

「一日待つこと」の謎：ヘミングウェイの短編小説技法

Mysteries of “A Day’s Wait”: Hemingway’s Art of Short Stories

麻生 雅樹[※]

Masaki Aso[※]

要約

アーネスト・ヘミングウェイの「一日待つこと」は、インフルエンザに罹患した9歳の少年 Schatz の奇妙な行動をめぐる短編小説で、タイトルが示すように、あるものを一日中待っていた少年の勘違いが最後に判明し、すれ違う父子関係も解消されるというプロットを持つ、ほのぼのとした後味の小品である。父親の視点で父子関係を描くヘミングウェイの文章表現はとてもシンプルで、語り手である父親の心理や息子の心境をほとんど描写せず、何を待っていたのかという謎そのものですら、あまり重要ではない小さな出来事かのように物語を締めくくる。しかし、この短編の中心テーマは小さな出来事めぐる死の恐怖を体験する少年の複雑な心理を暗示し、彼の心境の変化によって変容する親子関係を描くことであると考えられる。そのために、シンプルな文章で多くを示唆する「氷山理論」と呼ばれるヘミングウェイの小説技法が使われている。具体的には、含意、顕在化、反復、話法、象徴、韻律などの技法の効果によって、語り手が語ることのない息子の心境が浮き彫りにされる。これらの技法が当該作品の総合的な完成度を高めている要素であり、評価すべき文学的価値である。

本稿では、ヘミングウェイの小説技法を分析する装置として、物語の解釈に関する5つの謎（問い）を設定し、それらを解明する過程において、父子関係というテーマと関連させながら、小説技法の役割・効果を論証する。5つの謎とは、「なぜ窓は開いていたのか」「なぜ Schatz は服を着替えたのか」「なぜ医者の説明は一階で行われたのか」「なぜ父親は海賊の本を読み聞かせたのか」「なぜアイリッシュ・セッターは赤い犬になったのか」である。最終章では、ヘミングウェイの小説技法が、テキストに潜在する父親の心理的ダイナミズムだけでなく、「生と死」の二項対立を比喩的・象徴的に暗示していることを主張する。それによって、作品をより深く読み解くという文学的価値の創造という目標が達成されるはずである。

キーワード：ヘミングウェイ、短編小説、技法、文体、父子関係、生と死

Introduction

“A Day’s Wait” by Ernest Hemingway is a very short story about a nine-year-old boy called Schatz, who comes down with influenza, and his father. It unfolds a small mystery of Schatz waiting weirdly for something to come, which is finally explained as his silly misunderstanding about temperature scales. To ask the question “What was he waiting for?” is of much importance to the main plot of the story, but not much to its main theme of the story: the psychological conflicts of the relationship between Schatz and his father. As Raymond S. Nelson pointed out, “A Day’s Wait,” as well as some other short stories of his such as “The Sea Change” or “Hills Like White Elephants,” “concerns unnamed major figures whose unique existence is less important than

※日本経済大学経営学部グローバルビジネス学科

the types they represent” and “Hemingway is interested in their relationship and the revelation of their minds, their attitudes, their values” (Nelson, 35). Also, as Sheldon Norman Grebstein pointed out, “Hemingway almost always avoids direct exposition of theme” (Grebstein, 2) and “[f]undamental to Hemingway’s craft in the short story are the archetypal principles of antithesis and opposition, or, very simply, the conflict and contrast of antipodal forces and values” (Grebstein, 4). So, in “A Day’s Wait,” there are some more important mysteries left to solve in pursuing the main theme: the conflicts between the father and the son.

The story is told from the father’s point of view, mainly focusing on what happened, so his narrative is quite plain and simple. As Jan Bakker concludes that “[t]his story is a typical example of Hemingway’s stylistic economy and his particular ability to transfer the right emotional effect to the reader without having to sentimentalize or without even having to mention the emotions at play” (Bakker, 40), the narrator of the story rarely tells about his feelings until the end and finishes his story like a funny little anecdote about his son’s mishap, though he maintains his benevolent attitude toward his son all the time. Despite the seemingly simple story with the happy ending, the father seems to fail to understand what his son means and feels during the entire story except for the last scene, as Carlos Baker pointed out that the father’s “unspoken sympathy for his own son” is shown in the very last sentence of the story (Baker, 134). The father proves to be only a naïve narrator. As Brooks and Warren discussed, however, Hemingway’s style is “a result of calculation, and is not, strictly speaking, spontaneous and naïve at all” (*Understanding Fiction*, 201). The father’s narrative mode of this short story is “a result of calculation.”

This narrative mode of Hemingway’s is famously called “iceberg theory,” also known as the theory of omission, a minimalistic technique of writing, carrying a large amount of implication of main themes that underlie surface elements, as he explained in *Death in the Afternoon*: “If a writer of prose knows enough about what he is writing about he may omit things that he knows and the reader, if the writer is writing truly enough, will have a feeling of those things as strongly as though the writer had stated them. The dignity of movement of an ice-berg is due to only one-eighth of it being above water” (*Death*, 192). Peter L. Hays summarizes Hemingway’s writing style and his iceberg theory, concisely explaining that “[t]here is a poetic use of repetition (learned in part from the Bible and Gertrude Stein) and a concentration on surface detail, on suggesting character through things said and done rather than through psychological analysis” (Serafin, 510).

Contrasting with the simplicity of the father’s ego, Hemingway tried to suggest Schatz’s psychological dynamics: affection, rivalry, hesitation, hope, disappointment, envy, jealousy, shame, frustration, guilt, sadness, worry, anxiety, fear, despair, horror, loneliness, concession, acceptance, relief, embarrassment, sympathy, compassion, and maybe more. To do so, Hemingway applied in practice his “iceberg theory,” particularly by employing literary devices in the story, such as elicitation, repetition, free indirect speech presentation, symbolism, and poetic diction. Each of them reveals hidden psychological conflicts between the father and the son. Hemingway’s techniques of writing employed here to imply a large amount of underlying emotions heighten the literary values of the seemingly succinct short story of “A Day’s Wait” to a considerable degree.

In this paper, five mysteries of the story will be explained by analyzing the literary devices that Hemingway

used in it. In doing so, some linguistic and stylistic analyses of the text of the short story will clearly disclose the psychological conflicts and reconciliation in the relationship between Schatz and his father in detail. Finally, a metaphorical interpretation of the explanations to the mysteries will be presented, which claims that the relationship between the father and the son mirrors the one between life and death. The conclusion will make it possible to push the short story to another level.

1. Why had the windows been left open?

At the very beginning of the story, a man “came into the room” and “shut the windows,” which puts the reader right into the middle of a context of the story. They still do not know who “he” is, where “the room” is, and why he “shut the windows.” This is a literary device called “in medias res” that snatches the reader into the middle of the plot at the beginning of a story and give them no choice but to read it on with any questions unanswered. It is also used in Hemingway’s another short story *Indian Camp* and, in fact, many readers expect it when they read Hemingway’s short stories. If they are astute readers, however, it is possible for them to grasp a lot of details of the unknown situation from the opening paragraph of “A Day’s Wait,” which consists of only two sentences. What makes it possible is Hemingway’s technique of eliciting questions from the reader, for example, questions like “Why had the windows been open in the first place?” This can be called the technique of “elicitation,” which is arguably part of his iceberg theory. Now let us try to find the answer to the question above and examine how Hemingway’s writing technique of elicitation works here. In doing so, the psychological conflicts of the relationship between Schatz and his father can be disclosed.

