

**3.**

**HEMINGWAY'S *DEATH IN THE AFTERNOON*  
FROM A LIMINALIST PERSPECTIVE**

**Nancy Bredendick**

**UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA  
DE MADRID**

**THE GATEWAY PRESS  
MADRID**

*The TRELLIS Papers*

EDITORS

Manuel Aguirre (UAM)

Belén Piqueras (UAM)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Nancy Bredendick (UAM)

Mary Farrell (University of Jaume I)

Esteban Pujals (UAM)

Roberta Quance (Queens University, Belfast)

Robert K. Shepherd (UAM)

Philip Sutton (UAM)

CORRESPONDENCE

All correspondence regarding editorial matters, including submissions, should be sent to Belén Piqueras, *The TRELLIS Papers*, Departamento de Filología Inglesa, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Campus de Cantoblanco, 28049 MADRID, Spain.

PUBLISHED BY

THE GATEWAY PRESS

[www.angelfire.com/journal2/tgp-sll](http://www.angelfire.com/journal2/tgp-sll)

DISTRIBUTED BY

PÓRTICO LIBRERÍAS

[www.porticolibrerias.es](http://www.porticolibrerias.es)

ISSN: 1886-8223 • 1ª Edición

Depósito legal : M-31364-2006

Printed by: CLONYMAR

Design: KUMISAI, S.L.

2007 © All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced without written permission from the publishers.

**THE TRELLIS PAPERS**

## *THE TRELLIS PAPERS*

This is a series of working papers initially derived from a project designed to introduce Second Cycle students to research. TRELLIS is an acronym for “Teaching Research in English-Language Literatures, Intermediate Stage”. The project seeks to build links between research carried out at postgraduate and professional level and the kind of research-oriented work that is offered to First Cycle students. It includes a series of seven sessions -the *TRELLIS Seminar*- which has been running in the Department of English at the UAM since 2002.

The overall goal of these sessions is twofold. On the one hand they aim at laying down a practical base for research. Eight critical texts from different research areas (history of science, linguistics, postmodernist fiction, fairytale, medieval epic, medieval narrative construction, anthropology, thematics) are studied and commented in depth for their special contribution to literature studies; these all touch broad, mostly interdisciplinary, mostly historical concerns. Attention is paid to argument construction, use of data, and layout. There is also some coaching in library and web searches and use of source materials.

On the other hand, the seminars concentrate on issues at the intersection between canonical literature, popular culture, and folklore. Because this intersection appears to view only when researchers take up a global perspective, when they engage a *field theory of text*, the three domains under scrutiny have occasionally been referred to as ‘the Field triangle’, and the term may continue in use so long as we remember that it is not meant to be exhaustive and that other areas of interaction will be found to exist in the textual Field.

Among other tasks, and as part of their training, each participant in the TRELLIS Seminars is asked to prepare and deliver a 20-minute talk before a mixed audience. So far, papers have dealt with problems of narrative structure, evolution, thematics, and so on in such areas as cartography, videogames, myth, epic, fairytale, ballad, popular music, medieval romance, children’s literature, film, comix, advertising, and others. It is the result of these talks that the present series was initially designed to publish.

Meanwhile, however, the project goes on and the ‘trellis’ concept has outgrown its original intention and now has the full function suggested by the word: an interlace of efforts which, in bringing together various types of research at different levels of complexity, seeks to reinforce and disseminate results, thus hoping to create a feedback loop throughout the three Cycles. One practical aim is to provide a flexible, reasonably speedy method of publication by editing each paper independently — though the possibility that some of these materials may eventually be collected in book form on thematic or other criteria is not to be ruled out.

*The TRELLIS Papers* will accordingly edit a variety of materials that will include not only the results of the TRELLIS Seminar but also work presented by contributors to the *Liminality Seminars*, as well as other relevant work.

Three points need to be made here. First, the primary objective is to make available to the Department various types of work carried out in it. Second, quality is a must in any paper submitted for inclusion in the series. Third, submissions to *The TRELLIS Papers* will be expected to conform to the editorial policy outlined in the second number of the series. This is not a matter ‘for the editors to sort out’; on the contrary, it is an intrinsic responsibility of researchers to ensure that their work complies with some widely accepted set of conventions. The instructions provided in *TTP 2* are in agreement with international practice.

