zärtlich, Peduzzi begrüßte alle, die ihnen . . . begegten, mit großer Wichtigtuerei” (110).	‘Signorina,’ Peduzzi called tenderly, Peduzzi greeted everyone . . . who encountered them with great pomposity.
“Nick crawled out under the mosquito netting . . . to look at the morning. The grass was wet . . .” (“BT-HR” 197).	“ <i>Nick kroch unter dem Moskitonetz . . . den Morgen zu betrachten. Beim Herauskriechen . . .</i> ” (169).	Nick crawled under the mosquito net to observe the morning. By crawling out
“He washed his hands at the stream. He was excited to be near it” (“BT-HR” 198)	“ <i>Er wusch seine Hände im Strom. Seine Nähe erregte ihn</i> ” (170).	He washed his hands in the stream. Its nearness excited him.

Horschitz’s utilization of the known-new contract fits into her overall strategy of guiding the reader through the text, of providing information at the beginning of her sentences, as we have witnessed on numerous occasions, in order to remove Hemingway’s gaps and help create a cohesive text. A final example of this strategy occurs in “Out of Season” as Hemingway provides a quote but saves the attribution to the end: “‘It is closed until two,’ somebody passing in the street said scornfully” (129). Horschitz, in keeping with her tendency to heighten the cohesion of the text,

moves the attribution to the opening sentence slot (111) so the reader knows from the beginning who is speaking this line.

Overtranslation

Finally, one of Horschitz's tendencies, as we observed in Chapter Five, is to get ahead of the source text in providing overly specific translations. John Sallis describes this technique as overtranslation, which "occurs when . . . a word or phrase is, from the very beginning of the text, translated in such a way that in its translated form it signifies the mutated sense reached only through the developments in the text" (101-102). The result is a more cohesive text but one that seems to run counter to Hemingway's intention of creating gaps. In Chapter V, for example, "the wall of a hospital" (63) becomes "*der Mauer des Lazarettts*" (53) [the wall of a military hospital]. The reader's initial confusion in the chapter comes from trying to link the action of the scene (the execution of cabinet members) with the setting (a hospital). By providing a term with wartime implications, Horschitz allows a German reader to make more sense of the violence of the scenario but reduces the passage's irony.

A similar situation occurs in "Out of Season" as Hemingway's setting at one point in the story—a "street of Cortina" (128) turns into Horschitz's "*Hauptstraße von Cortina*" (109) [main street of Cortina]. This alteration in the translation initially seems unimportant until one realizes that something illegal is taking place. Walking down the main street is certainly more conspicuous than simply walking down a

street. While Hemingway eventually uses the term “main street” two paragraphs later, Horschitz has already established this location clearly for the reader.

Another seemingly insignificant overtranslation occurs in “Mr. & Mrs. Elliot.” One of the words that Hemingway uses repeatedly at the beginning of the story is “sick”: “She was sick and when she was sick she was sick as Southern women are sick” (109). Each time Horschitz translates this word as “*seekrank*” [sea sick]. Horschitz has clarified for the reader the cause of Cornelia’s sickness. In the original the reader is initially left to speculate whether Mrs. Elliot’s sickness might actually be morning sickness. Hemingway eventually closes the gap by using the term “sea sickness” two sentences later, but, as in the previous example, Horschitz, in her version of the story, has already disclosed the cause of Cornelia’s sickness.

Horschitz gets ahead of the translation frequently, filling in gaps in various ways to provide a more cohesive translation. In “The Doctor and the Doctor’s Wife,” when the doctor returns home after his embarrassing confrontation with Dick Boulton, his wife asks a very vague question: “Was anything the matter?” (29). Horschitz’s translation—“*Ist irgendwas passiert?*” (26) [Has something happened?]—presupposes that some incident has occurred. And in “Soldier’s Home,” Hemingway’s ambiguous sentence—“His father was non-committal” (91)—in reference to Krebs’ father—becomes, “*Mit seinem Vater konnte er überhaupt nicht reden*” (77) [He could absolutely not talk with his father]. Within the context of the story, this sentence clearly relates back to an earlier indication of communication difficulty between Krebs and his mother.

V.

There are, of course, many other examples of Hemingway's fragmented style and Horschitz's strategies to create a more cohesive text. In "Soldier's Home," for example, Horschitz inverts the clauses in several of Hemingway's sentences in order to reinforce a logical cause-effect relationship that Hemingway has reversed. Or in "Out of Season," we see an example of Horschitz's occasional approach as she combines sentences to create hypotactic logic. Hemingway's two sentences—"He was quite a way up the hill. Peduzzi called to him" (136)—become one with the second sentence subordinated: "*Er war schon ein ganzes Stück den Berg hinauf, als Peduzzi ihm zurief*" (116) [He was already an entire bit up the mountain as Peduzzi called to him].

Horschitz's approach is certainly not unique among translators. Remarking on Hans-Georg Gadamer's general observation that translation is, in effect, highlighting, Sallis writes,

[A] translation that takes its task seriously is always clearer than the original: expressions that in the original remain ambiguous, that bear manifold meanings, must be resolved by the translator into univocal expressions in all but those few fortunate instances in which the language of the translation offers expressions comparably ambiguous or manifold. But such resolution entails, on the other hand, that the translation is also flatter than the original, that—in Gadamer's

phrase—“it lacks some of the overtones that vibrate in the original.”

(72-73)

Is *In unserer Zeit*, due to Horschitz’s tendency toward cohesion, “out of tune” as Hemingway’s comment in his letter to Liveright would suggest? Or is it simply missing “some of the overtones that vibrate in the original”? Does the translation retain, to borrow from Edmund Wilson’s introductory comments to the 1930 edition of the text, “its very mixed and fragmentary character” (ix) or have Horschitz’s efforts to create a more readable text filled in these important gaps?

What we are certainly left with is an altered text—a “flatter text” as Sallis suggests. Horschitz’s desire to “fix” the source text, to bring it into compliance, to standardize it so that a German reader might be able to make easier sense out of Hemingway’s prose changes *In Our Time* in important ways. The key concern is that confusion and chaos is crucial for the text. *In Our Time* is about a world that is chaotic, disorderly, and fragmented. The text, therefore, needs to exhibit this fragmentation and resist cohesion. The language of *In Our Time* thus becomes iconic in that “it imitates, in its signals of textual forms, the meanings that they represent” (Leech and Short 233).

Additionally, the creation of a more cohesive text affects how Hemingway expects a reader will confront the material. In “Decoding Papa,” Scholes explores the way in which ambiguity functions in a Hemingway text to put certain demands on the reader: “The words on the page are not the story. The text is not the diegesis. The story is constructed by the reader from the words on the page by an inferential

process The reader's role is in a sense creative—without it no story exists . . .” (35).

