

THE INFERRED RESOLUTION OF  
ERNEST HEMINGWAY'S IN OUR TIME

THE INFERRED RESOLUTION  
OF  
ERNEST HEMINGWAY'S IN OUR TIME

By

John Ippolito, B.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies  
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements  
for the Degree  
Master of Arts

McMaster University

(January) 1986

MASTER OF ARTS (1986)  
(English)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY  
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: The Inferred Resolution of Ernest Hemingway's In Our Time

AUTHOR: John Ippolito, B.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor J. D. Brasch

NUMBER OF PAGES: xi, 93

This thesis looks at the first published collection of short stories by Ernest Hemingway, In Our Time. In this paper an attempt is made to bridge the gap between those critics who see unity in the collection as a whole and those who see unity in each individual piece. The approach assumed in this study believes that each piece in the collection follows a problem and solution pattern. The pattern is unified by a silent, inferred resolution in each story. The accumulation of these unified pieces renders the whole of the collection a unity as well. The collection becomes a coherent discussion concerning itself with the nature of a subjective code of conduct in an amoral, secular world. The primary task of this paper is to carry out a consideration of each respective piece in the collection. In doing this, the inferred resolution of each story comes to the surface. The accretion of these inferred resolutions makes it possible to view the work as Hemingway's discussion of a personal ethics. This, by implication, is Hemingway's prescription for the means by which to shape one's existence in the world of the twentieth century.

An expression of thanks is in order for Dr. J. D. Brasch. His advice, encouragement and patience were instrumental in the conceptualizing and completion of this paper.

## Table of Contents

Preface	vi
Introduction	1
The Stories:	
I - Building the case for a code of conduct	6
II - Qualifying the case for a code of conduct	31
III - The results of a code of conduct	49
IV - The choices with respect to a code of conduct	78
V - A summary	88
Conclusion	90
Works Cited	92

Ernest Hemingway's collection of short stories, In Our Time, has received considerable attention from literary critics. While interpretations of Hemingway's later works appear to be more extensive than those devoted to IOT, it seems safe to say that the lines of contention with respect to IOT have been drawn. The criticism is divided over the issue of the nature and degree of authorial intent in the collection. In other words, the debate concerns Hemingway's intent in compiling these short stories and the technique by which he realized these intentions.

On one side we find those critics who see a unifying thread connecting the respective pieces of IOT. We might refer to the approaches adhering to this belief as 'progression interpretations'. This is to say that critics espousing this attitude portray the structure of the collection as consisting of a problem and an ultimate solution. For instance, writers such as R. M. Slabey, C. S. Burhans Jr., and Philip Young propose interpretations that dwell on the general progression found in the collection as a whole. The stories, they claim, are necessarily inter-related. Slabey sees a movement from the loss of values to the search for a code. He explains, "The basic thematic movement of the chapters of In Our Time, therefore, is two-fold: the loss of values (I - VIII) and the search for a code (IX - XIV), concluded with an ironic postscript-picture of decadence and impotence...the fifteen stories trace chronological events in the life of one man, Nick Adams" (78-79). In this way, he credits both the vignettes and the stories with a thematic progression. For his part, Burhans claims that Hemingway exposes a central

consciousness in the collection. He proclaims that "Hemingway's first book reflects the central intellectual and esthetic concerns which dominated his life and writing from beginning to end...the unified whole of In Our Time introduces Hemingway's world and the art in which he creates it" (102). The gist of the collection, as Burhans believes, is to be found in its "unified whole" (102). Young's focus is on the progress of Nick Adams in the collection. With respect to this approach he says that "half of the stories are devoted to the spotty but careful development of a crucial character - a boy, then a young man - named Nick Adams. These stories are arranged in the chronological order of Nick's boyhood and young manhood, and are intimately related, one to another" (4). For Young, it is the development of Nick Adams which binds the collection together. All three critics, then, adhere to the view that there is a progression from problem to solution over the course of the collection. Whether it appears as the movement from the loss of values to the search for a code, the exposition and development of a central consciousness, or the maturing of Nick Adams, this 'progression interpretation' of IOT sees a problem and solution pattern over the course of the collection.

The critics that challenge this 'progression' view do so to varying degrees. For her part, Linda Wagner claims that "Hemingway would favor using plot to mean motion" (125). As such, his stories would not lead to a conventional moral or resolution. If the collection is unified by anything at all, she explains, it is simply "a mood of unrelieved somberness if not outright horror" (121). Moving further in this 'anti-progression' direction, we find Hasbany's imagist reading of IOT. Hasbany



is skeptical of those interpretations that see unity as being provided in the collection by a problem and solution pattern. With an appeal to Ezra Pound and the imagist postulations, he proposes that "there is no formula for the book, no problem and solution" (239). Rather, the didactic intent of IOT is provided by the "complex" of which Pound spoke (233). Pound had explained that "An 'Image' is that which presents an intellectual and emotional complex in an instant of time...It is the presentation of such a 'complex' instantaneously which gives that sense of sudden liberation; that sense of freedom from time limits and space limits; that sense of sudden growth" (200-01). Thus, Hasbany concludes that an inter-relation of the pieces is unnecessary for an interpretation of the collection. Finally, the type of interpretation which moves furthest away from seeing the stories as inter-related is provided by Chaman Nahal. Nahal claims that "each story is complete in itself...in no way is one story dependent on the other for the completion of its meaning" (81). He adds that "it does not appear that Hemingway consciously used a method of accretion in these tales" (82). If unity is present, then, it is within each individual piece and not in the collection as a whole.

The 'anti-progression' theories outlined above are admittedly convincing. It is worthwhile noting, however, that these arguments all seem to be a reaction against the 'progression' theories. This is to say that their emphasis on the self-contained nature of each story is pitted against, rather than alongside, those interpretations that dwell on the stories' relational nature to each other. For their part, the 'progression interpretations' are, by implication, antithetical to the view that does

not concede a thematic connection between the pieces. In short, the two schools of thought are mutually exclusive.

Must this necessarily be the case? Must an interpretation investigating the self-contained nature of each story necessarily consider itself to be in conflict with a relational interpretation? By the same token, must a relational interpretation necessarily discount the interpretation that sees each story as a unified, self-contained whole? A study of the structure of each individual story should not have to deny that an overall unity in the collection exists. Conversely, an investigation of the unity of the collection as a whole should not have to position itself against the assumption that each story is in itself a complete work. The two approaches are, in fact, compatible. All this is to say that there is a problem and solution pattern in each respective story in addition to a coherent lateral movement over the course of the collection. This stance concedes that there is a unity in each story and a unity in the collection.

Each piece has a structure which is common to all of them. That is, the same basic structure repeats itself in each piece. This structure consists of a problem and solution. By following a pattern of problem and solution, the structure of each story enables it to appear as a complete whole. The completion of each story is not, however, accomplished in an explicit manner. Hemingway presents the resolution in an indirect, inferred way. Authorial intent is not obvious. For the unity of each piece to be discerned, the reader must appreciate the inferred resolution. With this accomplished, the reader can then arrive at an overview of the collection.

The accumulation of the respective resolutions forms a coherent discussion. This is the discussion developed over the course of the collection.

The unity of each piece is provided by an inferred resolution within each respective pattern of problem and solution. The unity of the collection is provided by the accumulation of these resolutions.

At this point it might be useful to draw a distinction and in so doing clarify the parameters of this paper. The distinction deals with the disposition of both this writer and the critics cited in the paper. The approaches assumed and considered in the paper do not address structuralist concerns. This is to say that the focus of methodology in the paper is not the forces at work in the author's impulse to write, but rather the technique by which the author realizes this impulse. In short, In Our Time is considered as a work, and not as a text. The unity of the collection is assumed and it is from this initial assumption that the study progresses.

In Semiotics and Interpretation Robert Scholes employs a semiotic approach in his consideration of Hemingway's "A Very Short Story." In his study he says, "The story is constructed by the reader from the words on the page by an inferential process" (112). While this may appear to be an echoing of the concerns of this paper, it is not. When Scholes speaks of an inferential process, he is referring to an approach in which the reader infers meaning by viewing the text as the product of "a partial, flawed human being" (Scholes 121). That is, a consideration of the author becomes the primary task of the study. By contrast, this paper tends toward conceding an omniscient author and then moves on to direct attention

to a flawed narrator. In this way, the work itself becomes the object under scrutiny.

This paper sees the technique used by Hemingway in presenting the stories of In Our Time as an inferred or silent resolution. As the term suggests, Hemingway employs a pattern of problem and solution in each story. An inferred resolution exists in all of the stories of IOT. The problem, to which the solution is a reply, is introduced by a narrator or fictional character. The narrator presents the problem by simply relating information about what he sees and the fictional character does so by being himself responsible for the problem. "The situation," as Joseph Warren Beach notes in his assessment of the technique of Henry James, "is presented from without or from within" (70). Once the problem is established, the story turns to unveiling a solution.

The narrator or character, by what he says of the subject matter and by how he says it, casts doubt upon his credibility. The account, description, interpretation, or action of the narrator or character is flawed. What he says or does appears awkward or incomplete. This shortcoming on the part of the narrator or character is an implicit criticism of his treatment of the subject matter. Hemingway is responsible for this criticism. In his position as author, he creates a fictional entity that falls short of his expectations. The narrator or character is intentionally impaired. In other words, there is a distance between the demonstrated ability of the fictional entity and what the author believes is the potential ability of that narrator or character. This distance is the place wherein we find the inferred

resolution. The resolution does not appear as an explicit pronouncement made by the author. Rather, the author speaks through the obvious shortcomings in the narrator's or character's words and actions.

The narrator or a prominent character is the vehicle for an inferred resolution. Either one of these fictional entities implies a solution to the problem. They do this by falling short of achieving or recognizing the solution themselves. Hemingway organizes the subject matter by means of this technical arrangement which is based on the relative positions of the author, the vehicle for the inferred resolution, and the subject matter. This arrangement yields a resolution in each story.

Thus far we have addressed the function that the author, the vehicle for the resolution, and the subject matter play in the technical arrangement. The discussion has dealt with technique, but not substance. In considering substance one looks at the nature of the silent resolution. One is concerned here with the issue with which the resolution involves itself. We turn our attention now to the subject matter of the inferred resolutions. An examination of this subject matter is the primary task of this paper.

The stories of IOT portray the plight of individuals who exist in a world without a religious moral impetus. The world of IOT is an intensely secular one. The type of character we find in the collection is a solitary man. He has no established, objectified external guidelines to which he might appeal for moral assistance. He is on his own. He is, as John Killinger notes, "directed to himself for the

formation of a new ethic which will stand in an intimate relation to him alone" (98). In other words, he is responsible to himself for the creation of and adherence to a personal code of conduct. André Maurois also addresses this very sentiment when he says, "Only man, within this world without moral laws, can set up a code and observe it" (50). Thus, we might say that the man of IOT has a two fold responsibility. Initially, he has the obligation to construct a code by which to exist. He cannot wander in a moral aimlessness. His second responsibility is to be faithful to this code. He is the one who enacts and thus objectifies his self-made standard. In this way, moral obligation is reduced to personal responsibility. While elaborating on the nature of men who assume such a responsibility, R. P. Warren observes, "They represent some notion of a code, some notion of honor, that makes a man a man, and that distinguishes him from people who merely follow their random impulses and who are, by consequence, 'messy'" (86).

With respect to this issue of a personal code of conduct, Hemingway reveals a didactic intent in the collection. Not only does he attempt to instruct his readers with the material contained in the collection, but he also imparts the secular attitude with which he sees the world. He accomplishes this endeavour by allowing the inferred resolutions to deal with the conduct of people and the effects that this conduct has on other people. Over the course of the collection, individuals are placed in different situations and their conduct is gauged. When the narrator is providing the inferred resolution, the assessment is carried out with the aid of the failings in the narrator's

account. When a character is the vehicle for a resolution, then his own flawed actions assist in the evaluation. In either case, this assessment or evaluation of an individual's conduct is done against an authorial standard. This is to say that the author implies what he considers to be the requisite behaviour of an individual in a given situation. Hemingway outlines a prescription for a personal code of conduct in the world of IOT.

Each respective piece of IOT is a self-contained unit. The technical arrangement mentioned earlier is common to all of them. That is, the same basic technique of an inferred resolution repeats itself in each individual story. In looking at the collection as a whole, however, a pattern emerges. The lateral progression of IOT becomes the development of a discussion about a personally created code of ethics. The responsibility to this code is the element that shapes the mechanics of moral obligation in human affairs in the collection. The failure or success to fulfill responsibilities to the code constitutes the authorial standard against which the behaviour of individuals is measured.

The stories of IOT formulate an understanding of the qualities of a subjectively created code of conduct. A consideration of each individual story will reveal their respective inferred resolutions and in so doing elaborate on Hemingway's discussion of a personal code and personal responsibility.

The discussion has four basic stages which are constituted by four groups of stories within the collection. The first group serves to build the case in favour of the construction of and fidelity to a



personal code of conduct. This group includes "On the Quai at Smyrna," "Indian Camp," "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife," "The End of Something," "The Three-Day Blow," as well as the first four interchapters. This is followed by a qualification of the code. The group that provides this qualification is made up of "The Battler," "A Very Short Story," "Soldier's Home," and vignettes five, six, seven, and eight. The third group investigates the results of the acceptance or rejection of the responsibilities to a subjectively created morality. In this third group we find "The Revolutionist," "Mr. and Mrs. Elliot," "Cat in the Rain," "Out of Season," "Cross-Country Snow," and "My Old Man." The vignettes included in this group are all concerned with bullfighting. This refers to "Chapter IX" through "Chapter XIV." The fourth and final group of stories lays bare the connection between a self-made code of conduct and the nature of one's existence. The fourth group includes the two parts of "Big Two-Hearted River," "Chapter XV," and "L'Envoi."

## I - Building the Case for a Code of Conduct

The first group of stories begins with "On the Quai at Smyrna." The narrator in this story is a man of some authority aboard a ship. He tells us of some of the events on the pier in Smyrna during an evacuation. In his capacity on board the ship he is in part responsible for coordinating the evacuation. Through his observations he describes the plight of the people waiting to be evacuated. We are told of the squalor in which the people waited, of the death of infants and the elderly, and of the birth of children under the most severe conditions. He also gives an account of his experience with the Turkish commander on the pier and of the tension between his side and the Turkish side.

To describe the narrator as cold hearted would be an understatement. He demonstrates a barbaric ignorance and ruthless stupidity which is difficult to fathom. Through his conduct he fails as a man in a position of authority. His obvious failings, however, are the means by which Hemingway allows the reader to discern what the preferred conduct would have been. We are encouraged to form expectations for a code of conduct for an officer.

As an officer, the narrator reveals himself to be an insincere diplomat and a careless commander. In his efforts to diffuse the incident that arises between one of his men and a Turkish officer, the narrator has no qualms about duping the Turkish officer into believing that his man will "be most severely dealt with. Oh most rigorously" (Hemingway, "On the Quai at Smyrna," 87). Rather than conducting an adequate inquiry

[All further references to In Our Time will be denoted by an abbreviated version of the appropriate story or interchapter. The page number which follows this abbreviation will refer to the corresponding page in Scribner's The Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway.]

into the incident, the narrator prefers to pursue a course of arrogant trickery and deceit. Quite clearly, he neglects to carry out his diplomatic duties as an officer. This same irresponsibility is also demonstrated when he tells us of another episode in the evacuation. In reply to a Turkish order to discontinue the evacuation, the narrator brings his ship close to the pier. His intention was to "shell the Turkish quarter of the town" (Smyrna. 87). They are shelled with blank charges and eventually the most senior Turkish commander puts a halt to the confrontation. While some might see this as "the defiance and bravery of the rescuers" (Leiter 139), it is difficult to understand why someone concerned with evacuating refugees would want to shell the opposing side's civilian population. The narrator prefers to risk a ludicrous and pointless military exchange instead of engaging in diplomacy. Furthermore, the welfare of both his crew and the civilian population seems to be of little or no concern to him. He admits as much when he unperturbedly remarks, "It would have been the hell of a mess" (Smyrna. 88). It is interesting to note that the only man clearly upset at the possibility of a slaughter, Kemal, receives slighting remarks from the narrator. When Kemal dismisses the less senior Turkish commander, the narrator can only explain the action as being the result of the subordinate's "exceeding his authority or some such thing" (Smyrna. 88). The narrator's "some such thing" can only imply his own lack of military protocol and discipline. He has no code. To the reader, Kemal's action should appear quite understandable.