#### THE EDITORS

# Hemingway's *Death in the Afternoon* from a Liminalist Perspective

Nancy Bredendick

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Before beginning my talk on *Death in the Afternoon*, a note on liminality and how the concept may be used as a tool for literary analysis. A couple of years ago, I studied a group of the articles on literature in the English language that appeared in the MLA International Bibliography listings under *liminality*. In them, works representing a variety of genres (novel; epistolary prose; poetry; drama; film) and a variety of epochs (stretching from the Middle Ages to the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century) were submitted to scholarly analysis. (1)

The theories of ethnologists and cultural anthropologists Arnold Van Gennep, Victor Turner and Mary Douglas, adopted and adapted for literary analysis, were explicitly mentioned in over half of the articles, but in the rest, *liminal* and *liminality* were introduced without any preamble or preliminary remarks on the anthropological origin of the notion and were directly applied to describe moments, stages, phases, spaces, states, figures, voices and literary forms.

More specifically, the words *liminal* and *liminality* appeared in expressions like the following: "liminal setting", "liminal performative site," "a liminal figure," "the artist as liminal hero," "liminal environment," "in a liminal position," "liminal status," "some of the novel's more important liminal moments," "from a liminal perspective," "he exists in perpetual liminality," "an irreducible, Orphic liminality," "an encounter with the transcendental as the experience of liminality in poetic language," "the voice of liminality," and "the liminality of the Gothic mode."

These entities give us a general idea of the many ways liminality can manifest itself in a literary work, but to enlighten us about the specific attributes of literary liminality and the forms liminality can take, one must look more closely at the *types of liminality* applied to literary analysis. While there is general agreement that the limen is "a threshold predominantly associated with provisionality, instability, intermediate forms," as Peter Messent once said, the emphasis or angle from which the notion is taken up varies. In this respect, I found three basic groupings into which the treatments of liminality in the articles under review seemed to fall.

The first group or category is liminality as *duality*, an attribute common to those works whose liminal moment, space, phase, hero, genre, or voice is seen as two-fold or double—as straddling two orders that systematically, in the network of classifications of a society, are considered distinct. Anyone or thing positioned here either threatens order or enriches reality. The duality in question may be cultural or racial or it may be purely formal. Articles

exploring liminality in relation to issues of dual identity, two-ness, double consciousness are in this category. And so is an article on a liminal setting that permits musical film to switch gracefully from one register (song numbers) to another (story).

The second category is *transgression / transcendence*, an attribute common to those works whose liminal moment, space, phase, hero, genre, or voice is seen as something emanating out of the interstices (cracks, gaps) between the deep categories of a culture's conceptual scheme. Calling to mind the theories of Mary Douglas in *Purity and Danger*, liminality of this kind comes in two different varieties: transcendence or perfection on the one hand and abjection, defilement or pollution on the other. As an example of the latter, horror stories—the cultural fear of cannibalism in the Hannibal Lecter novels. And as an example of the former, the extra-lingual mysticism of a poet searching for ways to stretch the limits of language.

The third category is *transition*. To this category belongs the liminality of works whose characters act out, to one degree or another, the phases of the rite of passage sequence as described by Van Gennep and Turner: a first phase of segregation, an intervening liminal period, and finally a third phase of reaggregation or reincorporation, in which the passage is consummated. Into this category fall novels of initiation and education, and works dramatizing the moment of national or cultural border-crossings of all kinds.

Based as they are on a very limited sample, these categories are merely tentative, but they are useful I think in beginning to define a liminalist perspective as one that throws into stark relief a work's dualities, its transgressions, its transitions.

With this in mind, let's turn to *Death in the Afternoon* as seen from a Liminalist perspective (2).

*Death in the Afternoon* (1932), Ernest Hemingway's book on the bullfight, offers plenty of opportunities to illustrate what a liminalist perspective can reveal. As a major modernist work of literary non-fiction that is also a fully functional spectator guide to the modern Spanish bullfight, it not only mediates between Spanish culture and North American culture, it also transcends traditionally recognized borders between "literature" and documentary writing, between mass entertainment and high art, between oral tradition and written tradition, between visual codes and verbal ones, and even between the inside and outside of the text.