Advancing a similar theory, Matthew Stewart notes that Hemingway's style “requires a new sort of patience and attentiveness [on the part of the reader], a willingness to suspend the desire for missing information until a later point in the story (or forever).” Stewart continues, “The payoff comes in the rich ambiguities of the stories and in the emotional resonance produced by Hemingway's craft of omission” (23). Horschitz, in some important ways, takes over this process from readers by doing their inferential work. While Horschitz definitely follows Kolln's advice—“the writer must keep the reader and the reader's expectations in mind” (27)—this approach robs the reader of the crucial “payoff” that Stewart mentions.

What is interesting is that Horschitz does this despite the fact that she is clearly again operating under the premises of formal-equivalent translation. She is not taking extreme liberties and translating *In Our Time* based on dynamic-equivalent terms. Her subtle modifications, however, demonstrate again the powerful effect that seemingly minor alterations can have on a text. The pattern of her adjustments tells us something not only about the German version of the text that emerges but also about Hemingway's technique as she shores up Hemingway's fragments in order to create a more linguistically cohesive, but ironically less thematically coherent work.

Notes

¹ Citations of *In Our Time* are from the 1925 Boni and Liveright edition. Citations from *In unserer Zeit* are from the German first edition, published in 1932 by Rowohlt.

² In “Juxtaposition in Hemingway’s *In Our Time*” Linda Wagner argues for the significance of several titles in the text. Concerning “Soldier’s Home,” Wagner writes, “Soldier’s Home” with its echo of ‘old folks’ home’ or veterans’ home’ catches the reader off-balance twice—first when he realizes that Krebs is in his own home, where people love him, and therefore better off than someone in a ‘home’; and again, when he realizes that his first take is wrong, and that in Krebs’ home love is used—albeit unintentionally—to control instead of to protect” (126).

³ These various versions of the text are helpfully outlined by E.R. Hagemann: the *Little Review* edition, which appeared in the spring of 1923, contained what would later be Chapters I, II, III, IV, V, X. In 1924 *in our time* was published by Three Mountains Press. This contained 18 of the vignette-like chapters. In 1925, Boni and Liveright issued the first American edition, which contained 15 chapters with longer stories interspersed between these, concluding with the vignette “L ‘Envoi’” (38-40). In 1930 Scribners, Hemingway’s new publisher, came out with the second American edition, which, in addition to the “Introduction by the Author” (i.e., “On the Quai Smyrna”), contained various alterations from the Boni and Liveright edition, most notably the substitution of “Luz” for “Ag” in “A Very Short Story” in order to avoid possible charges of libel from the real-life Agnes von Kurowsky, an introductory disclaimer that all characters in the work are fictitious, and various changes to “Mr. and Mrs. Elliot.”

⁴ Writing specifically about the chapters, Hagemann argues that the 1925 edition is the “preferred text”—a claim that he bases heavily on Hemingway’s statements of satisfaction when he returned the galley proofs to Boni and Liveright. Hagemann writes, “Since he was satisfied with the final product, so should we be . . .” (45).

⁵ A rude equivalent for “knock up” could be “*dick machen*” [make fat]. One additional moment of translation loss in this story happens with George’s reference to Nick as “Mike.” While Horschitz at times keeps this confusing situation straight, George’s important line (also infused with youthful slang)—“Gee, Mike, don’t you wish we could just bum together” (146)—becomes, “*Gott, Nick, wär’s nicht herrlich, wenn wir einfach rumstrolchen könnten?*” (125) [God, Nick, wouldn’t it be glorious, when we simply could prowl around?]. In addition to the shift from “Mike” to “Nick,” Horschitz’s translation of this line also fails to replicate a youthful voice as “Gee” turns into “*Gott*” and Horschitz inserts the romantic “*herrlich*” into the conversation.

⁶ Nick is certainly not alone among characters in *In Our Time* in revealing a level of immaturity. Hemingway provides linguistic evidence throughout of a general childishness that infects a number of these characters. Consider, for example, the wife's repeated use of the childish word "kitty" in "Cat in the Rain" (not "Kitty in the Rain"). It is interesting to note that in the translation, "kitty" is not translated as its equivalent—"Kätzchen" but as "*kleine Katze*" [small cat]—a more adult expression.

⁷ Despite conventional wisdom that claims that Hemingway only used short, declarative sentences, many sentences in *In Our Time* are actually quite long and rambling. Part of the chaos in these sentences comes from the flurry of words without standard punctuation to organize the linguistic units into manageable segments. Horschitz's strategy when faced with these types of sentences is frequently to break them up into smaller units that are easier for a reader to follow. This usually happens with the insertion of semi-colons, as we see with Joe's first sentence in "My Old Man" or with the use of dashes to help delineate complicated structures. Or as in the last sentence of Chapter XV, the convoluted sentence in the original is broken up into two sentences in German. For his part Hemingway seems not to have cared very much about the punctuation of *In Our Time*. In a letter to Liveright, Hemingway noted, "My attitude toward punctuation is that it should be as conventional as possible" (SL 151). Hagemann contrasts Hemingway's "indifference toward accidentals [. . . with] his care about the text" (44). Nevertheless, punctuation does matter as it controls the interpretation of numerous sentences throughout the text. One instance that deserves special attention takes place in "Cross-Country Snow." Nick's response to George's question—"Are you glad [that Helen is going to have a baby]?"—is "Yes. Now" (147). Reynolds in *The Paris Years* rightfully attaches great significance to the period between "Yes" and "Now"—punctuation which indicates an important pause (188). The period expresses a full stop—a distinction between past and present, between "then" and "now." Horschitz's translation—"Ja, jetzt ja" (126)—eliminates this important pause.

⁸ Horschitz uses the verb "*kotzen*" in *A Farewell to Arms* as Hemingway's description "was very sick on the floor" becomes the more graphic "*auf den Boden kotzte*" (96) [puked on the floor]. The word also shows up in *The Sun Also Rises*, the most amusing instance being Bill's comment to Jake about Robert Cohn: "*Der ist absolut zum Kotzen*" [He is absolutely disgusting] or the more literal [He is absolutely to puke].

⁹ While it is often assumed that the narrator of both Chapter III and Chapter IV is the same British officer—a voice modeled on Hemingway's friend Chink Dorman-Smith—as Cohen successfully argues, the voices in the vignettes are quite different. Most notably, the speaker in Chapter IV "contrasts sharply with the laconic voice in Chapter III that narrates the thoroughly unexpected shooting of Germans" (25).

¹⁰ It should be noted that Horschitz would or should have been familiar with a tradition in German literature of reproducing unique aspects of characters' speech. During the period of German naturalism (1880-1900), writers frequently attempted to capture individual voices. The playwright Gerhart Hauptmann, for example, is famous for his use of "*Sekundenstil*," a technique that "seeks to reproduce the exact quality of human speech under the pressure of emotion from one second to the next" (Walker 143).

¹¹ *The Oxford English Dictionary* provides the following helpful definition for "pro-form": "A morpheme, word, lexical unit, or other clause constituent which concisely refers to and is used in place of a more specific expression occurring or implied elsewhere in the discourse."

