# THE CONFLICT OF "BEING GYPSY" IN *FOR WHOM THE BELL TOLLS*

DAVID MURAD
*Kent State University*

IN *DEATH IN THE AFTERNOON* (1932), a nonfiction account of bullfighting in Spain, Ernest Hemingway pauses to offer a little advice on writing: "When writing a novel a writer should create living people; people not characters. A *character* is a caricature. . . . People in a novel, not skillfully constructed *characters*, must be projected from the writer's assimilated experience, from his knowledge, from his head, from his heart and from all there is of him" (191, Hemingway's emphases). Yet less than a decade later, after returning to Spain to report on the Spanish Civil War (1936–39), Hemingway was writing a novel, *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940), that incorporated what was arguably his greatest "caricature" to date, a stereotypical "gypsy" character named Rafael. As a "gypsy," a caricature of a person of Romani descent, Rafael is carefree, easygoing, and even clown-like, as well as lazy, unreliable, and lacking seriousness. He whittles fox traps and chases rabbits when he should be guarding his post and makes jokes despite the seriousness of the war. Pilar, too, becomes "gypsy" when she reads palms, senses the earth move, and smells approaching death—skills which make her mysterious and even discreditable.

Rafael and Pilar are not "people" but skillfully constructed "gypsy" caricatures drawn from a mainly Western, non-Romani historical and literary tradition. This tradition associates gypsyness with mysticism, exotic dancing, and pastoral music, with a romantic and libertine disposition in relation to society and the law, and with a host of other colorful and less charming attributes like thievery, lying, and laziness. But *For Whom the Bell Tolls* also complicates and examines these traditions and associations.

THE HEMINGWAY REVIEW, VOL. 28, NO. 2, SPRING 2009. Copyright © 2009 The Ernest Hemingway Foundation. Published by the University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.

Through a conscious attempt to make Rafael and Pilar "be gypsy," Hemingway can better project "the writer's assimilated experience" of living in Spain both for his American protagonist Robert Jordan and his Western, non-Romani readership. While this "assimilated experience" does not accurately represent Romani culture or people, it does exemplify very real misconceptions and misappropriations between Romani and non-Romani in Spain. What often frustrates or challenges Robert Jordan about Rafael and Pilar is not who they are as people but what they are as gypsies. And yet, although critics have written a great deal about Pilar, there is very little consideration of Rafael or of "gypsyness" in the novel, or about what this concept may mean to readers.

Years of fanciful stories, media blurbs, and hearsay have created the concept of "gypsyness" embedded in popular culture. As Romani scholar Ian Hancock writes, "Although we Romanies have lived in Europe for hundreds of years, almost all popular knowledge about us comes not from socializing with our people at first hand, for we generally live apart from the rest of the population, but from the way we are depicted in stories and songs and in the media" (*We Are* xvii). This "popular knowledge" ignores a vital cultural history. Since migrating out of India in the 11$^{th}$ century, Romanies have interacted and melded culturally and socially with Middle Eastern, European, and other world cultures, and thus have affected and shaped them. Sadly, though, Romanies have also been banished, persecuted, and enslaved by these same societies. In Spain, where Romani migration occurred in the 15$^{th}$ century, Henry Kamen writes that "the first recorded law against them was in 1499. In 1525 the Cortes of Toledo petitioned that 'the Egyptians [the term "gypsy" derives from this common misconception of Romani origin] not wander through the realm, since they steal from the fields and destroy orchards and deceive people'" (109). "Gypsy" became synonymous with "liar," "beggar," "thief," and "criminal," and the distinction brought about two and a half centuries of persecution. Then, in 1783, with the hopeful intention of ending racial discrimination, Carlos III decreed that "Gitano" (the Spanish equivalent of "Gypsy") did not exist, being "merely a derogatory name given to or assumed by bands of thieves" (qtd. in Charnon-Deutsch 21), and that "by the same token any manifestation of distinctiveness, be it language, costume or lifestyle, was to be severely penalized" (Leblon 31). Ironically, Carlos III's decree was correct—the term "Gypsy" does not appropriately refer to any ethnic com-

munity, and many contemporary Romani scholars begin their publications pointing out that "gypsy" is a prescribed word invented by non-Romanies.[1] But the decree's insistence on assimilating Romanies into Spanish culture only further ostracized the Romani community, making "Gypsyness" more obvious than ever. It was not that the term "Gitano" or "Gypsy" did not exist (for it did when describing bands of thieves); rather the decree sought to erase the ethnicity represented by the word. Thus, the symbolic term "gypsy" remained alive while the Romani people and culture were driven into obscurity or worse.[2]

Whether Hemingway was fully cognizant of Romani history or culture when writing *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is not the focus of this essay. Certainly, though, he was aware of the symbolic value carried by the word "gypsy." At the end of Chapter Eighteen, we learn that in the "only book [Jordan] had published. . . [h]e had put in it what he had discovered about Spain in ten years of travelling in it. . .. There had been such good books written by Borrow and Ford and the rest that he had been able to add very little" (248). The "good books" by George Borrow and Richard Ford could be any of several sizeable narratives about Spain written in the mid-1800s, but all were travelogues borne out of a curiosity about and fascination with the land and people.[3]