Today I would like to discuss some ways in which *Death in the Afternoon* transcends the border between "literature" and documentary writing. That is, the degree to which, in spite of being a work of non-fiction, *Death in the Afternoon* lends itself to a literary reading—no, the degree to which it *demand*s--a literary reading. As an *arte de ver toros*, or spectator guide to the bullfight, it is complete and reliable. It tells where to sit and what to watch for, what to applaud, and what not to. It describes and illustrates the different *suertes* or set moves in a bullfight, it has a section on the breeding and testing of the fighting bull, an explanatory glossary of taurine terms, and a calendar of dates on which bullfights are held in Spain, France and South America.

Extraordinarily, however, it also has much that has nothing to do with bullfighting: a running dialogue with an invented comic character called the Old lady, 'decadent' anecdotes with a homosexual theme involving Faulkner and El Greco, a short story on death, dicta on the art of writing, attacks on literary critics, and a closing chapter-length prose poem celebrating Spain. Faced with such heterogeneity of subject and discourse, readers normally read *Death in the Afternoon* as a highly personal "essay on bullfighting," explicable solely in terms of Hemingway's life, character, whims, neuroses, and concerns. With the result that readers normally read *Death in the Afternoon* less for itself than for how it can illuminate their understanding of its author.

When *Death in the Afternoon* is looked at from a liminalist perspective, however, when it is read as a text that blurs the border between literary and documentary writing and one that mediates between two distinct cultures—aficionado culture and non-aficionado culture—, there emerge certain departures from the standard use of language and form that remain invisible when the work is given a literal, author-centered reading. Certain parallels, antitheses, and juxtapositions emerge between the bullfighting material and the non-bullfighting material that suggest *Death in the Afternoon* has much to offer when read for itself. Looked at this way, it is as figurative as a poem, the non-bullfighting material functioning as a vehicle to draw the reader into a spontaneous understanding of the perspective of the aficionado.

*Death in the Afternoon*'s literariness, its potential for a literary reading, first jumps into view when one focuses on the borderline between the inside and the outside of the text, specifically on what Gerard Genette, the French literary theoretician and narratologist, calls the paratexts. Paratexts are any and all texts that present, explain, situate, contextualize, illustrate, comment on, and classify the work for the reader. They include: the title, the dust jacket, the dedication, the table of contents, the prologue, etc. Subordinate to the main text, they occupy a threshold area filled with clues—some verbal, some iconic, some material, and some factual—whose function it is to present the book to its readers and guide them toward a proper reading of the book.

In *Death in the Afternoon*'s paratexts, there are a number of signs that the book will be no ordinary work of non-fiction. To begin with, the title is more appropriate for a novel or a poem than a bullfight manual. In contrast to “guide” or “manual,” which would openly announce the book's subject and didactic intent, Hemingway's title is oblique, suggesting its subject figuratively by evoking its culminating moment, when death is administered to the bull. Cast in such terms, the title widens our horizon of expectations beyond the merely technical, information-seeking level to the point that our “literary competence” is engaged.

Next, the dust jacket forges a link between the subject of the book, the author of the book, and the craft of writing. Featuring on the cover an exciting and exhilarating image of a charging bull by famous taurine poster artist Roberto Domingo—an authentic and direct visual invitation to the bullfight—it also contains texts, written on the front and back flaps, that celebrate Hemingway as a man of letters and that prepare the reader for an indirect approach to the art of bullfighting, telling us that the book presents “dicta about writing so honest and true they will very likely become common axioms.”

The frontispiece is *The Bullfighter* (1913), a work of analytical cubism by Juan Gris. Classic *tauromaquias*, or taurine rule books, customarily feature, on the cover or in a frontispiece, a life-like portrait honoring the matador-artist whose work, style or philosophy the book records (portraits of José Delgado (Pepe-Hillo), Francisco Montes (Paquiro), and Rafael Guerra (Guerrita) adorn the classic 18<sup>th</sup>- and 19<sup>th</sup>-century *tauromaquias* they inspired). With Gris's sophisticated, abstract, art-for art's sake *Bullfighter*, Hemingway duly honors the figure of the matador-artist in a general way, but he also provides a push in the fine arts direction that prepares the reader not so much for a taurine rule book as for a literary work designed to take a permanent place in American letters.