¹² One interesting example of the lack of a subject for an infinitive clause appears in "Indian Camp" after the husband has committed suicide. Turning to Nick, his father says, "It was an awful mess to put you through" (20). Notice the difference in the translation: "*Scheußlich, daß du das mitmachen mußtest*" (19) [Horrible that you had to participate in this]. In the original the father takes responsibility for putting Nick through the situation, although he does conveniently absolve himself somewhat from responsibility by removing himself as agent. In the translation, the father saddles Nick with the responsibility for participating.

Conclusion

Every human being is . . . in the power of the language he speaks . . . (46)

—Friedrich Schleiermacher

But if you make it up instead of describe it you can make it round and whole and solid and give it life. You create it, for good or bad. It is made; not described. (*B-L* 216)

—Hemingway, “Monologue to the Maestro”

In the German Literary Archives in Marbach, Germany, there is a letter from Heinrich Maria Ledig-Rowohlt to Alfred Rice, Hemingway’s long-time lawyer, dated 15 September 1962—a little over a year after Hemingway’s suicide. Ledig-Rowohlt, having recently taken over the Rowohlt Verlag, revisits an issue that has caused numerous headaches over the past ten years: Annemarie Horschitz. Throughout the 1950s the publisher had complained repeatedly about Horschitz’s high translation fees and even asked Hemingway to intervene on behalf of the publisher. In the letter Ledig-Rowohlt does not dwell on the fee controversy but instead focuses on the quality of Horschitz’s work, recounting a story about a meeting with Hemingway in which he showed the author the German translation of *The Sun Also Rises* with all the translation mistakes marked with red ink. Commenting on Horschitz’s translation, Hemingway is reported to have said, “Sure it is bad, but could it be that bad, if we sold more than 300.000 copies?”

So is Horschitz “the finest translator” as Hemingway claimed in a letter to Ernst Rowohlt in 1946 (*SL* 615), or is her work in actuality “bad”? As I stated at the beginning of my study, questions like this, although dominant in discussions of translations, miss the mark. While blatant translation errors certainly need to be

identified, the alterations that happen when a text is moved from source language to target language are much more complex and demand a much broader approach than simply hunting for mistakes and, as a result, labeling the translation as good or bad. Translation involves the complicated acts of explanation, clarification, and evaluation of the source-language text. “Every translation” as Heidegger reminds us, “is . . . interpretation” (107).

What we have seen in this study is an analysis of Horschitz’s translational interpretations of Hemingway’s early fiction. Through this process I have attempted to provide a thorough overview of Horschitz’s translated texts. Such a study is important for two initial reasons. First, it focuses direct attention on the integral and sometimes problematic role of the translator, who is too often either looked at with unsubstantiated suspicion—“*Traduttore, traditore*” according to the famous Italian phrase—or, more troubling, is completely ignored.

Second, while such broad examinations of literary texts in translation are very important, they are, unfortunately, too rare. This lack of careful study is especially troubling when the author in question is one with a substantial international reputation. Although Hemingway became known “as the quintessential twentieth-century American writer” (Mellow 169), he, as well as his texts, repeatedly transcended national borders. More work certainly needs to be done to contextualize Hemingway as an international writer, and such studies must begin with careful examinations of his works in translation.

Unfortunately, there has been a widespread lack of interest in the careful study of Hemingway in translation. Carlos Baker, the dean of Hemingway scholars, in his introduction to *Hemingway and His Critics* expresses a representative attitude:

More than most American writers of his approximate stature, he has managed to write in such a way that the impact of his work carries easily across national boundaries, irrespective of the idiosyncratic ‘genius’ of the country it enters. The young Berliner who opens *In Einem Andern Land* and reads, “*Im Spätsommer jenes Jahres lebten wir in einem Hause in einem Dorfe, das über den Fluss und die Ebene bis zu den Bergen hinübersah,*” is having almost precisely the same imaginative experience as the old Roman who opens *Addio alle Armi* and reads, “*Sul finire dell’estate di quell’anno eravamo in una casa in un villaggio che di là del fiume e della pianure guardava le montagne.*” (17)

As this study has demonstrated, Baker’s pronouncement is woefully inaccurate. In this study we have seen how Horschitz interprets (and ultimately diminishes) stylistic techniques utilized by Hemingway. The German translation of *The Sun Also Rises* fails to carry over Hemingway’s central conceptual metaphors. In *Men Without Women* Hemingway’s repetition, which reinforces his ironic vision, is lost in Horschitz’s translation. Next, Frederic Henry’s carefully constructed understated narration in *A Farewell to Arms* is embellished in translation. And finally,

Hemingway's style of fragmentation is altered by Horschitz, the result being a more cohesive version of *In Our Time*.

While I have focused on a specific stylistic feature in each chapter, it should be noted that Horschitz's strategies of translation span across Hemingway's texts. As we observed, Horschitz's tendency for variety affects not only ironic repetition in *Men Without Women* but also conceptual metaphors in *The Sun Also Rises*. Metaphoric loss in translation, as noted throughout this study, is certainly evident in the translations of each of Hemingway's texts. And Hemingway's fragmented and understated style and Horschitz's corresponding tendency for cohesion and embellishment are certainly not unique to *In Our Time* and *A Farewell to Arms*. By isolating a stylistic feature in each translated text, however, we have been able to observe the significant effects that translational choices have on a *central* element of each source text.

Although reasons to account for shifts in translation are difficult to identify with complete certainty, I have proposed several possible explanations in my analysis. Of initial importance is Horschitz's apparent desire to "correct" Hemingway's prose. There are very real pressures on translators to address the supposed "mistakes" in the original text. Translators want to protect their reputation and so will often adjust the original based on their own assumptions about "good writing."

As we have observed at several points in the analysis, some of these changes come from Horschitz's tendency to domesticate Hemingway's texts. If translation is a

bridge, as it is often described, then it is most certainly an imperfect one. The message does not simply amble from one culture/language to another but undergoes complex adjustments. As Lawrence Venuti observes, “The aim of translation is to bring back a cultural other as the same, the recognizable, even the familiar.” The danger, as Venuti notes, is that this process can result in “a wholesale domestication of the foreign text . . .” (*TI* 18). While Horschitz avoids total domestication in her translations, many of her modifications are made to help the text conform to German standards. Her embellishment of *A Farewell to Arms* in order to comply with comparable German war narratives is an example.

Some of her translational adjustments are also the results of linguistic differences between English and German. Although these two languages are closely related, differences clearly exist. In her comparative study of German and English, Juliane House highlights various general tendencies in the two languages, specifically “German speakers’ preference of directness” (351) as well as explicitness (354)—trends that could affect Horschitz’s tendency to transform Hemingway’s ambiguous and understated prose. More significantly, as we noticed in Chapter Three, the translator is faced with very difficult linguistic differences between German and English when she is confronted with Hemingway’s metaphoric expressions.

A more pervasive concern, however, is Horschitz’s misunderstanding of Hemingway’s texts. This begins with a failure to appreciate the significance of Hemingway’s style. Horschitz, of course, is not unique in this lack of understanding. Percy Hutchinson, in a review of *Men Without Women* in the *New York Times Book*

Review, notes, “Hemingway’s is a stark naked style” (qtd. in Hanneman 356). And in an unflattering review of *A Farewell to Arms*, Donald Davidson claims, “Therefore style (as style is generally known) is wiped out, or is reduced to its lowest, most natural terms. It will take the form of simple, unelaborated predications, not unlike the sentences in a First Reader” (85-86).

