

CRITICAL RECEPTION OF HEMINGWAY'S NOVEL *FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS (KOMU ZVONI)* IN THE SLOVENE CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT, 1950–1960

Irma Kern

1. Introduction

The name Ernest Hemingway was first mentioned in the Slovene cultural environment in 1932, in the journal, *Dom in svet*,¹ but Hemingway attracted the attention of the Slovene reading public only when the translation of his novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls (Komu zvonj)* was published in 1950. It was the first work of the author to be translated into Slovene.

Since its first publication, the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls* has been reissued eight times, always in Janez Gradišnik's translation. This allows the conclusion that, despite social changes over the years and the ever-increasing distance from the subject matter, the translation has preserved its meaning in the Slovene cultural arena. It should also be noted that the reprinted text has not changed significantly; Gradišnik made only minor updates in 1964, when the translation was reprinted as part of the series *Sto romanov* (A hundred novels). The updates mostly encompassed stylistic corrections; obsolete words were replaced with contemporary counterparts. Given the few updates, the revised text does not have any significant shift in meaning.² It has remained unchanged in subsequent reprints. Nevertheless, there is evidence that the text remains current: in recent times, young generations of readers have taken an interest in it, especially after it was "rediscovered" and became part of the obligatory readings for high school examinations in 2005. This shows that Gradišnik's

¹ In Slovenia, Hemingway was first mentioned in an article by Boris Orel (1932) entitled "Jack London, Dolina meseca." *Dom in svet* 50, no. 7–8, 330.

² Gradišnik's translation of the novel was first published under the title *Komu zvonj* by Cankarjeva založba in 1950; an additional 4,000 copies were printed in 1951. It was published again in 1964 in the series *Sto romanov* by Cankarjeva založba. The third reprint was in 1975, in the series *Nobelovci* (Nobel Prize winners) by Cankarjeva založba; two reprints were issued in 1978, by Cankarjeva založba and Mladinska knjiga; in 1987 it was part of the reprinted series *Sto romanov* (publishing house Cankarjeva založba); the sixth reprint was in 1998 by Mladinska knjiga as part of the series *Veliki večni romani* (Great eternal novels); the seventh in 2004, by Mladinska knjiga, was a reprint of the series *Veliki večni romani*; the last reprint was in 2005, also by Mladinska knjiga.

translation, with its vivid, everyday language in particular in the dialogues, is still relevant.

2. Critical responses to the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls*

The critical responses to the Slovene translation of Hemingway's novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls* can be divided into two groups: early critical responses covering the first decade after the translation was published (1950–60), and critiques written after 1960. The analysis presented here deals with the early responses. These show that in the 1950s Slovene critical responses varied with social conditions and prevailing values. The textual world of the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls* was demanding for the general Slovene readership. Ever since its entry into the Slovene literary system, it has presented Slovene readers with generally unfamiliar and distant subject matter that originates in the American literary system; however, its core reveals elements of two cultures, American and Spanish. These elements manifest themselves in the full complexity of interpersonal relations at the crossroads of important historical events within the framework of the Spanish Civil War. The text is likely to raise many questions for Slovene readers. Thus professional critics played an important mediating role. Forewords, afterwords, and critiques of translations are intended to help readers better understand the text by analyzing the themes, motifs, and characterizations. Critical responses are supposed to familiarize readers with complex parts of a novel's narrative structure and also draw attention to formal and aesthetic characteristics that help shape the reading experience. At the same time, they offer important details on the impact of historical events on a person's life at the time of the events narrated in the novel. They prompt readers to examine the elements of the novel they can identify with in greater detail, which is an important source of motivation for reading. The following analysis of selected commentaries on *For Whom the Bell Tolls* helps ascertain to what extent critics met these expectations.

2.2 Early period of critical reading responses (1950–60)

2.2.1 Janez Gradišnik on Hemingway's novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls*

“Ernest Hemingway” is the title Janez Gradišnik gave to his short afterword to his translation of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1950). The translator does not mention any special, personal relation to the text. This can be attributed to the fact that analytical processes that have emerged in recent decades as part of translation studies were unknown at the time. In the first part of the afterword he includes, among other carefully selected basic data on Hemingway, the fact that during the Spanish Civil War Hemingway was a war correspondent in Madrid, reporting on the republican efforts, and he presents important milestones in Hemingway's

writing career. Gradišnik considers Hemingway a master of the short story, illustrated by the facts that not all his novels had been successful, and that he wrote only one play. When presenting the novels, he stresses that Hemingway's greatest success until then was the 1940 novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. In the following decade, Hemingway did not publish, illustrating, according to Gradišnik, a crisis in the author's creative impetus, which apparently ended with the publication of the novel *Across the River and into the Trees* (1950) (*Čez reko in med drevje* 1967). American author Sherwood Anderson's significant influence on Hemingway is also mentioned.³