For Ford, Spain was a "singular country" that hovered "between Europe and Africa. . . civilization and barbarism" (100), a place where "Nature reigns" (255) and her people were always "like Orientals," primarily because they were "descendents of the Arab" (100) but perhaps also because the Spaniard was the "raw man material made by nature, and treats himself as he does the raw products of his soil, by leaving art and final development to the foreigner" (318). Although Ford professedly aimed for a more accurate and less sensational depiction of Spain, such classic examples of Orientalism as "leaving art and final development to the foreigner" show him caricaturing instead of reporting, yet perhaps in a way he did not consciously intend.

For a consideration of "gypsies," though, Borrow would have been the better source, a point Ford himself admits in *Gatherings from Spain* (63).[4] Hemingway, or at least Robert Jordan, perhaps thought so, too, because Borrow recognized how words carry descriptive weight. For Borrow, the "word Gypsy was always sufficient to excite my curiosity," and "if there be one being in the world who, more than another, deserves the title of sor-

ceress (and where do you find a word of greater romance and more thrilling interest?), it is the Gypsy female. . . " (*The Zincali* 19, 101). Here, "romance" and "thrilling interest" are produced by the words "Sorceress" and "Gypsy" and not by any cultural context. The word "Gypsy" is not used as a cultural referent but as a mysterious, picaresque, and/or romantic descriptive adjective. Such use of the word "Gypsy" became part of a larger literary tradition. As Lou Charnon-Deutsch points out, "Borrow bequeathed many, if not all, of the loathsome or fabulous stereotypes that quickly got grafted onto Preciosa's Romantic progeny: Guiseppe Verdi's Azucena, Prosper Mérimée's Carmen, Ambroise Thomas's Mignon, George Eliot's Fedalma, George Sand's Moréna, and Victor Hugo's Esmeralda all owe something to Borrow's picaresque imagination" (15). And as Deborah Epstein Nord observes, Borrow's Victorian and pastoral images did not die with the age: "Borrow's work, largely forgotten today, enjoyed a revival at the turn of the twentieth century, when he was recast as a figure dear to cultural conservatives nostalgic for a prelapsarian and preindustrial England" (72).

On the one hand, Ford and Borrow gave Hemingway visual and textual access to landscapes and peoples he had never met in Spain (much as his reading about Italy and World War I before writing *A Farewell to Arms* [1929] augmented his own war experience). But these Victorian writers also bequeathed to Hemingway images of Spain and gypsyness that he knew his Western readership would find charmingly familiar. Following this outline, M.B. Mencher tells us that Borrow, in his collective works,

> . . . fixed forever, in English eyes, an image of everyday Spain in the 1830s—an image composed chiefly of ruinous and rowdy wayside inns, volatile mule-drivers, cunning Gypsies, ignorant but pious villagers, dusty towns embellished by magnificent churches or palaces, a vast, often hostile, landscape of deserts and mountain ranges: a country in the grip of bloody civil war, in which a lone English traveler, accompanied by a distrustful guide or quirky servant, makes his way undaunted by a myriad [of] dangers in the pursuit of his holy mission to spread the Word of God. . . . This traveler, George Borrow himself, emerges as an infinitely resourceful, brave figure—a hero fit to stand by Robinson Crusoe or the pilgrim Christian himself… (536–537)

The parallel to the "infinitely resourceful, brave" Robert Jordan in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* should be evident. In the midst of a "bloody civil war," and with the help of a "quirky" guerilla band including Rafael and a "distrustful" Pablo, the lone *Inglés* "makes his way undaunted by a myriad of dangers in the pursuit of" his mission.

In fact, one of the driving themes in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is how sentiments like romanticism, nostalgia, quirkiness, or sheer disobedience naturally interfere with duty to society. These qualities—all easily associated with "being gypsy"—are negative, but Robert Jordan also envies the freedom from duty they suggest. Hemingway may have felt similarly. In a letter to Ivan Kashkin written only a year before the Spanish Civil War began, Hemingway drew this analogy: "A writer is like a Gypsy. He owes no allegiance to any government. If he is a good writer he will never like the government he lives under. . . . A writer is an outlyer like a Gypsy" (qtd. in Josephs 178). This idea of (apolitical) Gypsy freedom leads Allen Josephs to comment that "To avoid the politics of the real war. . . Hemingway invented his own war in the mountains where Robert Jordan could be a Gypsy and an outlyer whose anarchic energies could be directed against the forces of fascism but remain pure of political taint" (183). Robert Jordan envies the unattached Gypsy lifestyle and so envies Pilar and Rafael, but ironically, he is fascinated because he is realistically and rationally against that lifestyle. He reminds himself of his duty to destroy the bridge: "But do not start deceiving yourself into thinking you won't have to blow it. You will blow it one day or you will blow it another. Or if it is not this bridge it will be some other bridge. It is not you who decides what shall be done. You follow orders. Follow them and do not try to think beyond them (335).