*Death in the Afternoon*'s missing paratexts point the reader in the same direction. *Death in the Afternoon* has no prologue, no acknowledgements, its chapters are numbered, not titled, it has no index, and no alphabetized list of sources. While the absence of such paratexts is the norm for modern, serious fiction, it is generally accepted that modern, serious non-fiction would have them, and the effect of their absence is to nudge us away from a literal to a literary reading.

Finally, *Death in the Afternoon*'s paratexts reveal another sign of literariness—this time, a sign not seen until after the book is read and one is analyzing it. A gap exists between the chatty, brash, ribald, first-person narrator of *Death in the Afternoon* and Ernest Hemingway, the author of the book. The latter appears at the end of *Death in the Afternoon* in a very short and clearly paratextual section called "Bibliographical Note." In this note, which he signs with his initials E. H., Hemingway announces the book's antecedents, defines its scope and limitations, and justifies its existence—and he does so in tones that introduce what Genette calls "a break in the enunciative regime." In place of the informal, personality-drenched, role-playing, speech-oriented voice adopted throughout by the narrator of the text, the note presents a distant, formal, neutral, standardized tone in which both writer and reader are referred to in the third-person. Now, a basic sign of non-fiction is an identity between narrator and author, and in this shift in enunciative regime, a gap opens between them—although they both belong to Hemingway, their voices are radically different. While this gap is likely to go unnoticed in a literal reading, focusing on the borderline between paratexts and text reveals it and opens the way to seeing the narrator as a construct, rhetorical tool rather than as a self portrait and the dialogues with the Old lady as a device rather than a simple diversion.

Leaving behind *Death in the Afternoon*'s paratexts, we turn to the text. Another aspect of *Death in the Afternoon*'s literariness, its figurativeness, jumps into view when one looks at how Hemingway mediates between aficionado and non-aficionado culture using an implied comparison between the art of bullfighting and the fine arts—a comparison grounded in the concept of decadence. Without being explicit, the connection develops in a series of conversations between the narrator and the Old lady that follow the technical explanations in six chapters at the heart of the book. In the course of these conversations, Hemingway uses Faulkner and El Greco—whose work he presumes is familiar to his readers—as vehicles for communicating a feeling for the unfamiliar art of Juan Belmonte—whose revolution in the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century is universally held to have changed the course of bullfighting and whose "new decadent method", in the hands of his followers, was proving to be a threat to the health of the fiesta.

To understand how Belmonte's art can be called decadent, we have to know that in the classic style, the essence of the art was the adeptness, agility, intelligence, wit, grace, art, and magic that the bullfighter displayed as he escaped the danger he himself provoked. These are positive, healthy, life-affirming qualities that made bullfighting a universal art. By contrast, Belmonte shocked and thrilled his audiences with his impossible, almost depraved faenas. Drawing close as never before to the bull, slowing down the rhythm of its movements, he exhibited a kind of over-ripe, mannered, languid, heavy style, which, instead of intelligence, communicated a kind of morbid yearning for self-destruction. Belmonte's look on the dark, "unhealthy" side changed the focus of the art of bullfighting, and his technical innovations brought with them a new rhetoric to the expression of it. In emphasizing the closest kind of capework, Belmonte's art called for smaller, more easily managed bulls, and in de-emphasizing the moment of truth, it called for bullfighters who were artists, stylists, specialists rather than good killers.

One can state this simply enough and Hemingway does in Chapter 7 (*DIA* 68-70), but if Belmonte's revolution is really to matter to his readers, if it is to engage their taste or preference as an aficionado, and make them aware of its effects on the art of bullfighting, something more than simple statement is needed. For this, Hemingway goes beyond simple statement to an analogy with the art of Faulkner and that of El Greco, and puts directly up to the readers' experience a feeling for Belmonte's masterful but decadent art.