Since Slovene readers first met Hemingway's writing with the translation of the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, Gradišnik thought it necessary to mention that the novel had been a great success all over the world, making Hemingway the most widely read and most famous American author of the day. At the same time, he informs the reader that the novel presents a step forward in the author's spiritual development. This is based on the translator's own knowledge of Hemingway's previous works, until then unknown to readers of Slovene. Thus he ascertains that although in his novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls* Hemingway maintains some characteristic motifs and traits which marked his previous work—such as the connection of love and death, violence against man, and primitive passions in people—in this novel Hemingway's protagonists turn from their pronounced individualism back to society. The translator emphasizes the importance of the English poet John Donne's verses in the motto of the novel, according to which an individual is nothing and life only becomes meaningful in a community of people. Gradišnik characterizes the novel's protagonist in the wider sense of the initial message, since, in his opinion, Robert Jordan "opposes death with his activity, but this activity is dedicated to community" (Gradišnik, 1950: 526). In view of the fact that at the time of writing in 1950—i.e., at the time of the post-war communist rebuilding of Slovene society, the predominant spiritual value was subordinating personal individual interests to communal activities, Gradišnik's stress on the collective orientation of the novel's main character served as a very convincing reading incentive for Slovene readers.

³ Hemingway allegedly freed himself from Sherwood Anderson's influence only in *The Torrents of Spring* (1926). In this work, Hemingway presented himself as a naturalistic pessimist who does not admit any morals, denying both emotion and passion. Gradišnik explains Hemingway's belief that a writer cannot get inside another's mind, so he will describe only what he sees and hears, reporting the real words and acts of his characters, while it is the reader's task to think about them and make conclusions (Gradišnik, 1950: 526).

But according to Gradišnik, the central theme of all Hemingway's work is death and its proximity. This often colors characters and situations with violence. Characters are generally portrayed as drunkards, wanton individuals, and brutal fighters. The shadow of destruction, physical or spiritual, lurks in every story. According to Gradišnik, women in Hemingway's stories are at their best when their behavior approaches that of men. Such is his perception of the figure of Pilar, who, in extraordinarily inhumane living conditions in the midst of the Spanish Civil War, took the lead in the guerrilla group's struggle for survival. Despite this, Gradišnik realizes that Hemingway's typical characters are hard-bitten "tough guys" in a merciless world. The characters are aware of being threatened by defeat and death, so they look for a truth to hold onto in the presence of death. Two paths exist for them: they can acknowledge sensual pleasure as the greatest and possibly only value in life, or they long for love as the perfect union with another being. Characters in Hemingway's novels are not insensitive but they do not desire to display their feelings. Gradišnik thinks that the contrast between "the outer lack of concern and inner agitation" is one of the most convincing characteristics of Hemingway's narratives (Gradišnik, 1950: 527).

Gradišnik had to tackle many practical translation problems, which forced him to study the novel's stylistic peculiarities, analyze, weigh with precision, and consider in detail choices of words and their stylistic peculiarities. In his comments on the author's style, Gradišnik emphasizes the originality of the dialog. This is Hemingway's way of expressing the subtlest of emotional experience—through simple everyday words—and it becomes the hallmark of his style. Gradišnik cites love scenes as examples of such endeavors in the novel's depiction of events.

The afterword centers on the message that the translation can satisfy readers who are merely interested in the story, but also more demanding readers who are looking for profound meaning. He thus helps Slovene readers unfamiliar with Hemingway's works by highlighting a path into the world of the novel and introducing them to the author, who was little known in Slovenia.

Yet Gradišnik might have been expected to attempt to bring the text closer to the Slovene reader by mentioning that the depiction of the Spanish Civil War might resonate with a divided Slovene nation during this time. Pointing thus out, he might have promoted—at least among experienced readers—self-reflection on co-existence as a fundamental issue. Curiously, nowhere in his overview of the novel's narrative structure does Gradišnik mention the similarity between the guerrilla warfare of the Spanish Civil War and in Slovenia during WW II. Maybe the atmosphere in

1950, when the afterword was written, was not opportune,⁴ but later on circumstances changed. The Slovene social climate, which had been constrained by strict communist policies deriving from the Soviet model⁵