The gypsies Pilar and Rafael challenge Robert Jordan to "think beyond" orders, producing inner conflicts about prejudice, individual freedom, and duty or social responsibility. At the beginning of the novel, when Robert Jordan first approaches the band's cave, he notices that it is "little better guarded" than a bear's den and immediately attributes this social irresponsibility (and laziness) to the "seated man" whittling a stick at the entrance. As Jordan moves closer—mindful of the irresponsibility and idleness—the "man" becomes a "gypsy," and a person is replaced with a caricature:

> There was a large cave in the rim-rock formation and beside the opening a man sat with his back against the rock, his legs

> stretched out on the ground and his carbine leaning against the rock. He was cutting away on a stick with a knife and he stared at them as they came up, then went on whittling.
>
> "*Hola*," said the seated man. "What is this that comes?"
>
> "The old man and a dynamiter," Pablo told him and lowered the pack inside the entrance to the cave. Anselmo lowered his pack, too, and Robert Jordan unslung the rifle and leaned it against the rock.
>
> "Don't leave it so close to the cave," the whittling man, who had blue eyes in a dark, good-looking lazy gypsy face, the color of smoked leather, said. "There's a fire in there."
>
> "Get up and put it away thyself," Pablo said. "Put it by that tree."
>
> The gypsy did not move but said something unprintable, then, "Leave it there. Blow thyself up," he said lazily. "'Twill cure thy diseases." (18)

No mention has been made of Rafael's ethnicity, yet once Robert Jordan observes Rafael and his actions, he becomes "gypsy." Moreover, Robert Jordan's image of what the word "gypsy" means also serves to rationalize Rafael's laziness. He is lazy because he is a gypsy; he is a gypsy because he is lazy. From this point onward, the word "gypsy" accompanies Rafael as a descriptive marker, a figurative scarlet letter.

The association of gypsies with idleness or social irresponsibility has been a common but strange stereotype given that many Romanies, over the course of centuries, have been enslaved and subjugated to work for the controlling governments or peoples around them.[5] Herbert Heuss traces the "laziness" myth back to the 18th century, when a study by Heinrich Grellman highlighted a "dichotomy between work and idleness, which appears to be a fundamental principle for Western Civilization: the creation of work as a social and cultural category, whose enforcement required centuries of lengthy efforts, and which today measures a person's value by his contribution to productive work." Heuss then quotes Grellman: "'If one seeks people earning their bread in the sweat of their brows, nowhere will they be more difficult to find than among Gypsies. Work of all kind is their enemy, if it is arduous and requires copious effort'" (61).

If Robert Jordan is the Westerner ingrained with the idea that "work" and "contribution" to society are the value measurements of individuals, Rafael is the dichotomous gypsy "other," representing an antithesis to the active participation necessary in war. In this sense, gypsies depend solely on "being" whatever the onlooker's active imagination and understanding projects onto them,[6] a point brought out when Anselmo announces he is going for wine.

> "Is there wine?" Robert Jordan asked, sitting down again by the gypsy.
>
> "Wine? Why not? A whole skinful. Half a skinful, anyway."
>
> "And what to eat?"
>
> "Everything, man," the gypsy said. "We eat like generals."
>
> "And what do gypsies do in the war?" Robert Jordan asked him.
>
> "They keep on being gypsies."
>
> "That's a good job."
>
> "The best," the gypsy said. . . . (19–20)

The manuscript of *For Whom the Bell Tolls* shows that the use of the word "gypsy" here was particularly important to Hemingway. In the first line of the passage he crossed out the words "sitting down by *him* again" and replaced them with "sitting down again by the *gypsy*" (EH Manuscript, my emphasis). Using the word "gypsy" instead of "him" or "Rafael" allows Robert Jordan to generalize Rafael's unique experience into an identifiably gypsy one. Rafael is not an active equal, but a gypsy type carrying gypsy qualities. His actions for the Spanish Republic during the Spanish Civil War are overshadowed by what gypsies, as a stereotype, are thought to do in wars. Rafael reaffirms the stereotype by leaving Robert Jordan's question unanswered, and neither man learns anything about the other.[7] Ultimately, the main problem is the perpetual communicative and interpretive distance created by Rafael's "being gypsy."

In *Lavengro*, Borrow recounts a similar incident, except that in this case he is the one being gypsy: "'Are you, then, a Gypsy?' said the man in black." "What else should I be?" Borrow answers. A few moments later, Borrow asks the man, "Do you know how Gypsies live?" and the man replies, "By hammering old iron. . . and telling fortunes." At this point,

Borrow does not deny that he is a gypsy or that he makes his living as the old man supposes. Although neither assertion is true, he allows the other man to think so: "Well. . . there's my forge, and yonder is some iron. . . and by your own confession I am a soothsayer" (478). In both *For Whom the Bell Tolls* and *Lavengro*, the identity and occupation of a real or supposed "gypsy" are disguised both by prejudice and deliberate deception.