The narrator's general reaction to the misery of the refugees

seems to be surprise, curiosity, and a sporting sense of inquiry. At no time does he demonstrate the least bit of genuine human feeling toward the refugees. For example, in opening his account the narrator exclaims that he cannot understand why the refugees on the pier screamed at midnight. It never occurs to him that perhaps these people are hungry, cold, sick, or simply afraid of the darkening squalor around them. As if he were dealing with restless cattle, the narrator triumphantly proclaims that turning the searchlight on them "did the trick" (Smyrna. 87). Their cries would stop. One is invited to feel disgust for the narrator.

This insensitivity prevails throughout. When telling of the examination of an old woman, the narrator claims to have seen her die and then immediately go stiff. He treats the incident not as the death of an old woman, but more like an exceedingly peculiar medical mystery. The women having babies receive this same detached treatment. In reading it one might be reminded of Lieutenant Henry's first impression of his son as "a freshly skinned rabbit" (A Farewell to Arms 224-25). For the women who refuse to give up their dead babies in this story, the narrator can only offer, "Nothing you could do about it" (Smyrna. 87). Nonetheless, he is surprised at how few of the babies did die. Perhaps he believes that his generosity in allowing the women to have their babies in "the darkest place in the hold" is responsible for this success. This twisted logic goes on to explain that "None of them minded anything once they got off the pier" (Smyrna. 88). As a man of some authority, he fails to alleviate the misery of the refugees and

provides an unfeeling interpretation of their plight. His actions are morally aimless. This man of authority is a moral vacuum.

If any doubt with respect to the narrator's disposition still remains, it is quickly dispelled by his comment regarding the Greek's baggage animals. With their forelegs broken they are thrown into the shallow water. Our narrator finds this to be "a most pleasant business" (Smyrna. 88). Even if this were an ironic or sarcastic statement, it would still do little to establish the narrator as someone capable of appreciating the gravity of such cruelty. In this instance, sarcasm would be as inappropriate as ignorance.

Hemingway demonstrates that moral indifference in a man in a position of authority, in this case an officer, is unacceptable. The narrator in this story has no subjective code of conduct by which he might govern his interactions with others. As a result, those under his influence suffer. In "On the Quai at Smyrna" Hemingway presents conduct which is the antithesis of what Hemingway would expect from a man in authority. As an opposite, our fictional narrator's conduct, or lack of it, is the vehicle for an inferred, silent resolution.

The conduct of the narrator is also the focus of the first interchapter of IOT. The narrator in this piece recounts an experience that he has undergone. We are told that as a kitchen corporal he was part of a battery that was moving along a road in wartime. He tells us that it was at night, that the battery was fifty kilometers from the front, and that the entire battery was drunk. Since the account is given in the past tense, we also know that the narrator has had some time

to think about the experience he is recounting.

For someone who has had time to consider the events of that evening, the narrator demonstrates very little insight. In relating the scene he does not take the opportunity to offer a significant comment on what happened. The only judgement he does pass is in the way of reaffirming his incomprehension of the experience. He says, "It was funny going along that road" (I-kitchen corporal. 89). By qualifying the experience in such an ambiguous way, the narrator obscures the seriousness of war and highlights his own linguistic inability. As such, he is unable to assess the situation with respect to his own conduct and the conduct of those around him.

As portrayed by the narrator, the scene along the road resembles a circus more than it does an episode in war. By accepting the scenario at its face value, the narrator is unable to place the scene into context. In other words, while the battery's conduct may appear comically insignificant or perhaps mildly confusing, this does not mean that a more important issue is not at hand. The war in which this battery is involved is no less grave on account of the actions of the battery that evening. The seriousness of war remains and it demands a compatible attitude from those engaged in it. The narrator is apparently unaware of the implications of war and oblivious to a requisite conduct from those taking part in it. The narrator provides the information and the reader is left to make the conclusion.

The discrepancy between the expectations for an individual's conduct in war and the actual actions of men in war is highlighted in

the person of the lieutenant. The lieutenant, who is supposed to be in a position of authority, is "so soused" that he chides the kitchen corporal with absurd orders (I-kitchen corporal. 89). If he is aware of the seriousness of war and has formulated a fitting response to it, he does not demonstrate as much on the evening in question. His drunkenness makes a mockery both of his authority and of any possible code of conduct by which he guides his actions. The lieutenant illustrates the disorder which results from the lack of adherence to a personally created code of conduct. The victims of such a failure are individuals like the narrator of this vignette. His superior's example is enough for him to fail to recognize the gravity of war. It also prevents him from witnessing a justification for the chain of command. This, in turn, accounts for the confusion of the kitchen corporal who can only offer an ambiguous interpretation of the scene. In creating such a perplexed narrator, Hemingway encourages the reader to pursue the causes of this confusion. It becomes clear that the narrator is a casualty of conduct not befitting an officer. In short, the lieutenant has neglected to fulfill the responsibilities of his post.

Another man in a position of authority fails to satisfy the expectations of his position in "Indian Camp." This is the story of a doctor's performance in delivering the child of a woman in labour. The labour is plagued with complications and the delivery takes place in less than ideal surroundings. While the narrator sets the scene and provides us with the dialogue as it takes place, it is the doctor who is at the center of the subject matter. The doctor makes the significant

pronouncements and he is directly involved in the issue at the heart of the story.

As they row across the bay, we discover that the doctor has taken the liberty to bring his son along to witness the delivery. A young Nick Adams is somewhat surprised to hear that they are going to see an Indian lady who is "very sick" (Indian. 91). One might initially think that the doctor avoids saying 'pregnant' because he wants to cushion the blow of reality for his son. Such an explanation, however, soon becomes suspect. The delivery, from first to last, takes on the air of a staged performance. The doctor seems eager not only to expose his son to one of the realities of life, but also to demonstrate his own medical ability. In both of these endeavours, however, he falls short of the mark. By saying "very sick" instead of 'pregnant', the doctor may simply have been trying to create a sense of mystery and suspense for his son.

We will initially look at the doctor's efforts to perform for the audience around him. He sets the standard for the type of attitude he will adopt throughout the delivery as soon as he approaches the woman. Besides the fact that he has no anaesthetic, the doctor claims that the woman's screams "are not important" anyway (Indian. 92). With respect to his patients, or at least this one, he is not the sympathetic and understanding physician. As the preparations proceed the doctor demonstrates an extreme professionalism in the cleaning of his hands. While such precautions are admittedly routine, the doctor does display a certain arrogance while he carries out this routine. He knows that



he is the center of attraction and he will not lose the opportunity to command the attention of those witnessing the delivery. In short, only he has the knowledge required to perform the delivery. This puts him in a position of authority and power. The woman in the kitchen receives her order of "Those must boil" and George is told to "Pull back that quilt" (Indian. 93). The bravado in his speech to Nick while he washes his hands and his pronounced refusal to touch the quilt both hint at a not too subtle arrogance. This arrogance is confirmed with his boasting after the operation. It may seem a trivial question, but why, after just leaving his home to come to the Indian camp, does the doctor only have a jack-knife and tapered gut leaders with which to deal with the incision? One might justifiably suspect that the doctor has decided to heighten the dramatic effect of his part in the delivery.

The doctor sees his advantaged position shattered when he discovers the Indian with the slit throat. The doctor's knowledge is applicable only to the living. Confronted with death he is rendered as helpless and ignorant as any other. It is regrettable that the doctor's return to a world of equals had to be caused by ignorance. It would have been commendable had knowledge been the instigator of this return. Such a return would have demonstrated that his subjective will and not chance circumstance was responsible for his actions.

The doctor's other endeavour deals with his relationship to his son. The purpose of bringing Nick along is presumably to expose the boy to an episode in man's existence. The doctor's effort in this regard fails primarily because of a lack of sensitivity and tolerance on his

part. Rather than being aware of the boy's innocence and inexperience, he is almost brutal in subjecting his son to the delivery. When Nick professes to be aware of the fact that the woman is going to have a baby, his father retorts with "You don't know...Listen to me" (Indian. 92). As frightening and inhuman as the procedure must appear to the boy, it must appear even more horrible from the attitude his father assumes. For the doctor, human feelings such as pain are "not important" (Indian. 92). The squalid hut in the Indian camp must seem an alien world indeed to the young Nick Adams. It is a place where human feelings, in this case pain, are not recognized. Once the baby is delivered, the doctor asks Nick, "How do you like being an interne?" Once again, the doctor is less than tactful in his communications with Nick. In suturing the incision the father's intolerance continues with "You can watch this or not, Nick, just as you like" (Indian. 93).

The doctor's reaction to Nick's view of the dead Indian is one of panic and then regret. He quickly instructs George to take Nick out of the hut and then apologizes for taking Nick along. When the doctor concedes that "It was an awful mess to put you through" (Indian. 94), the reader cannot be certain whether he is referring to the delivery or the death or both. Whichever is the case, the doctor is clearly shocked into humility. Nick's final queries into life and death are met with less than confident answers from his father. When Nick is finally ready to learn something about reality, he finds a father who is just as confused as he is. While the doctor cannot be faulted for this, he did err by not previously showing Nick that he too is only human. As a father, the

doctor has stumbled in his attempt to educate his son. Had the doctor only identified and sympathized with his son to begin with, Nick would not have expected the answers that his father could not provide.

Nick's entry into this facet of reality has been a failure. For Nick, death is something that one finds in places like the hut in the Indian camp. As far as he was concerned, "he felt quite sure that he would never die" (Indian. 95). This misdirected impression is a consequence of his father's failure to properly introduce him to the reality of life and death.

The doctor's shortcomings provide the necessary information for the reader to formulate conclusions. The doctor's misuse of power in his capacity has lead to regrettable results . As a doctor he has chosen a dramatic sensationalizing of his authority over a respect for the power he commands. He has chosen to avoid a self-regulating code of conduct much like Rinaldi in A Farewell to Arms. This has consequently demeaned the supposed selflessness of his profession and misguided his son's entry into reality.

This issue of youth's induction into reality is further explored in the ensuing piece. "Chapter II" presents us with yet another evacuation scene. The narrator describes a seemingly endless procession of refugees, cattle, carts, and possessions moving along the road. He tells of the rain and mud and of the fright of a young girl witnessing the birth of a child. The procession, he says, is "herded along" by Greek cavalry (II-Adrianople. 97). It would not be totally accurate to say, however, that the narrator is only a purveyor of information. While he does

provide a factual description of the scene, he also demonstrates some emotion. The narrator's show of emotion is a mixture of wonder and helplessness. Nonetheless, this human reaction is neither sufficient nor commendable. It is an incomplete reaction to the scene before him.

The narrator is awestruck by the magnitude of the evacuation. He says that it has "No end and no beginning" (II-Adrianople. 97). In allowing himself to remain overwhelmed by the proportions of the evacuation, the narrator is unable to make a wider insight into the plight of man in war. Rather than elaborating on issues such as the causes of war or the factors responsible for bringing such hardship upon civilian populations, the narrator can only gape in astonishment at a seemingly inexplicable phenomenon. The narrator senses that the evacuation is terrible, but he lacks a standard by which to measure it. In short, he knows that such human suffering is unpleasant, but he is not capable of judging it to be wrong. Incapacitated as he is, the narrator is prevented from yielding insights into the nature of war. In ignorance of the nature and causes of war, he cannot possibly assess the true effects of it.

The narrator's distress at the scene makes him human, but his failure to address the overall plight of man in war makes him incompetent. The narrator's lack of a subjective standard prevents him from identifying the root causes of the suffering depicted in the vignette. He is incapable of tracing the problem back to those persons in authority who are in part responsible for the propagation of human suffering. He cannot make a pronouncement on the actions of men entrusted with the welfare of civilian populations. As such, he overlooks the subtle but

poignant effects of war.

We are presented with one such effect at the end of the passage. The young girl holding the blanket over the woman in labour is said to be crying. The narrator's horrified sympathy is expressed in his explanation that the girl was "Scared sick looking at it" (II-Adrianople. 97). A more insightful perception is begging to be made. This perception deals with the effects of such an experience on the young girl. The ravages of war are making the birth of a child a frightening and terrible thing for her. Her early experience with this part of life will remain as an awful memory. The narrator fails to realize that the conditions created by war will cause this young girl to fear in ignorance. This will consequently prevent her from arriving at a clearer understanding of the place of birth in life. Her induction into reality is as successful as Nick's in "Indian Camp."

Hemingway is drawing the reader into the conclusion that an emotional response to human suffering is simply not enough. Without a personal moral code, the narrator is unable to address and assess the conduct of men with governmental authority who are ultimately responsible for the misery of these refugees. In addition, he cannot make the firm pronouncement that this kind of human suffering is unacceptable. Hemingway demonstrates that without a moral standard, one is incapable of judgement and understanding.

In "Chapter II" Hemingway reveals that a moral standard is necessary for evaluating the performance of people in positions of authority. In "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife" this evaluation takes

place as the doctor fills the role of the man of authority. In the story, Nick's father is reminded that the status of a doctor is not always an advantageous thing. The prestige involved in his particular position of authority renders him vulnerable to certain constraints. The doctor has accepted the accrued status from society and in turn society expects the doctor to abide by a certain code of conduct. In this piece, the doctor is expected to be above committing a crime such as theft and above engaging in something as repugnant as physical violence. As we will see, these expectations put him in a difficult position.

The incident that acts as a catalyst to the doctor's troubles is that one in which he experiences "a very humiliating argument" with Dick Boulton (Baker 129). Boulton and two helpers arrive at the doctor's cottage to cut logs for him. The logs belong to a lumber company, but since they have drifted away on to the shore near the doctor's home, the doctor does not consider it wrong to claim them for his own. Boulton teases the doctor by insinuating that the logs are stolen. Boulton successfully manipulates the expectations that society has for persons in positions of authority. He is keenly aware of this circumstance. Even after being threatened by the doctor, he persists in cynically addressing him as "Doc." Near the end of the argument the doctor threatens Boulton with "I'll knock your eye teeth down your throat" (Doctor. 101). Boulton has succeeded. He has forced the doctor to defend himself against an accusation of theft and in so doing drawn the doctor into conduct considered unacceptable for a man in his position.

This incident is only the first in a series of events that

contribute to the doctor's frustration. When he arrives back at the cottage he is further irritated by the sight of his unopened medical journals. These too remind him of the expectations and responsibilities of a doctor. The doctor, who has already been reminded of the difficult position he occupies in society, has patience for neither the symbols of status as a doctor nor for his wife. Her simple question, "Aren't you going back to work, dear?", is met with a pronounced "No!" (Doctor. 101). Perhaps she too places expectations on his behaviour.

In this story, the doctor is confronted with the realization that his position in society is as much a crown of thorns as it is a symbol of authority. He reacts to this realization by attempting an escape of sorts. His refusal to go back to work is followed by the cleaning of his gun. When he finishes with the gun, he heads outdoors. He and Nick then go for a walk. In this way the doctor puts mental distance between the occupation that has recently caused him frustration and the present thoughts that he seeks for refuge. He is willing to think about anything but medicine and his capacity as a doctor. In this case, Nick's "black squirrels" will do just fine (Doctor. 103).