⁴ The question of why Gradišnik did not mention in his afterword the similarity between guerrilla fighting in the Spanish Civil War and the Slovene partisans (which would further motivate and promote the interest of Slovene readers), can take us in two directions: either he could not write about it due to a lack of direct experience, or he wanted to avoid potential negative reactions on the part of the authorities to the depiction of Stalinism in the novel. The structure of events includes a historical person named André Marty, a Stalinist, who, when the translation of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* was published, was already banned from Slovenia on ideological grounds (due to the 1948 conflict between Yugoslavia and Stalin concerning the Informbureau). Indirect support for this can be found in Gradišnik's letter to Gordana Banjanin. In this letter, the translator reveals the social conditions in which he translated the novel for the Cankarjeva založba publishing house and its editor, the poet Cene Vipotnik. He wrote: "*For Whom the Bell Tolls*, in my opinion the author's best work, enchanted us, but we feared possible political consequences as the novel featured a negatively—presented André Marty, who was at the time a fanatic Stalinist (he later converted to democratic socialism), which was also true for our authorities. Vipotnik took a risk but nothing happened. Our reading public was enthusiastic about the novel, and it has been republished several times" (Banjanin, 2002: 163).

⁵ In 1945, Slovenia became one of the six republics of the new Yugoslavia, in which a communist system on the Soviet model prevailed until 1948. As a result, socialist realism, in which the main characters were war heroes and builders of socialism, became the prevailing literary style. Those who opposed socialist collectivism were considered enemies of society. The Informbiro (also Konformbiro or Information Bureau of Communist Parties) was an international advisory and steering body of nine European Communist and labor parties established in 1947 to co-ordinate the parties' activities. The following year, a conflict arose between Yugoslavia and the Informbiro. The seat of the Informbiro was in Belgrade until the summer of 1948. After the conflict with the Yugoslav Communist party (KPJ), it was transferred to Bucharest. The Informbiro was to be a means of spreading Soviet Communist Party power and influence. This became apparent between 1948 and 1956. After WW II, the Yugoslav head of state Josip Broz Tito and the state administration insisted on equal relations among socialist states and parties, while Stalin had his mind set on building a socialist block in which the Soviet Union would be primary. Stalin equated Yugoslavia with other Eastern European countries that had been liberated by the Red Army during the war. Therefore, their leaders ascended to head positions in those states with the help of the RA and Soviet Union, while Yugoslavia was liberated by its own force, the Yugoslav Army. For this reason, Yugoslavia demanded autonomy in managing its own state policy and economy.

In a special resolution of 28 June 1948, Stalin accused the KPJ of deviating from Marxism-Leninism and of animosity towards the Soviet Union,

immediately after the war, turned, together with Yugoslav policy, away from Soviet influences and the country gradually opened to literary influences of the Western world in the 1950s. In this respect, author Juš Kozak, who wrote an article on the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls* two years later (in 1952), draws attention to the aforementioned similarities between Spanish and Slovene partisan fighting.

2.2.2 Juš Kozak on the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls*

In 1952, Juš Kozak published his critical analysis of the translation of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* subtitled “Considerations of Art” (Komu zvoni: Razmišljanja o umetnosti)” in the journal *Novi svet*. Kozak discussed the roles of truth and reality in art after the period of socialist realism, which in the Slovene and Yugoslav territory ended in 1948, following the break with Stalin’s Russia. It is in this context that he analyzed the novel—namely, its role in conveying truth and in changing the relation towards truth in Slovene society. He placed the subject of the novel in the cultural environment in which a Slovene partisan who had fought in the war since 1941 expresses his fascination with the novel:

“Mind you, I was almost ashamed when I read Hemingway’s book, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. It took an American to describe our partisan fight as we all experienced it, when we vainly expected its portrayal from our own authors.” (Kozak, 1952: 402)

resulting in expulsion from the Informbiro. The true reason behind the conflict was the disagreement between Stalin and Tito resulting in Tito wanting increased autonomy in decision-making regarding Yugoslav policy after the war. Since some Yugoslav politicians supported Stalin in this dispute, Yugoslav authorities began to arrest and eliminate the so-called *informbirojevci*. In 1949, Tito established a concentration camp on the island Goli otok for those who supported or were suspected of supporting Stalin. Although the conflict ended with Stalin’s death, it was officially settled in 1955 with a meeting of Tito and Khrushchev, the new Soviet leader. During the Informbiro conflict, 60,000 members were expelled from the KPJ and 16,312 people were imprisoned in various camps (such as those at Goli otok and on Grgur Island).