The false assumption is that Hemingway’s art, because of its apparent simplicity, is style-less. Charles Scribner, Jr., in discussing the impact of *In Our Time*, writes about the tendency in criticism to ignore Hemingway’s deliberately constructed prose style, which is characterized by “the apparent simplicity of the writing and the seeming naturalness of the language. Each story is told so directly that the narration *seems* like a pane of perfectly clear glass through which one simply ‘sees’ what is happening” (xiv, emphasis mine).

Due to Horschitz’s lack of understanding of the significance of Hemingway’s style, her response is to make Hemingway more “literary.” This means variety, embellishment, cohesion, and the modification of idiomatic metaphors that ostensibly serve no purpose. These adjustments in translation are subtle, yet, as my study has demonstrated, significant. The irony, of course, is that in an attempt to make Hemingway more “literary,” Horschitz actually undercuts his aesthetic framework. In striving to make Hemingway less “simplistic,” she actually makes him more simplistic.

Hemingway’s style is based on linguistic structures that appear simple but actually point the way to a multi-faceted and complicated substructure. This is the

iceberg theory at work. The difference between surface and deep structures is what James Hinkle refers to when he claims, “Playing with the multiple meanings inherent in words is a pervasive feature of Hemingway’s writing” (107). The result is, as James Phelan describes, a readerly “experience” that is “complex, multi-layered, part intuitive, part self-conscious . . .” (47).

Horschitz’s misunderstanding of Hemingway’s style thus extends to broader interpretive issues as her stylistic adjustments are reflections of more pervasive misinterpretations of Hemingway’s narratives. Her surface-level stylistic modifications, to continue with Hemingway’s famous metaphor, begin to alter the larger substructure of his texts.

Horschitz’s misinterpretations, linguistically speaking, are due in part to the narrowness of her “frame,” to use Max Black’s term (28). Her translational focus is placed on Hemingway’s sentences. In her efforts, however, to provide faithful renditions of these sentences, she loses sight of broader issues. Her concern is on the micro-textual level (i.e., word, phrase, clause) and not on the macro-textual (i.e., the larger text) level. As a result, her translations provide generally appropriate micro-level equivalents. Her failure comes, however, in her inability to appreciate what Hemingway is doing on a macro-level through his use of certain stylistic techniques. Horschitz’s hesitancy to reproduce Hemingway’s stylistic patterns becomes, therefore, much more significant than simple stylistic adjustments.

As we have observed, Hemingway’s stylistic techniques, far from rhetorical flourish or mere coincidence, are essential elements in his fiction. As Paul Simpson

reminds us, “Choices in style are motivated, even if unconsciously, and these choices have a profound impact on the way texts are structured and interpreted” (22). *What* Hemingway writes is, therefore, intimately linked with *how* he formulates these ideas. The loss of these formal elements in their transfer into German results in significant loss in the translated texts.

Hemingway’s stylistic choices—metaphors that represent post-war reality, repetition that reinforces an ironic vision, understatement that is a reaction against war rhetoric, and fragmentation that reflects a varied and order-defying worldview—are linguistic manifestations of Hemingway’s principal concerns. As Roger Fowler notes, “Cumulatively, consistent structural options, agreeing in cutting the presented world to one pattern or another, give rise to an impression of a world-view, what I shall call ‘mind style’” (76).

Horschitz’s lack of attention in carrying over these stylistic choices results in significant diminishment of Hemingway’s “mind-style”—his worldview that is essential to his fiction. Hemingway’s style is crucial not only as he constructs his narratives but also as he chronicles an inter-war reality. Metaphor, repetition, understatement, and fragmentation all help Hemingway express his time. “A writer’s job,” Hemingway notes in his introduction to *Men at War*, “is to tell the truth” (xiv). These stylistic devices prove indispensable to that end.

Language thus becomes more than simply the means of expression. It becomes iconic—mirroring the reality it presents. For modern literature this type of language function is extremely prominent. As Michael Bell observes, “Cultural

periods are often characterized by dominant metaphors such as the medieval and Renaissance great chain of being, the eighteenth-century clock or machine, or the nineteenth-century organism. In the twentieth century, language itself became the pervasive metaphor” (18).

And this self-conscious language usage is certainly linked with cognition. Our thoughts and our language are interconnected in profound ways. Change the language, and thought is altered. In an insightful passage from Hemingway’s “The Undefeated,” the narrator addresses the mysterious language-thought connection as he enters Manuel’s mind: “He thought in bull-fight terms. Sometimes he had a *thought* and the particular piece of slang *would not come into his mind and he could not realize the thought*. His instincts and his knowledge worked automatically, and *his brain worked slowly and in words*” (201, emphasis mine).

By forcing us to grapple with the complex issues of language, thought, and reality, translation analysis allows us to examine not only the translated text but also the source-language text in a fresh way. In his “Dedicatory Letter” at the beginning of *The Good Soldier*, Ford Madox Ford remarks on the focus that the act of translation gives to the source text: “I had to translate it into French, that forcing me to give it much closer attention than would be the case in any reading however minute” (xxi). Almost a century earlier, Goethe asserts a similar sentiment as he describes a translation as “close to an interlinear version,” the reading of which “greatly facilitates our understanding of the original.” Goethe concludes, “We are led, yes, compelled as it were, back to the source text: the circle within which the

approximation of the foreign and the familiar, the known and the unknown constantly move, is finally complete” (66).

More scholarship is certainly needed to explore the complex movements that take place as a text is translated. This is true for all texts, but especially literary texts, in which stylistic issues play crucial roles. Because of traditional interest in Hemingway’s style, translation scholars are beginning to pay attention to Hemingway in translation. More work, however, is needed to help contextualize Hemingway within various international frameworks. Studies of other major authors in translation are either nonexistent or extremely limited. Such research, if performed correctly, can provide new insights into core issues within the fields of literary studies and linguistics.

As this study has aimed to demonstrate, a study of an author in translation allows us to apply helpful concepts from stylistics. The results of such analysis are not ends in themselves but help us read the literary text in new ways, thus closing the gap between linguistics and literary criticism. As G.W. Turner notes, the work of the linguist and literary critic need to go hand-in-hand: “the better the grammarian and the better the critic, the closer the two come together as the grammarian reaches up towards the whole text in all its subtlety and the critic reaches down deeper into the nature of the linguistic patterns that make the work of literary art” (144). Translation analysis, with its focus on both linguistic and textual levels, has the potential to bridge the long-standing divide between linguistics and literary criticism, to the benefit of both disciplines.