He came into the room to shut the windows while we were still in bed and I saw he looked ill. He was shivering, his face was white, and he walked slowly as though it ached to move.

(*Complete*, 332)

There is no doubt about the fact that the room was the narrator’s bedroom because he said, “we were still in bed” when the man came into. The expression “in bed” without the definite article refers to their intention that they were going to stay there for some time longer or not going to get up soon, because it is used to show that someone is physically in their bed without necessarily being asleep or asleep in their bed. The “still” indicates that it must have been early in the morning, when they are usually in bed, or that they were in bed later than usual on that day. In the room, there were at least three people: the “he,” the narrator, and someone else who were in bed with the narrator, which probably means that they were a married couple. The narrator may be the man’s parent, or his child if the man is old. Soon after this, the “he” will be identified as a nine-year-old boy called “Schatz” and the narrator his father.

No matter what the relationship between them was, the reader should ask a next question like “How did the narrator know when Schatz came and why?” The infinitive “to shut” in the first sentence suggests that

the narrator already knew why Schatz came into the room when he came into the room, but it should be explained more logically that it was not until he shut the windows that the father noticed his presence and his purpose. Then his father saw that he was looked ill and he was shivering, when he was probably going back to his bedroom without saying anything.

As the verb “looked” and the subordinating conjunction “as though” show, the father only observed Schatz’s physical conditions, probably from the bed during the whole scene. The father saw him shivering at some point, but the present participle suggests that the father saw only part of his action, not all of it. On the other hand, the past simple verb “walked” suggests that the father saw a completed action of his walking and reaching the door to leave the room. In other words, his father saw Schatz walked until he left there, when his father first spoke to Schatz.

Now let us review all the information we have gotten from the opening paragraph so far.

1. Schatz came into the room.
2. The father was still in bed with someone else.
3. Schatz shut the windows.
4. The father first noticed that Schatz was in the room.
5. Then the father knew why Schatz was there.
6. Schatz headed for the door.
7. Schatz looked ill.
8. Schatz was shivering and his face was white.
9. Schatz walked slowly to the door painfully.
10. The father just observed Schatz from his bed.
11. Schatz did not say anything.
12. His father spoke to Schatz from the bed just before he left the room. (Not in the first paragraph)

Although the pieces of information above may elicit some questions about their relationship from the reader, there are still some more important questions left to ask and a further investigation is required here for more details about what Schatz and his father did.

One of the biggest mysteries is, “Why did Schatz shut the windows?” Taking his father’s observation into account, the simplest answer would be that he was very cold because of a kind of illness. If so, however, another difficult question will be raised: “Why did he know that the windows had been open?” Even if he felt the cold wind coming from under the door into his bedroom, that would not explain why he knew that the windows of his father’s room were open and the wind was coming from there. If it ached for him to walk, it would be unlikely that he tried to find out where the wind was coming from after he walked out of his room. So, now the question is, “Why did he know that it was coming from his father’s room?” The most logical answer is that the door of his father’s room had been open as well.

If the door had been opened, the wind would have been flowing out into the hallway and it would be more probable that Schatz felt cold. He could have heard wild birds singing noisily outside through the open windows, and he could infer where to look. Above all, the hypothesis would be strongly supported by the fact that his father noticed that he was in the room after he shut the windows, because he would not have made a noise if he needed not to open the door.

The speculation above will lead to a next question “Why had not only the windows but also the door been left open?” In general, it is thought that the night was very hot, or fresh air was needed. Now, the information about the weather of the day and other crucial facts from other parts of the story are necessary.

Additional information 1: It was a very cold winter morning of a beautiful sunny day.

Additional information 2: The house had fireplaces.

Additional information 3: The father went hunting a little after 11 a.m. and killed two wild quails.

Additional information 4: Schatz knew that his father had wanted to go hunting that day.

Additional information 1 enables us to eliminate the possibility of being hot the previous night. Someone opened the windows early in the morning. Additional information 2 can confirm our presumption that someone opened both the windows and the door for ventilation. It requires two open places to let fresh air through the room for ventilation. However, it seems unusual to leave some windows and the door open in a cold winter morning while people are in bed. It would have made the room very cold. In fact, Schatz came to the room and shut the windows for that very reason. If someone ventilates a room in a cold morning, they would do it after they get up and change their clothes. Therefore, there must be any more reasons that they were in bed with the windows and the door open.

Additional information 3 can be of help to figure out at least one of the reasons. The father went hunting in the neighborhood later that day. Additional information 4 suggests that the father seemed to have been thinking about going hunting and looking forward to it since that morning. So, he must have checked out the weather first in the morning and he knew that it was a beautiful morning and the fresh air was very pleasant. Then he must have heard quails crowing loudly around the house. It is a well-known fact that quails crow loudly in the morning. In fact, as Additional information 3 tells us, he killed two quails in the hunting and he got very happy to find some more coveys of quails near the house. He must have decided to leave the windows open to hear more of quails crowing, enjoying his idea of going hunting and shooting a covey of quails. The open windows surely imply his excitement for hunting. It is probably a secondary reason for keeping them open to let the stagnant air of the room caused by the fireplace go. This will explain why the windows had been left open when Schatz came into the room.

Let us now go back again to the question about the reason why Schatz shut the windows. He should have been cold, it nevertheless seems a little strange that Schatz got out of bed, went out of the room into the cold hallway and all the way to his father’s room, and shut the windows, though the door of Schatz’s room was

closed, so that the wind did not bother him very much, and it hurt for him to move that morning. In addition to the reason that he was cold, there must have been some more reasons why he went all the way to his father's room. They must be stronger reasons why he shut the windows than being cold.

To figure out them, it should be helpful to focus on Schatz's behavior when he came into the room. He did not say a word until he was asked by his father. What does his silence mean? When his father was worried about Schatz's physical condition and asked him, he replied, "I've got a headache," and, when his father told him to go back to bed, he said, "I'm all right." It is too obvious that the father did not believe that. Therefore, it should be regarded that Schatz wanted his father to be worried about him, but he could not tell his father honestly, because he did not want to show his weakness to his father. His painful way of walking seems to represent his frustration that was building up due to his dilemma about his father.

Furthermore, additional information 4 tells us that Schatz realized the reason why the windows were open, or rather his father's true intention of keeping them open. He too could have heard quails crowing loudly from his father's room, which made him certain of his father's intention to go hunting. Schatz's behavior of shutting the windows should reflect his disapproval of his father's idea of going hunting. He felt envious of his father, lonely, and sad.

As examined above, only two sentences can imply Schatz's feelings about his father and reveal the relationship conflicts between the father, who opened the windows, and the son, who shut them. Hemingway's technique of elicitation enables us to get much more information about Schatz and his father from the opening paragraph of two sentences, even though the narrator describes only what happened and what he observed from the bed.