From a literary point of view, the Informbiro conflict represents the end of socialist realism’s influence on literature. Although the emphasised collectivist spirit and social realism still prevailed in the 1950s. An increasingly stronger influence of Western literatures could be felt, opening the door to new currents and modern literary trends (individualism, intimism, existentialism), which only flourished from the end of the 1950s into the 1960s.

Kozak wonders about the causes of the novel's huge success in both Europe and America, especially in light of the fact that people immediately after the war were more likely to avoid themes of war and social and political issues. He is convinced that people were satiated with works of socialist realism, which praised the war effort and builders of socialism, so he perceives changes in the society's relation towards the arts, especially literature. Following this assumption, he focuses on Hemingway's novel, with its realistic depictions of people as the light and the dark image of guerrillas in the Spanish Civil War. In his view, the vitality of the author's presentation of the "gallery of living, real people in the Spanish Civil War" is like the suggestive artistic force the author used to describe man and reach into his depths (Kozak, 1952: 402).

Kozak assesses the individualism of the main character, "Robert Jordan, the dynamite man," in accordance with the general collectivistic spirit which prevailed within Slovene society after the Second World War, not finding his role as convincing as that of the Spanish guerrillas—the simple locals—in their fighting.

Kozak perceives the main character as a reflective intellectual who is not, and does not want to be, a communist, even in the event that republican Spain wins the Spanish Civil War. In his analysis of Jordan's situation, he draws attention to his culturally defined life decisions, originating in the fact that he was an American volunteer fighting on the republican side in Spain. In Kozak's view, however, the characterization of Jordan is weak, since the reader, despite Jordan's frequent reflections on freedom and the righteous fight of people, has little insight into the causes that brought him, an American, to the Spanish republican cause. In comparison with other critiques of Hemingway's novel, this makes Kozak's original, but the reason for this perception of the main character can be found in the prevailing social—as well as Kozak's—ideological positions, according to which pronounced individualism was as a negative value. It is within this context that we can understand his statement that Jordan remains a linear figure that fails to develop. This is illustrated by Jordan's love for Maria, his "rabbit," since he "despite some nice moments remains devoid of human warmth" (Kozak, 1952/6: 387).

Based on his favorable attitude towards an individual acting for his community, Kozak views Hemingway's depiction of Spanish guerrillas as the author's creative triumph. He draws attention to Spanish republicans and their tragic guerrilla war against the fascist forces, thus reminding Slovene readers of their own situation and role during WW II. Yet, in his opinion, it is impossible to compare the organization of Spanish guerrillas with the experience of Slovene partisan fighters who fought under a single command and with a specific ideology. In this respect, he thinks the Spanish more akin to anarchists than to socialists or even communists

because they have no concept of their future republic. They are led by primordial passion, which can also be destructive, as Hemingway masterly exposed in his depiction of the massacre of village fascists in which the guerrilla, Pablo, plays a significant role. He also attributes high artistic potential to Hemingway's portrayal of other guerrilla actions that significantly influenced the course of events. He is convinced that, contrary to Hemingway's portrait of Jordan, supporting characters are presented as complex figures that develop over the course of events.

Kozak further wonders whether the novel's main characters are typical in view of realistic poetics, but is unable conclusively to answer this question. All the characters come from the common folk—they share typical superstitions, habits, and mindset—yet they are strongly individualized. He stresses that the highest quality of Hemingway's writing lies in his "description of human types and their instincts" (Kozak, 1952: 403). The guerrilla figures are so artistically convincing that they will "live as typical representatives of Spanish guerrilla even if, in reality, they were not." Thus he acknowledges the timelessness of the novel and highlights it as being open to different interpretations.

In his study of Hemingway's presentation of the history of the Spanish Civil War, he ascertains that the intercultural contact in which the American author operated furnished the work with insights into the tragedy of the Spanish war much earlier than in Europe, which was then already engulfed in WW II. The novel was published in the United States in 1940. Due to his origins, Hemingway was able realistically to present the influence and methods of Russian commissars in the leadership of Spanish republicans. He draws particular attention to the historical figure of the French communist André Marty, whom he depicts in the novel using paranoid Stalinist methods on his own fighters in Spain, executing many an innocent republican.

At the time of his writing, when the social climate in Slovenia had turned against Russian Stalinism, Kozak was able to shed light on the cause of the tragedy of the Spanish republicans, especially because of the negative role of Russian communists in the Spanish republican cause. During the first three years after WW II, this topic was not to be discussed freely, as Stalin's political influence was very strong in Slovenia until 1948. Kozak opens Slovene readers to the truth of the Spanish civil fight throughout Hemingway's text.