Also in both texts, the lighthearted undertone of the dialogue creates rather humorous scenes; but both nevertheless exemplify a failure to communicate encouraged and accepted by both participants. Robert Jordan asks Rafael about action ("What do gypsies *do*?") and receives an answer about "being" ("They keep on being gypsies."). Jordan's "that's a good *job*," then, offers a playful irony that underscores the gypsy stereotype of laziness. Simply "being" is not a "job" (it takes no work to arrive at what you already are). But the conversation is equally humorous for Rafael. He recognizes that the original question has already objectified "gypsyness," so that there is no way of explaining to this newly arrived foreigner who gypsies are and what they are doing in the war. Robert Jordan assumes he already knows. Rafael's answers—that gypsies "keep on being gypsies" and that it is "the best job"—are sarcastic responses to the questioning itself.[8]

Miscommunication between gypsy and non-gypsy occurs immediately before this scene, as well, when Anselmo and Rafael have a lighthearted exchange of their own about Rafael's "fox trap":

> "He catches rabbits," Anselmo said. "He is a gypsy. So if he catches rabbits he says it is foxes. If he catches a fox he would say it was an elephant."
>
> "And if I catch an elephant?" the gypsy asked and showed his white teeth again and winked at Robert Jordan.
>
> "You'd say it was a tank," Anselmo told him.
>
> "I'll get a tank," the gypsy told him. "I will get a tank. And you can say it is what you please.
>
> "Gypsies talk much and kill little," Anselmo told him. (18–19)

For Anselmo, Rafael needs no explanation beyond "being gypsy." The only question is, "which gypsy traits is Rafael currently demonstrating?" In this passage, for Anselmo, they are "liar" and "embellisher." Moreover, the lan-

guage between Anselmo and Rafael is deficient: nouns do not correspond to their referents (the word "gypsy" does not actually describe Rafael, while the word "rabbits" means "foxes" and "foxes" means "elephants," etc). Gypsy and non-gypsy are unable to resolve the discrepancies, essentially "killing" the conversation. When Rafael tells Anselmo, "you can say it is what you please," he emphasizes that the non-gypsy may speak for and appropriate the gypsy's meaning as he or she sees fit, creating a single perspective in place of a multi-voiced reality. Rafael's winking, though, disrupts Anselmo's appropriation of the interaction, inviting both Robert Jordan and the reader to see the imbalance of subjectivity unfolding.

When Rafael leaves his post to chase rabbits and an enemy cavalryman enters the band's dwelling, the stereotype of "being gypsy" is heightened. Robert Jordan ends up saving the day, but his anger and frustration with the gypsy are immediate:

> "You *hijo de la gran puta!*" he said softly. "Where the obscenity have you been?"
>
> "I tracked them [the rabbits]," the gypsy said. "I got them both. They had made love in the snow."
>
> "And thy post?"
>
> "It was not for long," the gypsy whispered. "What passes? Is there an alarm?"
>
> "There is cavalry out."
>
> "*Rediós!*" the gypsy said. "Hast thou seen them?"
>
> "There is one at the camp now," Robert Jordan said. "He came for breakfast."
>
> "I thought I heard a shot or something like that," the gypsy said. "I obscenity in the milk! Did he come through here?"
>
> "Here. *Thy* post."
>
> "*Ay, mi madre!*" the gypsy said. "I am a poor, unlucky man."
>
> "If thou wert not a gypsy, I would shoot thee." (274)

The word "gypsy" occurs constantly in this scene and each time that Rafael speaks. This accentuates the stereotype of "being gypsy" over independent action. Furthermore, the word "thy" is emphasized to accentuate Jordan's frustration with Rafael's "*being* gypsy," while the word "post" is not emphasized because "gypsies," as generalized entities and idle creatures,

cannot claim ownership of a post or job. Essentially, the rules of soldiering and war do not apply to gypsies, and disciplining (or worse, executing) Rafael for deserting his post is thus absurd because being gypsy means being irresponsible and unreliable by definition.[9]

Robert Jordan then laughs at the situation, but quite in spite of himself. After Jordan tells Rafael that he killed the cavalryman, Rafael praises him in "open flattery": "*Qué tio!*. . . . Thou art a veritable phenomenon," to which Robert Jordan replies, "Thy mother!" Then: "He could not help grinning at the gypsy. 'Take thy hares to camp and bring us up some breakfast,'" and feeling the "hares that lay limp, long, heavy, thick-furred, big-footed and long-eared in the snow, their round dark eyes open," Jordan adds, "They *are* fat." Then, Rafael asks,

> "You are not angry with me, Roberto?"
>
> "Not angry. Disgusted that you should leave your post. Suppose it had been a troop of cavalry?"
>
> "*Redíos*," the gypsy said. "How reasonable you are."
>
> "Listen to me. You cannot leave a post again like that. Never. I do not speak of shooting lightly." (275)

Because a gypsy cannot help being irresponsible, lighthearted, and humorous, it would not be rational for Robert Jordan to get—or stay—angry. So he laughs, accepting and revalidating that flightiness defines "being gypsy." But while Jordan cannot be angry, he remains disgusted, showing that such qualities are still beneath him.