The narrator of the story always fails to understand his son. On the other hand, Schatz himself usually talks little or answers vaguely. The combination of the unreliable narrator and the quiet son makes it difficult for the reader to know what they really feel or think. This scarcity of psychological descriptions is the fundamental effect of the technique of elicitation. The reader is always required to read what the narrator does not narrate. On the contrary, they are always required to pay attention to what the narrator repeats in the story. The importance of the technique of repetition is what Gertrude Stein taught Hemingway in Paris, as he wrote in *A Moveable Feast*: "She had also discovered many truths about rhythms and the uses of words in repetition that were valid and valuable and she talked well about them" (*Moveable*, 17). In this short story, however, the technique of repetition emphasizes not only what the narrator expresses but also what the narrator does not express.

2. Why was Schatz dressed?

After the opening paragraph of the story, the conversation between Schatz and his father follows as quoted below, in which the father repeats some words and phrases and so does Schatz. Let us examine what their repetitions imply.

“What’s the matter, Schatz?”

“I’ve got a headache.”

“**You better go back to bed.**”

“No. **I’m all right.**”

“**You go to bed. I’ll see you when I’m dressed.**”

But when I came **downstairs** he was **dressed**, sitting by the fire, looking a very **sick** and miserable **boy** of nine years. When I put my hand on his forehead I knew he had a fever.

“**You go up to bed,**” I said, “**you’re sick.**”

“**I’m all right,**” he said.

(*Complete*, 332; boldface mine)

In the first five lines of the quotation still exchanged in the father’s bedroom, the father repeats almost the same advice to Schatz two times. As David Lodge pointed out, Hemingway used the technique of repetition to “put down what really happened in action, what the actual things were which produced the emotion that you experience,” though “[I]exical and grammatical repetition on this scale would probably receive a black mark in a school ‘composition,’ and quite right” (Lodge, 90). The father’s repetition here emphasizes his parental concern for his son, trying to give a nuance of advice instead of order. At the same time, however, the repetition implies another aspect of the father’s intention. He repeated not only because his son did not go back to bed obediently, but also because he tried unconsciously to claim his superiority to his son. He implied here, by adding “I’ll see you when I’m dressed,” that he has an authority to make his son wait for him to get dressed, and emphasized the superior/inferior relationship between a “father who take care of” and a “child who is taken care of.” That is to say, the father’s repetition emphasizes both his parental concern for and his superiority to his son at the same time.

As if he admits it, the father, using the “looking,” describes Schatz subjectively as a “very sick and miserable boy of nine years.” It leaves a strong impression of Schatz as a weaker boy on the reader. The father also repeats the word “sick” again to tell Schatz to go to bed after he confirms Schatz’s fever. This repetition of the “sick” emphasizes his compassion for his small boy, and his three-time advice for his son to go to bed demonstrates his love to the miserable boy. On the contrary, the repetitions strengthen the impression of the inferiority of Schatz on the reader like subliminal messages. He does not try to understand the reason why his son was dressed and sitting by the fire downstairs.

With the father’s repeated advice, Schatz expresses his disagreement again by repeating the same answer “I’m all right,” which emphasizes his resistance to the father. However, his answer reveals almost nothing about his feelings. Although Schatz must have been very sick, as the father observed, it is nevertheless unable for the reader to know exactly how he felt, because the story is told from the father’s point of view, who does not understand his son very much. So, the questions “Why was Schatz dressed and why was he there downstairs?” are naturally elicited here.

Despite the unreliable narrator's description, the technique of repetition suggests that there can be two kinds of interpretations about not only the son's behavior, but also the father's behavior. They can explain the complicated relationship between the two: a father who is (or wants to be) worried about his son and a son who does not want to worry his father about him/a father who treats his son as a small child and a son who does not want his father to treat him as a small child. The possibility that the two interpretations do not conflict each other in their relationship must mainly cause the son's trouble. The complexity of the father-son relationship keeps increasing tension between them. The repeated word "dressed" divulges it as well as what lies the deepest in the son's mind.

When the father got dressed and went to Schatz's room, he must have been surprised to find that the son was not there, though he did not tell anything about what happened upstairs. Also, he must have felt a little disappointed and annoyed when he went downstairs to find that Schatz had not followed his advice and was "dressed, sitting by the fire." For the father to get dressed represents his concern for his son and his desire to demonstrate his fatherhood to his miserable son, and, on the other hand, for Schatz to get dressed represents his remarkable stoicism not to worry his father and his strong will not to admit his inferiority. Then again, the repetition of the word "dressed" discloses how complicated their relationship is and emphasizes the tensions between them.

The repetition of "dressed" also suggests the possibility of forming a rhyming couplet to demonstrate the tensions between them in verse.

You go to bed. I'll see you when I'm **dressed**.

But when I came downstairs he was **dressed**,

(boldface mine)

In the form of the couplet, the contrast of the word "dressed" is much easier to be noticed, and it is clearly understood that Schatz's act of getting dressed is contrasted against his father's same act. Also, the subordinate clauses of "when" in both lines and the conjunction "but" in between can suggest ironically both his fatherhood to take care of his son and his puzzlement over Schatz's strange behavior of being dressed and waiting for him downstairs.

Schatz's act of getting dressed and going downstairs surely reflects his mixed feelings about his father, but it is still incomprehensible that a nine-year-old boy that was very sick with a fever got dressed and went downstairs, even if he did not want his father to worry about him and treat him as a small child. He could wait for his father in his room upstairs after he got dressed because he knew that his father came to see him soon. The situation of Schatz must have been more complicated than it seemed.

Getting dressed in the morning usually means starting the day. If Schatz wanted to show his father that he was not ill and he was ready for a usual day, he would have had breakfast first. Although he was sitting by the fire probably because he was cold, it is very probable that he was dressed and went downstairs to try to have

breakfast with his family. If Schatz had not been ill, what would he have planned to do that day? Generally, a boy would go outside whether to school or not. Schatz must have had a plan to go outside. If so, he might have decided to go hunting with his father. However, Schatz must have hesitated to ask his father to take him along, because he did not seem to have promised with his father about it. So, by getting dressed and waiting for his father to come downstairs, he was clinging to a mere possibility to go hunting with his father and finally, his illness terminated his hope for it. The repeated “dressed” implies his hopeless hope to go hunting and his jealous of his father, frustration, and sadness about going hunting.

As shown by Additional Information 4 above, there is a scene later in the story that indicates that Schatz knew about his father’s plan to go hunting. After the doctor left, the father was trying to kill time reading a children’s book silently until the time to give him some medicine. Schatz, who had already been facing the fear of death, offered that his father did not have to stay there with him and could go to do something else. It should be interpreted that Schatz hinted to his father that he let his father go hunting alone if the father wanted to. Schatz’s offer expresses that he thought it was good for his father, but he might also have been trying to find out if the fatherhood was sincere or not. The technique of repetition is effectively used to illustrate Schatz’s feelings.

“Why don’t you try to **go to sleep**? I’ll **wake you up** for the medicine.”

“I’d rather **stay awake**.”

After a while he said to me, “**You don’t have to stay** in here with me Papa, **if it bothers you**.”