From the point of view of modern translation studies, the systematic study of effects of the translation of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* in Kozak's critical text may be considered a study of the intercultural position of Slovene translation, since it encourages reflection on existing time- and history-related cultural differences as well as special details which help readers bridge differences in their reading horizon of expectations. In the

Slovene literary environment of more than fifty years ago, readers came to the text burdened with experiences of WW II, which tragically influenced Slovene readers in ways similar to those of the characters in the novel, burdened with their involvement in the Spanish Civil War. Slovene readers found in the novel the guerrilla experience that they had, as Kozak stresses at the beginning of his commentary, until then searched for in vain in Slovene literature. It was now possible to treat the translation within special ideological determinants of the post-war time and its accompanying conditions. The complex structure of the critical review, which highlights the presentation of guerrilla warfare as the artistic triumph of the novel, originates in Kozak's view of artistic verisimilitude; he believed that the author's basic mission was to serve the truth and to reveal reality in lives of ordinary people.

Kozak's critical observation confirms that the effects of the novel's translation conform to conditions of the target (Slovene) culture, and that its functions or interpretative possibilities change accordingly. He pays no attention to the fact that he is studying a translation and not the original text, which is understandable, since, at the time of his writing, literary studies did not make the differentiation. Nonetheless, he clearly defines the basic function of Hemingway's novel in the Slovene literary system by stating that the text enriched the Slovene cultural environment with a picturesque image of the Spanish guerrilla fight. Through the literary depiction of another nation's experiences, Slovene readers were able realistically to recreate an awareness of their own wartime experiences and form their own attitudes towards armed conflict.

2.2.3 Dušan Pirjevec on aesthetic elements in the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls*

In the 1953 essay "O Hemingwayevi umetnosti" (On Hemingway's art), which appeared in the journal *Beseda*, Dušan Pirjevec treated *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940) and the short novel *The Old Man and the Sea* (1952), which one year later, in 1954, won Hemingway the Nobel Prize for Literature.

Pirjevec addresses the reader as a literary critic and comparative literary scholar, which is evident from his use of the comparative-critical method in evaluating both of Hemingway's works. Since we are only interested in his study and assessment of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, our analysis will be limited to those parts of the article which shed light on this subject. Pirjevec analyzed the artistic power of Hemingway's word in both literary works by comparing separate aesthetic elements in both works, and on the basis of similarities and differences, came to his own conclusion as to which of the two possesses greater expressive value.

Within this framework he evaluated the method of textualization and special stylistic features in the structure of events and defined, on the basis of his own conclusions, how the author fulfilled the artistic criteria of high literature. He evaluates the literary work according to his own subjective criteria, which he does not present, but which can be understood to some extent from his evaluation of the textual world of the novel.

Pirjevec states that there are large amounts of energy condensed in the novel which, however, “evaporate unused.” He conveys this opinion in his own metaphoric manner:

The heroes’ life potencies are predominantly the author’s means of giving his novel an exotic character. The same holds true for primitivism and de-civilizing. Most of all, the novel is—in its subject and in style—an attack on “good” literary taste. (Pirjevec, 1953: 558)

This statement raises the question of what is, in the critic’s opinion, “good” literary taste. It is the view of many literary critics that Hemingway’s narrative style in the novel demonstrates a well-balanced and sharpened sense of extreme trials, as well as awareness that war forces confrontation with deep human feelings and previously unknown existential situations. Pirjevec alone views this subject as one that Hemingway cannot express artistically.

Pirjevec further contends that the author was more a “topical publicist than artist.” On the other hand, he thinks that the main impulse of the work stemmed from the wish to provoke, to irritate, to attack a disagreeable bourgeois society, to “*épater le bourgeois*” (Pirjevec 1953: 558). He derives this from his belief that Hemingway is a bohemian rebel—roughly the type known in French literary history as a member of French decadence in the 1880s. His revolt against provincial conventions supposedly stems from his own personal experiences and is condensed in a special Hemingway-type hero, expressing itself in the manner in which Hemingway formed his protagonists, as well as the choice of protagonists and their favored qualities.

Pirjevec states that, in his protest against society, Hemingway aimed to show the richness of primitive human forces: the so-called primordial energy that is “oppressed, regulated, and distorted by society.” He freed elementary human passions and instincts in his heroes, allowing them to achieve ultimate satisfaction. That is why his heroes carry in themselves “elements of brutality, animality, and crime.” Based on this finding he concludes that both elements’ release of creative forces as well as destructive elements in heroes are Hemingway’s protest against provincial morality, thus revealing its “absurdity, inefficiency, and triviality” (Pirjevec 1953: 558). He adds that Hemingway also opposed

established aesthetic rules. Many characteristics that broke generally-accepted aesthetic norms could be cited. As an example of unconventionality, he quotes the description of a lovers' night in the novel in which both main characters, Robert Jordan and Maria, experience their most beautiful moments of love in a bedroll. He views this as "willful opposition to conventional lyricism in literature."