The doctor's reaction to his confrontation with this unfavourable aspect of his reality is not a wise one. The revealed disadvantages of his position should have made him think of the nature of his position as a whole. This would have brought him closer to an essential insight into himself. In other words, he would have realized that as a man in a position of authority, he has all along accepted the special status that society has endowed him with. As we saw in

"Indian Camp," the doctor carries on without a code of conduct. He has not formulated his own well thought out code. The doctor's perturbation in this instance is due in part to the necessity of creating a code of conduct. This task has been forced upon him by the realization that he has hitherto functioned without a subjectively created standard of conduct.

Richard Fulkerson correctly points out that there is "little doubt that Dr. Adams, not Nick, is the protagonist" in this story (152). As the center of attention, the doctor's shortcoming is highlighted. Hemingway implies that any code of conduct must be subjectively created and consciously adhered to. Furthermore, such a code is inevitably necessary. It is time for the doctor to be scrupulously honest with himself.

As is the case with the first four pieces of IOT, "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife" looks at men in positions of authority. These men are all portrayed as existing without a personally created code of conduct. This absence renders them unable to pronounce consistent moral judgements. Since these individuals in positions of authority do not adhere to a subjective moral code, then they are oblivious to matters where a moral response is called for. We see officers who appear aloof to the implications of human suffering and to the seriousness of war. We see a narrator who is incapable of making a personal judgement with respect to human suffering brought on by feuding governments. Finally, we see a doctor who cannot regulate his use of the power of his position. In each case the result is the prolonged suffering of subordinates and the propagation of ignorance in youth. In "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife"



one of these individuals in authority, the doctor, is reminded that he does not have a code of conduct and that existence is rather difficult without one. Without a code, the doctor cannot conceptualize who he is. Thus, he cannot formulate moral decisions befitting a self-perceived moral make-up. A moral vacuum does not and cannot make moral decisions.

The next four pieces in the collection highlight the effects of the absence of or irresponsibility to a code of conduct. With "Chapter III" the focus of attention shifts from individuals in authority without a code to the victims of these individuals. The narrator in "Chapter III" is a soldier. He tells us of one of his experiences while in action. He explains how he and the men who were with him layed in wait for approaching German soldiers. From their vantage point, they were easily able to shoot the Germans who had to climb up over a garden wall. The account is short and succinct. It does, however, tell us something about the person responsible for recounting it.

The narrator's treatment of the episode reveals that he has not been deeply affected by it. His attitude is one of mild disbelief and simple-minded confusion. He appears dumbfounded by the ease with which they "potted" the first German soldier. He also adds that the shot soldier "had so much equipment on and looked awfully surprised." In assessing the fate of the other German soldiers he concludes in a casual way by remarking, "We shot them. They all came just like that" (III-Mons. 105). The narrator's reaction to what he sees is incomplete. The narrator is oblivious to the fact that human beings are being killed. While such occurrences are to be expected in wartime, this does not mean

that one should necessarily fail to recognize the impact of one's actions. For instance, the narrator is unable to sympathize or even understand the German soldier's last conscious expression of distress. He is unwilling or unable to identify with the people he is shooting.

The narrator shows little or no emotion at what he sees. Without this fundamental starting point, he is unable to move on to an insight regarding the nature of war. He cannot rationalize a synthesis between the immediate necessity of shooting the Germans and the contemplative regret that might follow this action. He cannot assess the plight of man in war.

The narrator in this vignette is damaged. His faculties of rationalization and contemplation are deficient. His reaction to the devastation of war is incomplete. We might say that he lacks a moral dimension. He has no code of conduct. The bewildered surprise of this soldier, however, justifies the suspicion that he is young. As a young man in war he is presumably a mirror of those who are above him. In other words, his moral emptiness is a reflection of the amorality of his superiors. This soldier might just be one of the victims of the type of officer discussed in the stories above.

In "The End of Something" Nick Adams demonstrates that he too is a young victim of those codeless individuals who set an example. This is the story of the end of the relationship between Nick and his girlfriend Marjorie. Before the separation, however, the narrator portrays the closeness of the two and their familiarity with each other. They form the perfectly practiced couple as is demonstrated by their proficient

teamwork in fishing. Their intimacy is portrayed as a silent one. Theirs is a relationship of intuitive understanding. This understanding is the very element which enables Marjorie to ask, "What's the matter, Nick?" (Something. 109). She is able to sense that something is wrong.

Nick Adams is at the center of this story. His performance in the scene that follows Marjorie's initial question is the enactment of a failure on his part. He demonstrates that he is deficient in a particular respect.

Nick's separation from Marjorie is a premeditated act. We know this because at the end of the story Bill reveals his knowledge of what Nick was intending to do. Though Nick has presumably had time to think about how he might approach his girlfriend, when the time comes he performs awkwardly. Initially he tries to be difficult by refusing to eat any supper and then he attempts to draw his girlfriend into a row. Her provocations finally encourage Nick to concede that he does not want to see her any more. He is "afraid" to look at her, but becomes somewhat more talkative when he realizes that her back is turned toward him. "I feel as though everything was gone to hell inside of me. I don't know, Marge. I don't know what to say" (Something. 110). If Nick wanted a separation from his girlfriend at any cost, he has succeeded. She refuses his offer of assistance and takes the boat away over the water..

During the separation scene, Nick's words and actions are cowardly. While his reasons for wanting a separation are not quite clear, it does appear that he felt it necessary to end the relationship. One

would think that such a resolute decision would be followed by words and actions to match. However, Nick's conduct is less than admirable in this respect. He commits an injustice to his girlfriend and a disservice to himself. He fails to see the pressing need to be honest. He refuses to state his position clearly. Nick abrogates his responsibility to the relationship. He ends the relationship in a manner which is less than adequate.

In ending the relationship in this way, Nick is setting a precedent for the future. As one of his first experiences with life in the adult world, it is an important one. By shirking his responsibility to Marjorie in a cowardly way, he has failed to address reality in a competent manner. Furthermore, he has neglected to commence construction on the person he will come to see himself as. He has delayed the formulation of a code. In a world of human relationships, a code of conduct is necessary. Without it, the system of human contact becomes unworkable and the individual remains without shape or identity. While Nick does not ever mention a word of this, his unease at the end of the story is indicative of his dissatisfaction with his actions.

Nick's friend, Bill, seems to be supportive of Nick's actions since he asks Nick for a progress report once Marjorie is gone. Nick, however, is unable to tolerate Bill's insensitive questioning. Bill's reaction is to turn away and coolly select a sandwich. The coldness that permeates Bill's actions is the coldness that Nick cannot tolerate. It is the very coldness of which Nick is guilty in his separation from Marjorie. It is the coldness which is oblivious to sensitivity in delicate matters

such as the separation between Nick and Marjorie. It would seem that Nick is already beginning to regret his conduct. He senses that sensitivity was called for and that he failed to meet this requirement. In other words, Nick begins to realize that one cannot interact without a standard of conduct. His actions during the separation are wrong because he judges them to be wrong. Nick's tendency is toward the formation of and adherence to a subjective moral code. His actions to the contrary must be the result of the influence of a codeless elder or associate. Nick's failure is the failure of a victim of individuals without a subjectively advanced moral standard.

Hemingway demonstrates that to act without a personal code is to act amorally and perhaps even immorally. Nick fails in his actions, but he does become aware of this situation. To say that Nick's discomfiture is "the pain of the adolescent who does not know what to do about his inward stresses and his relationships with other people" (Parker 158), is to treat this episode not as an experience, but rather as a complete failure.

This glimmer of optimism we find in Nick's regret is dashed by the ensuing interchapter. The narrator of "Chapter IV" is a victim who demonstrates a complete absence of morality. He describes an episode from his experience in the war. He explains how he and the men who were with him constructed a barricade across a bridge. The barricade served as an obstacle to approaching enemy troops. He adds that the barricade was extremely effective. Not only did it force the enemy soldiers to have to climb over it, but it also enabled his side to shoot the oncoming

soldiers through the barricade. Ultimately, however, his side abandons their advantageous position on account of other developments in the battle.

This is the objective information that we can glean from the account. The narrator, however, does display emotion throughout the passage. For instance, his pride in the effectiveness of the barricade is unmistakable. He describes the construction as "absolutely perfect... simply priceless...absolutely topping." This rather conceited attitude continues with his description of the enemy troops at the obstacle. He explains how "we potted them from forty yards." While telling of this position of strategic superiority, he also condescendingly adds that "Their officers were very fine" (IV-perfect barricade. 113). The narrator is absorbed in his temporary success.

The narrator demonstrates that he has only one concern in recounting the experience. He wants to reveal the great satisfaction he had with his side's self-constructed strategic advantage. The attitude of the narrator is blind to the life and death nature of the engagement. Enthralled by the excitement of the scene, he is unable to fully absorb the reality of what is going on. For him the experience is, quite simply, a sensual one. For instance, he talks of 'potting' enemy soldiers rather than 'killing' or even 'shooting' them. This killing may have been necessary under the circumstances, but just as necessary is the realization that individuals in wartime must make. That is, they must realize that they are humans taking the lives of humans. Once this is established the issue becomes not merely a logistical one, but a moral one as well. The

narrator demonstrates that he is without a moral dimension. He has not made morality a subjective concern.

The bewildered surprise of the soldier in "Chapter III" is reiterated in "Chapter IV." Both men reveal the excitability of youth and both demonstrate their complete ignorance of what might be called the moral implications of their actions. In short, one might reasonably presume that no one has ever told them that such a thing exists. This would imply that their elders or superiors have themselves failed to formulate a code of conduct. The respective narrators of "Chapter III" and "Chapter IV" are thus rendered victims.

The only regret that the narrator expresses in "Chapter IV" has to do with the fact that his side had to finally abandon their "absolutely perfect obstacle." He most civilly expresses his disappointment with "We were frightfully put out when we heard the flank had gone, and we had to fall back" (IV-perfect barricade. 113). This is Hemingway's concluding demonstration of the discrepancy between what the attitude of the narrator is and what it could be. The wrong attitude is articulated; the preferred attitude is inferred. The preferred attitude knows that amorality is untenable in the world of human interaction.

As "Chapter III," "The End of Something," and "Chapter IV" looked at the victims of elders and superiors without a personal code of conduct, so "The Three-Day Blow" considers the victims of the victims. In other words, it demonstrates the propagation of codelessness from one generation to another. The victim is represented by Bill and his victim is, in turn, Nick.

"The Three-Day Blow" provides us with subsequent information about the relationship between Nick and Marjorie. The relationship was initially presented in "The End of Something" and here it receives further attention. The format of the story itself adheres to a problem and resolution pattern. This means that it can stand on its own. It is complete. The information that this construction yields, however, is valuable in the developing discussion of the effects of the lack of a code.

The conversation between Nick and Bill is, for the most part, an exercise in small talk. They touch on many subjects, but ultimately the conversation leads to a discussion of the separation between Nick and Marjorie. The role played by Bill in the discussion is important. From the previous stages of the conversation, one might conclude that Bill is more assertive and insistent than Nick is. Bill's statements appear definite. By comparison, Nick's seem uncertain. This state of affairs in the relationship is accentuated in the discussion about Nick and his girlfriend. Quite without provocation, Bill begins the discussion by telling Nick that he was wise to "bust off" the relationship with Marjorie (Three-Day. 122). For the most part, Nick plays a very minor role in a discussion that is supposed to be about him. Bill takes the initiative. He goes on about the disadvantages of being married and the self-control that men must practice in such relationships with women. He reminds Nick of the prospect of having to be close to Marjorie's family had they in fact married and then finally expresses approval for Nick's actions. In all of this, Nick is almost completely silent. In reply to



Bill's persistent onslaught of arguments, Nick offers "I guess so... Sure...Yes" (Three-Day. 122). His replies also take the form of nods and silences. Clearly, then, Bill is having his way with the discussion.

Bill's persuasiveness seems to have an effect on Nick. Nick moves from giving empty replies to providing replies that are music to Bill's ears. When Nick explains, "I couldn't help it," a satisfied Bill replies, "I know. That's the way it works out" (Three-Day. 123). If Nick is looking for advice, Bill is not the person he should be looking to. Bill's pronouncements constitute bad advice because they prevent Nick from making a clear assessment of the separation and his part in it. Bill discourages Nick from clarifying his thoughts and emotions. He hinders Nick's formulation of a personal code. Bill tries to impose a form on the relationship and separation before Nick has had an opportunity to arrive at his own understanding. Bill's suggestion that "You might get back into it again" makes Nick feel better. This piece of speculative advice, however, has a dual irony. In the first instance, its effect runs counter to Bill's intention of keeping Nick away from Marjorie. If anything, it reminds Nick that "Nothing was finished. Nothing was ever lost" (Three-Day. 124). Secondly, it causes Nick to abandon his attempts to sort out his reaction to the separation. Having lost the immediate discomfort which prodded him toward the formation of a code, Nick no longer seeks clarification.

Nick's misguided condition is certain. At the end of the story he makes two erroneous conclusions. He concludes that the "Marge business" is not important (Three-Day. 122), yet he also says that the thought of a

possible reunion "was a good thing to have in reserve" (Three-Day. 125). The fact that he has not yet settled his reaction to the affair means that the relationship is still important. He has a matter to settle for himself before he can dismiss the relationship. In the latter instance of irony, considering a possible reunion before even rationalizing the separation is not "a good thing to have in reserve" (Three-Day. 125). Rather than moving in the direction of a less confused state, Nick seems to be stumbling along aimlessly.

Bill is largely responsible for this state of pandemonium in Nick. While we cannot say for certain that he is responsible for the separation, we do know that he has been influential in advising Nick on how to cope with it. Bill is completely oblivious to the sensitive emotions involved in the separation. He brushes aside Nick's struggle with what is fundamentally a moral issue. He dismisses the moral dimension of the situation. As far as Bill is concerned, Nick has no further responsibilities to the relationship. In imposing his own amoral view of the progress of the separation, Bill reveals that no one has ever pointed out to him the need for a moral response. Bill's codeless elders have rendered him codeless. Subsequently, this victim has chosen his own victim, Nick.

In this story, Hemingway presents us with a young Nick Adams who wages a desperately confused campaign to confront reality. The confusion is accentuated because Bill hinders his first attempts at the formation of a subjectively created moral standard. It appears that amorality in some individuals seeks to prevent subjective codes of conduct in others.

Amorality and a subjective code of conduct represent two possible responses to the secular world of IOT. In the first nine stories and vignettes Hemingway builds the case in favour of the code. He does this by demonstrating that the lack of a code, especially in persons in positions of authority, is both harmful and ultimately untenable. While individuals without a code manage to carry on in the first four pieces, the inescapable need for a code is expressed by the doctor's situation in "The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife." As far as the harmful effects of this codelessness are concerned, all nine stories in the group reveal that the consequences are prolonged suffering and ignorance. This result is highlighted in the last four pieces. Here we find younger people who are the products of their elders, superiors, and associates. We find young soldiers seemingly oblivious to the seriousness of war and killing. We also find a young Nick Adams who begins to sense the need for a code in "The End of Something," but is dissuaded by a codeless young man himself, Bill. This section portrays the chaos and damage that is the result of the failure to formulate a subjective code of ethical conduct.

## II - Qualifying the Case for a Code of Conduct

Thus far the code of conduct has been presented in a favourable light. "Chapter V" begins the group of stories that qualifies the favourable case. This vignette has the air of journalistic reporting. It does everything that one would expect a piece of journalism to do. It sets a scene, it presents facts, and it provides graphic details. The scene is in the courtyard of a hospital. It is the place of execution

for six cabinet ministers. A minor complication arises when one of the ministers is too sick to stand up. This man is left sitting against the wall. The ministers are all shot.