Robert Jordan does not speak lightly of shooting Rafael for deserting his post, because, in the end, there is a lesson that gypsies (and we) should learn: war and its consequences will ultimately come to all, a point emphasized in the following passage:

> The gypsy, he thought. He is truly worthless. He has no political development, nor any discipline, and you could not rely on him for anything. But I need him for tomorrow. I have a use for him tomorrow. It's odd to see a gypsy in a war. They should be exempted like conscientious objectors. Or as the physically and mentally unfit. They are worthless. But conscientious objectors weren't exempted in this war. No one was exempted.

> It came to one and all alike. Well, it had come here now to this lazy outfit. They had it now. (275–276)

Deciding to "use" the "gypsy" for his own designs, Robert Jordan objectifies Rafael's potentially unique, active contributions as tools for his own use. In this example, gypsies cannot be "conscientious objectors" or even physically or mentally fit on their own. In all cases, they must await the active, non-Romani other to make worth of them or not.

"It's odd to see a gypsy in a war" because gypsy qualities are out of place in war. At the end of the novel, when Rafael "stops" beside the road being fired upon by the big 47 mm. gun, Robert Jordan must urge him, "[G]o ahead, Rafael. Gallop, man!" (459). It is unclear whether Rafael's hesitation at the road causes Robert Jordan to be wounded when he crosses last. But the gypsy as the hesitant character does not seem out of place. The final image before the artillery shell that strikes Jordan's horse reads:

> He saw the gypsy's hand extended behind him, rising higher and higher, seeming to take forever as his heels kicked into the horse he was riding and the rope came taut, then dropped, and he was across the road and Robert Jordan was knee-ing against a frightened pack-horse that bumped back into him as the gypsy crossed the hard, dark road and he heard his horse's hooves clumping as he galloped up the slope. (459)

The interspersion of Robert Jordan's and the gypsy's actions creates the scene's nervousness and confusion, catalyzed not by Rafael the person but by the confusing and odd circumstances that lead to Robert Jordan's fall and to the broken leg that fatally disables him.

Although this essay focuses primarily on Rafael, a note on Pilar as "gypsy" helps clarify the concept. Pilar is more complex than Rafael, primarily because she has the distinctive ability to move in and out of gypsy roles whenever she (or the observer) chooses. With her Spanish blood and connections, she can criticize gypsyness as any other non-gypsy might; yet she can also disparage gypsyness as no non-gypsy can because, as Rafael notes, "she has gypsy blood. . . [so] she knows of what she speaks" (28). Before readers have even seen Pilar, we hear her deep voice berating Rafael, "What are you doing now, you lazy drunken obscene unsayable son

of an unnameable unmarried gypsy obscenity? What are you doing?" (30). Attributing Rafael's inactivity to his being a "lazy drunken gypsy" connects Pilar to Robert Jordan, and when she hails the Republican cause, she and Jordan are instantly happy with one another. She tells him, "We will understand each other" (31), and then suggests he take Maria when the bridge is done: "And you will be careful of her now if I trust you? I speak to you as though I knew you for a long time." Robert Jordan replies, "It is like that when people understand one another" (32). They feel they have "known each other for a long time" because they hold similar values of duty and responsibility, and Robert Jordan recognizes this because in this scene she speaks as he does (as a non-gypsy).

But once Pilar's gypsyness surfaces, a sharp communicative break occurs, leaving Robert Jordan to doubt and even discredit her. When Jordan says he will take Maria "if we are alive after the bridge," Pilar is troubled about his "manner" and asks to see his hand:

> Robert Jordan put his hand out and the woman opened it, held it in her own big hand, rubbed her thumb over it and looked at it, carefully, then dropped it. She stood up. He got up too and she looked at him without smiling.
>
> "What did you see in it?" Robert Jordan asked her. "I don't believe in it. You won't scare me."
>
> "Nothing," she told him. "I saw nothing in it."
>
> "Yes you did. I am only curious. I do not believe in such things."
>
> "In what do you believe?"
>
> "In many things but not in that."
>
> "In what?"
>
> "In my work."
>
> "Yes, I saw that."
>
> "Tell me what else you saw."
>
> "I saw nothing else," she said bitterly. (31–33)

Although their conversation had begun positively, her gypsy palm reading creates an awkward bitterness between them, and both the abrupt stop of communication (she will not speak to him honestly about what she saw) and the cultural practice of palm reading itself ultimately divide them.[10]

Robert Jordan senses that she has seen something troubling, but by immediately telling her, "I don't believe in [palm reading]. You won't scare me," he undermines her legitimacy before she has had a chance to speak. She cannot scare him because he has already convinced himself that such gypsy beliefs carry no truth. Because Jordan refuses to recognize or empathize with Pilar's beliefs, her words and actions are essentially lost to him.