Despite deficiencies in the textual world of the novel, Pirjevec admits that Hemingway's writing is still literature since his presentation of "untamed human forces was not intended to reveal inner disorder in man nor his inner inconsistency, his depiction of elementary instincts rather mocked bourgeois ethics" (Pirjevec, 1953: 558). Nevertheless, due to Hemingway's endeavors to oppose the petty bourgeoisie and their provincialism, his writing talent was realized in his publicist work and not in works of art. At this point, Pirjevec expresses the thought that if an artist is too sensitive to issues of a certain time,

if an author becomes part of a disorderly choir that rather screams than sings lines of the bloodthirsty "La Carmagnole,"⁶ he risks cramming his works with declarations instead of introducing artistic images, and his attention may turn away from the tangle of problems that is human spiritual and material existence and simplify them. (Pirjevec, 1953: 55).

He concludes his reflection on the novel by stating that the material Hemingway dealt with, the "chaos of passion," required him to take a stand, to "find a better solution than 'negated morality,'" as he called the Spanish Civil War. Such a perspective could be realized only in a work where he could maintain his own concept of man, by presenting man in his primordial power, and allowing elementary human forces to take over again. But in his view, Hemingway achieved this only in his following work, the short novel *The Old Man and the Sea*.

The peculiarities in Pirjevec's interpretation of Hemingway's novel become even more evident if we observe differences in critical reviews of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* gathered in a comparison between Pirjevec's evaluation of content-related and aesthetic elements of the novel and evaluation of the same elements by the American literary critic Carlos Baker. Both critics worked during approximately the same time, but in different cultural contexts. Baker's evaluation of the artistic and aesthetic value of the novel in "Hemingway as an Artist" (1952) differs essentially from the views of Pirjevec (1953). Differences in the assessment of the artistic qualities of the novel cannot be attributed to the fact that Baker read

⁶ The verses of "La Carmagnole"—the mob shouting and demanding their rights in 1789—are a metaphor for Spanish republican fighting.

the original text, while Pirjevec read the translation, since some other Slovene critics (for example, Gradišnik 1950, Kozak, 1952) evaluate the translation similarly to Baker. It is rather obvious that the key differences between Baker's and Pirjevec's views of the novel originate in differences between the socially and culturally determined background of reception, which indirectly influence individual readings.

Pirjevec's starting position was materialistic philosophy, according to which class struggle is the motor of social progress, and the aesthetic aspects of the novel were judged accordingly. That is why he saw Hemingway's presentation of the Spanish Civil War as a struggle for dominance and the unleashing of related elementary human passions, without noticing the "higher" message deciphered by Baker. Baker namely discovered that behind its apparent non-determination, the narrative is actually defined, but not at the party level. Rather, it is defined in terms of human ideals, which are above passions and animalism in human relationships. Baker puts the fight for human ethos, demonstrated through Pilar's narration of the massacre of fascists in Pablo's village, at the center of the novel's expressive value. This depiction of violence is full of elementary forces and passions which become unleashed in people in critical situations, yet in the symbolic aspect of the narration, Baker notices not only a protest against violence perpetrated on fellow humans, but also the message of how vital it is to protect basic human values, including freedom, respect of human life, preservation of human dignity, and peaceful co-existence.

The differences between the reviews of the novel make it clear that Hemingway's *For Whom the Bell Tolls* permits various readings, perspectives, and starting points, allowing for varied critical interpretations. Studying different elements in early critical reviews enables better understanding of all further studies of the novel in Slovenia.

3. A short outline of critical responses to the novel *For whom the Bell Tolls* after 1960

From the 1960s onwards, compared to the first decade after the initial publication of the translation in Slovenia, critical reviews of the novel *For whom the Bell Tolls* were published at more lengthy intervals. That said, critical reviews nevertheless continue appearing to this day. Within the framework of critical discourse, authors analyzed dimensions of existential issues in the text and paid most attention to the relation between the individual and society, which they studied through the situations and actions of the main protagonist, presented as a foreigner in dialog with the Spanish Revolution. Afterwords to the reprints of the novel have been written by Janko Kos (1964), Mirko Jurak (1975), and Vanesa Matajč (1998).