The passage may be successful with respect to journalism, but it is otherwise incomplete. In his account, the narrator is unable to demonstrate a penetrating understanding of what he has seen. Nonetheless, this discrepancy between the narrator's actual account and the account he might have given is the place wherein we find authorial intent. The focus of this intent is the real plight of the cabinet ministers. The passage concerns itself with an analysis of the fate of the executed men. The narrator fails in this respect because he does not formulate an insight into the causes of the events that unfold in the courtyard. He simply provides enough information for the reader to speculate. For instance, as representatives of the former government, the ministers are presumably held responsible for it. When the new men in authority destroy the old, they also destroy the disposition that these deposed rulers brought to their positions. In other words, the execution is a sweeping away of the ethics that permeated the former government. The cabinet ministers once wielded the authority of office and now they suffer the reaction against that office. They once brought their respective codes of conduct to bear on the governing of a nation and now they are executed along with that approach. They are identities who are held responsible.

What the passage hints at but never deals with is the condition of readily identifiable persons in positions of authority and power.

The narrator does not elaborate on the identities of the six cabinet ministers as representatives of a deposed power. The vacuum left by the absence of such commentary is the place for an inferred interpretation.

Hemingway is concluding that people in positions of authority can bring their own personal approaches and standards to that office. Their code of conduct becomes identified with the conduct of the government. In the passage, the ministers cannot be reconciled to the new men in authority because the identity of the former government and the identity of the former ministers is the same thing. One cannot destroy the former without deposing the latter. Without this insight, the narrator is unable to make a consequent observation. This has to do with the persons of authority who are held responsible for the government of which they were once a part. As the shots were fired we are told that "The other five stood very quietly against the wall" while the sick minister "was sitting down in the water with his head on his knees" (V-cabinet ministers. 127). These symbols of former power have, by adhering to a code of conduct, created meaning for their respective existences. It is this very meaning which becomes the symbol of vanquished power.

In adhering to a particular code of conduct, the cabinet ministers become identities. These identities constitute the identity of the government. The new rulers will not find it possible to spare these ministers because they are vestiges of an opposed and deposed identity. The loyalty to a code makes these ministers the personification of the former government. As such, they are inescapably tied to the fate of that

government. In this vignette, fidelity to a code of conduct is fatal.

The qualification of the favourable case made for a code of conduct is continued in "The Battler." In this story, Nick Adams is exposed to the bizarre relationship of Ad Francis and Bugs. The story is constructed in such a way that the interaction of the two appears as a staged performance on Nick's behalf. Nick is given the opportunity to witness an almost surrealistic enactment of the workings of a code of conduct. The story deals with Nick's reaction to what he sees. In other words, the information pertinent to the qualification of subjective codes of conduct is provided through Nick's insight, or lack of it. In this vein, William Bache explains that "Nick has been given an attitude, a point of view; and the purpose of the story is to attack, to alter this point of view" (item 4). While this explanation is basically accurate, Bache's conclusion that the experience serves to provide Nick with "a more complicated and more nearly true understanding of the nature of the world" (item 4), is somewhat overly optimistic. That is, it is in fact Nick's failure to learn anything which is the catalyst for an inferred resolution. Nick's blindness is the reader's vision.

To begin with, Nick feels that a black eye from "That lousy crut of a brakeman" is "Cheap at the price" (Battler. 129). He believes that he has learned a valuable lesson. The simplicity of the brakeman's trick and the aching of Nick's eye, however, is like the most basic mathematical equation. Nick merely adds together the obvious and concludes that he should avoid such carelessness in the future. Nick's belief that he has made a substantial discovery is a marker of sorts for illustrating

his rather limited perceptive capacity. Nick is less than completely credible.

As he makes his way toward the fire by the embankment, Nick meets one half of the relationship, Ad Francis. Instead of showing surprise or shock at Nick's sudden "Hello!", Ad retorts in a familiar way with "Where did you get the shiner?" (Battler. 130) This is only the first in a series of rather awkward expressions from Ad. For instance, in talking about the brakeman who knocked Nick off the train, Ad advises, "Get him with a rock sometime when he's going through." In addition, when Nick stares at the distorted features on Ad's face, Ad returns with "Don't you like my pan?" (Battler. 131) The reply has a certain grotesque hilarity to it. Ad's ensuing remarks and actions emphasize that something is not quite right with him. He goes on to display his condition of having only one ear and is determined to let Nick feel his forty beats per minute pulse. He even comes right out and tells Nick, "I'm crazy." Nick's reaction to all of this is almost non-existent. We are simply told that "Nick felt like laughing" (Battler. 132). Nick's sense of suspicion is nowhere to be seen. Since he is unable to speculate on the condition of Ad Francis, it comes as no surprise that he shows only mild curiosity and shallow confusion at the peculiarity of the relationship.

Ad and Bugs demonstrate a range of incoherent emotions. One minute they lightheartedly dwell on Ad's accusation that Nick is crazy and the next moment there is tension when Bugs flippantly replies to Ad's query with "I hear most of what goes on" (Battler. 133). Something is definitely peculiar about the relationship and yet Nick does not draw

conclusions from what he sees. He doesn't even get suspicious when Bugs prevents him from giving the knife to Ad. Nick finally "felt nervous" after Ad had stared at him for several minutes (Battler. 135). Nick is taken aback by the episode in which this "dangerously punch-drunk ex-prizefighter" tries to attack him (Baker 129), but it is only in simple physical fear for himself. Even Nick's reaction to Bugs' tapping of Ad "across the base of the skull" is limpid (Battler. 135). Nick does not speculate on the peculiarities he witnesses. The conclusions that he does not make are left for the reader.

In the relationship between Ad and Bugs, Bugs is in a strange position. His mannerisms are those of a man who feels subservient and yet his actions are those of a man in a position of authority. He is "at once servile, responsible, and personal" (Bache item 4). It is obvious that Bugs takes care of Ad. Ad, however, still sees himself as the superior of the two. Ad expects Bugs to provide for the both of them. Bugs, in return, not only provides for the both of them, but he also accepts the responsibilities of being the man who is de facto in charge. Part of this responsibility entails the bizarre task of knocking Ad over the head when he becomes unmanageable. Bugs performs the menial chores and he also keeps Ad under control. Nonetheless, Ad's illusion of authority in the relationship is not broken. Bugs is unwilling to deny Ad his belief of appearing in control. "He likes to think I'm crazy and I don't mind" (Battler. 137), says Bugs. Bugs is faithful to the task of caring for Ad.

Nick is unable to rationalize the workings of the relationship



through the apparent disorder. He cannot understand the implications of what he sees. This failure implies a solution. That is, it becomes apparent that Bugs has made a decision to provide for the welfare of the handicapped Ad Francis. He is unwavering in his dedication to this self-chosen station. Bugs has assumed an attitude in his relationship with Ad and seems quite content to adhere to it. By assuming and adhering to this subjectively formulated purpose, Bugs shapes his life. That is, he creates responsibility for himself and in so doing is spared an empty, aimless existence. In return for the meaningfulness wrought from his part in the relationship, Bugs must make constant sacrifices. He must fulfill the role of both master and servant.

From demonstrating that adherence to a code can result in death and sacrifice, we move on to three pieces which look at the reasonable limits of fidelity to a code. The first of these pieces is "Chapter VI." It is presented by a narrator who gives us a description of the wounded Nick Adams and of the scene around him. We are told that Nick has been shot in the spine and that his legs "stuck out awkwardly" and "His face was sweaty and dirty" (VI-separate peace. 139). Rinaldi is also wounded, perhaps even fatally. While the narrator's exposition of the scene may be successful as a piece of reporting, it is otherwise unperceptive. He cannot possibly have a complete grasp of the situation because he fails to seriously consider the few words that Nick utters in the passage. A discussion of this shortcoming will reveal the authorial intent in the passage.

Other than relating the only words that Nick pronounces in the

passage, the narrator says nothing of them. The narrator's failure to consider them is the reader's opportunity to look more closely. Sitting "against the wall of the church" Nick is barely able to move his head. He looks at Rinaldi and says, "Senta Rinaldi. Senta. You and me we've made a separate peace...Not patriots" (VI-separate peace. 139). Nick is commenting on his and Rinaldi's relationship to the hostilities. He is implying that the two of them have not achieved satisfaction by fighting for their side, but by simply facing the war as an unavoidable phenomenon. Their satisfaction is the satisfaction of men who have approached a distasteful chore with disciplined resolve. In short, they have made a subjective decision to fight well. They have formulated a code. The attitude with which they approach the task is indicative of a choice they have both made.

In light of his injury, Nick now tries to establish some distance between his attitude and the attitude of a patriotic soldier. It is a wound which does indeed "isolate him from the rest of men" (Leigh 133). That is, he abandons his adherence to the code of the brave soldier. This tells us that Nick's perception of war is wider and less restricted than would have been the case had he not qualified his approach to the fighting. He reveals that his performance in battle was rooted in a personal decision and not in the blind fervour of collective patriotism. He establishes himself as an individual.

Nick demonstrates that in war man has a responsibility to himself. This responsibility has to do with maintaining one's involvement in perspective. Nick is able to perceive the ignorance and shallowness of

patriotism in war. Patriotism is blind because its justification is to be found outside of the individual. It is a collective phenomenon. So as not to have his actions misconstrued as those of a patriot, Nick makes it clear that his own resolve was responsible for his actions. He abandons the code of the brave soldier because his identity is at stake. He posits his individual will as supreme.

The little attention that the narrator pays to the words of Nick is a clue for the reader to consider them more carefully. When we do so, we find that Nick has arrived at the limits of fidelity to a code. This limit is denoted by the point at which the individual will is in danger of being usurped. The only element more important than the code itself is the subjective force responsible for the code's existence. Thus, Hemingway's intention in the vignette is to illustrate the relative nature of a subjective code of conduct.

The relative quality of a code of conduct is further discussed in "A Very Short Story." In this story, the narrator presents a condensed account of the relationship between an American soldier and a nurse by the name of Luz. He relates a concise summary of the progress of the relationship. It begins with the wounded soldier living in the hospital where she works. It ends with Luz and the soldier on different sides of the Atlantic. Throughout this account, the narrator offers no interpretation of what he sees. We are further told that they would have been married before he left for the front had they only had time. They wanted to marry "so they could not lose it" (Very Short. 141). Again, the narrator offers no commentary on this information. The

narrator's silence in this respect is good reason for the reader to be concerned. The reader is being placed in a position to make an insight into the conduct of the parties to the relationship.

The eventual separation of the two results in the end of the relationship. This development illustrates that relationships are susceptible to varying conditions. In other words, the respective attitudes of the two during the relationship need not have been insincere on account of the separation. While they were together, Luz and the soldier were faithful to the demands of the relationship. Their conduct befitted two persons who were involved in an intimate way. They had even intended to marry. They had, in short, established and adhered to a code of conduct. When the code is finally abandoned, it is a necessary and justifiable development. An understanding of the expectations and potentials of the relationship reveals that circumstances may make further adherence to a code untenable. In this case, Luz cannot be charged with irresponsibility. For that matter, neither can the soldier be faulted. Either party to the relationship could not have been expected to be faithful to a code which was no longer feasible. The effort required to uphold the responsibilities of the relationship would have been too demanding. The expectations of responsibility, in the form of fidelity, would have been unreasonable. Luz's initial decision to leave the soldier for another represents a subjective decision on her part. When this is coupled with the fact that the two are on opposite sides of the Atlantic, it becomes apparent that adherence to this code of fidelity is now inapplicable.

Responsibility to the requisites of a relationship depends on the feasibility of continuing the adherence to a self-chosen code of conduct. Circumstances may render such adherence purposeless. Furthermore, one cannot decide to subjectively embrace two opposed approaches. For instance, in opting for the major, Luz throws the weight of her subjective will into the decision. She disowns her former allegiances. The soldier too makes a break from his former ties by contracting "gonorrhea from a sales girl in a loop department store while riding in a taxicab through Lincoln Park" (Very Short. 142).

In this story, Hemingway qualifies the applicability of adherence to a code of conduct. He demonstrates that the circumstances of a situation can in fact make a code untenable. In addition, he establishes the supremacy of the individual will over a code of conduct. This situation is similar to the one in "Chapter VI" where Nick decides to abandon the code of the brave soldier.

Following "Chapter VI" and "A Very Short Story" is the last of these three pieces outlining the limits of fidelity to a code. "Chapter VII" continues to portray a code of conduct in a relative light. The narrator in this vignette describes the experience of a soldier in battle. He recounts the soldier's personal feelings both during and after a harrowing artillery attack on his side's trenches. The narrator's position is a peculiar one. Initially, he assumes an all seeing, all knowing position. However, as the passage progresses and he tells us of the next day's happenings, he begins with, "We went to work on the trench..." (VII-Fossalta. 143) The use of "We" implies that the narrator

is part of the unit to which the man he is describing belongs. In other words, he is a comrade in arms who has presumably undergone the same terrifying experience that he describes the other man's reaction to. One might expect the narrator to show a deeper understanding of the soldier's reaction to the event.

Such, however, is not the case. While the narrator competently chronicles the thoughts and actions of the soldier, his commentary on them is absent. Nonetheless, the narrator does present enough information for the reader to make certain insights into the relative aspects of a code of conduct.

During the shelling, the soldier is extremely vociferous in his pleas to God. The final deal that he works out for his life is a concluding profession of faith and the promise to "tell every one in the world that you are the only<sup>one</sup> that matters" (VII-Fossalta. 143). In making such a covenant, the soldier has in effect formulated a code of conduct with respect to God. He has made a subjective decision to act in a particular way.

We are told that the next night while in town the soldier "did not tell the girl he went upstairs with at the Villa Rossa about Jesus" (VII-Fossalta. 143). This information demonstrates how absurd the soldier's formulation of a code was. While the soldier did make a subjective decision, the conditions under which he made the decision render it void. The contract made with God is a farce. Rather than making a well thought out and carefully considered choice of conduct, the soldier's decision was made in the heat of panic. A valid distinction

can be drawn here between a deliberate subjective decision and an impulsive choice. The final pronouncement on the validity of such contracts is made by the narrator at the end of the passage. As if to emphasize that any expectations of fidelity to the contract are preposterous, he concludes, "And he never told anybody" (VII-Fossalta. 143). The implication is that a code of conduct is as significant as the decision which brought it about. In this vignette, the impetus for the soldier's decision is not subjective, but external. The choice is not valid.

Through the interpretation that the narrator never makes, the author says something about subjectively formulated codes of conduct. In the passage, Hemingway further qualifies the relative nature of a code by revealing that the subjective will is supreme only when its decisions are rooted within the individual. The panic of the soldier in "Chapter VII" does not qualify as an acceptable subjective decision. He need not be faithful to the contract because the contract does not exist.

In abandoning a code of conduct which never really existed, the soldier in "Chapter VII" does no one any harm. The next two stories, however, deal with the real dangers involved in recklessly abandoning a code which does exist. "Soldier's Home" is the first of these two pieces. It is the story of a young man's return from war. After fighting in Europe, Harold Krebs comes home to Oklahoma a changed man. The story is about the difficulties encountered by Krebs once he is back in familiar surroundings. The reader is presented with an opportunity to look into Krebs' situation. These insights are made possible by Krebs' difficult

attempts to adjust to life at home. In "Soldier's Home" Krebs is the vehicle for an inferred resolution.

The first section begins by telling us how Krebs enlisted in the Marines in 1917. Everything that follows is a demise. What we are shown of his time in the military is depressingly realistic. For instance, in the photo that is described the girls are not beautiful, the uniforms of Krebs and another soldier are too big, and the Rhine cannot be seen. This lack of mystery or adventure is reason to speculate that for the most part Krebs' time in arms was spent fighting. At the very least, "he seems to have come to terms successfully with war in the war" (Roberts 200).

Once at home, Krebs does not receive a hero's welcome. "People seemed to think it was rather ridiculous for Krebs to be getting back so late" (Home. 145). The people's willingness to listen to the war stories has also dwindled. When Krebs finally feels like talking to someone about his experiences, there is no one to listen. He finds that he must lie for people to listen. Krebs pretends to be everything that he was not. These lies quickly destroy any of the memories that he might have cherished from the war. This is especially devastating because Krebs was a good soldier. As a good soldier, he was satisfied with and proud of his conduct during the war. The conditions at home have drawn him into disinheriting the code of conduct which he had successfully adhered to overseas. We are told that "he lost everything" (Home. 146). His failure to be faithful to a code, which he had himself posited and abided by, yields negative results. He distorts the truth in the hope that he might be able to re-enter his community with some degree of ease,



but the final result is that he becomes disassociated from the Krebs of whom he was proud. In misrepresenting the code by which he served in the army, Krebs is no longer the individual who drew an identity out of that code. Krebs' identity is the first victim of his impulsive abandonment of a code of conduct.