Shared communication and understanding return briefly when Robert Jordan tells her that he believes in "work." On this issue, Pilar affirms, "Yes, I saw that." Robert Jordan does not believe in palmistry, but he does not challenge this reading because he likewise sees this ethic in himself. Instead, he demands to know "what else" she has seen, and communication abruptly ends again. While we infer that Pilar will not tell him because she has read something very bad in his palm, we cannot overlook her bitterness. She sees that he discredits her because, in these moments, she is "being gypsy." A few passages later, Pilar informs him about the situation in the hills—how many "dependable" men there are, how many rifles they have, and who they can trust in the matter of the bridge. He appreciates and accepts this quantitative and rational analysis, "Thank you for what you have told me. I like very much your way of speaking." Pilar replies, "I try to speak frankly," and he immediately challenges her again, "Then tell me what you saw in the hand." Again she refuses, saying she saw "nothing" (34). Robert Jordan "likes," or accepts, her way of speaking in reference to the Spanish cause; but when they return to the subject of palm reading, Jordan no longer understands her. Misunderstanding then becomes frustration and anger.

After Pilar hears about Jordan's sexual experience with Maria (when the "earth moved"), Robert Jordan becomes angry because Pilar "has to make it a gypsy thing" (174-175). His diction has become derogatory and negative: "I do not believe in ogres, soothsayers, fortune tellers, or chicken-crut gypsy witchcraft" (176). Too "tired" to move beyond such language towards a shared understanding (176), Jordan demands she "leave the mysteries": "We have enough work and enough things that will be done without complicating it with chicken-crut. Fewer mysteries and more work." (176). As before, he prefers the shared value of "work."

Pilar senses Jordan's anger and frustration, and also his tiredness and inability to get past the gypsyness. Immediately after she asks him "Did the earth move?" (to which he angrily replies, "Yes God damn you"), she

"laugh[s] and laugh[s]," teasing him: "Oh, *Inglés*, *Inglés*. . . You are very comical. You must do much work now to regain thy dignity" (176). Just as Jordan laughed about Rafael's gypsyness in the cavalryman incident, Pilar here laughs at Jordan's non-gypsyness (or "Inglés-ness"). But she also tries to repair the communicative breakdown between them, referring back to the idea of "work" and "dignity." If at first Robert Jordan will have none of it ("To Hell with you, [he] thought. But he kept his mouth shut"), when his eyes move to the clouding, gray sky, Pilar tries again: "Sure. . . It will snow." The potentially disastrous chance of snow brings them back to the cause and to the logistics of destroying the bridge. Even though Robert Jordan is at first inclined to question, and even disagree with Pilar about the weather, he can still see the grayness in the clouds for himself, and so as the chapter closes he agrees with her prediction: "Yes. . . I guess you are right" (176–177).

While *For Whom the Bell Tolls* remains and should be read as a fictional account, the novel's historical context is important. However, not much is known about the role of Romanies during the Spanish Civil War. Although Hemingway wrote two gypsies into his Republican guerrilla band, Romanies had no clear collective allegiance in the war and, as David Martín observes, many Catholic Romanies actually supported Franco's Nationalists and were killed for it.[11] In one case, a woman whose Romani parents lived during the war testifies that "Franco saved us from the concentration camps because when Hitler asked Franco to hand over the gypsies of Spain, Franco said they were indeed inhabitants of Spain and refused" (qtd. in Martín 29, my translation). As Martín acknowledges, the actual communication between Hitler and Franco regarding Spanish Romanies is not completely certain, but this portrayal of Franco-as-savior can be misleading, as Romanies were also very much harassed under Franco. However, the problem of understanding the role of Romanies in the Spanish Civil War is not conflicting stories but that so much still remains untold.

What remains significant is that stereotypes of and prejudices about Romani culture have been compounded by the absence of Romani voices in popular discourse, with tragic results—especially during the time period of *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. As Hancock states, as early as 1933, Nazi Germany began "singling out" the Romani population for "warranted. . . euthanasia" ("The Roots" 30–31), and in December 1941, Himmler "issued the order to have Romanies throughout western Europe deported to

Auschwitz-Birkenau for extermination," (*We Are* 42). When a handbook and CD-ROM issued by the German Press and Information Office in 2000 looks back to the Holocaust, it states,

> The Nazi regime applied a consistent and inclusive policy of extermination based on heredity only against three groups of human beings: the handicapped, Jews, and Sinti and Roma ('Gypsies'). The Nazis killed multitudes, including political and religious opponents, members of the resistance, elites of conquered nations, and homosexuals, but always based these murders on the belief, actions and status of those victims. Different criteria applied only to the murder of the handicapped, Jews, and 'Gypsies.' Members of these groups could not escape their fate by changing their behavior or belief. They were selected because they existed (qtd. in Hancock *We Are* 51).

During Nazism's reign in Europe, the condition of "being gypsy" was not just racial but inescapable. Stripped of subjectivity and a chance to speak or act, Romanies were persecuted simply for existing.