What reviews written after 1960 have in common is their increasingly modern critical approach, through which we can detect changes in Slovene society that signify a different view of the role of an individual. According to the social doctrine of the 1960s which opened the possibility of research into the individual's inner world (which was not possible in the 1950s due to the prevailing influence of collectivism in the post-war, communist policy), commentaries on the novel also began stressing the significance of the role of the hero and his American roots on which his individualism is based. The Slovene national character, by contrast, is traditionally thought to be compliant and individualism alien to it.⁷ Thus critics' attention to Jordan's individualism. Even though the fact that individualism is not a value close to the Slovene character, it is illustrated by our history. They analyze the presentation of Jordan's thinking with "his own head," referring to the author's biographical feature in the fictional character's traits.

In their assessment of linguistic and stylistic features, Slovene critics point out the significant innovation of Hemingway's simple style, which the novel brings into the Slovene literary environment and which offers suggestive support for an exciting story. Peculiarities of the translation's intercultural position are not dealt with in critical reviews of the novel in any period since translation studies started developing in the 1990s, meaning that findings about the intercultural position of the translated text could not have been accounted for by the authors of earlier reviews.

In various time-sensitive critical reviews of the novel, differences between its reception in the first decade after its publication (1950–60) and reviews written after 1960 can be detected. The most obvious feature of the earlier reviews is their authors' emphasis the novel's detailed, matter-of-fact, and historically grounded presentation of collective activities of guerrillas in one of the most critical moments of Spanish history. Responses from 1960 onwards shed light not only on collectivism, but also on individualism, which contributes significantly to the idea of working for community and gives meaning to individuals' actions. To a greater extent

⁷ A Slovene person was, with rare exceptions, most often obedient and compliant. Ivan Cankar mentions this aspect of Slovene nature in his works (Kos, 1992: 208). For example, in the play *Hlapci* (*Serfs* 1910), which presents the servile role of Slovene teachers, and in the story "Hlapec Jernej in njegova pravica" ("The Servant Jernej and His Right," 1907), in which he presents an individual—an ordinary farmhand who fights capitalist landowners for his individual and common right of all people to receive decent pay for their work or for the right to a decent life in advanced age. The Slovene people in his village do not support him since they believe that rulers must be obeyed because their powers have been vested in them by God.

than earlier critical articles, recent reviews regard Hemingway's innovative and meticulously polished reporting style as the innovative, essential element of artistic unity. These differences in reception confirm that Hemingway's text is an "open meaningful structure, which only partly defines the meanings and the presented world with linguistic signs, while the rest is left to be concretized and concluded by receivers" (Juvan 2006: 145). Personal socialization, knowledge, and priorities in stressing cultural values differ considerably among readers, which is why actualizations of the novel's reception have necessarily differed through time. The structure of the literary work which unfolds in psychic and social elements of individual readings can never be identical. Even before the beginning of the twenty-first century, Slovene critical reviews praised the novel's actuality and ascertained that it tackled numerous existential issues through which modern Slovene readers learn to understand and accept behavior patterns of other cultures.

4. Conclusion

Early critical responses to the novel *For Whom the Bell Tolls* evaluated the depiction of how individuals in a guerrilla group act and human aptitude to adjust to extreme conditions. They detect a deficiency in the weakly founded individualism of the main protagonist and in the unconvincing development of the topic of love. These responses tend to reflect the prevailing values in Slovene society of the day. Intimate subjects were either unimportant or considered inferior to the prevailing socialist constructivist motifs in literature. Nevertheless, critical reviews admit that the novel surpasses socialist patterns of depicting an individual's life in wartime as it realistically reveals psychological profiles and thus demystifies the black-and-white depiction of the partisan fight found in Slovene literature, especially in works written during the first years after WW II. Only in his afterword does the translator Janez Gradišnik draw attention to style and the narrative method, while Juš Kozak and Dušan Pirjevec neither analyze these aspects nor do they define their role in the structure of the novel. We can conclude that in the Slovene cultural environment, the content of the novel promoted realistic views of guerrilla fighting in the Spanish Civil War, further encouraging new perspectives on the similar Slovene experience.

Univerza v Ljubljani

Works Cited

- Banjanin, Gordana. 2002. Ernest Hemingway pri Slovencih (Ernest Hemingway and Slovenes). M.A. thesis, Filozofska fakulteta, University of Ljubljana.
- Baker, C. 1972. *Hemingway, the Writer as Artist*. 4th ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gradišnik J., 1950. Ernest Hemingway. In Ernest Hemingway, *Komu zvoní*. Trans. Janez Gradišnik. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.
- Hemingway, Ernest. 1950. *Komu zvoní*. Trans. Janez Gradišnik. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.
- Juvan, M. 2006. *Literarna veda v rekonstrukciji: Uvod v sodobni študij literature*. Series Novi pristopi. Ljubljana: Literarno-umetniško društvo Literatura.
- Kos, Janko. 1992. *Pregled slovenskega slovstva*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.
- Kozak, Jus. 1952. Komu zvoní. *Novi svet* 6: 387–415.
- Orel, Boris. 1932. Jack London, Dolina meseca. *Dom in svet* 45, no. 7–8: 330.
- Pirjevec, Dušan. 1953. O Hemingwayevi umetnosti. *Beseda* 2, no. 9: 555–61.