When Krebs returns to Oklahoma, he returns to an existence that makes new demands of him. Basically, he is expected to find a girlfriend and get a job. As his mother implies, it is time for him to acquire "a definite aim in life" and start on the trek to become "a credit to the community" (Home. 151). It is time for Krebs to assume the responsibilities of his life back home, but he is hesitant to come to terms with this reality. When we are told that Krebs "did not want any consequences" (Home. 147), or that "He wanted his life to go smoothly" (Home. 157), it becomes apparent that Krebs does not want the burden of responsibilities. One of his explanations for refusing to accept responsibilities is that "now...things were getting good again" (Home. 148). After having squandered the satisfaction derived from his code of conduct during the war, Krebs seems intent on remaining codeless. He wants to drift aimlessly. His mother's pleas, however, remind Krebs that in this milieu he must make decisions. These decisions will require an approach as embodied in a code of conduct.

Krebs is fighting a difficult battle at home. He does not want to assume responsibilities and yet he realizes that living at home makes these demands unavoidable. He cannot remain codeless because he must make the choices which are inextricably tied to responsibilities. The

episode with Krebs and his mother demonstrates the impossibility of Krebs' attempts to remain without a code. Krebs realizes that his initial anger at his mother's expectations is inadmissible. He makes amends and gives her what she wants. He reassumes the stance of the obedient son. "He had felt sorry for his mother and she had made him lie" (Home. 153). That is, Krebs lies if it is necessary for the protection of his mother's emotions. She is one of his necessary responsibilities. In unleashing his own unrestrained frustrations on a mother "who shows an indisposition to face reality and is unable to understand what has happened to her boy in the war" (Baker 130), Krebs only causes more damage. He reassumes a code of conduct which demands that he make compensations for his mother's expectations. He must make sacrifices and practice self-control. In this way he positions a buffer between his anger and his mother's ignorance.

Through the story of Krebs and his reaction to a situation, the reader is presented with insights into the dangers of abandoning a code of conduct. Initially, Krebs misrepresents his conduct during the war and loses that part of himself of which he was proud. He loses that identity. Subsequently, Krebs realizes that he cannot remain codeless. In order that he might regulate his conduct with respect to his mother, Krebs seeks the restraint which a subjectively created code of conduct can provide. If this course of action is not pursued, his mother suffers, he suffers, and his overall position is made worse. In "Soldier's Home" Krebs has the inclination to rid himself of all responsibilities. Fortunately, he is of a disposition that recognizes the necessity of

some of them. As such, he is able to sense the potential destructiveness of codelessness. Without a code the impetus to fulfill responsibilities is lacking.

Krebs sees the danger involved in abandoning a code when he dismisses the code he was proud of. The identity he was proud of disappears. In the ensuing encounter with his mother he realizes that without a code, he cannot face the responsibilities of his life at home. Over the course of the story Krebs moves in a positive direction. He begins to recognize the dangers involved in abandoning a code and he concludes that codelessness is untenable. In the ensuing "Chapter VIII," however, the abandoning of a code has only disastrously negative results.

In this vignette the narrator provides the account of a robbery and presents the conversation that takes place between two police officers after the incident. The narrator ventures to make an interpretation neither of the action nor of the conversation. The opportunity to interpret is given to the reader. The reader's interpretation, in turn, is directed toward the dangers of abandoning a code of conduct.

In confronting the two Hungarians who have just looted a cigar store, Boyle wastes no time in dispensing severe justice as he shoots them both dead. The other officer is concerned at the possible repercussions of the incident, but is oblivious to the slaughter itself. These police officers are criminals. They are guilty of murder. Their actions demonstrate how dangerous the abandoning of a code can be. During the incident, the conduct of Boyle is without any sense of restraint. The code of conduct befitting an officer of the law is nowhere to be seen.

The fact that they dismiss the approach which should shape their conduct is especially harmful because of their positions in society. Without a code of conduct in this instance, they have the power to dispense with justice.

Without a code, Boyle appears either ignorant of or uninterested in the laws that govern a society. He recognizes that the looters have contravened something that should not be crossed, but he does not realize that he and his partner are guilty of an even greater contravention. The Hungarians were stealing; they have murdered. In other words, they are prepared to punish the Hungarians for their failure to honour responsibilities to the state. The policemen, however, are blind to their own relationship to the state. Once they abandon the expectations they should have of themselves as officers of the law, they abrogate their responsibilities to the state with impunity. In filling the role of policemen while suspending their identities as officers of the law, their actions amount to a challenge to the structure of the state.

These policemen reveal the grave risks involved in carelessly abandoning a code of conduct. Their subsequent actions constitute a denial of the supremacy of law and the state. It also renders them conveniently amoral. They have, as Hemingway would put it in A Farewell to Arms, "that beautiful detachment and devotion to stern justice of men dealing in death without being in any danger of it" (224-25).

"Chapter VIII" concludes the section that began with the shooting of the cabinet ministers in "Chapter V." In this section, the favourable

case made for a subjectively formulated code of conduct is qualified. Initially, it is shown that adherence to a code of conduct can have serious results. The results looked at are death and sacrifice. From this elaboration on the nature of a code we move to a **delineation** of the reasonable limits of fidelity to a code. This delineation is provided by the wounded Nick Adams of "Chapter VI," by the relationship between Luz and the soldier in "A Very Short Story," and by the soldier of "Chapter VII" who makes a farcical covenant with God. In all three instances, a code of conduct is portrayed as being relative. That is, the adherence to a code of conduct may be justifiably terminated under certain circumstances. In addition, the individual will is posited as supreme over a code of conduct. The final matter dealt with in this section has to do with the effects of carelessly abandoning a code. Where a code does not exist there is no damage done, but the dismissal of a real code is dangerous. Krebs learns this and reacts accordingly. The police officers in "Chapter VIII" do not.

In general, this second group of stories elaborates on the nature of a code of conduct and it investigates the relative aspects of it. When one can see the relative qualities of a code, one can better understand its applicability. In the first group of stories it was shown that a code of conduct is useful and necessary. In this second group, it is shown when and why the code is applicable.

### III - The Results of a Code of Conduct

The first two groups of stories may be viewed as preliminaries to the third group of stories. This is to say that the positing and qualification of a subjectively created code of conduct serves to

familiarize the reader with the nature of the code. With this established, the third group moves on to deal with the actual results of the acceptance or rejection of a code and the responsibilities inherent in it.

The first story in this group is "The Revolutionist." It is the first of two pieces which look at the results of youth's adherence to a subjective code of conduct. The narrator in "The Revolutionist" is a member of the movement to which the young man he is describing belongs. He tells us how the young revolutionist was persecuted in his native Hungary for his political beliefs. From there, he travelled through Italy and was eventually arrested as he made his way into Switzerland. The narrator appears rather perplexed both at the revolutionist and his travels. This is odd because though he has not known the Hungarian for long, he is familiar with the revolutionist's philosophic and aesthetic preferences. In other words, they adhere to the same party, they discuss the same works of art, and they recognize each other's respective position. The narrator seems surprised that someone so "very shy and quite young" could actually be an active party member. He emphasizes his impression of the boy when he describes him again as "a very nice boy and very shy" (Revolutionist. 157). It appears that the narrator finds it inconceivable that a man of such character can be a recognized revolutionary.

This, however, is in fact the case. The revolutionist has suffered for his political beliefs and now he receives assistance from comrades in Italy. His "square of oilcloth from the headquarters of the

party" is his currency (Revolutionist. 157). The narrator is deceived and befuddled by the young man. This points to a weakness in the narrator's interpretive abilities. He misinterprets the young man's fidelity to his cause. In this respect, Jim Steinke gives the narrator undeserved applause when he says that "the older man understands that the boy still clings to the illusion of world revolution because he needs to" (222). Steinke is inaccurate in two respects. Firstly, the narrator does not understand the revolutionist or his motivation. He cannot identify with this young man. For instance, when the Hungarian optimistically projects success for the movement in Italy, the narrator describes his own reaction as, "I did not say anything." The narrator is skeptical of "the world revolution" about which the revolutionist is so enthusiastic (Revolutionist. 157). Their attitudes are worlds apart. In the second instance, Steinke incorrectly points out that the revolutionist's motivation is one of necessity. He does not adhere to the concept of world revolution because he needs to, but rather because he wants to. The narrator's failure to see this is the element which points the reader toward an assessment of the story that deals with the revolutionist and a code of conduct.

The young man is an ideal of belief. He suffers, he endures, he moves on in silent confidence. The consistency and resiliency of his belief in the cause is indicative of a course of action which he has selected and remained faithful to. He has formulated and adheres to a code of conduct. In this light, the revolutionary is an absolutely necessary element in causes such as the one that he and the narrator espouse. He is important because his absolute belief is an ideal. In a world of

relatives, the revolutionary provides a pure ideal which serves as a standard. His perseverance makes him the essence of his cause. As his adherence to a code of conduct consolidates the identity of his cause, so too does it establish his own identity. C.S. Burhans, Jr. succinctly explains that the revolutionist "personifies the way a man can face the violent and disillusioning actualities of the world and give his life order and meaning and value" (97). In short, the young man becomes the revolutionist.

The revolutionist's adherence to a code of conduct also yields results that are not positive. The most prominent adverse result of the young man's code is his own suffering. He receives imprisonment and torture for his efforts in the cause of world revolution. This suffering is portrayed as constant and unavoidable. For instance, at the end of the story the narrator tells us in a matter of fact way that the last he heard of the revolutionist, "the Swiss had him in jail near Sion" (Revolutionist. 158). His suffering continues.

The young revolutionist's subjective code strengthens his cause and establishes his own identity. The price he pays, however, is to be found in the suffering brought on by his fidelity to a cause.

The effects of fidelity to a code of conduct found in "The Revolutionist" are also found in the young matador's situation in "Chapter IX." Once again we are dealing with a young man's relationship to a code and once again the narrator's insufficiency points the reader in the direction of an analysis of a code. "Chapter IX" is the summary of a bullfight. The narrator recounts how the first two matadors were



unsuccessful in their attempts to kill the first bull. The third and youngest matador had to come out and kill the five remaining bulls. The narrator is thorough in his observations, but he offers no interpretation of them. The information he relays, however, is sufficient for an examination of the implications of the young matador's performance.

In this passage, bullfighting and the position of the matador are highlighted. The vignette presents an exposition of the risks faced by the matador in the execution of his responsibilities. The first matador experiences the injury and unpopularity of failure while the second one is gored in the stomach. The young matador is consequently left with an exceedingly large share of the risk. From the narrator's account we know that the killing of the bulls, especially the last one, draws every ounce of ability from this matador. In the execution of his duties as a matador, the danger he faces increases with each bull fought. In spite of this, like the young Hungarian from "The Revolutionist," the young matador demonstrates a fidelity to the responsibilities of his position. His perseverance and determination point to a decision which he has formulated and abides by. His code of conduct governs and disciplines his approach. C.S. Burhans, Jr. claims that the young man "has no choice; and he does what he must do without complaint or evasion and with all the courage and skill at his youthful command" (93). While the praises in the latter part of this statement are well deserved, the initial claim is inaccurate. Contrary to what Burhans says, this matador does in fact have a choice. He acts the way he does because he has made a subjective choice to do so. He faces the five bulls and kills them properly. He might just as easily

have disposed of the bulls in a slovenly way. He remains faithful to his profession.

The young matador's performance has certain implications for both the bullfight and himself. In the first instance, by unhesitatingly pursuing the ideal of the bullfight in which "six bulls are put to death in a formal and ordered manner" (Hemingway, Death in the Afternoon 372), the matador contributes to the validity of the bullfight. He confirms for the audience what the spectacle can and should be. In doing this, he also justifies the existence of the matador. This point leads us to the second implication of the matador's attitude. In fulfilling the expectations made of a matador, the young man becomes a matador. That is, he assumes an identity. His assumption of a code of conduct ultimately provides a shape and meaning for his existence. In conclusion, then, his adherence to a code of conduct has the positive effects of strengthening the standing of his profession and lending meaning to his existence.

As was the fate of the young man in "The Revolutionist," the matador pays for these developments with suffering. Suffering is the negative effect of his assumption of a code of conduct. We are told that when the young matador had finally managed to kill the last bull, "He sat down in the sand and puked and they held a cape over him while the crowd hollered and threw things down into the bull ring" (IX-the kid. 159). The rewards of success are not always what one might imagine them to be. In this vignette, the matador's victory with respect to his profession and his identity is emphasized by denying him a final promenade in glory. His is a personal success. Thus, by portraying only suffering after the

bullfight and by creating a narrator who passes no judgement, Hemingway's inference is that the real success is to be found in the matador's decision to carry on as he did during the spectacle.

From an examination of the results of youth's assumption of a code, we look now at the results of the rejection of a code. The next five pieces deal with this issue. The first of these is "Mr. and Mrs. Elliot." The story is presented by a narrator who provides us with the exposition of a marriage. He recounts how the Elliots are married despite the fact that the wife is fifteen years older than the husband. They move to Europe and continue their unsuccessful attempts at having a baby. After being deserted by their friends, they continue their summer stay in Touraine where they are joined by the wife's girlfriend from America. The husband begins to prefer the company of white wine while he writes poetry at night and the wife turns to the girlfriend for comfort. By the end of the story, the Elliots have drifted apart. The narrator's treatment of the simple progress of the marriage is not obviously faulty. However, while the narrator is persistent in his exposition of the problems that arise in the marriage, he fails to suggest explanations for the problems. The narrator's shortcoming in this respect points to a resolution concerned with the causes of the failure of the marriage. These causes are tied to the lack of adherence to a code of conduct in the marriage.

The conduct of the Elliots once they are married is indicative of two persons who have been neither perspicacious before the marriage nor realistic after it. They have not conceptualized the need for an attitude or approach toward their relationship. Thus, when difficult situations

arise, they are helpless. For instance, the husband is taken aback by the discrepancy between his expectations on the wedding night and the fact that his wife has fallen asleep. He does not know how to react. Furthermore, their fruitless attempts to have a baby produces panic between them. They react by continuing the efforts to have a baby and near the end of this series of tedious performances we are told that they tried "very hard to have a baby in the big hot bedroom on the big, hard bed" (Elliots. 164). They are unwilling to address the futility of the situation. They have no plans for dealing with the realization that their marriage is most likely to be a childless one. The Elliots drift aimlessly over the course of their marriage. They have not brought an attitude to the marriage and they do not formulate one when it becomes increasingly obvious that an approach is needed. Their frustration simply increases. Ultimately, the couple allows the marriage to become what Carlos Baker calls "the extreme travesty of the relationship between Mr. and Mrs. Elliot" (139). Unable to formulate a response to the difficulties encountered in the marriage, the two allow the relationship to wither.

At the end of the story the narrator makes the pronouncement that the husband and wife and friend from America "were all quite happy" (Elliots. 164). The narrator's reading of the situation is a surface one. His understanding of a marriage which is "all calm and acceptable superficially, all in jagged remnants underneath" (Baker 139), does not address the real problems. The insufficiency of the narrator, however, is an invitation to the reader. It becomes necessary for the reader to

consider the attitude of the Elliots toward the marriage if he is to arrive at a complete understanding of it. An analysis in this vein reveals that the couple does not really have an attitude or approach. They carry on a sporadic attempt to make the relationship into a marriage, but their efforts are unsuccessful and are ultimately discontinued.