Works Cited

- “Annemarie Horschitz-Horst.” *Wikipedia: Die freie Enzyklopädie*. 16 July 2009. Web. 17 September 2009.
- Ardat, Ahmad K. “The Prose Style of Selected Works by Ernest Hemingway, Sherwood Anderson, and Gertrude Stein.” *Style* 14:1 (1980): 1-11. Print.
- Arnold, Matthew. “On Translating Homer: Three Lectures Given at Oxford.” *Essays by Matthew Arnold*. Ed. Humphrey Milford. London: Oxford University Press, 1914. Print.
- Atkins, John. *The Art of Ernest Hemingway: His Work and Personality*. London: Peter Nevill, 1952. Print.
- Azevedo, Milton. “Addio, Adieu, Adios: A Farewell to Arms in Three Romance Languages.” *The Hemingway Review* 25:1 (Fall 2005): 22-42. Print.
- Baker, Carlos. *Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story*. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1969. Print.
- . *Hemingway: The Writer as Artist*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952. Print.
- . “Introduction: Citizen of the World.” *Hemingway and His Critics: An International Anthology*. Ed. Carlos Baker. New York: Hill and Wang, 1961. Print.
- Barbarese, J.T. “Bert-and-Ernie Stylistics: Introducing Hemingway through a Discussion of Hemingway’s Style.” *Teaching Hemingway’s A Farewell to Arms*. Ed. Lisa Tyler. Kent: Kent State University Press, 2008. Print.

- Barthes, Roland. *S/Z*. Trans. Richard Miller. New York: Noonday, 1974. Print.
- Bassnett, Susan. *Translation Studies*. 3rd edition. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- . "Writing and Translating." *The Translator as Writer*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and Peter Bush. London: Continuum, 2006. 173-195. Print.
- Bayley, John. *Selected Essays*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984. Print.
- Bell, Michael. "The Metaphysics of Modernism." *The Cambridge Companion to Modernism*. Ed. Michael Levenson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 9-32. Print.
- Bell, Millicent. "Pseudoautobiography and Personal Metaphor." *Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms*. Ed. George Monteiro. New York: G.K. Hall & Co, 1994. 145-160. Print.
- Bennett, Andrew and Nicholas Royle. *An Introduction to Literature, Criticism and Theory*. 4th Edition. Harlow: Longman, 2009. Print.
- Berk, Lynn. *English Syntax: From Word to Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. Print.
- Black, Max. *Models and Metaphors*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1962. Print.
- Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961. Print.
- . *A Rhetoric of Irony*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974. Print.
- Bradbury, Malcolm and James McFarlane. "The Name and Nature of Modernism." *Modernism 1890-1930*. Ed. Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane. New York: Penguin, 1991. 19-55. Print.

- Brenner, Gerry. "A Hospitalized World." *Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms*. Ed. George Monteiro. New York: G.K. Hall & Co, 1994. 130-144. Print.
- Bütow, Hans. "Ernest Hemingway, ein Schriftsteller aus U.S.A." *Frankfurter Zeitung* (5 July 1934): 335-336. Print.
- Cass, Colin S. "The Look of Hemingway's 'In Another Country.'" *Studies in Short Fiction* 18:3 (Summer 1981): 309-313. Print.
- Childs, Peter. *Modernism*. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.
- Cobley, Evelyn. *Representing War: Form and Ideology in First World War Narratives*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993. Print.
- Cohen, Milton. *Hemingway's Laboratory: The Paris in our time*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2005. Print.
- Comely, Nancy R. and Robert Scholes. *Hemingway's Genders: Rereading the Hemingway Text*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994. Print.
- Corbett, Edward P.J. and Robert J. Connors. *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. 4th Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. Print.
- Cowley, Malcolm. *A Second Flowering: Works and Days of the Lost Generation*. New York: Viking, 1973. Print.
- , ed. *Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews*. Second Series. New York: Viking Press, 1963. Print.
- Crowley, Sharon. "The Current-Traditional Theory of Style: An Informal History." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 16:4 (Fall 1986): 233-250. Print.

- Crystal, David and Derek Davy. *Investigating English Style*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1969. Print.
- Dagut, M.B. "Can Metaphor Be Translated?" *Babel* 22:1 (1976): 21-33. Print.
- Darbyshire, A.E. *A Grammar of Style*. London: Andre Deutsch, 1971. Print.
- Davidson, Donald G. "Perfect Behavior." *Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms*. Ed. George Monteiro. New York: G.K. Hall & Co, 1994. 84-87. Print.
- Davidson, Donald H. "What Metaphors Mean." *Inquiries into Truth and Interpretation*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984. 245-264. Print.
- DeFalco, Joseph. *The Hero in Hemingway's Short Stories*. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1979. Print.
- Dietrich, Max. "Ernest Hemingway." *Hochland* 30 (April 1933): 89-91. Print.
- Doderer, Klaus. "Die angelsächsische Short Story und die deutsche Kurzgeschichte." *Neueren Sprachen* 2 (1953): 417-424. Print.
- Donaldson, Scott. "Hemingway's Morality of Compensation." *American Literature* 43:3 (1971): 399-420. Print.
- . "Preparing for the End: Hemingway's Revisions of 'A Canary for One.'" *Studies in American Fiction* 6 (Autumn 1978): 203-11. Print.
- Douthwaite, John. *Towards a Linguistic Perspective of Foregrounding*. Torino: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2000. Print.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983. Print.

- Eliot, T.S. *Complete Poems and Plays, 1909-1950*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1958. Print.
- . *The Sacred Wood and Major Early Essays*. New York: Dover, 1997. Print.
- Ellis, Donald G. *From Language to Communication*. Philadelphia: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1999. Print.
- Fadiman, Clifton P. "A Fine American Novel." *Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms*. Ed. George Monteiro. New York: G.K. Hall & Co, 1994. 81-83. Print.
- . "Hemingway—ein amerikanischer Byron." *Der Querschnitt* 13 (April 1933): 235-240.
- Fallada, Hans. "Ernest Hemingway oder Woran liegt es?" *Literatur* 33 (Sept. 1931): 672-674. Print.
- . "Gespräch zwischen Ihr und Ihm über Ernest Hemingway: *In unserer Zeit*" *Die Literatur* 35 (Oct. 1932): 21-24. Print.
- Farrell, James T. "The Sun Also Rises." *Ernest Hemingway: The Man and His Work*. Ed. John K.M. McCaffery. New York: Avon, 1950. Print.
- Flora, Joseph M. *Reading Hemingway's Men Without Women*. Kent: Kent State University Press, 2008. Print.
- Ford, Ford Madox. Dedicatory Letter to Stella Ford. *The Good Soldier*. By Ford. New York: Vintage, 1989. xix-xxiv. Print.
- Fowler, Roger. *Linguistics and the Novel*. London: Methuen, 1977. Print.