First, Hemingway needs to establish a connection between bullfighting and the fine arts, and the Old lady is crucial to this task. In a four-page conversation, co-incidental with her first appearance in *Death in the Afternoon* (68-71), Hemingway introduces the word



“decadence” to describe Belmonte’s revolution in terms like those outlined above. Initially, he defines decadence strictly in aesthetic terms as: “the decay of a complete art through a magnification of certain of its aspects” (69-70). Then, in response to the Old lady’s persistent questions about how one could call “decadent” such manly chaps as bullfighters, he widens the meaning of the term to include abnormality or perversion (in this case sexual orientation) in his definition. And finally he warns her that, in this sense, it is a concept open to interpretation (“Madame, we must be careful chucking the term decadence about since it cannot mean the same to all who read it” 71), and illustrates this with an anecdote involving a perverse “lapse into heterosexuality” by a man’s male lover in which the former (Jean Cocteau) accused the latter (Raymond Radiguet) of being decadent for sleeping with women (71).

By the end of this conversation between the narrator and the Old lady, Hemingway has established a complicated coil of associations of stylized art with effeminacy, homosexuality and decadence that evokes, albeit not explicitly, the spirit of the “decadents,” those 19<sup>th</sup>-century, fin-de-siècle European authors who sought inspiration—both in their lives and in their writings—in aestheticism, in illicit or perverse amours, and in all the more or less morbid and macabre expressions of human emotion.

Faulkner is brought into *Death in the Afternoon* during the course of a subsequent conversation between the narrator and the Old lady as a modern decadent—an author of a book so shocking in its use of language and subject matter that it revolutionized the art of novel writing in America by pushing the parameters of the printable. The word whorehouse comes up, and it becomes clear, without ever being made explicit, that *Sanctuary* (1931), Faulkner’s most recent novel, is being referred to. *Sanctuary*, with its corncob rape and picture of amoral justice—its morbid study of human degeneracy—shocked, even as it proved irresistibly attractive to readers, prompting the narrator to tell the Old lady he is considering writing a book about some lurid experiences of his own in whorehouses.

Increasingly less entertained by the narrator’s own efforts to amuse her, the Old lady asks for a story “of the kind...Mr. Faulkner writes.” Avid for abnormality, she wants a true story “about those unfortunate people” (*DIA* 179). At her urging, the narrator somewhat reluctantly complies with a story of homosexual initiation--of homosexual rape, actually—that, for the pure shock value of its subject, tops Faulkner’s. But the Old lady doesn’t like it. Although she has demanded a shocking story—a story from the dark side, it has fallen flat; she finds the ending feeble; it seems our narrator is no Faulkner. At this point, the narrator throws the Old lady out of the book, and conducts his conversations at chapters’ end solely with the reader. But the coil of associations linking decadence, the fine arts, and bullfighting put into motion in his conversations with her continues to function throughout the book.

El Greco is brought into *Death in the Afternoon* as a mannerist, a painter of great integrity, and a producer of “incomparable art,” whose paintings of elongated, androgynous figures make the narrator wonder out loud whether one might make the painter a *maricón*. (*DIA* 205). The question of El Greco’s sexuality is never resolved one way or another in *Death in the Afternoon*, but that doesn’t matter because one can’t take the posing of it entirely literally. Its function is to distinguish true mannerism from mere affectation by opposing male homosexuality to effeminacy. We see it in the contrast between the hostile comments directed to the art of André Gide, Oscar Wilde, and Walt Whitman and the shouted *viva* directed to the painter in the following passage in which the narrator says that El Greco, if he was one (a *maricón*),

he should redeem for the tribe, the prissy exhibitionistic, aunt-like, withered, old maid moral arrogance of a Gide; the lazy, conceited debauchery of a Wilde who betrayed a generation; the nasty sentimental pawing of a Whitman and all the mincing gentry. Viva El Greco, El Rey de los Maricones, (205)

Characterizing these writers' deplorable affectations as effeminate excesses (prissy, aunt-like, old maid, sentimental, mincing), the narrator establishes an unbridgeable gap between El Greco and the lesser *maricones*—not based on style (they are all decadents) but, as the morally charged language indicates, on the shortcuts, the timidity, and other kinds of bad faith the lesser *maricones* show with respect to their art. By contrast, with “Viva El Greco, El Rey de los Maricones,” the narrator, reminding us of the instability of the term “decadence”, uses an insult to convey applause and applies a term of abuse as part of a song of praise. It is an ironic cheer to a great painter who, because he is a complete artist, can afford to break the rules of symmetry and harmony to paint the way he must.