“**It doesn’t bother me**.”

“No, I mean **you don’t have to stay** if it’s **going to bother you**.”

I thought perhaps he was a little lightheaded and after giving him the prescribed capsules at eleven o’clock I went out for a while.

(*Complete*, 333; boldface mine)

When the father told Schatz to try go to sleep, the son mildly declined to accept the advice by using the words “stay awake,” as if he intentionally repeated the father’s “wake you up” to show his independence. As Joseph DeFalco pointed out, “an ironic reversal of roles” in the father-son relationship is illustrated here. Schatz “assumes the authoritarian role” and, on the contrary, the father is “portrayed more as a young boy” when he went hunting later (DeFalco, 53-54). Schatz’s repeated offer to let his father go hunting suggests as if he was the father who allowed a child to go outside to play.

However, his offer also implies his more subtle feelings. The two conditional clauses directed to his father are expressed in different tenses (“bothers”). The first one is in the present tense, which asks about the father’s feeling or situation “at the time,” but the second one is in the future tense (“be going to”), which asks about the father’s feeling or situation in the near future. So, Schatz repeated his offer with a slight change in the tenses

intentionally, because he tried to make it easier for his father to understand what he hinted at. On the contrary, he made his father become more confused about it and even think that he was “a little lightheaded.” Schatz’ subtle and vague offer indicate his consideration for his father not to frustrate his father’s efforts, but it can also suggest his concession on his father’s going hunting without him. Schatz’s vagueness clearly shows his dilemma about his father.

3. Why did the doctor explain downstairs?

The scenes before and after the doctor came are very important to the main plot in that they give the reader two crucial clues to Schatz’ mystery that can be gained only from the context as foreshadowing. One of them is that Schatz might have overheard the doctor say that his temperature was “one hundred and two” upstairs in his room, and the other is that Schatz was not there when the doctor explained to his father downstairs that he got influenza and his illness was not serious. The setting of the two different places, upstairs and downstairs, is the key device of providing the foreshadowing. These scenes develop upstairs and downstairs alternatively at a rapid pace, which intentionally makes the foreshadowing more subtle to notice.

But when I came **downstairs** he was **dressed**, sitting by the fire, looking a very **sick** and miserable **boy** of nine years. When I put my hand on his forehead I knew he had a fever.

“**You go up to bed**,” I said, “you’re sick.”

“**I’m all right**,” he said.

When the doctor came he took the **boy’s** temperature.

“What is it?” I asked him.

“One hundred and two.”

Downstairs, the doctor left three different medicines in different coloured capsules with instructions for giving them. One was to bring down the fever, another a purgative, the third to overcome an acid condition. The germs of influenza can only exist in an acid condition, he explained. He seemed to know all about influenza and said there was nothing to worry about if the fever did not go above one hundred and four degrees. This was a light epidemic of flu and there was no danger if **you** avoided pneumonia.

Back in the room I wrote the **boy’s** temperature down and made a note of the time to give the various capsules.

“Do **you want** me to read to **you**?”

“**All right**. If **you want** to,” said the **boy**. His face was very white and there were dark areas under his eye. He lay still in the bed and seemed very detached from what was going on.

(*Complete*, 332; boldface mine)

The father went downstairs and told Schatz to “go up to bed” but he preferred to stay there. Next, however, the scene changes abruptly to another, where the doctor came and took Schatz’s temperature. So, the reader can conclude that some time passed between the scenes from the time expression with subordinate conjunction “when” and the context itself. Deliberately avoiding stating clearly where the place exactly is, however, the narrator succeeds in connecting the scenes rather seamlessly and the reader does not have trouble finding the transition quite natural, though some awkwardness still remains about it. And then the scene changes just after the three lines to another again, at the beginning of which the place where the doctor explained Schatz’s illness is emphasized. The second transition of the scenes goes more smoothly and the important fact about Schatz’ mystery is elaborately embedded in the chain of the fast-paced events.

In addition to the key to the mystery, however, a psychological drama between the father and the son is embedded here as well. The father told nothing about what happened to them between the scenes. For example, if the father called the doctor just before or after he went downstairs in the first scene, it took the doctor at least about one hour to come to the house. As the reader is to know later in the story, the doctor came and saw Schatz around 9:00 a.m., so it must have been between 8:00 and 9:00 a.m. During the hour, Schatz must have returned upstairs, changed into pajamas, and gotten into bed, because his temperature was one hundred and two degrees Fahrenheit, about thirty-nine degrees Celsius, and it is almost impossible that a nine-year-old boy did something else with that high fever. He must already have given up his hope of going hunting.

The missing link between the first scene and the second will invite the reader to ask the question “How did he feel while he was waiting for the doctor?” Against his hope, he had to do as his father told him to do, be looked after by his father, and accept his childhood eventually. He himself had to admit that he was a “very sick and miserable boy of nine-years.” His father, on the other hand, must have felt his love to his son more strongly and become aware of his fatherhood more clearly. That is shown by his repetition of the word “boy.” The father first used it when he saw Schatz sitting by the fire. He used it again when the doctor took the “boy’s temperature.” He used it two more times soon after these sentences and four times in all within these scenes concentratedly. Whether it was used intentionally or unconsciously, his repetition of it both indicates his strong fatherhood and leaves the impression of Schatz as a small boy on the reader.

His strong fatherhood is also shown in his repeated use of “you.” When he told Schatz to go to bed, he added “You better” or “You” before the imperative. The repetition of “you” is used to soften the imperative form in the first place, but it may be also used to strengthen his authoritative tone. Finally, as if the strange combination of his softness and strongness is meant to be shown, he mentioned “you” in a strange way after the doctor explained downstairs.

The germs of influenza can only exist in an acid condition, he explained. He seemed to know all about influenza and said there was nothing to worry about if the fever did not go above one hundred and four degrees. This was a light epidemic of flu and there was no danger if **you** avoided pneumonia.

(*Complete*, 332; boldface mine)

The first two sentences here are narrated in indirect speech with the reporting clause of “he explained” or the reporting verb “said.” The third sentence, however, has neither a reporting clause nor a reporting verb, though it is very likely that the doctor said the sentence, judging from its contents. What the doctor actually said would be as follows:

“This is a light epidemic of flu and there is no danger if you avoid pneumonia.”

Compared to this, the difference of the father’s sentence is the tense of the verbs. It has verbs in the past tense and is therefore written in “free indirect speech,” which is the “technique of presenting a character’s voice partly mediated by the voice of the author,” or, as Gérard Genette put it, “the narrator takes on the speech of the character, or, if one prefers, the character speaks through the voice of the narrator, and the two instances then are merged” (Randall Stevenson, 34). The father’s sentence presents the doctor’s voice partly mediated by the voice of the father, or, according to Genette’s words, the father takes on the speech of the doctor and the two instances then are “merged.”

When the doctor spoke the sentence, the “you,” which is called “generic you,” was used to refer to “people in general” (Leech & Svartvik, 58), so in the father’s sentence in free indirect speech, the “generic you” is mediated by the father to make it indirectly mean Schatz as well. That is to say, the free indirect speech sentence has the effects of shifting (or giving a dual role to) the speaker of the sentence, and recounting as if the father had told Schatz personally and directly that there was no immediate danger from the illness.