While *For Whom the Bell Tolls* is not directly related to the events of the Holocaust, its exploration of what "being gypsy" meant in 1930s Spain and Europe is important to both Romanies and non-Romanies, then and now. Hancock observes that "In 1936, Rroma had been cleared from the streets of Berlin in anticipation of the Olympic Games; fifty-six years later, the police in Spain did exactly the same thing in preparation for the 1992 Olympic Games in Barcelona, when Spanish Rroma were moved to Campo de la Bota outside the city for the same reason—to hide the Gypsy 'eyesore' from the public" ("The Roots" 42). When the First Romani Congress of the European Union met in Seville, Spain in May 1994, Spanish Romani Manuel Martín pointed out that "'The history of Spain and Spanish Gypsies should be the same. . . We must organize ourselves better, need to be able to work with each other and with non-Gypsies. . . We are not just dancers and musicians, we have a complete culture of our own to share with the rest of the world. We must spread the word'" (qtd. in Wilson). There is no paradox in Martín's insistence that Spanish and Spanish Romani history "should be the same," while also insisting on "a complete culture of our own." To fully encompass and benefit from the vastness,

complexity, and richness that is human experience, we need to acknowledge cultural differences and political concerns, and give different cultural groups equal consideration.

In *Our America: Nativism, Modernism, and Pluralism*, Walter Benn Michaels underscores that the modernist movement of the 1920s produced a new way of imagining identity—what was "foreign" and what was "ours" or "American." He theorizes that modernists such as Hemingway had an "interest" "in the word itself rather than in what it signifies." Quoting William Carlos Williams, he adds that words "'supersede in themselves all ideas, facts, movements which they may under other circumstances be asked to signify'" (74–75). One conclusion Michaels draws from this is that identities such as "American" or "not American" are decided not just by the subject matter of a written work, but by its very language. In a sense, Hemingway's use of the word "gypsy" makes *For Whom the Bell Tolls* a specifically American, or non-Romani novel, just as his choosing the word "Romani" instead would have changed Robert Jordan's, and even an American reader's Westernized experience of Spain. But the novel's use of the word "gypsy" also makes *For Whom the Bell Tolls* a potential carrier of the "popular [uninformed] knowledge" about Romani culture Hancock discusses. Thus, because the narrative exploits certain Western stereotypes of "being gypsy," we need to be aware of the caricaturing taking place. Left unchecked, such caricatures may lead to false ideas both about what it means to be part of a cultural community we think of as "ours" and what it means to be considered outside of that community.

## NOTES

*This article has gone through several stages and so I would like to thank several people—Anne Dewey, Fred Arroyo, Niall Binns, and Paul Vita were all extremely helpful with early thoughts and responses during my time at Saint Louis University, Madrid Campus. Robert Trogdon and the readers at* The Hemingway Review *helped considerably in sharpening the final focus.*

1. It is necessary, though, to use terms such as "gypsy" or "gitano" when, as Heuss articulates, "it is a reference to sources or where the image of 'Gypsies' fabricated by the majority and its institutions is meant" (53). Failing to make this distinction assumes that when a writer uses the word "gypsy," he/she means Romani. I argue this is not really the case. In literary texts especially, "gypsy" usually only describes human actions and qualities, it does not necessarily refer to a person or ethnic community.

2. For an excellent general explanation of Romani history and culture see Hancock's *We Are the Romani People; Ame sam e Rromane dǏene*. For information on the different cultural claims and backgrounds of Romanies living in Spain, see Lou Charnon-Deutsch and Angus Fraser. For one of the few accounts of Romanies during the Spanish Civil War, see David Martín.
3. Ford and Borrow knew each other and even reviewed, appreciated, and critiqued each other's works. Hemingway's library, as documented by Brasch and Sigman, included Ford's *Gatherings from Spain* and Borrow's *Lavengro*, *Romano Lavo-lil: Word Book of the Romany*, and multiple copies of *The Bible in Spain* (78, 148). Given Hemingway's appetite for reading and love for Spain, he was probably familiar with their other works as well. I make reference in the essay to Borrow's *The Zincali*, which deals specifically with "the Gypsies of Spain," even though the book is not listed in Brasch and Sigman.
4. Charnon-Deutsch points out that Ford nicknamed Borrow "el gitano" (101).
5. See Hancock's *We Are the Romani People*, Chapter 2, for a historical account of Romani slavery over the past several centuries. In Spain, "according to a decree issued in 1538, Romanies were enslaved for their whole lives to their accusers as a punishment for escaping from prison" (27).
6. Hancock observes that failing to account historically or politically for a group of people allows other people to speak "for" that group. Following Isabel Fonseca, he adds "we [Romanies] are whatever they [non-Romanies] want us to be, and in the absence of a well-recognized history and clearly understood ethnic identity, our whole presence as a people remains in a sense confusing" (*We Are* 63).
7. Immediately afterward, though, Rafael does ask Robert Jordan, "What do they call thee?" and they exchange names (20). But both Jordan and the narrative continue to refer to and see Rafael as "the gypsy," precluding a shared relationship free of prejudice.
8. Instead of answering with "I" and an active verb ("I guard," "I cook," etc), Rafael advances a sense of "otherness" by using the pronoun "they." The third-person plural does not refer to Rafael or even to "gypsies," per se, but to a nameless group residing outside the presently active perspective. The word "gypsies" and the group it represents has no subjectivity in Rafael's response.
9. Earlier in the novel, Robert Jordan relies on Rafael as a guard and Rafael fulfills his duty (78-80, 190). But Rafael's irresponsibility here shows that he is ultimately undependable, and ironically Jordan may be more frustrated by his own irresponsibility in believing a gypsy could be responsible in the first place. In *The Zincali*, Borrow also suggests that gypsies are unaccustomed to and unworthy of soldiering experience (188-189), a point that Charnon-Deutsch also addresses (99).
10. Readers at *The Hemingway Review* were kind enough to point out that Pilar *is* being honest with Robert Jordan when she says "I saw nothing in it," for she does see the "nothingness of death." Clearly, though, Robert Jordan does not interpret her remarks this way, as he responds, "yes you did (see something)" intimating at the very least confusion about what Pilar means.
11. In fact, in 1997, Pope John Paul II beatified Ceferino Jiménez Malla (El Pelé), a Spanish Catholic Romani, for interceding in the detention of a Catholic priest by militant leftists. Jiménez Malla was imprisoned for this interference and given the chance to deny his faith, but he refused and so was shot shortly afterwards (Martín 34).