- Friedrich, Hugo. "On the Art of Translation." *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*. Ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992. 11-16. Print.
- Frielinghaus, Helmut. "Re-translation." *Translation Review* 63 (2002): 79. Print.
- Frost, Robert. *The Poetry of Robert Frost*. Ed. Edward Connery Lathem. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979. Print.
- Fussell, Paul. *The Great War and Modern Memory*. 25th Anniversary Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. Print.
- Gay, Peter. *Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider*. New York: Harper and Row, 1968. Print.
- Gerogiannis, Nicholas. Introduction. *Complete Poems: Ernest Hemingway*. Ed. Nicholas Gerogiannis. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992. Print.
- Gibbs, Raymond. *The Poetics of the Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984. Print.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. *Schriften zur Literatur*. Rpt. in *Werke*. By Johann Wolfgang Goethe. Hamburg: Wegener, 1967. Excerpt from *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig*. Ed. Andre Lefevere. Assen/Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1977. 38-39. Print.
- . "Translations." Trans. Sharon Sloan. *The Translation Studies Reader*. 2nd edition. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York: Routledge. 64-66. Print.

- Graham, John. "Ernest Hemingway: The Meaning of Style." *Modern Fiction Studies* 6 (1960-1961): 298-313. Print.
- Grebstein, Sheldon Norman. *Hemingway's Craft*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973. Print.
- Greenbaum, Sidney and Randolph Quirk. *A Student's Grammar of the English Language*. Burnt Mill, Harlow, Essex: Longman, 1990. Print.
- Grimes, Larry. "Even the Darkness is Light? Or, Does the Sun Also Rises?" *Teaching Hemingway's The Sun Also Rises*. Ed. Peter Hays. Moscow, Idaho: University of Idaho Press, 2003. 149-173. Print.
- Grimm, Jakob. "Über das Pedantische in der deutschen Sprache." *Kleinere Schriften I*. 2nd edition. Berlin: Dümmler's Verlagshaus, 1879. Excerpt from *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig*. Ed. Andre Lefevere. Assen/Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1977. 95. Print.
- Hagemann, E.R. "A Collation, with Commentary, of the Five Texts of the Chapters in Hemingway's *In Our Time*, 1923-1938." *Critical Essays on Hemingway's In Our Time*. Ed. Michael Reynolds. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1983. 38-49. Print.
- Halliday, M.A.K. *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. New York: Elsevier, 1977. Print.
- . "Hemingway's Ambiguity: Symbolism and Irony." *Hemingway: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Robert P. Weeks. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1962. 52-71. Print.

- Halliday, M.A.K. and Ruqaiya Hasan. *Cohesion in English*. Hong Kong: Longman, 1976. Print.
- Halverson, Sandra. "The Concept of Equivalence in Translation Studies." *Target* 9:2 (1997): 207-234. Print.
- Hanne, Michael. "Metaphors for the Translator." *The Translator as Writer*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and Peter Bush. London: Continuum, 2006. 208-224. Print.
- Hanneman, Audre. *Ernest Hemingway: A Comprehensive Bibliography*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1967. Print.
- Hawkes, Terence. *Metaphor*. London: Methuen, 1972. Print.
- Heidegger, Martin. *Was Heisst Denken?* Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1961. Print.
- Heller, Arno. "The Fading of a Legend: Hemingway's Reception in Germany and Austria." *The Hemingway Review* (Special European Issue, Summer 1992): 27-35. Print.
- Hemingway, Ernest. *By-Line: Ernest Hemingway: Selected Articles and Dispatches of Four Decades*. Ed. William White. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967. Print.
- . *The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway: The Finca Vigia Edition*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1998. Print.
- . *Death in the Afternoon*. 1932. New York: Scribner, 1960. Print.
- . *A Farewell to Arms*. 1929. New York: Scribner, 1995. Print.
- . *Fiesta*. Trans. Annemarie Horschitz. Berlin: Rowohlt, 1928. Print.

- . *Fiesta*. 1928. Trans. Annemarie Horschitz. Berlin: Rowohlt Taschenbuch, 2007. Print.
- . *Green Hills of Africa*. 1935. New York: Scribner, 2003. Print.
- . *In einem andern Land*. Trans. Annemarie Horschitz. Berlin: Rowohlt, 1930. Print.
- . *In einem andern Land*. 1930. Trans. Annemarie Horschitz. Berlin: Rowohlt Taschenbuch, 1999. Print.
- . *In Our Time*. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1925. Print.
- . *In Our Time*. New York: Scribner, 1931. Print.
- . *In unserer Zeit*. Trans. Annemarie Horschitz. Berlin: Rowohlt, 1932. Print.
- . Introduction. *Men at War*. Ed. Ernest Hemingway. New York: Bramhall House, 1979.
- . *Männer*. Trans. Annemarie Horschitz. Berlin: Rowohlt, 1929. Print.
- . *A Moveable Feast*. New York: Scribner, 1964. Print.
- . *Selected Letters, 1917-1961*. Ed. Carlos Baker. New York: Scribner, 1981. Print.
- . *The Sun Also Rises*. 1926. New York: Scribner, 1995. Print.
- Hinkle, James. "What's Funny in *The Sun Also Rises*." *Ernest Hemingway's The Sun Also Rises: A Casebook*. Ed. Linda Wagner-Martin. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002. 107-123. Print.
- Hoffman, Michael. *Gertrude Stein*. Boston: Twayne, 1976. Print.
- Holmes, James S. "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies." *The Translation Studies Reader*. 2nd edition. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York: Routledge, 180-193. Print.

- . "Poem and Metapoem: Poetry from Dutch to English." *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988. 9-21. Print.
- Horschitz, Annemarie. Letter to Ernest Hemingway. 15 June 1933. Ernest Hemingway Collection. John F. Kennedy Library. Boston, Massachusetts. Print.
- . Letter to Ernest Hemingway. 21 Sept. 1934. Ernest Hemingway Collection. John F. Kennedy Library. Boston, Massachusetts. Print.
- . Letter to Ernest Hemingway. 23 Oct. 1934. Ernest Hemingway Collection. John F. Kennedy Library. Boston, Massachusetts. Print.
- . Letter to Ernest Hemingway. 26 Sept. 1935. Ernest Hemingway Collection. John F. Kennedy Library. Boston, Massachusetts. Print.
- House, Juliane. "Contrastive Discourse Analysis and Misunderstanding: The Case of German and English." *Contrastive Sociolinguistics*. Ed. Marlis Hellinger and Ulrich Ammon. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1996. 345-61. Print.
- Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." *The Translation Studies Reader*. 2nd Edition. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York: Routledge, 2004. 138-143. Print.
- Jameson, Frederic. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. London: Routledge, 2002. Print.
- Joachim, Hans A. "Romane aus Amerika." *Neue Rundschau* 41 (Sept. 1930): 396-409. Print.