Schatz had to undergo the ordeal of facing the fear of death, because the doctor explained Schatz’s illness downstairs to only his father while the boy was lying upstairs, and his father did not tell him about the doctor’s explanation. If the doctor had explained to Schatz, he would not have experienced the unnecessary predicament. It would be quite natural that the doctor would explain to Schatz upstairs if his illness was not so serious. Why did the doctor explain to only his father downstairs? As examined above, the father’s repetition of “boy” indicates that he felt his fatherhood more strongly and the father wanted to think that Schatz was a small, fragile boy being so vulnerable to illness that he needed his father’s careful attention. He also might have remembered about the deadly Spanish flu in 1918. Either way, it is quite logical to think that the father must have been too careful about Schatz’s illness to let his son hear the doctor’s explanation and he took the doctor downstairs. Unfortunately, his consideration backfired and Schatz was forced to face the fear of death. Nevertheless, Schatz did not ask his father about his illness because he did not want to hear that his illness might be fatal, and his father did not tell his son the truth either because he was a little self-righteous about his fatherhood. That kind of relationship between them must have made Schatz’s unnecessary predicament inevitable.

Back in Schatz’s room upstairs, the father observed that the son was “detached from what was going on.” He might not have realized a change in the son’s behavior, but the reader can do for sure. Schatz was not able to think about anything but the only one thing, not even about his father.

Back in the room I wrote the **boy's** temperature down and made a note of the time to give the various capsules.

“Do **you want** me to read to **you**?”

“**All right**. If **you want** to,” said the **boy**. His face was very white and there were dark areas under his eye. He lay still in the bed and seemed very detached from what was going on.

(*Complete*, 332; boldface mine)

His response to his father's offer to read a book is very suggestive of a change in him, and his repetition of the same words assumes a different significance. He repeated the “All right” again here, but it is a confirmation, not a rejection as before, so the same words have an opposite meaning this time. The father seemed to just ask his son's preference, but he must also have offered to read a book to his son from his sense of responsibility. So, Schatz dutifully answered the father's dutiful offer by repeating the similar phrase “If you want to,” in which his indifference to his father is shown with a kind of sarcasm about his father's incompetence to drive away his fear of death.

The father thought that it was good that the doctor explained downstairs and his son did not hear it, because his fatherhood was too self-righteous. That was why his son experienced the fear of death and ironically broke free of the tensions in the relationship to his father.

4. Why did the father choose the Pirate book to read?

Despite the son's dutiful response, the father read Schatz a book about pirates, which was a popular children's book written by Howard Pyle.

I read aloud from **Howard Pyle's *Book of Pirates***; but I could see he was not following what I was reading.

“How do you feel, Schatz?” I asked him.

“Just the same, so far,” he said.

I sat **at the foot of the bed** and read to myself while I waited for it to be time to give another capsule. It would have been natural for him to go to sleep, but when I **looked up** he was **looking at the foot of the bed, looking** very strangely.

(*Complete*, 333; boldface mine)

The *Howard Pyle's Book of Pirates* was posthumously published in 1921 by a publisher that collected a number of Howard Pyle's pirate stories and illustrations. Pyle was very talented as an illustrator and so important a person in the art world at that time that the modern images of Pirates' attires are based on his illustrations. He also played an important role in the then resurgence of children's books and became a role model for writers and illustrators who wanted to be successful in children's books.

The *Book of Pirates* must have been Schatz's favorite book, because he had a copy of the book in his room and the father read it to him. So, the father chose it to read just because he thought that his son would really like it. However, Schatz were not interested in listening to his favorite story now. Apparently, something had been changed in him and he was not the same boy as before. As Joseph DeFalco pointed out, "Schatz undergoes a complete transformation from child to adult" (Defalco, 53). He used to love Pyle's book as many boys did, probably because it illustrates the pirates' way of life and represents pirates' values of life such as adventures, courage, toughness, and excitement. It symbolizes what he used to be in a sense. The father did know that the son loved the book, but he did not realize that Schatz could not enjoy his favorite book now. It might have been more than that. It seems to go as far as to imply that Schatz was not what he used to be now and he could not enjoy his favorite book anymore.

As if he was hurt that his reading had not made his son feel any better, the father sat down now "at the foot of the bed" and read the pirate book to himself. He must have expected that Schatz could go to sleep comfortably because of his closeness to his son. Not understanding his son's psychological change, he saw his son looking "at the foot of the bed" strangely when he looked up and he was more puzzled about his son. The phrase "at the foot of the bed" is repeated twice in the paragraph and the verb "look" is also repeated as many as three times and clustered in a short sentence that consists of only sixteen words after the conjunction "but." As Ronald Carter pointed out in his stylistic analysis of "Cat in the Rain," the effect of these repetitions is "to enact a circularity of sameness and repetition" and "the positioning of words, tense and sentence structure combine with 'cohesive' devices to reinforce further the deflation or reversal of expectations" (Carter, 105-106). These repetitions make an impression of stagnation in the scene entirely, which equally represents Schatz's stagnant state of mind and the deflation of his father's expectations.

The concentrated repetition of "look" indicates two things: emotional detachment in their relationship and Schatz's confrontation with the fear of death. When the father looked at Schatz, the son was looking at the foot of the bed. They were looking at different things and their eyes never met, which illustrates their emotional detachment in their relationship. Moreover, it is quite natural that after the "but," the sentence should be "he was looking at the foot of the bed very strangely," because the both subjects of the two present participles is Schatz. That is to say, the latter one of the two present participles "looking" is a redundant repetition of the former one. The redundant repetition of the latter "looking" is intentionally added to emphasize Schatz' stagnant state of mind and his physical and psychological immobility by the fear of death.

The repetition of "at the foot of the bed" also indicates two things: Schatz' waiting for something and the father waiting for something else. The word "wait" appears three times in this story: The title, here, and at the end of the story. The last one reveals what Schatz had been waiting for finally, and the second one reveals what the father had been waiting for here. Schatz was waiting for it to be time to die, looking at foot of the bed, but his father was waiting for it to be time to give another medicine to his son, sitting at the foot of the bed. The father's act of sitting at the foot of the bed means that he got closer to his son to show his parental devotion. His act of reading the children's book to himself, however, discloses that he just did so to wait for

another thing patiently, which was not only the time to give medicine but also the time to go hunting. The father was staying there, not only because he was worried about his son, but he also felt that he should do so as a father's duty. In fact, he was just killing time until the next medicine time came. As analyzed above, Schatz knew that his father wanted to go hunting and suggested that he would not mind if his father did so. His indirect suggestion implies his concession. They were in the same room, but they were waiting for different things, they were detached and distant each other.

The medicine time finally came at 11:00 a.m. and the father went out hunting as the son suggested. When his father came home from hunting, Schatz was looking at the foot of the bed just as before the father went hunting. Schatz was still waiting for his death to come. His father still did not understand his son. The repetition technique highlights the father's incapableness to understand his son here.

I took his temperature.

“What is it?”