What might all this have to do with bullfighting? Well, let's see. The art of Faulkner connects with that of Belmonte in that both are unhealthy, mysterious, and beautiful—at once shockingly degenerate and hugely popular with the public—, a similarity that allows us, in turn, to make a connection between the shift in bullfighting and a corresponding shift in modern prose. Hemingway makes us feel the intensity of this shift by comparing a revolutionary development in an unfamiliar art (bullfighting) with a revolutionary development in a familiar one (prose writing). Although this shift to “art for art's sake” involved a radical change in social or ethical values—a decline in values, if you will, it has nothing to do with quality. The quality of Belmonte's art and that of Faulkner's art is as high as that of any “healthy” master prior to or contemporaneous with them.

This becomes clear when we turn to the connection between Belmonte and El Greco. Nowhere does the narrator question Belmonte's sexual orientation (and his insistence on the torero's wolf jaw and killer instinct make Belmonte an unlikely prospect for speculation in that regard [*DIA* 178, 212, 243]). But Belmonte's art in its long, languid forms, is like El Greco's, and it breaks the rules of classicism like El Greco's too. But what links Belmonte and El Greco most of all, is that both are decadents with integrity. Mastering the art of killing as well as that of artistic cape work, capable of performing well with bulls of all sizes and tendencies—something the more limited, more pusillanimous “artists”, “stylists,” and “specialists” never managed to do—, Belmonte reveals himself to be a complete artist (*DIA* 59, 69), a revolutionist who is a genuine mannerist, in contrast to the “incompleteness” of the art of his followers. And, in the figure of the Rey de Maricones, “the decadent, the impossible, the almost depraved style of Belmonte” is equated with mastery and sound art.

At the beginning, I mentioned that Belmonte's “new decadent method”, in the hands of his followers, was proving to be a threat to the health of the fiesta. According to Hemingway (and he's not alone in this), after Belmonte's retirement and the death of another great bullfighter, Joselito, bullfighting was left with “the new decadent method,”... “the bred-down bulls,” and, alongside the old-style bullfighters who no longer pleased, “a crop of new bullfighters, sad, sickly and decadent who had the method but no knowledge of bulls, no apprenticeship, none of the male courage, faculties or genius ... needed to make it work” (*DIA* 70).

In this regard, even the homosexual rape story and the disparaging feminine imagery used in connection with the art of Gide-Wilde-Whitman have a taurine application. To wit: the Old lady begging an un-Faulknerian narrator for a story “a la Faulkner” is similar to the bullfight public clamoring for faenas “a la Belmonte,” obliging artists of every tendency to adopt a decadent style whether they believe in it or not, and the deplorable affectations associated with the art of Gide-Wilde-Whitman suggests a disgust for the moral cowardice and bad faith (lack of *pundonor*) that the less talented and especially less principled followers of Belmonte (sometimes referred to in feminine gender role terms such as *señorita torero* or *torero hembra* in the taurine press) were exhibiting in the bullring.

To conclude: Relying entirely on juxtaposition and association for the connections between the bullfighting and the non-bullfighting material and their meanings to emerge, Hemingway never makes the comparisons explicit in *Death in the Afternoon*. Read literally, all the talk about decadence and homosexuality, about Faulkner and El Greco is irrelevant to the subject of bullfighting, explainable only in terms of Hemingway's personal obsessions, professional jealousies, and artistic preferences. But, read metaphorically, with an eye to the possible *similarities* between the 'alien' world of taurine history on one hand and the familiar one of fine arts criticism on the other, all the talk about decadence and homosexuality, about Faulkner and El Greco reveals itself to be a vehicle for bringing directly up to the reader's experience the nature and the impact of the Belmonte revolution and its consequences.