## WORKS CITED


Borrow, George. *Lavengro: The Scholar, the Gypsy, the Priest.* 1851. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1927.

———. *The Bible in Spain.* 1843, London: John Murray, 1923.

———. *The Zincali.* 1841. London: John Murray, 1901.

Brasch, James D. and Joseph Sigman. *Hemingway's Library: A Composite Record.* Boston, MA: G.K. Hall, 1981. John F. Kennedy Library Electronic Edition, 2000. < http://www.jfklibrary.org/NR/rdonlyres/D809DDAD-CCC6-4C97-8505-9AC5E224200D/19103/hemingwayslibrary99.pdf >.

Charnon-Deutsch, Lou. *The Spanish Gypsy: The History of a European Obsession.* University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 2004.

Ford, Richard. *Gatherings from Spain.* 1846. Ed. Ian Robertson. London: Pallas Athene, 2000.

Fraser, Angus. *The Gypsies.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1995.

Hancock, Ian. "The Roots of Antigypsyism: To the Holocaust and After." In *Confronting the Holocaust: A Mandate for the 21st Century.* Eds. G. Jan Colijn and Marcia Sachs Littell. Lanham, MD: UP of America, 1997. 19–49.

———. *We are the Romani People; Ame Sam e Rromane dSÏene.* Hatfield, UK: U of Hertfordshire P, 2002.

Hemingway, Ernest. *Death in the Afternoon.* 1932. New York: Scribner's, 2003.

———. *For Whom the Bell Tolls.* 1940. New York: Scribner's, 1995.

———. Manuscript and Corrected Typescript of *For Whom the Bell Tolls.* Hemingway Collection. John F. Kennedy Library. Boston, MA. File 83.

Heuss, Herbert. "Anti-Gypsyism Research: The Creation of a New Field of Study." In *Scholarship and the Gypsy Struggle: Commitment in Romani Studies: A Collection of Papers and Poems to Celebrate Donald Kenrick's Seventieth Year.* Ed. Thomas Acton. Hatfield, UK: U of Hertfordshire P, 2000. 52-67.

Josephs, Allen. "Hemingway and the Spanish Civil War, or the Volatile Mixture of Politics and Art." *Rewriting the Good Fight: Critical Essays on the Literature of the Spanish Civil War.* Eds. Frieda S. Brown, et al. East Lansing: Michigan State UP, 1989. 175–184.

Leblon, Bernard. *Gypsies and Flamenco: The Emergence of the Art of Flamenco in Andalusia.* Trans. Sinéad ní Shuinéar. Hatfield, UK: U of Hertfordshire P, 2003.

Kamen, Henry. *Spain, 1469-1714: A Society of Conflict.* London: Longman, 1991.

Martín, David. "*Gitanos en la guerra civil española.*" *I Tchatchipen* 51 (2005): 27–36.

Mencher, M.B. "George Borrow." *English Studies* 79 (1998): 536–547.

Michaels, Walter Benn. *Our America: Nativism, Modernism, and Pluralism.* Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1995.

Nord, Deborah Epstein. *Gypsies and the British Imagination, 1807–1930.* New York: Columbia UP, 2006.

Wilson, George, comp. *The First Romani Congress of the European Union, Seville, 18th to 21st May 1994: A Report from the Gypsy Council for Education, Culture, Welfare and Civil Rights.* Aveley, UK: European & UK Central Office, 1995.