“Something like a hundred,” I said. **It was one hundred and two** and four tenths.

“It was a hundred and two,” he said.

“Who said so?”

“The doctor.”

“Your temperature is **all right**,” I said. ‘It’s **nothing to worry** about.’

“I **don’t worry**,” he said, “but I **can’t keep from thinking**.”

“Don’t think,” I said. “Just **take it easy**.”

“I’m **taking it easy**,” he said and looked straight ahead. He was evidently holding tight onto himself about something.

(*Complete*, 333-34; boldface mine)

The father took his son's temperature just as the doctor had done before, and his son asked just as his father had done before. Everything is just like déjà vu. Then they still repeat some phrases to each other like the one “not worry,” “not think,” or “take it easy” in their conversation and these repetitions suggest that they still do not communicate each other very well and the way they argue is almost comical. Taking a closer look at the conversation, however, there are some slight changes between the two similar scenes. The father took “his temperature,” not “the boy's temperature.” The person who said the “all right” is the father this time, not Schatz. That indicates that the father finally admitted Schatz's claim by repeating the same “all right.” These slight changes in the déjà vu-ish scene imply that the father had slightly changed his view of Schatz and tried to avoid treating his son as a small boy. This is supported by the fact that the father realized that something was “evidently” wrong with his son.

The change of the father's view of Schatz appears to be also expressed when the father tried to read the pirate book again.

I sat down and opened the *Pirate* book and commenced to read, but I could see he was not following, so I stopped.

(*Complete*, 334)

The father tried to read the pirate book again when he returned Schatz' room. If the two reading scenes, before and after he went hunting, are closely examined, small but important differences are identified in the sentence. The father sat down again, but the place is deliberately not mentioned in this scene. It seems that the father here avoided the words "at the foot of the bed," which represented his stagnant state of mind. His intentional omission of the location implies that he was not sitting now for his duties to his son, but he was honestly trying to cheer his son up.

Another difference is that the father "commenced" to read the book. The word "commence" has a French origin. Hemingway might have avoided commoner words like "started" or "began" because he wanted to make the word special and conspicuous. He learned a lot from Gertrude Stein, Ezra Pound, or James Joyce in France, so he must have known that the differences in the nuance between the two languages can be used for that purpose. If so, to "commence" to read even the same pirate book has a special meaning. It implies metaphorically that the father tries to begin a new story about him and his son, or rather a new relationship between them.

The last word of the sentence is "stopped, which is an antonym of the verb "commence." So, the sentence will be a couplet if it is divided into two in half. The rhymed words show a clear contrast.

I sat down and opened the Pirate book and **commenced**,
To read, but I could see he was not following, so I **stopped**.

(boldface mine)

The rhymed words are not rhymed in a strict sense, but it is safe to say that they must be emphasized with a contrast in meaning. The reading scene depicted in the poetic diction shows that this is a metaphor of a psychological drama of the father and the son. The father commenced to read the book and stopped here, because his son was not ready for the new story about them. Schatz was still facing the big fear, so he needed to solve the problem. It is a metaphor of the psychological drama in which the father stopped there to solve the problem together with his son and wait for his son to take a step forward.

5. Why did the Irish setter changed into a red dog?

After he gave some medicine to Schatz, the father had a chance to go outside and went hunting with an Irish setter at 11 a.m. The hunting scene is depicted in two paragraphs and it is very easy for the reader to notice that the paragraphs, which are filled with words that describe the beautiful outdoors, express the father's healthy

delight of hunting with a lot of energy and commotion.

In particular, the first paragraph is impressive because it succeeds in conveying the freshness of the crisp cool air of the outdoors in contrast to the unhealthy stagnant air of the indoors in two long sentences that respectively include conjunctions and subordinating conjunctions like “and” and “so that,” participial clauses, and long and complicated noun phrases. Hemingway uses the poetic diction in this paragraph to express the beauty and joy of the winter outdoors by combining the poetic form and content.

It was a **bright, cold day**, the **ground covered** with a **sleet** that **had frozen so** that it **seemed** as if all the bare trees, the bushes, the cut brush and all the grass and the bare ground had been **varnished** with ice. I took the young **Irish setter** for a little walk **up the road and along a frozen creek**, but it was **difficult** to **stand** or **walk** on the **glassy surface** and the **red dog slipped** and **slithered** and I **fell twice, hard, once dropping my gun** and having it **slide away over the ice**.

(*Complete*, 333; boldface and underline mine)

In this paragraph, as shown above, the poetic techniques concerning sounds and rhythm are skillfully used. In a strict sense, perfect rhymes and meters are not realized, but the sentences have some effects of certain rhymes and alliterations and a bouncing and slipping rhythm.

Here is the list of the alliterations and rhymes in the paragraph.

1. Words that begin with a [b] or a [g] sound: bright, ground, bare, bushes, brush, but, grass, glassy, gun
2. Words that begin with a consonant and a [r] sound: bright, ground, frozen, trees, brush, grass, creek, dropping
3. Words that begin or end with a [d] sound: cold, day, ground, covered, had, seemed, and, road, stand, red, dog, slithered, hard, slide
4. Words that start or end with a [s] sound: sleet, so, seemed, grass, ice, setter, stand, glassy, surface, slipped, slithered, twice, once, slide
5. Words that end with or include a [sh] sound: bush, brush, Irish, varnished
6. Words that include a [l] sound: cold, sleet, all, little, along, glassy, slipped, slithered, fell, slide
7. Words that begin or end with a [k] or a [p] sound: cold, covered, cut, took, walk, up, creek, slipped, dropping
8. Words that begin or end with a [t] sound: bright, sleet, cut, varnished, took, difficult, slipped, twice,
9. Phrases that have alliterations or rhymes: [d] cold day, red dog, [s] Irish setter, grassy

surface [sl] slipped and slithered, [r] frozen creek, [d, t] difficult to stand

10. Other types: [z] frozen, trees, as, [v] covered, varnished, over, [w] twice, once, away

Of these alliterative and rhymed sounds are divided into two categories: voiced and voiceless consonants. Voiced consonants have a heavy element of sound and in general gives a sense of imperturbable stability, vigor, or dullness and clumsiness. Voiceless consonants, on the contrary, have a light element of sound and in general gives a sense of swiftness, flexibility, or frivolity. So, here in the paragraph, the voiced consonants phonetically symbolize the grand presence of the nature, the cold immobility in the winter, and the clumsiness of the movements on the ice, and the voiceless consonants the father's light-heartedness, the swiftness of the movements, and the instability on the slippery ice. This paragraph is an excellent example of the component of poetic form and content using the techniques of alliteration and rhyme.

Now let us examine the structure of the underlined noun phrase, which shows the skillful device of organizing and arranging multiple nouns. The noun phrase “all the bare trees, the bushes, the cut brush and all the grass and the bare ground” has four elements of noun (A, B, C, and D) lined up and its structure can be formulated as follows:

all (A, B, C) and all (D1 and D2)

In general, if there are more than three elements lined up, an “and” is put before the last one, and in this particular phrase an “and” is put before Element D. The three elements before the “and” are each divided by commas, but no comma between Element C and the “and” because Element C and Element D are different types of things and can be unmistakably differentiated without a comma. Element A, B, and C are of trees or plants that grow above the ground and Element D is of a plant that grows from the ground or the ground itself. The word “all” is put in the two places, before Element A and Element E. They indicate that there are two groups of elements: Group 1 (A, B, C) and Group 2 (D1 and D2).