POVZETEK

KRITIŠKA RECEPCIJA HEMINGWAYEVEGA ROMANA KOMU ZVONI V SLOVENSLEM KULTURNEM PROSTORU V OBDOBJU 1950–1960

Hemingwayev roman Komu zvoní (For Whom the Bell Tolls, 1940) je na Slovenskem prvič izšel leta 1950 v prevodu Janeza Gradišnika. Prevod romana je z relativno dolgo prisotnostjo v slovenskem kulturnem prostoru doživel več strokovno utemeljenih kritiških odzivov, ki so večinoma nastali v daljših časovnih razmikih. Izjema je le prvo desetletje po izidu romana, ko so v relativno kratkem obdobju nastali trije kritiški odmevi. Prvi zapis o romanu je bil spremna beseda prevajalca Janeza Gradišnika k izidu prvega prevoda romana Komu zvoní na Slovenskem leta 1950. Juš Kozak je svoj pogled na roman izrazil v kritiškem razmišljanju z naslovom Komu zvoní leta 1952, temu pa je sledil tretji strokovni odmev z naslovom O Hemingwayevi umetnosti izpod peresa literarnega teoretika in komparativista Dušana Pirjevca. V prvem desetletju po izidu romana so se kritiki posvečali predvsem vsebinskim značilnostim besedila, ki so jih neposredno ali posredno navezovali na lastno zgodovinsko izkušnjo druge svetovne vojne, medtem ko so redkeje obravnavali formalne značilnosti Hemingwayevega pisanja.

Zgodnji kritiški zapisi o romanu Komu zvoní, ki so zaznamovali petdeseta leta prejšnjega stoletja, pozitivno vrednotijo prikaz delovanja posameznikov v gverilski skupini in človekove sposobnosti za prilagajanje v razmerah na robu smrti. Pomanjkljivost ubeseditve pa zaznavajo v šibko utemeljenem individualizmu glavnega junaka in v neprepričljivem razvoju motiva ljubezenskega odnosa v kriznih razmerah. V pričujoči razpravi ugotavljamo, da vsebinska naravnost teh odzivov odraža prevladujoče vrednote v takratni slovenski družbi, saj v začetku petdesetih let prejšnjega stoletja intimne teme niso bile pomembne oz. so jih smatrali za manjvredne glede na prevladujočo socialistično graditeljsko motiviko v literaturi. Vendar prevodnokritiški odzivi romanu priznavajo, da je presegel socialistične vzorce prikazovanja življenja posameznika v izrednih vojnih razmerah, saj realistično razkriva psihološke profile junakov – gverilcev, zato demistificira črno-belo podobo partizanskega boja, ki so jo v slovensko literaturo prinašala dela v prvih letih po drugi svetovni vojni. Slogu in pripovednemu načinu nameni pozornost le prevajalec Janez Gradišnik v svoji spremni besedi, medtem ko Juš Kozak in Dušan Pirjevec tega področja ne razčlenita oz. ne opredelita njune vloge v celotni strukturi romana. Prisotna je misel, da je v slovenskem kulturnem okolju roman Komu zvoní po vsebinski plati omogočil oblikovanje realističnih pogledov na prikaz gverilskega boja v španski državljanski vojni, ki spodbujajo nov razmislek o podobni situaciji slovenskega naroda v drugi svetovni vojni. V okviru teh razmišljanj je v prvem desetletju po izidu prevoda romana Komu zvoní na Slovenskem v ospredju recepcijskih odzivov razčlenitev odnosa med posameznikom in skupnostjo v izjemnih razmerah na robu smrti.

Drugačen pogled na tematiko romana se uveljavi v novejših odzivih, ki so nastajali od šestdesetih let prejšnjega stoletja, saj so avtorji v okviru prevodnokritiškega diskurza razčlenjevali razsežnosti odprtih bivanjskih vprašanj v besedilu, predvsem odnos med posameznikom in družbo, ki so ga raziskali skozi položaj in delovanje glavnega junaka kot tujca v dialogu s špansko revolucijo.