From a liminalist perspective, the text's unity lies, not in its author's life or character, but in the juxtaposition of bullfighting with the fine arts. And *Death in the Afternoon* reveals itself to be a non-fiction work of art in which much that is apparently extraneous and irrelevant functions, obliquely and poetically, as a rhetorical tool to persuade and inform, and to bring readers to an appreciation of the art of bullfighting by bridging the gap between whatever idea about it they bring with them to the book and the perspective on it held by a competent aficionado.

## NOTES

1. In chronological order, the titles of the articles are:

“The Journey Between: Liminality and Dialogism in Mary White Rowlandson’s Captivity Narrative” by Michele Burnham. *Early American Literature* 1993

“This Indian Bait:” Samson Occom and the Voice of Liminality” by Michael Elliott *Early American Literature* 1994

“The Platea in the York and Wakefield Cycles: Avenues for Liminality and Salvation” *Studies in Philology* 1997

“Approaching the Threshold(s) in Postmodern Detective Fiction: Hawthorne’s “Wakefield” and Other Missing Persons” *Critique*, Spring 1998

“Indoctrination for Pariahdom: Liminality in the Fiction of Paul West” by David W. Madden *Critique*, Fall 1998

“The World Would do Better to Ask Why is Frimbo Sherlock Holmes?: Investigating Liminality in Rudolph Fisher’s *The Conjure-Man Dies*” by Adrenne Johnson Grosselin *African American Review* , Winter 1998

“American Gothic: Liminality in Thomas Harris’s Hannibal Lecter Novels” by Peter Messent *Canadian Review of American Studies*, 1999

“Limits, Lacunae, and Liminality: New and Recent Poetry by William Bronk, Ed Roberson, and Gustaf Sobin” by W. Scott Howard. *Denver Quarterly* 2000

“Filth, Liminality and Abjection in Charles Dickens’s *Bleak House*” by Robert E. Lougy. *English Literary History* 2002

“Resolving a Paradox through Liminality: *Stand Up and Cheer* (1934). *Journal of Popular Film and Television* 2002

2. This article is based on a talk originally titled “The Liminal Aspects of Hemingway’s *Death in the Afternoon*” given in the Liminality Seminars, Department of English Studies, UAM on March 27, 2006. The article draws heavily on two published articles (Bredendick 2004a and 2004b) and, to a lesser extent, on an unpublished paper.

Bredendick, Nancy “‘Qué tal, hombre, qué tal?’: How Paratexts Narrow the Gap between the Reader and Text in *Death in the Afternoon*” in Mandel, Miriam B. (ed.). *A Companion to Hemingway’s Death in the Afternoon*. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2004. 205-34.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Dynamics of Decadence in *Death in the Afternoon*” in Bredendick, Nancy (ed.). *Mapping the Threshold: Essays in Liminal Analysis*. SLL 4. Madrid, Spain: Gateway Press, 2004 99-114.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Elements of Style: The *cronica taurina* and *Death in the Afternoon*” presented at the 12<sup>th</sup> Biennial International Hemingway Conference held in Ronda, Spain June 25-30, 2006.

## PRINCIPAL WORKS CITED OR CONSULTED

- Bergamín, José. *El arte de Birlibirloque (Entendimiento del toreo)*. Madrid: Cruz del Sur, 1961. 50
- Genette, Gerard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Trans. of *Seuils* (Paris, 1987). Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Hemingway, Ernest. *Death in the Afternoon*. New York: Scribners, 1932
- Mandel, Miriam B. "Introduction" in Mandel, Miriam B. (ed.). *A Companion to Hemingway's Death in the Afternoon*. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2004. 1
- Orts-Ramos, Tomás. "Libros de toros: Un rato a bibliografía II." (Review of *DIA*). *La Fiesta Brava*. April, 1933. 2-3
- Scholes, Robert and Comley, Nancy R. "Toros, Cojones, y Maricones in *Hemingway's Genders: Re-reading the Hemingway Text*. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1994. 107-144.
- Thurston, Michael. "Genre, Gender and Truth in *Death in the Afternoon*." *The Hemingway Review* 17.2 (1998): 47-63