However, Elements B, C, and D1 can make another group of green plants, all of which are rhymed with a [s] or a [sh] sound, and Elements A and D2 can make yet another group of bare things, both of which are alliterated with a [b] sound. The conceptional groups are formulated as follows:

all the green (B, C, D1) and all the bare (A and D2)

This rearranged formula illustrates both the fertility of the green trees and grass and the sterility of the trees that have lost their leaves and the ground without any plants. These two formulas are rich examples of the writing technique that can suggest the possibility to depict the diversity of the nature by combinations of groups of nouns.

Next, let us examine the second underlined part, in which two commas are used. The first comma

emphasized the word “hard” and the second one divides the participial part from the main clause. The “hard” is an adverb of manner that modifies the verb “fell” and is usually put right after the verb. The “hard”, however, is put after the “twice” to emphasize it in terms of meaning and sound--and also probably to avoid putting the similar words of “twice” and “once” side by side--and a comma is added between the “twice” and the “hard” because the order is grammatically unusual. This arrangement results in creating an alternative pattern of a pair of the rhymed words, “twice” and “once,” and a pair of words that begin or end with a [d] sound, “hard” and “dropping,” and creating a kind of hopping rhythm as well. In this way, the second underlined part is well arranged with regard to sound and rhythm to describe the two similar happenings by contrasting the father’s fall “twice, hard, once dropping his gun” (a pair of a [s] sound and a [d] sound) and the red dog’s funny predicament, in which it “slipped and slithered” (a pair of a [d] sound and a [s] sound).

Finally, let us examine the mystery of the Irish setter and the red dog, now that the sound effects used here are well analyzed. An Irish setter, also called red setter, is a gundog with long red hair. It is derived from the Gaelic words *sotar rua*. *Sotar* means “dog” and *rua* “red.” So, it is literally a “red dog” and it is no wonder that an Irish setter is called a red dog. Here in the paragraph, however, the two names are connected phonetically and each of them represents an aspect of the canine in sound. The “Irish setter” has a [s] and a [sh] sound in its name and the voiceless consonants symbolize the animal’s agility as a gundog. It first appeared as a smart gundog when the father introduced it and set off hunting. On the contrary, the “red dog” has a [d] and a [g] sound and the voiced consonants symbolize the animal’s clumsiness as an awkward dog that “slipped and slithered” on the ice. The two aspects of the animal are illustrated by different sounds.

Dogs usually have a negative image as shown in some idioms like “a dog’s breakfast,” “go to the dogs,” “a dog’s life,” and “not have a dog’s chance,” but there is also a positive one like the expression “A dog is a man’s best friend.” Dogs are, for better or worse, very close to human lives. The father also called the Irish setter “red dog” in a friendly manner.

6. Story of Life and Death

Now that we examined Hemingway’s techniques of writing short stories well enough, we should have one more thing to look into. Hemingway’s art of writing includes the title of this short story, as Bernard Oldsey painstakingly analyzed that “[n]one of these (T. S. Eliot, Ezra Pound, Wallace Stevens, Eugene O’Neill, F. Scott Fitzgerald, and William Faulkner) was more ardent in the search for the *exact* title than Hemingway” (Oldsey, 12). The title, “A Day’s Wait,” is also a vital clue to the mysteries of the short story in the first place and it suggests a key element of another underlying theme. Considering it, not only did Schatz wait all day for the death that would never come, but the father also “waited for it to be time to give another capsule” to Schatz. In fact, he was waiting to go hunting. So, what is in the title? What is in waiting? How important was it to them, Schatz in particular? Is it important for his entire life?

Waiting is indeed everyone’s business. Some look forward to something good and some have no choice but to face something bad. So did the father and the son in the story. The father waited for something fun and

Schatz waited for something bad. Moreover, waiting is even everything's business. As people wait, so time can wait. The title "A Day's Wait" can possibly be interpreted that "a day waited for something or someone." If so, it will give us a significant implication about another theme of the story. What waits us at the end of our time is death. Then the title seems to suggest death as an underlying theme of the story. This is not only because the story deals with Schatz's fear of death, but also because, as H. E. Bates pointed out, Hemingway's stories "appear to deal with a variety of themes," but "in reality Hemingway has only one theme---death," and the theme of death is "Hemingway's constant preoccupation" (Bates, 76).

As Carlos Baker shrewdly pointed out in his analysis of *A Farewell to Arms*, if "the controlling symbolism is the deep central antithesis between the image of life and home (the mountain) and the image of war and death (the plain)" (Baker, 109), the controlling symbolism of "A Day's Wait" is the deep central antithesis between the image of life and the father (e.g. the outdoors) and the image of death and the son (e.g. the indoors). As Grebstein pointed out, "once we perceive the underlying structural design and the particular antithesis or opposition it embodies, such seemingly random and spontaneous factors in the story as traits of behavior, details of setting, forms of speech, gestures---in short, all the necessary components of the work's credibility and verisimilitude---take their rightful place in the pattern and become deeply resonant with meaning" (Grebstein, 4). So, the relationship of the father and the son can be interpreted metaphorically as that of life (the father) and death (the son), and "all the necessary components of the work's credibility and verisimilitude," concerning all the mysteries of "A Day's Wait" that we examined above, can be interpreted as the antithesis and opposition of life and death.

1st mystery: Outdoors (life; health; freshness) / Indoors (death; illness; stagnation)

Schatz shut the windows as the symbol of his refusal to the world of life. Outdoors symbolize the world of life and indoors the world of death. The father aspires the world of life outdoors and the son stays in the world of death indoors. Grebstein pointed out that "[t]he story's action follows an inside/outside/inside pattern which straightforwardly narrates a commonplace sequence of events yet is highly suggestive" (Grebstein, 9).

2nd mystery: Downstairs (life; dressed; hunting) / Upstairs (death; pajamas; lying in bed)

Schatz gets dressed and go downstairs because he still hopes to go hunting, which symbolizes life, and clings to the world of life. Upstairs, which symbolizes the world of death, is the place for the son and pajamas are his burial clothes.

3rd mystery: Downstairs (life; explanation; flu) / Upstairs (death; misinterpretation; fever)

Downstairs symbolizes the world of life, where the medical doctor explains illnesses and upstairs the world of death, where no one explains illnesses.

4th mystery: Pirates (life; adventures; crime) / Pirates (death; danger; punishment)

Pirates symbolize both life and death because they are heroes that seek adventures and thrills, but sometimes they symbolize miserable losers that bite the dust in their battles or are hanged as a punishment.

5th mystery: Irish setter (life; smart; agility) / Red dog (death; dullness; clumsiness)

Hunting (life; hunt; delight) / Hunted (death; hunted; horror)

The Irish setter symbolizes the positive aspects of life and a hunter that takes lives and the red dog symbolizes the negative aspects of life and a prey whose life is taken by a hunter. It can be replaced by quails killed by the father.