- Johnston, Kenneth G. *The Tip of the Iceberg: Hemingway and the Short Story*. Greenwood: The Penkevill Publishing Company, 1987. Print.
- Kaiser, Herbert. "Hemingway's 'The Sun Also Rises' in deutscher Übersetzung." *Lebende Sprachen* 3-5 (1958-1960): 25-26.
- Kann, Hans-Joachim. "Ernest Hemingway and German Culture." *Neusprachliche Mitteilungen aus Wissenschaft und Praxis* 28 (1975): 16-20. Print.
- Keller, Rudi. *Linguistik und Literaturübersetzen*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag: 1997. Print.
- Kelly, L.G. *The True Interpreter: A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979. Print.
- Kern, Stephen. *The Culture of Time and Space 1880-1918*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983. Print.
- Kiaulehn, Walther. *Mein Freund der Verleger: Ernst Rowohlt und seine Zeit*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1967. Print.
- Kolln, Martha. *Rhetorical Grammar: Grammatical Choices, Rhetorical Effects*. 4th Edition. New York: Longman, 2002. Print.
- Kory, Fern. "What We Talk about When We Talk about Drinking in *The Sun Also Rises*." *Teaching Hemingway's The Sun Also Rises*. Ed. Peter Hays. Moscow, Idaho: University of Idaho Press, 2003. 207-223. Print.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. Print.

- Kvam, Wayne E. *Hemingway in Germany*. Athens: University of Ohio Press, 1973. Print.
- . "Zuckmayer, Hilpert, and Hemingway." *PMLA* 91:2 (Mar. 1976): 194-205. Print.
- Lakoff, George. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987. Print.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980. Print.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Turner. *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989. Print.
- Lania, Leo. "Mr. Hemingway vagaboniert Europa." *Das Tagebuch* IX (Dec. 1928): 2178-80. Print.
- Lawrence, D.H. Review of *In Our Time*. *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence*. Ed. Edward D. McDonald. New York: Viking, 1936. 365-366. Print.
- Ledig-Rowohlt, Heinrich Maria. Letter to Alfred Rice. February 1959. Deutsches Literaturarchiv. Marbach, Germany. Print.
- . Letter to Alfred Rice. 15 Sept. 1962. Deutsches Literaturarchiv. Marbach, Germany. 69-71. Print.
- . "Old Counter-Comrade Ernest." *100 Jahre Rowohlt: eine Illustrierte Chronik*. Ed. Hermann Gieselbusch, et al. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 2008. Print.
- Leech, Geoffrey N. and Michael H. Short. *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*. New York: Longman, 1982. Print.

- Lefevere, Andre. *Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context*. New York: Modern Language Association, 1992. Print.
- Levenson, Michael. Introduction. *The Cambridge Companion to Modernism*. Ed. Michael Levenson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 1-8. Print.
- Levin, Harry. "Observations of the Style of Ernest Hemingway." *Contexts of Criticism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957. 140-167. Print.
- Lewis, Robert B. Lewis. *A Farewell to Arms: The War of the Words*. New York: Twayne, 1992. Print.
- Lewis, Wyndham. *Men without Art*. London: Cassell and Company, 1934. Print.
- Leydecker, Karl. Introduction. *German Novelists of the Weimar Republic: Intersections of Literature and Politics*. Ed. Karl Leydecker. Rochester: Camden House, 2006. 1-17. Print.
- Link, Alex. "Taking Everything on It: A Stylistic Analysis of Linguistic Patterns in 'Hills Like White Elephants.'" *Hemingway Review* 23:2 (Spring 2004): 66-74. Print.
- Longyear, Christopher. *Linguistically Determined Categories of Meanings: A Comparative Analysis of Meaning in "The Snows of Kilimanjaro."* The Hague: Mouton, 1971. Print.
- Lynn, Kenneth S. *Hemingway*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987. Print.
- Lyons, Michael J. *World War I: A Short History*. 2nd Edition. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2000. Print.

- Lüdeke, Henry. "American Literature in German: A Report of Recent Research and Criticism—1931-1933." *American Literature* 6 (May 1934): 168-175. Print.
- Mann, Klaus. "Ernest Hemingway." *Neue Schweizer Rundschau* 24 (1 April 1931): 272-277. Print.
- Martin, Robert A. "Hemingway's Sun as Title and Metaphor." *The Hemingway Review* 6:1 (1986): 100. Print.
- Mason, Kirsten. "Metaphor and Translation." *Babel* 28:3 (1982): 140-149.
- Mellow, James. *Hemingway: A Life Without Consequences*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1992. Print.
- Meyers, Jeffrey. *Hemingway: A Biography*. New York: Harper and Row, 1985. Print.
- Mosse, George. *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars*. New York : Oxford University Press, 1990. Print.
- Mowrer, Edgar A. *This American World*. New York: J.H. Sears and Company, 1928. Print.
- Nagel, James. "Catherine Barkley and Retrospective Narration." *Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms*. Ed. George Monteiro. New York: G.K. Hall & Co, 1994.161-174. Print.
- Newmark, Peter. "The Translation of Metaphor." *Babel* 26:2 (1980): 93-100. Print.
- Nida, Eugene. "Principles of Correspondence." *The Translation Studies Reader*. 2nd Edition. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York: Routledge, 2004. 153-176. Print.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Birth of Tragedy and The Genealogy of Morals*. New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1956. Print.

- Ortony, Andrew. "Metaphor, Language, and Thought." *Metaphor and Thought*. Ed. Andrew Ortony. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993. 1-16. Print.
- Papajewski, Helmut. "The Critical Reception of Hemingway's Works in Germany Since 1920." *The Literary Reputation of Hemingway in Europe*. Ed. Roger Asselineau. New York: New York University Press, 1965. 73-92. Print.
- "Perfectly." *The Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Draft Revision 2008. 26 Oct. 2009. Web.
- Peterson, Richard K. *Hemingway: Direct and Oblique*. The Hague: Mouton & Co, 1969. Print.
- Phelan, James. "'Now I Lay Me': Nick's Strange Monologue, Hemingway's Powerful Lyric, and the Reader's Disconcerting Experience." *New Essays on Hemingway's Short Fiction*. Ed. Paul Smith. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998. 47-72. Print.
- Plath, James. "Le Torero and 'The Undefeated': Hemingway's Foray into Analytical Cubism." *Studeis in Short Fiction* 30:1 (Winter 1993): 35-43. Print.
- Polgar, Alfred. "Der neue Hemingway." *Das Tagebuch* 11 (Oct. 1930): 1646-1647. Print.
- "Pro-form." *The Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Draft Revision 2008. 6 Oct. 2009. Web.
- Putnam, Samuel. *Paris Was Our Mistress: Memoirs of a Lost and Found Generation*. Southern Illinois University Press, 1970. Print.

- Reich-Ranicki, Marcel. "Verräter, Brückenbauer, Waisenkinder." *Übersetzen: Vorträge und Beiträge von Internationalen Kongreß literarischer Übersetzer in Hamburg 1965*. Ed. Rolf Italiaander. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum, 1965. 69-73. Print.
- Reynolds, Michael. *Ernest Hemingway: The Paris Years*. Boston: Blackwell, 1989. Print.
- . *Hemingway: The Homecoming*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1999. Print.
- . *Hemingway's First War: The Making of A Farewell to Arms*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976. Print.
- . *Hemingway: The 1930s*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1997. Print.
- . *The Young Hemingway*. New York: Basil Blackwell, 1986. Print.
- Richards, I. A. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965. Print.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *The Rule of Metaphor*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977. Print.
- Sallis, John. *On Translation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002. Print.
- Schäffner, Christina. "Metaphor and Translation: Some Implications of a Cognitive Approach." *Journal of Pragmatics* 36 (2004): 1253-1269. Print.
- Schlegel, Friedrich. "Kritische Fragmente." *Kritische Schriften*. Ed. Wolf-dietrich Rasch. München: Hanser, 1964. 5-24. Print.

- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. "On the Different Methods of Translating." *The Translation Studies Reader*. 2nd Edition. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York: Routledge, 2004. 43-63. Print.
- Scholes, Robert. "Decoding Papa: 'A Very Short Story' as Work and Text." *New Critical Approaches to the Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway*. Ed. Jackson J. Benson. Durham: Duke University Press, 1990. 33-47. Print.
- Schopenhauer, Arthur. "Über Sprache und Worte." *Sämtliche Werke*. 2nd Edition. Ed. Julius Frauenstädt. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1891. Excerpt from *Translating Literature: The German Tradition*. Ed. Andre Lefevere. Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1977. 98-102. Print.
- Schorer, Mark. "The Background of Style." *Ernest Hemingway: The Critical Heritage*. Ed. Jeffrey Meyers. New York: Routledge, 1997. Print.
- Schulz, Dora and Heinz Griesbach. *1000 idiomatische Redensarten Deutsch: Mit Erklärungen und Beispielen*. Berlin: Langenscheidt, 1966. Print.
- Scribner, Charles Jr. Introduction. *The Enduring Hemingway*. Ed. Charles Scribner, Jr. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1974. xiii-xxix. Print.
- Searle, John R. "Metaphor." *Metaphor and Thought*. 2nd Edition. Ed. Andrew Ortony. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993. 83-111. Print.
- Seligo, Irene. "Mr. Hemingway und der Tod." *Frankfurter Zeitung* (1932): 969-970. Print.

- Semino, Elena and Jonathan Culpepper. Foreword. *Cognitive Stylistics: Language and Cognition in Text Analysis*. Philadelphia: J. Benjamins, 2002. ix-xvi. Print.
- Simpson, Paul. *Stylistics: A Resource Book for Students*. New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.
- Sinclair, Gail D. "A Cartography for Teaching *A Farewell to Arms*." *Teaching Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms*. Ed. Lisa Tyler. Kent: Kent State University Press, 2008. 59-84. Print.
- Slabey, Robert M. "The Structure of *In Our Time*." *Critical Essays on Hemingway's In Our Time*. Ed. Michael Reynolds. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1983. 76-87. Print.
- Smiley, Pamela. "Gender-Linked Miscommunication in 'Hills Like White Elephants.'" *Hemingway: Seven Decades of Criticism*. Ed. Linda Wagner-Martin. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1998. 81-94. Print.
- Smith, Hazel. *The Writing Experiment: Strategies for Innovative Creative Writing*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2005. Print.
- Smith, Paul. *A Reader's Guide to the Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway*. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1989. Print.
- Spilka, Mark. "The Death of Love in *The Sun Also Rises*." *Hemingway: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Robert P. Weeks. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1962. 127-138. Print.
- Springer, Anne. *The American Novel in Germany*. Hamburg: Cram, de Gruyter and Co., 1960. Print.

- Springman, Luke. *Carpe Mundum: German Youth Culture of the Weimar Republic*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2007. Print.
- Stein, Gertrude. *Three Lives*. 1909. New York: Dover, 1994. Print.
- Steiner, George. *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*. Oxford University Press, 1975. Print.
- Stewart, Matthew. *Modernism and Tradition in Ernest Hemingway's In Our Time*. Rochester: Camden House, 2001. Print.
- Stoehr, Ingo R. *German Literature of the 20th Century: From Aestheticism to Postmodernism*. Rochester: Camden House, 2001. Print.
- Stoneback, H.R. *Reading Hemingway's The Sun Also Rises*. Kent: The Kent State University Press, 2007. Print.
- Thompson, Geoff. *Introducing Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold, 1996. Print.
- Thompson, Sandra A. "Grammar and Discourse: The English Detached Participial Clause." *Discourse Perspectives on Syntax*. Ed. Flora Klein-Andreu. New York: Academic, 1983. 43-65. Print.
- Todd, B.E. "Farewell and Return." *Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms*. Ed. George Monteiro. New York: G.K. Hall & Co, 1994. 88. Print.
- Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995. Print.

- Travers, Martin Patrick Anthony. *German Novels on the First World War and Their Ideological Implications, 1918-1933*. Stuttgart: Akademischer Verlag Hans-Dieter Heinz, 1982. Print.
- Trotter, David. "The Modernist Novel." *The Cambridge Companion to Modernism*. Ed. Michael Levenson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. 70-99. Print.
- Turner, G.W. *Stylistics*. New York: Penguin, 1973. Print.
- Turner, Mark. *Death Is The Mother of Beauty*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987. Print.
- van den Broeck, Raymond. "The Limits of Translatability Exemplified by Metaphor Translation." *Poetics Today* 2:4 (1981): 73-87. Print.
- Vaughn, Elizabeth Dewberry. "In Our Time as Self-Begetting Fiction." *Hemingway: Seven Decades of Criticism*. Ed. Linda Wagner-Martin. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1998. 135-147. Print.
- Venuti, Lawrence. "I.U. Tarchetti's Politics of Translation; Or, A Plagiarism of Mary Shelley." *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York: Routledge, 1992. 196-230. Print.
- . *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul and Jean Darbelnet. "A Methodology for Translation." Trans. Juan C. Sager and M.-J. Hamel. *The Translation Studies Reader*. 2nd Edition. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. New York: Routledge, 2004. 128-137. Print.

- Wagner, Linda. "Juxtaposition in Hemingway's *In Our Time*." *Critical Essays on Hemingway's In Our Time*. Ed. Michael Reynolds. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1983. 120-129. Print.
- Wagner-Martin, Linda. Introduction. *Three Lives*. By Gertrude Stein. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins 2000. 3-26. Print.
- Walker, John. "Two Realisms: German Literature and Philosophy 1830-1890." *Philosophy and German Literature, 1700-1990*. Ed. Nicholas Saul. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 102-149. Print.
- Weseen, Maurice H. *A Dictionary of American Slang*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1934. Print.
- Westerfield, Lillian Leigh. *'This Anguish, Like a Kind of Intimate Song': Resistance in Women's Literature of World War II*. New York: Rodopi, 2003. Print.
- Williams, David. "The Poetics of Impersonality in *A Farewell to Arms*." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 59:2 (Winter 1989-90): 310-333. Print.
- Williams, Wirt. *The Tragic Art of Ernest Hemingway*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981. Print.
- Wilson, Edmund. Introduction. *In Our Time*. By Ernest Hemingway. New York: Scribner, 1930. ix-xv. Print.
- . *The Shores of Light: A Literary Chronicle of the Twenties and Thirties*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1952. Print.
- Winter, Jay. *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. Print.

Wolfram, Walt and Natalie Shilling-Estes. *American English*. Malden: Blackwell, 1998. Print.

Young, Philip. *Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1966. Print.