The negative results of the absence of a code of conduct are further pursued in "Chapter X." In this vignette, the issue is discussed not through the medium of a marriage, but through the example of the bullring. The narrator presents us with the predicament of a severely wounded horse in the bullfight. The horse has been gored and we are told that his "entrails hung down in a blue bunch and swung backward and forward as he began to canter" (X-nervously wobbly. 165). In conveying the scene, the narrator in this vignette is graphic in his portrayal of the progress of this episode of the fight. Not only does he detail the horse's plight, but he also tells of the actions of the ring servants. If the scene described by the narrator had been typical and commonplace for the bullfight, then the need for a further examination of the account would not have been necessary. However, there is something out of the ordinary in the scene related by the narrator. We refer here to the extreme actions of the bullring servants. The narrator does not comment on the conduct of the servants, but such a commentary is called for. In this way, the reader is placed in a position to carry out the investigation. In looking at the conduct of the bullring servants, the reader looks at the results of the absence of a code of conduct.

The presumably fatal injury of the horse does not in itself reveal anything out of the ordinary. As Hemingway points out in Death in the Afternoon, "In a perfect bullfight...some horses will be killed as well as the bulls since the power of the bull will allow him to reach the horse." He goes on to add that "the death of the horse in the ring is an unavoidable accident" (372). The problem, as was mentioned earlier, is not with the horse, but with the ring servants. In Hemingway's outline of the duties of the ring servants, he says nothing of the violence with which the servants in this vignette treat the horse. The servants in "Chapter X" use unnecessary force in the execution of their responsibilities. They cause the horse more pain than they need to. While the servants are expected to meet the demands made of them in the ring, the manner in which they decide to satisfy these demands is invariably affected by their own respective attitudes. For instance, the servants in this vignette are expected to incite the horse to make his way nearer the bull. In light of the horse's condition, their vehemence in attempting to fulfill this duty is inhumane. Their "whacking" of the gored horse is unnecessarily cruel and points to a lack of self-restraint and discipline (X-nervously wobbly. 165). One might justifiably conclude that the monosabios carry on without a personally formulated code of conduct.

The horse is a victim of codeless, unrestrained individuals. The ring servants' perversion of responsibility is carried out at the expense of a helpless victim. The horse's death is admittedly "incidental" (Hemingway, Death in the Afternoon 372), but in this vignette the horse's

vulnerability is exploited by individuals who have no qualms about inflicting unnecessary suffering. Through their actions, the servants forfeit their identities as moral entities. They carry out their duties oblivious to the uncalled for cruelty of their conduct. The ring servants submerge themselves in the larger identity of the bullfight. They are no longer individuals. Thus, not only do they refuse to make the choices befitting subjective moral entities, but they demean the larger entity to which they cling. In short, the bullfight is demeaned.

The horse is described as "nervously wobbly" in his anxiety of the bull who "could not make up his mind to charge" (X-nervously wobbly. 165). This is how it should be. In this interchapter, however, the added excess of the ring servants is not normal for the bullfight. What the narrator fails to address is this very issue. The narrator cannot make the connection between the cruelty of the servants, their lack of a code of conduct, the loss of their individual identities, and the demeaning of the bullfight.

In the next piece we return to the medium of a marriage. Once again the absence of a subjectively formulated approach leads to negative results. Like "Mr. and Mrs. Elliot," "Cat in the Rain" looks at the relationship of an American couple. Unlike the Elliot story, however, this latter one presents a short episode within the course of a marriage. If what is presented is typical of the marriage, then it is safe to say that there is a fundamental problem with the relationship. The marriage does not function as it should. This is to say that the relationship operates to the detriment of both parties to it. While

the husband does seem insulated to the problems experienced by his wife, he too is as much a victim of the marriage as is his wife. The frustration of the wife and the insensitivity of the husband are the means by which one arrives at a resolution to the story. This resolution concerns itself with the problems created by the lack of a code of conduct in the parties to the marriage.

The wife is portrayed as being restless, unsatisfied, and unhappy. The husband is presented as unable or unwilling to acknowledge his wife's distress. The wife's obsession with wanting a cat is indicative of a void within her. She yearns for a tangible form of physical and emotional contact. She despairingly exclaims, "Oh, I wanted it so much. I wanted a kitty." Her husband's degree of concern at her unsuccessful search for the cat amounts to a mockery of genuine concern. He asks, "Did you get the cat?" and follows with "Wonder where it went to" (Cat. 169). His reaction is unenthusiastic and empty. The wife's unsatisfied yearning is further expressed when she talks about how tired she is of the way her hair looks and of the domestic surroundings that she wants for her own. She grasps at these thoughts in a panic and her husband replies to them with, "Oh, shut up and get something to read." She finally reiterates her feelings with "Anyway, I want a cat...I want a cat. I want a cat now. If I can't have long hair or any fun, I can have a cat." Her husband's position is made clear by "George was not listening" (Cat. 170). The episodes before and after the search for the cat reveal two people who are divided by a completely oblivious attitude to one another. The wife



yearns for the fulfillment that she has not received from the marriage and the husband is hard pressed to merely tolerate her presence. They are individuals who demonstrate not the least concern for that mutual thing called the marriage. As such, the marriage does not exist.

The aimlessness and pointlessness of the relationship is indicative of the couple's failure to collectively impose a form on their relationship. Like the Elliots, this couple demonstrates that without a resolved, chosen approach, the parties to the relationship bring nothing to the marriage. Consequently, the marriage does not fill in. It does not take shape. In leaving their relationship to drift without direction, this couple denies itself the opportunity to partake of a common arrangement. They remain distinct people masquerading as a married couple.

The husband and wife in "Cat in the Rain" do not gauge or govern their actions by a personally formulated approach. As individuals, they have not carried out their respective individual duties. They are without a code of conduct. Since they confront the marriage as individuals without direction, then the marriage too is without direction. As a marriage, it is the sum of its parts. It is nothing.

In "Cat in the Rain" the rejection of a code of conduct demeans a marriage. In the ensuing piece, "Chapter XI," we return to the bullring and witness the demeaning of the bullfight by a codeless matador. The bullfighter involved in the scene personifies the ideal of bad bullfighting. His performance is diametrically opposed to what is expected of a good bullfighter. He does not satisfy his responsibilities

to the bullfight. As a result, he commits a disservice to the ideal of bullfighting and he casts his own name into disrepute. The narrator who relates this interchapter does not condemn the matador's actions nor does he assess the consequences of them. Once again, this task is left to the reader. A consideration of the matador's performance reveals that his problems have their origin in the absence of a subjectively formulated code of conduct.

The bullfighter in this vignette enrages the crowd by giving a horrendous performance. He does manage to incapacitate the bull, but he does so in a less than commendable manner. We are told that the bull is injured by "so much bad sticking" (XI-bad sticking. 171). This is a failure on the part of the matador. In Death in the Afternoon, Hemingway points out that bullfighters are expected to "expose themselves to the maximum of danger over which their ability and knowledge will allow them to triumph without casualties" (372). The matador in "Chapter XI" is not injured, but this is not due to his ability. It is due to his inability. He has fought the bull from a distance and not exposed himself to a great deal of danger. His performance confirms that he is not a good bullfighter, but his reaction after the bullfight illustrates the nature of his relationship to the profession of bullfighting itself.

After his performance, the matador suffers the disgrace of having his pigtail cut off. This catastrophe in his professional career does not seem to impress on him as it should. We are told that he is drunk after this episode. He says, "it has happened before like that. I am not really a good bullfighter" (XI-bad sticking. 171). This type of

bullfighting, then, is neither unfamiliar nor upsetting for him. He is accustomed to bad bullfighting. This man is an incapable bullfighter who persists in participating in matches. He has no reservations about giving terrible performances. In other words, he has no qualms about slighting his own reputation and demeaning the spectacle of the bullfight. His words and actions are those of a man who has no standard of conduct. He is without a well thought out, consistent approach to the bullfight and his place in it. As a result, he staggers through the bullfight with not the least concern for the requisites of good bullfighting. This man is not really a matador because he does not assume the identity of one. He certainly does not feel the compulsion to act as a matador.

Through this scene that the narrator merely describes, the reader is put into a position to assess the negative effects of the absence of a code of conduct. The matador's codelessness denies him the identity of a matador. His subsequent aimlessness is enacted in the bullring. Here his actions create dissent against him and belittle the reputation of the bullfight. Without a subjectively posited guide for his conduct, he wreaks havoc in all directions. He is in dire need of a standard by which to assess his actions. He is incapable of judging what is right or wrong, acceptable or unacceptable.

Codelessness causes further damage as we move on to the final piece in this section of five which deals with the results of the rejection of a code. "Out of Season" concerns itself with a "young gentleman" and his relationships with his wife and the old man, Peduzzi (Out. 173). The young man's conduct is the issue at the heart of the

story. Since he partakes of a marriage and of an acquaintance, his actions throughout the story are to be measured with respect to his conduct in these two relationships. A consideration of his actions will reveal that his conduct is deficient with respect to his wife and the old man. The cause of this deficiency is the man's lack of a code of conduct. This shortcoming on his part is a destructive force in both relationships.

The story is set around a fishing expedition which is doomed from the start. Neither the husband nor the wife is particularly enthusiastic about the outing. This attitude is at least partly attributable to an argument that the couple has had earlier in the day. When they are in the wine shop, the husband says, "I'm sorry you feel so rotten, Tiny...I'm sorry I talked the way I did at lunch." He continues with an attempt to smooth things over. "We were both getting at the same thing from different angles." The wife's impatience and frustration with her husband is expressed in, "It doesn't make any difference...None of it makes any difference" (Out. 175). His ensuing concern over her attire reiterates his reluctance to confront whatever it is that is troubling the marriage. The problem with the marriage is confirmed during the fishing excursion when the wife says, "Of course you haven't got the guts to just go back...Of course you have to go on" (Out. 176). She chides the husband for his inability to make decisions. His indecisiveness is indicative of a codelessness within him. He has not performed the necessary formulation of a subjective standard and as such his conduct is without direction. He does not act firmly or consistently because he lacks a standard to which he might appeal for assistance. The husband

wavers and the marriage suffers.

This quality in the husband's conduct is also at play in his relationship with Peduzzi. His first error in this relationship is his involvement in it at all. It is difficult to understand why he would choose the town drunk to be his fishing guide. His sense of discrimination is lacking, but he does ultimately realize that his choice has not been a wise one. When he realizes that fishing season is closed, he voices a criticism of Peduzzi. He says, "I wish we weren't in on this damn thing. This damn old fool is so drunk, too" (Out. 176). Despite this perception, he continues to provide money and tolerate the old man. The younger man is simply unable to tell Peduzzi that the fishing excursion is a farce. He is incapable of confronting Peduzzi with the truth of the matter. This, again, is attributable to the absence of a subjective code of standards within the younger man.

This inability on the young man's part yields regrettable results. His silence throughout the affair convinces Peduzzi that "Life was opening out" (Out. 179). The old man is under the impression that he is earning a legitimate, albeit easy, salary. The young man's co-operation and willingness to comply with Peduzzi's suggestions bestows a legitimacy on Peduzzi himself. He believes he has become one of the salary workers in the town. He expects some respect. The business-like gentility of "Thank you, caro. Thank you" (Out. 179), demonstrates that Peduzzi now feels no embarrassment or shame in accepting the young man's money. He does not look upon it as charity.

When the young man tells Peduzzi, "I may not be going" (Out. 179),

the result must be devastating for the old man. We are given only his initial surprise, but his fall must have been hard. It may be suitable here to point out that in A Moveable Feast, Hemingway admits that "I had omitted the real end of the story which was that the old man hanged himself" (75). This admission confirms the suspicion with respect to the effects of the young man's lack of a code. His indecisiveness and hesitation has the impact of a cruel prank. He kills Peduzzi.

The young man's conduct in his relationship with Peduzzi is similar to his conduct in the relationship with his wife. In both instances, the young man demonstrates that his codelessness is present and that it is dangerous. In these two relationships it is the other parties to the relationships, namely the wife and Peduzzi, who suffer most visibly. However, this younger himself is a victim as well. He remains a non-entity. He has no identity. He is neither a husband for his wife nor an employer for the old man. He is nothing. In this story, the young man's conduct illustrates the potential for damage inherent in the absence of a code of conduct.

"Out of Season" is the last of five stories concerned with the absence of a code of conduct. Villalta's performance in "Chapter XII" introduces a section consisting of five pieces which look at the ultimate results of the formation and acceptance of a code of conduct. "Chapter XII" considers success as one possible result.

The conduct of the matador in "Chapter XII" is in stark contrast to the performance given by the codeless matador in "Chapter IX." Where the latter is the ideal of bad bullfighting, Villalta's deportment in

"Chapter XII" is representative of that which bullfighting aspires to be. Villalta's attitudes and actions, as well as the progress of the bullfight, combine to produce success. The narrator in this vignette provides a description of the appearance of success, but he does not look at the motivation behind the man responsible for this success. A consideration in this direction can provide a link between Villalta's success and Villalta's assumption of a code of conduct.

Villalta is faithful to the requisites of proper bullfighting. He exposes himself "to the maximum of danger" and triumphs through "ability and knowledge." He carries out "The planned and ordered death of the bull" with controlled and intentional finality (Hemingway, Death in the Afternoon 372). This courage and precision in Villalta's actions has its roots in a decision made before the actual bullfight. This is to say that Villalta's approach to bullfighting is a premeditated one. His performance is guided by a self-chosen attitude to the spectacle and his profession. He wants to fight the bull as he feels he must. That is, the proper conduct in the bullfight is important because he wants it to be. Villalta has subjectively created a standard by which he governs his performance. He abides by a personal code of conduct.

In allowing his actions to be shaped by such a code, Villalta enhances his own reputation and the standing of the spectacle of the bullfight. In disposing of the bull in an admirable way, his performance will be viewed in a favourable light by the audience. This, in turn, leads to the crowd's approval and endorsement of Villalta and the bullfight. Therefore, in addition to successfully carrying out his

responsibilities to the bullfight, Villalta also succeeds in furthering the respect for and significance of the bullfight. It is bestowed with legitimacy and importance. Thus, Villalta's success is twofold. He succeeds as an individual and as a spokesman for his profession.

In this vignette, the matador is naturally endowed with the qualities that make him a potentially talented bullfighter. His decision to apply this ability in a particular way constitutes the adherence to a code of conduct. In this piece, the narrator fails to recognize that success can be one of the results of the formulation and adherence to a code of conduct.

In moving from "Chapter XII" to "Cross-Country Snow," we move from the success generated by a code of conduct to the ability to endure which is facilitated by a code of conduct. In referring to endurance, we refer specifically to Nick's ability to cope with the responsibilities and demands of his position in the adult world.

In "Cross-Country Snow," Nick and George enjoy their last day of skiing together in Switzerland. As they sit themselves down at a table in the inn, however, the two friends become increasingly sombre. Their conversation turns to the end of their holiday and the inevitable return to a life of responsibilities. George must go back to school and Nick must rejoin his pregnant wife. The story focuses on Nick's reaction to the re-emergence of responsibilities. An assessment of Nick's reaction provides an insight into his adherence to a code of conduct. As such, his reaction furthers the discussion of the effects of adherence to a code.



Alan Holder correctly points out that in "Cross-Country Snow," "the world of skiing and male companionship was set in opposition to the world of domesticity and fatherhood encroaching on Nick Adams" (106). As was mentioned above, it is Nick's reaction to this opposition that is important. When Nick tells George that he and his wife do not particularly want to go back to America, George returns, "It's hell, isn't it?" Nick's reply is revealing. He says, "No. Not exactly" (Cross-Country. 187). While Nick is not sure why the approach of responsibilities is tolerable, he does feel that it is. His thinking is well in keeping with the qualities of an individual who abides by a code of conduct.