These metaphors and symbolism of life and death reveals how well Hemingway could handle metaphors and symbolism in his short stories to suggest how deep and multilayered the meanings and interpretations of human behaviors and psychologies can be. As E. M. Halliday pointed out, however, “A point deserving great attention and emphasis about this writer [Hemingway] is his devotion to the implic[i]t rather than the explicit mode: and both symbolism and irony truly serve this artistic purpose,” and “with all his skilful use of artistic ambiguity, he remains the great realist of twentieth-century American fiction” (Halliday, 69-71).

At the end of the story, the father described Schatz when he found out that he had made a mistake about his illness.

But his gaze at the foot of the bed relaxed slowly. The hold over himself relaxed too, finally, and the next day it was very slack and he cried very easily at little things that were of no importance.

(Complete, 334)

To be “slack” means to be not stretched tight, slow, or sluggish, but, in this context, the word also has a psychological meaning like to be unable to control his feelings. Schatz cried very easily because he was unable to control his feelings. He had been forced to be so nervous during the day that he became weak both physically and mentally when he knew the truth about his possible death, and he was unable to control his feelings as well as his body. It can be also interpreted that he came to feel deep affection to every little thing, because he experienced the fear of death and learned how precious living things are and how wonderful it is to live life to the fullest.

Although the process of solving the mysteries that we examined above can demonstrate the roles and effects of Hemingway’s techniques of short stories to reveal the psychological conflicts of the relationship between the father and the son as well, it can also shed light on the underlying theme: a metaphorical antithesis between life and death, as the title suggests the theme of life and death.

Conclusion:

It is well known that “A Day’s Wait” is based on a true story. At Thanksgiving holiday in 1932, Hemingway and his second wife Pauline Pfeiffer visited her parents’ house in Piggott, Arkansas. On the visit, he also took his son John, as known as “Jack,” or “Bumby,” who was born to Hemingway and his first wife Elizabeth Hadley Richardson. John Hadley Nicanor Hemingway is the person who was the model for Schatz, which means “treasure,” “sweetheart,” or “darling” in German. John lived in Paris for some time, as Schatz tells in the story, with his parents.

John confirmed in an interview that “A Day’s Wait” is based on what actually happened to him during the visit.

My father was too far away to collect me from school. Except for the summers in the States I’d lived in France and went to school there until 1932, when I was nine. That was the year my father drove me to join Pauline, Patrick, and Gregory for Thanksgiving at the Pfeiffer family home in Piggott, Arkansas. Just before the trip I came down with influenza. I was certain I was going to die because I’d heard that my temperature was 102 and I’d learned in France that no one could live above a temperature of 44. Of course, I was relieved when my father explained the difference between centigrade and Fahrenheit, more than it being told as a family story and then reading about it later in my father’s short story, “Father and Sons,” than actually remembering it, although I’m quite sure it was factual.

(Brian, 87)

John’s account of the episode explains persuasively to us why Schatz was so hesitant about almost everything, the father “found a covey close to the house” as if it had been for the first time, and the mother does not have much of a presence, rather almost nothing. In fact, these mysteries do not belong to the part of Hemingway’s iceberg that is below the surface of the text, but, I think, they belong to the part that Hemingway cut off of the photograph taken in Piggott. These kinds of mysteries cannot be inferred from the context examining and analyzing any writing techniques. Extra information from outside of the story can only tell that the father just enjoyed hunting in an unfamiliar neighborhood or Schatz had a mother-in-law in that house at that time. In reality, John must have felt very lonely and sad when he stayed with unfamiliar people and suffering from the influenza, much more the fear of death. Certain facts were included and expressed in the story for sure. Accordingly, these authentic elements of the true story are skillfully used as raw materials in the story.

Hemingway’s techniques of writing, however, made the factual experience of John about his visit to the parents’ house of his mother-in-law and his bad-timing contraction of the influenza transcended into a story of psychological conflicts in a father-son relationship and gave it another giant leap to a metaphorical or symbolical antithesis of life and death. For the purpose, he implemented his art of writing in the short story: implication, elicitation, repetition, free indirect speech presentation, symbolism, and poetic diction. “A Day’s Wait” clearly

shows his creative skills to fictionalize and dramatize an actual episode in a short story that is highly assessed as an excellent literary work.

References

- Baker, Carlos (1972). *The Writer as Artist*. Fourth Ed. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- (1969). *Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Bakker, Jan (1972). *Ernest Hemingway: The Artist as Man of Action*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Bates, H. E. (1942). Hemingway's Short Stories. In Carlos Baker (Ed.), *Hemingway and His Critics: An International Anthology* (American Century Series). New York: Hill and Wang, 1961, pp. 71-79.
- Benson, Jackson Jr. (1986). *The Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway: Critical Essays*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Brian, Denis (1988). *The True Gen: An Intimate Portrait of Ernest Hemingway by Those Who Knew Him*. New York: Grove Press.
- Brooks, Cleanth, and Robert Penn Warren (1979). *Understanding Fiction*. Third Ed. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.
- Carter, Ronald (1982). Style and interpretation in Hemingway's 'Cat in the Rain'. In Ronald Carter and Peter Stockwell (Eds.), *The Language and Literature Reader*. London: Routledge, 2008, pp. 96-108.
- DeFalco, Joseph (1963). *The Hero in Hemingway's Short Stories*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Gajdusek, Linda (1989). Up and Down: Making Connections in "A Day's Wait". In Susan F. Beegel (Ed.), *Hemingway's Neglected Short Fiction: New Perspectives*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1989, pp. 291-302.
- Grebstein, Sheldon Norman (1973). *Hemingway's Craft*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Haddleston, Rodney, Geoffrey K. Pullum (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, E. M. (1956). Hemingway's Ambiguity: Symbolism and Irony. In Robert P. Weeks (Ed.), *Hemingway: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Twentieth Century Views). Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1962, pp. 52-71.
- Hemingway, Earnest (1932). *The Death in the Afternoon*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- (1964). *A Movable Feast*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- (1987). *The Complete Short Stories*. The Finca Vigía Ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Lamb, Robert Paul (2010). *Art Matters: Hemingway, Craft, and the Creation of the Modern Short Story*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Leech, Geoffrey, and Jan Svartvik (2002). *A Communicative Grammar of English*. Third Ed. London: Longman.
- Levin, Harry (1957). Observations on the Style of Ernest Hemingway. In Harold Bloom (Ed.), *Ernest Hemingway: Modern Critical Views*. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1985, pp. 63-84.
- Lodge, David (1992). *The Art of Fiction*. London: Martin Secker & Warburg, 1992; London: Vintage Books, 2011.
- Nelson, Raymond S. (1979). *Hemingway: Expressionist Artist*. Ames: The Iowa State University Press.
- Oldsey, Bernard (1979). *Hemingway's Hidden Craft: The Writing of A Farewell to Arms*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik (1981). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Serafin, Steven R., and Alfred Bendixen (Eds.) (2003). *The Continuum Encyclopedia of American Literature*. New York: Continuum.
- Stevenson, Randall (1998). *Modernist Fiction*. Revised Ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1998.