The demands of Nick's situation are at odds with his wishes. Nevertheless, the attitude which he assumes stipulates that the demands must be satisfied. The code he measures his actions by is a restraint which enables him to carry out the requisites of his marriage. Nick must have ostensibly decided to make his marriage a priority. Following this decision would have been the assumption of a code which would facilitate the satisfaction of the responsibilities to the marriage. The code of conduct enables Nick to endure the transition from liberty to responsibility. Carlos Baker accurately describes Nick's transition as one toward "that involvement with woman, all the approaching domestication, all that half-ruefully, uncomplainingly accepted responsibility which will arrive at the moment Nick's fatherhood begins" (133). Thus, when Richard Hasbany points out that George and Nick accept their responsibilities "without joy," he incorrectly concludes that this contributes to "a pervading sense in the passage of the ambiguous value of responsibility" (230).

Quite to the contrary, the absence of enthusiasm is indicative of a more profound impetus for action. In other words, Nick acts out of a sense of determination and resolve. He has made a decision, constructed a code, and now he abides by it. In the face of approaching responsibilities, he is steadfast. He is prepared to endure.

In "Cross-Country Snow," Nick reveals that he has established a code of conduct and that this code enables him to endure the increase in his responsibilities. Nick conceptualizes the resolution in his reply to George's "It's hell, isn't it?" (Cross-Country. 187), and the reader is left to articulate and assess this resolution.

Thus far it has been demonstrated that a code of conduct can create success or facilitate endurance. With "Chapter XIII" the results of a code become more unpleasant. In this vignette, the adherence to a code results in isolation.

The narrator of "Chapter XIII" is a matador. The other two matadors in the piece are identified as Maera and Luis. All three of them are supposed to take part in a bullfight scheduled for the afternoon of the day in which the vignette is set. A drunken and unmanageable Luis causes concern on the part of Maera. He wonders about the consequences of Luis's failure to prepare himself for the bullfight. Maera fears that he and the narrator will inevitably have the responsibility of killing Luis's bulls. The narrator is as aware of the situation as is Maera. However, the narrator demonstrates neither the same degree of concern nor the same depth of understanding. He explains Luis's attitude as typical of "an ignorant Mexican savage" and replies to Maera's query of "who will

kill his bulls after he gets a cogida?" with a frank "We, I suppose" (XIII-drunken Luis. 189). Maera agrees and yet he perceives a significance in the situation that the narrator is oblivious to. Maera becomes aware of the effects of his adherence to a code of conduct with respect to the bullfight. While Luis abandons any sense of control or discipline and joins in the revelry of the fiesta, Maera is left isolated by his self-imposed code of conduct. He prepares himself for the bullfight because he believes it the proper thing to do. By the same token, it is proper because he wants it to be. In other words, his code of conduct may be adhered to as if it were objective, but ultimately it is a subjective creation. Thus, the objectification of this subjective choice of conduct is responsible for Maera's isolated position.

Maera becomes aware of the position that his code of conduct puts him in. At the end of this vignette, he is a man who feels terribly alone. Others are allowed to abandon their responsibilities during the fiesta, but Maera cannot lose sight of his responsibility in the bullring. As a matador, he assumes the responsibilities of an entire society. Maera concludes, "We kills the savages' bulls, and the drunkards' bulls, and the riau-riau dancers' bulls. Yes. We kill them. We kill them all right. Yes. Yes. Yes" (XIII-drunken Luis. 189). The fiesta is a symbolic as well as actual reprieve from responsibilities. Society willingly sets aside its sense of responsibility and yet it expects the bullfighter to maintain his. The matador's compliance with this expectation is facilitated by a code of conduct. The compliance, in turn, leads to isolation.

Maera's insight is not recognized by the narrator. The discrepancy between what Maera says and how the narrator reacts is the place wherein one might look at what Maera says more closely. When one does this, it becomes apparent that Maera recognizes the effects of his fidelity to a code of conduct. He sees that his self-chosen approach to the bullfight isolates him from the rest of society. Without this isolation, the bullfight could not continue. The attitude espoused by Maera is responsible for the propagation of the bullfight. He is a representative of the bullfight. His self-discipline is the discipline of the spectacle of the bullfight.

The effects of adherence to a code become increasingly severe as we move on to the next piece. The isolation of "Chapter XIII" becomes the isolation and death of "My Old Man." The story concerns itself with the relationship between a father and his son. It also deals with their relationship to the father's profession as a jockey. The story is narrated by the son. He tells us that everything the father did was related to the profession of horse racing and that he himself "was nuts about the horses, too" (Old Man. 193). The son, Joe, maintains an untainted respect for his old man. He does not see the reality of his father's involvement in a corrupt sport. The story does indeed contain a "contrast between Joe's adoring innocence and his father's vicious world of thrown horseraces" (Baker 134). As such, the son cannot understand his father's ultimate reaction against the corruption of the sport. The significance of the father's actions is further highlighted by the son's failure to recognize the importance of them. The reader is thus put into

a position to assess the father's actions.

Joe's father first challenges the constraints placed on him by a corrupt sport when he wins a race in Milan. It is clear that he was not supposed to win because two men associated with the race are furious with him. Furthermore, father and son leave for Paris three days later. All that Joe can say is, "I knew something had happened" (Old Man. 194). This "something" has its origin in the father's first attempts to establish and adhere to a code of conduct. His reaction is directed against the fixed races and deception of the industry. He wants to ride fair races. This is made difficult because the father is set in opposition to a widespread corruption which he once accepted and supported. The initial result of his attempts to formulate a code is isolation. Not only does he have to leave Milan, but subsequently he finds it difficult to secure employment in Paris. It appears that he has affronted the legitimized corruption of an entire industry.

Since Joe's father finds it impossible to ride the horses, he begins to bet on them. After winning a considerable amount of money on a fixed race, the father replies to Joe's "Wasn't it a swell race, Dad?" with "George Gardner's a swell jockey, all right... It sure took a great jock to keep that Kzar horse from winning" (Old Man. 199-200). Joe does not see that his father is in the midst of making a transition to a code of conduct. While the change is not yet complete, it is taking place. The remark from Joe's father is both a criticism of the dishonesty in horse racing and a proclamation of the low esteem in which he holds the corrupt sport. He is trying to retreat from being identified with horse racing. He wants to

de-legitimize it. Joe, however, is difficult to convince. He simply accepts the rebuke as unpleasant. He fails to perceive the significance in the comment. While the father does involve himself in corruption by betting on a fixed race, he also makes an attempt to dispel any illusions that his son might have with respect to the race.

The father ultimately attempts to bring his new approach to horse racing by buying and riding his own horse. His efforts, however, end in death. He is killed while running his second steeplechase. It matters little whether the others running in the steeplechase were in on a predetermined race plan. If they were, then there is a real possibility that Joe's father was run off the track. If, on the other hand, the race was fair, then he would still have been killed while trying to bring a code of conduct to bear on his performance on the track. In either case, the establishment of and adherence to a code of conduct would be seen to be fatal.

The initial isolation and subsequent death brought on by the father's formulation of a code of conduct is followed by a further attack on his character. By the time of his death he is openly despised. In reply to his death one of the spectators says, "He had it coming to him on the stuff he's pulled" (Old Man. 205). Isolation and death has lead to yet a further affront. In this respect, Joe's final comment is vague and yet ominously poignant. He says, "Seems like when they get started they don't leave a guy nothing" (Old Man. 205). His father's adoption of a code of conduct has enabled him to establish himself in opposition to the corruption around him, but it has also exacted a heavy toll.

The price for adhering to a code of conduct is equally steep in "Chapter XIV." This vignette provides an account of the death of Maera. It is the last of the bullfighting vignettes. In it, the narrator graphically portrays Maera's perceptions as he is being gored and soon after in the infirmary before he dies. The narrator focuses on the scene before him as he records the last moments of Maera's life. A few words on the significance of Maera's death are noticeably missing. In addressing this point, the reader can place the scene into context and come to recognize Maera's death as the result of the adherence to a code of conduct.

The concern that Maera expressed in "Chapter XIII" is proven to be justified. We do not know whether he has in fact had to kill Luis's bulls, but he has had to fulfill his responsibilities to the bullfight. We cannot even say for certain that this is the bullfight of which he spoke in "Chapter XIII." This connection, however, is not necessary for an understanding of the import of Maera's death. The elements necessary for such an understanding are all present in the vignette itself. We have the bullfighter, the bull, the spectators, and death. These four things combine to give a picture of the essential nature of the bullfight. The vignette demonstrates that death is the ultimate conclusion of the bullfight. The death is usually that of the bull, but in some cases it is the matador who dies. In performing before the crowd, the matador enacts a dramatisation of his adherence to a code. In other words, the people who come to see the spectacle of the bullfight want to see a disciplined, regulated performance. The matador's courage is, after all,

made possible by his fidelity to a particular approach. The matador that the audience approves of is the one who is able to execute his part in the formal performance with competency and consistency. As a prior decision, the assumption of a code of conduct allows the matador to address the demands of his position in the face of self-induced danger. With the decision to face the bull made, the matador need only concentrate on performing to the best of his ability. The successful matador is the one, like Villalta in "Chapter XII," who provides a courageous and competent performance. In this respect, Maera's final bullfight is complete. He has brought the proper approach to the bullfight and his death is in keeping with the possibilities inherent in the formal spectacle.

The death of Maera is a result of his adherence to a code of conduct. By placing himself in a position of danger he is satisfying the demands of his profession. In other words, he is adhering to a self-chosen approach. In this way, he constructs for himself the identity of a matador and he strengthens the reputation of his profession. His existence assumes meaning. The only thing that terminates Maera's adherence to a code is death. It is a grave yet fitting conclusion to his life. In a meaningful existence, a code of conduct becomes unnecessary only in death.

The death of Maera concludes the group of stories that began with "The Revolutionist." This group concerns itself with the effects of the acceptance or rejection of a code of conduct. The first two pieces in the group look at youth's assumption of a code. In both cases the young people in question, a so called revolutionist and a courageous young matador,



draw an identity out of their adherence to a code and strengthen their respective causes. The code, however, does result in suffering as well. The next five pieces consider the effects of an absence or rejection of a code of conduct. In the three stories dealing with marriage, "Mr. and Mrs. Elliot," "Cat in the Rain," and "Out of Season," the lack of a definite attitude or approach results in meaningless relationships. The absence of a code prevents the marriages from acquiring any substance, and in "Out of Season" it proves to be harmful to the old man Peduzzi as well. The other two pieces in this section illustrate the demeaning of the spectacle of the bullfight at the hands of codeless ring servants and a codeless matador. The final section in this group is made up of three bullfighting vignettes, "Cross-Country Snow" and "My Old Man." These five pieces focus in on four possible effects of the adherence to a code of conduct. In "Chapter XII" Villalta demonstrates the success resulting from his code of conduct. This success provides a favourable standing both for himself and for the profession of bullfighting. Nick's decision to accept the responsibilities of marriage in "Cross-Country Snow" is aided by his formulation of a code. The code endows him with endurance. Maera's code in "Chapter XIII" propagates the ideal of good bullfighting and secures his identity as a true matador. However, he experiences isolation on account of his approach and ultimately dies for it. Isolation and death is also the price exacted from the jockey who begins to adhere to a code of conduct later on in his life. In "My Old Man," Joe's father establishes his opposition to corruption, but dies in doing so. In summary, then, the effects of adherence to a code considered in

these five pieces are success, endurance, isolation, and death.

This third group of stories reveals the dangers involved in assuming a code of conduct. On the other hand, it also shows that a code of conduct enables an individual to strengthen the cause or profession to which he belongs. In doing this, the individual establishes his identity and lends meaning to his existence. The rejection of a code may require less effort, but it is portrayed as being incompatible with a meaningful relationship or admirable profession. The third group expresses the belief that the assumption of a code of conduct may exact a price, but that the price is ultimately irrelevant.

#### IV - The Choices With Respect to a Code of Conduct

The final group of stories consists of the two parts of "Big Two-Hearted River" and the last two vignettes in the collection. These four pieces deal with the choices one has with respect to the acceptance or rejection of a code of conduct. The circumstances under which the respective decisions are made in these pieces are instrumental in highlighting the nature of the choice. This is to say that by portraying the main characters as individuals who are very alone, only the bare essentials of the issue are visible. That is, we see only an individual and a decision.

"Big Two-Hearted River: Part I" is the narrator's account of the beginning of the solitary camping trip of Nick Adams. The progress of the action in the story is straightforward. Nick gets off the train at Seney and makes his way through the charred remains of the town. From there, he hikes overland and finally makes camp near the river. The narrator is

thorough in his presentation. He details Nick's actions and is attentive to what Nick feels. The narrator does not, however, attempt to assess the significance of Nick's conduct during the course of the story. The opportunity to interpret Nick's actions is thus left to the reader. In this respect, one can place Nick's actions into context if his conduct is seen as an effort toward establishing his aloneness. In short, the aloneness of "Big Two-Hearted River: Part I" sets the stage for the decision made in "Big Two-Hearted River: Part II."

Nick establishes this aloneness in several ways. One of these avenues is to be found in the way that Nick posits his individual will. For instance, he knows that his pack is "much too heavy" (River:I. 210), but rationalizes while he eats that "I've got a right to eat this kind of stuff, if I'm willing to carry it" (River:I. 215). Nick believes that the benefits arising from the responsibility of carrying the heavy pack belong to him. He is prepared to sacrifice for himself. At times it appears that Nick merely wants to prove to himself that his will is in control. For example, as he walks over the terrain, he knows that "At any time... he could strike the river by turning off to his left" (River:I. 212). In a demonstration of the superiority of his will, however, he keeps "on toward the north to hit the river as far upstream as he could go in one day's walking" (River:I. 212). There is no other apparent reason for this decision.

Nick is also determined to make his will triumph over the influence of externally imposed responsibilities. He makes a conscious effort to distance himself from the entanglement of human inter-action.

He wants no one and nothing to make demands of him. His is a physical and mental separation. The physical aspect is clear enough in his decision to make the trip alone. The mental disassociation is illustrated in phrases such as "He felt he had left everything behind, the need for thinking, the need to write, other needs. It was all back of him" (River:I. 210). Nick returns to a state of no inflicted responsibility. He even goes so far as to cynically belittle the relationships between one person and another. Near the end of part one, Nick demeans and criticizes the relationship he once shared with a friend. He makes a pretense of being faithful to the memories he has of Hopkins. He feigns fidelity to Hopkins by making the coffee in the way that Hopkins did. The fidelity of Hopkins is reciprocated when Nick thinks of how they were supposed to have gone fishing after Hopkins had struck it rich. We are then told that he and Bill "never saw Hopkins again" (River:I. 217). Nick widens the gap between the relationships he once shared and the state he wishes to pursue. He wants to be alone so that he can gain control of the forces that shape his existence. In this respect, the responsibilities that he assumes in the story are all of his own creation. Nick believes that if he can make himself the creator of his own responsibilities, then he can become the creator of his own existence.

In his existentialist reading of Hemingway's work, John Killinger explains that "The hero is very much alone in this world, because he has no God and no real brother" (99). This description is applicable to the Nick Adams of "Big Two-Hearted River: Part I." He has severed the intimate relationships he once shared with friends and has turned to

himself for support. This is to say that he does not turn to God for guidance or encouragement in the face of disillusioning reality. He is determined to establish his aloneness so that the meaning or significance he brings to his existence will be of his own doing. This meaningfulness begins to take shape in "Big Two-Hearted River: Part II" as we see Nick's creation of a code of conduct. The necessary condition of aloneness, however, is established in part one of the story. In "Big Two-Hearted River; Part I," Nick prepares himself for the code of conduct he assumes in part two.

"Chapter XV" also deals with aloneness and a decision with respect to the assumption of a code of conduct. This interchapter concerns itself with the hanging of a man by the name of Sam Cardinella. The narrator in "Chapter XV" presents an account of the final hours and minutes preceding the death of the man. The narrator's account is not judgemental and it makes no attempt at offering an interpretation of what passes in the piece. The vignette, however, does offer a pronouncement. The silent resolution in the passage says something about an individual's relationship to a code of conduct or lack of it.

Sam Cardinella is not only anxious and frightened at the prospect of being hanged, but he is quite simply mortified. In his cell he "lay flat on his cot with a blanket wrapped around his head" and on the way to the gallows we are told that "They were carrying Sam Cardinella" (XV-Cardinella. 219). When it comes time to prepare him to be hanged, the guards have to put the noose over his head while Cardinella remains in a chair. He then loses "control of his sphincter muscle" and the guards are

"both disgusted" (XV-Cardinella. 219). The whole scene serves to isolate Cardinella in his final moments. Those involved in the hanging conduct themselves routinely. The guards carry on as ordinary labourers and the priests, for their part, demonstrate that they are responsible only for administering a service. They are the purveyors of spiritual reinforcing. One of the priests is said to whisper, 'Be a man, my son' (XV-Cardinella. 219). Cardinella is portrayed as being oblivious to what those around him say. He is conscious only of the impending hanging that will put an end to his existence.

Rather than creating the aloneness of his situation as Nick Adams did in "Big Two-Hearted River: Part I," Sam Cardinella has aloneness inflicted upon him. His subjective will is not responsible for his situation. As such, he is not prepared to formulate a code of conduct. His aloneness is not used as an opportunity to establish a code. The product of this state of affairs is the picture of a man whose existence is emptied of meaning. What is really disturbing about Cardinella's plight is that he has no expectation of establishing a code out of the emptiness of his position. He does not enjoy the expectation of a meaningful existence. Where Nick's position in "Big Two-Hearted River: Part I" is hopeful, Cardinella's is destitute of hope. Cardinella faces the final, most poignant episode of his existence with no approach. His last hours are a living death. He experiences the nothingness of death before he has actually died.

The story of Sam Cardinella lays bare the fundamental nature of a code of conduct. As a subjective cushion to the meaninglessness of one's

existence, its absence is only tolerable when aloneness is the prelude to the establishing of a code. When aloneness is not remedied by the approach provided by a code, aloneness becomes the ideal of emptiness and nothingness. During the final hours of his existence, Sam Cardinella is irrevocably cast into the emptiness at the heart of existence.

Nick's avoidance of the type of despair experienced by Cardinella is enacted in "Big Two-Hearted River: Part II." In this story, Nick builds a code of conduct out of the self-induced aloneness of "Big Two-Hearted River: Part I." The meaning provided by a code spares him a confrontation with nothingness.

In part two we soon realize that this is to be a day of fishing for Nick. He is still alone. The code of conduct that emerges during the day is not generated by Nick's interaction with other individuals, but rather through Nick's interaction with nature. Even in this elemental relationship with nature, Nick has certain expectations that he feels he must live up to. Having established his aloneness in part one, Nick's decision to interact with nature in a particular way in part two is presented as a purely subjective one. No force beyond his individual will compels him to act as he does during the day of the fishing trip.

We are told that early in the morning he is anxious to go fishing. He is "too hurried to eat breakfast" and yet "he knew he must" (River:II. 221). This declaration is followed by what can only be called an extremely efficient breakfast. It is thorough and sufficient. Nick begins the day by adequately satisfying his bodily requirements with exacting

precision. His preparations for the fishing excursion have this same exactitude about them. He quickly catches the grasshoppers without crushing them and then prepares himself with a barrage of equipment. We are told that he feels "professionally happy" (River:II. 223). Nick has competently prepared himself for his interaction with nature. His actions are codified and regulated. He is aware of the way he should act, and he does. This fidelity to proper conduct is emphasized further by his treatment of the trout when he lets it back into the water. He takes precautions to ensure that the fish will not die unnecessarily. By assuming a code of conduct which enables him to interact in a compatible way with nature, Nick becomes a part of nature. In this way, he can identify with his position in nature. By partaking of this larger entity, his existence assumes meaning and significance. He has successfully orchestrated an approach in the face of nothingness.

This reading of the story credits Nick with an important accomplishment. At the opposite extreme of such an interpretation is Philip Young's view. Young claims that in this story, Nick "is trying desperately to keep from going out of his mind" (6). While Nick is admittedly encountering an extremely significant event, it is difficult to understand how his exactitude and competence can be read as being the actions of a desperate man. To the contrary, his conduct is indicative of a subjective will that is in full, unpanicked control. His actions ensure that he will not go out of his mind.

In "Big Two-Hearted River: Part II" Nick reveals that the aloneness established in part one was a prelude to the formulation of



a code of conduct. After baring his existence, Nick then clothes it with a code of conduct. The positing of his subjective will prevents his existence from sliding into nothingness. The exercise enacted in "Big Two-Hearted River: Part II" posits Nick's will as supreme and shapes his existence. In this respect, Killinger's reading of the Hemingway hero is accurate. He says, "The real hero is the man who chooses this difficult way to his self, who perpetually reconstitutes his ex-sistence by choosing to be authentic and to bear the responsibilities of personal action" (98). As an individual, Nick ensures that his existence will not be without meaning.

The issue of aloneness and meaning in one's existence is also dealt with in the final piece of the collection. In "L'Envoi" the deposed monarch is the focus of attention, but the title itself refers to the narrator of the vignette. He is a messenger of some kind visiting the monarch who is under house arrest. The narrator chats with the king and we are thus presented with the king's views on the political upheaval that has presumably relieved him of his authority. The narrator does not assess the significance of the king's attitude. What is revealed of the king's attitude from what he says, however, is sufficient for an insight to be made into the king's conduct. In light of his position, the king's thoughts on his situation are relevant to the issue of aloneness and existence.

The king has had aloneness inflicted upon him. In being relieved of his official responsibilities, he also loses the identity that he once drew out of his office. Like the Nick Adams<sup>of</sup> "Big Two-Hearted River" and

the Sam Cardinella of "Chapter XV," he arrives at a state where his existence is stripped of essence or meaning. Unlike Nick or Cardinella, however, the king refuses to acknowledge the essential nature of his situation. He is of a disposition to turn away from the reality of his aloneness. He rejects a recognition of his naked existence. The king appears to be satisfied to engage in pleasantries and to shift his attention to political developments in general. Rather than focusing in on his individual situation, he talks of Plastiras and Kerensky and of the progress of revolutions. He gauges his position relative to larger, external developments. He looks outward and conceptualizes his identity as a part of the external, albeit altered, relationship by which he is connected to the state.

Since the king refuses to see the solitary, essential nature of his position, then he is neither compelled to formulate a code of conduct as did Nick in "Big Two-Hearted River: Part II," nor must he suffer the despair experienced by Sam Cardinella. He envelops himself in "the anonymity of the mass" (Killinger 6). The king's stubborn clinging to a larger identification is unwittingly touched on by the narrator when he says, "Like all Greeks he wanted to go to America" (L'Envoi. 233). In other words, the king sacrifices his individuality so that he might **be spared the necessity** of making a fundamental decision concerning his existence. At this momentous stage in his life, he refuses to formulate an individual, subjective code of conduct. The king may well be "very jolly" (L'Envoi. 233), but he is also deficient as an individual, subjective entity.

The final four pieces of IOT all present individuals who arrive at a state where they are confronted with the essential aloneness and meaninglessness of their respective existences. Nick Adams induces this state while Sam Cardinella and the deposed monarch have this state inflicted upon them. Once this condition is established, they are then faced with a fundamental decision. This decision is a twofold one. Initially, these individuals must decide whether to confront the aloneness of their existences. If this is accomplished, they must then decide whether they are willing to subjectively endow this emptiness with meaning. The monarch in "L'Envoi" chooses to carry out neither decision. He refuses to acknowledge his aloneness and is consequently spared the decision of whether to bring subjective meaning to his existence. As a result, he sacrifices his individuality. Sam Cardinella does confront aloneness. He does not, however, orchestrate a response to it. As a consequence, he spends his last hours in the despair of nothingness. Nick Adams carries out both decisions. He encourages a state of aloneness and then formulates a code of conduct in reply. In doing this he posits his will as supreme, lends meaning to his existence, and all the while sustains and reiterates his individuality.

In this final group of stories, Hemingway outlines the accessibility and purpose of a subjective code of conduct. A code of conduct, by its very subjective nature, is portrayed as being accessible only to the individual who is aware of and willing to confront the essential aloneness of his existence. For such an individual, a code of conduct is the means by which to posit meaning in the place of nothingness. The person who

accomplishes these two tasks is thus able to become a true individual with a meaningful existence.

#### V - A Summary

In looking at the thirty-two pieces of IOT both individually and collectively, this paper has chosen to divide the collection into four main groups. These four groups have outlined the structure of Hemingway's treatment of the issue of a code of conduct. The first group opened with "On the Quai at Smyrna" and ended with "The Three-Day Blow." This group built the case in favour of a subjective code by revealing the chaos and damage which is a result of the code's absence. Group one demonstrated that moral decisions could not be made without the aid of a code. The second group began with the execution of cabinet ministers in "Chapter V" and closed with the murder of two small time thieves in "Chapter VIII." This group qualified the favourable case made for a code of conduct in the first group. This is to say that the second group elaborated on the nature of a code. It reiterated the necessity of a code, but it also looked at the relative qualities of a code. That is, an individual will is responsible for and supreme over a code of conduct. As such, it must carry out the task of discerning the limits of fidelity to a code. The third group was encompassed by "The Revolutionist" and the death of Maera in "Chapter XIV." This group investigated the possible results of the rejection of or adherence to a code of conduct. It also assessed the price exacted from individuals who choose one of these two routes. Generally speaking, this group expressed the opinion that the benefits arising from adherence to a code of conduct outweighed the price

exacted for this fidelity. This is to say that even death is an acceptable exchange for the meaning that a code can lend to one's otherwise meaningless existence. On the other hand, the facility of codelessness was shown to be a poor exchange for the results it wrought. The fourth and final group of stories included the two parts of "Big Two-Hearted River," "Chapter XV," and "L'Envoi." This group demonstrated that a code of conduct is accessible and useful only to those individuals who are willing to face the fundamental aloneness of their existences. A code of conduct allows such individuals to both achieve a meaningful existence and to maintain their individuality.

These, then, are the cornerstones of Hemingway's treatment of a code of conduct in IOT. A code of conduct is necessary because it facilitates moral decisions and thus prevents the chaos of amorality. Though the code is essential, it is nonetheless relative. The individual, subjective will must reign supreme over any code of conduct. This individual will may recognize the negative effects of adherence to a code, but it will also recognize that the benefits outweigh the costs. For individuals willing to concede the aloneness of their existences, the code will lend meaning to their existences and sustain their individuality.

In considering Hemingway's In Our Time collection of short stories, this paper has touched on the technique used by Hemingway in presenting the thematic matter of the collection. Each respective piece was found to follow a pattern of problem and solution. That is, the author presented both a problematic situation and the consequent reaction of a narrator or major character. The failings or shortcomings in the reaction of a narrator or major character were the means by which the reader was enabled to discern an inferred resolution. These inferred resolutions were the structural elements which permitted the thematic discussion to take shape. Each inferred resolution concerned itself with the issue of a subjectively created code of conduct. This is to say that the words or actions of a narrator or major character either implied the necessity for a code of conduct or implied the necessity of recognizing the existence of a code of conduct. By investigating a particular aspect of such a code in each piece, the collection as a whole offered a discussion dealing with various aspects of a code. The thematic discussion concerning a code of conduct was a product of its accumulated parts.

This paper's assessment of the thematic aspect of In Our Time revealed that Hemingway's intent in the collection was didactic. His intention was to demonstrate the necessity of a subjectively created code of conduct. He painted the picture of a world in which a religious moral impetus was no longer existent. This secular state of affairs had certain repercussions. It removed an externally imposed regulating influence on an individual's conduct and it also stripped the individual existence of its identification with the divine. This result meant that

the impetus for moral conduct became the responsibility of an individual who was now confronted with a meaninglessness at the heart of his existence. There would inevitably be various responses to this new situation. Some would carry on without a code of conduct and the results would be disastrous. Others would look for meaning by refusing to confront the meaninglessness of their existences and by partaking of their collective societal identities. This course of action would sacrifice their individuality. Clearly, the situation was one that demanded a suitable response.

The proper response, as Hemingway would have it in the collection, is the creation of and adherence to a personal code of conduct. Such a code exerts a self-regulating influence and sustains a moral, albeit subjective, dimension in one's faculty of judgement. In this way, an individual becomes a moral entity. He can make the moral decisions that will render him compatible with the environment around him. His existence assumes meaning. However, unlike that individual who merely hides from meaninglessness by turning to the collective identity he shares with others, the individual who formulates a code of conduct endows the meaninglessness with essence and in so doing posits the distinct importance of his individual will. Such conduct is the preferred conduct in the world of In Our Time.

## Works Cited

- Bache, William. "Hemingway's 'The Battler.'" Explicator 13 (1954): item 4.
- Baker, Carlos. Hemingway: The Writer as Artist. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1963.
- Beach, Joseph Warren. The Method of Henry James. Philadelphia: Albert Saifer, 1954.
- Burhans, Clinton S., Jr. "The Complex Unity of In Our Time." Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's In Our Time. Ed. Michael S. Reynolds. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1983. 88-102.
- Fulkerson, Richard. "The Biographical Fallacy and 'The Doctor and the Doctor's Wife.'" Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's In Our Time. Ed. Michael S. Reynolds. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1983. 150-54.
- Hasbany, Richard. "The Shock of Vision: An Imagist Reading of In Our Time." Ernest Hemingway: Five Decades of Criticism. Ed. Linda Welshimer Wagner. East Lansing: Michigan State UP, 1974. 224-40.
- Hemingway, Ernest. Death in the Afternoon. New York: Scribner's, 1932.
- Hemingway, Ernest. A Farewell to Arms. New York: Scribner's, 1929.
- Hemingway, Ernest. A Moveable Feast. New York: Scribner's, 1964.
- Hemingway, Ernest. The Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway. New York: Scribner's, 1938.
- Holder, Alan. "The Other Hemingway." Ernest Hemingway: Five Decades of Criticism. Ed. Linda Welshimer Wagner. East Lansing: Michigan State UP, 1974. 103-09.
- Killinger, John. Hemingway and the Dead Gods: A Study in Existentialism. Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 1960.
- Leigh, David J., S. J. "In Our Time: The Interchapters as Structural Guides to a Psychological Patter." Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's In Our Time. Ed. Michael S. Reynolds. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1983. 130-37.



- Leiter, Louis H. "Neural Projections In Hemingway's 'On the Quai at Smyrna.'" Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's In Our Time. Ed. Michael S. Reynolds. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1983. 138-40.
- Maurois, André. "Ernest Hemingway." Trans. Joseph M. Bernstein. Hemingway and His Critics: An International Anthology. Ed. Carlos Baker. New York: Hill and Wang, 1961. 38-54.
- Nahal, Chaman. The Narrative Pattern in Ernest Hemingway's Fiction. Cranbury, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1971.
- Parker, Alice. "Hemingway's 'The End of Something.'" Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's In Our Time. Ed. Michael S. Reynolds. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1983. 157-58.
- Pound, Ezra. "A Few Don'ts by an Imagiste." Poetry 1 (1913): 200-06.
- Roberts, John J. "In Defense of Krebs." Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's In Our Time. Ed. Michael S. Reynolds. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1983. 199-202.
- Scholes, Robert. Semiotics and Interpretation. New Haven: Yale UP, 1982.
- Slabey, Robert M. "The Structure of In Our Time." Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's In Our Time. Ed. Michael S. Reynolds. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1983. 76-87.
- Steinke, Jim. "The Two Shortest Stories of Hemingway's In Our Time." Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's In Our Time. Ed. Michael S. Reynolds. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1983. 218-26.
- Wagner, Linda Welshimer. "Juxtaposition in Hemingway's In Our Time." Critical Essays on Ernest Hemingway's In Our Time. Ed. Michael S. Reynolds. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1983. 120-29.
- Warren, Robert Penn. Selected Essays. New York: Random House, 1951.
- Young, Philip. Ernest Hemingway. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1959.