John W. Fawell talks about how he should have out grown Maupassant's stories but can’t, because they are just good plot driven stories with often twist, surprise or revelation like that of O. Henry. He then goes on to talk about how Maupassant’s sentences are short and concise to the point that readers understand him easier. But he wasn’t too thrilled about Amazon.com listing one of Maupassant’s volumes of stories as representing a seventh-grade level in reading difficulty, as he supported him by mentioning the fact that to find Maupassant’s point of view in his article one must look between the lines or trace the sarcasm to the driest spot.

 He goes on by sharing is love for “Idyll” one of Maupassant’s stories. Talking about how it was just four page long and how a brief description of the story basic scenario tells almost everything that was going to happen in the story, but Maupassant added a surprising twist at the ending which made the readers realize something about a character they never knew before. John classifies “Idyll” as “a first-class parody of a literary form.” He then goes on explaining how the story fulfills all the functions of an idyll, (an extremely happy, peaceful, or picturesque episode or scene, typically an idealized or unsustainable one.) by the scene of the book being set for a lovely, gentle day in southern France for a few hours. Further on he talks about how Maupassant’s anger lies below the humor, as he mocks the country life ideal centralized in Romantic thinking.

The story which is basically about a man and a woman met on a train ride and started talking. At a point in the story the woman felt discomfort from her breast being full of milk, then she opened her dress all the way, at this point the man saw her right breast and offered to help her with her discomfort by sucking it. From a romantic view it seems like the man just took an advantage of a sexual opportunity. But at the end Maupassant kept a twist to the story by the man saying she helped him more than he helped her for he had been starving for two days straight. This killed the romance in the story as the man sucked her breast for his own hunger satisfaction rather than sexual and the woman allowed him to suck her breast for her own discomfort relief also rather than sexual satisfaction. This is why John called “Idyll” a first class parody.

Mirta Ojito in the year 1975, when she turned 11 was sent to a tobacco field in one of the small clay towns around Havana, Cuba. Expecting evenings of serious boredoms, she prepared by going to her school librarian and asking her for any book that had nothing to do with the Soviet space program or the war in Vietnam (Which were probably the popular book of the time, as this was during the cold war era and towards or a bit after the ending of the Vietnam war). The librarian gave her a book called, “She pulled out a thick tome”.

The book was a collection of short stories by a French author called Guy de Maupassant, a name she couldn’t pronounce or have ever heard of before. Out of the stories in the book, the one story that really stood out to Mirta was a story called “The Necklace”. She talks about how the story really connected with her by understanding the type of teenager she was and the woman she aspired to be.

Maupassant became her favorite amongst authors in her early adolescent. She became obsessed with him to the point that she had frame picture of him, copied from a book on her night stand. She had to leave both his picture and book behind when she rushed out of Cuba in the year 1980. Eventually with time and other books her obsession for him past, but she claims the lesson never did.

During the summer of the year she wrote “Finding Mañana: A Memoir of a Cuban Exodus”, she claimed to have gone back to Maupassant, describing the feeling as that of returning to an old love and not being sure if the magic was still there. She went on stating that he was the writer she always wanted to be.

In Lev Nikolayevich Tolstoy book “THE WORKS OF GUY DE MAUPASSANT” he talks about a day in 1881 whereby he had a visit from a Russian novelist called Ivan Turgenev. During this visit, Turgenev gave him a French novel called “Maison Tellier” and told him to read it if he got a chance. When Tolstoy started the book, he noticed from the first story “La Maison Tellier” that in spite of the obscene and irrelevant subject of the story, Maupassant which is the author possessed something called talent.

 He further on explained why he said Maupassant possessed talent, by saying that he saw the ability to direct people’s attention to an uncommon type of subject in the story. Appreciating Maupassant act for a clearly, simple statement and how he did not simulate love or hatred but actually loved and hated what he described, he criticizes Maupassant of not having moral relation to what he represented, which he describes as the difference between good and evil. Furthermore, in the book the stories he started encountering disgusted him to the point in which he said he missed a story called “le Papa de Simon” and “Sur l'Eau”. After being done with the book, he was disappointed and told Turgenev "There are in our time, when there are so many who are willing to write, a number of people with talent, who do not know to what to apply it, or who boldly apply it to what ought not and should not be described,".

Later on after that, someone advice Tolstoy to read a novel called “Une Vie” which was also written by Maupassant. He said the story suddenly changed his view on Maupassant and ever since that story, he read all the story that had Maupassant name on it. He then goes on to say the novel had some of the thing missing in the “Maison Tellier”, things like Maupassant moral relation to the subject. What Tolstoy claim to like most about “Maison Tellier” was how he left him asking questions

In “THE EPISTEMOLOGY OF THE MANTELPIECE: SUBVERSIVE ORNAMENTS IN THE NOVELS OF GUY DE MAUPASSANT” Andrew J Counter examined similar times in Maupassant’s fiction where uncertain knowledge, ignorance and disavowal comes into place, and where ornamental objects take on a new significance. Counter also emphasize on the fact that it ornamental objects are situated with some frequency on mantelpieces, because Maupassant’s stories were written in the nineteenth-century, which was a period where the floor of a fireplace had “a practical and symbolic centrality and thus was a site at which both functional and ornamental objects were concentrated.” He then goes on stating the fact that the ornament had no obvious use-value, but rather decorative. Counter argues that Maupassant takes that ornament which is use for decorative use and turns it into the set of symptoms characteristic of a medical condition. He then goes on saying his argument represent an extension of Pierre Bayard’s “Maupassant, juste avant Freud” which focuses on the study of Maupassant’s evocation of psychopathologies. Furthermore, in the article Counter breaks down or simplifies his argument by saying “I want to show that Maupassant’s non-fantastical, ‘naturalistic’ fiction (and primarily his novels) shares Lacan’s interest in interrogating precisely normative psychical and epistemological processes, or what we might call the conditions of possibility of intersubjective life.”

He argued with Beth Gordon reasoning that “one of the primary functions of the ornament is to carry meaning and intent that have been suppressed or excluded from central field”. Counter went on by explaining why he argues with Gordon point of view, by stating the fact that Gordon concentrates more on the appreciation of the beauty which is present in textual ornamentation to the readers. But he believes Maupassant’s interest is more deeply narrative and thematic. Counter also believes the ornament are there to offer various scenes of viewing by a narrative frame viewer whose reaction is reported, thereby making the ornament a direct challenge to the viewer’s self-image.

LUIS-CARLOS ALVARO started his article “Hallucinations and Pathological Visual Perceptions in Maupassant's Fantastical Short Stories- A Neurological Approach” by acknowledging Maupassant as one of the greatest writers in nineteenth century French literature. He then sheds some light to Maupassant’s past by calling him a “disciple of Flaubert”, who was Maupassant’s mentor. Alvaro went on explaining Flaubert role in Maupassant’s writing career by saying Flaubert was the one who taught Maupassant to develop is stories writing about natural things and elements that could be seen by the audience and perceived. Further on Alvaro wrote on how Maupassant time attending “Salpetriere”, where he learnt about hypnosis reflected within his works.

After talking about Maupassant and how Maupassant past helped him be the type of author he was, Alvaro started breaking some of Maupassant’s stories, showing or giving evidence to back up his thinking that Maupassant’s past made Maupassant the Author he was. He started off with a story called “Le Horla”. Alvaro claimed “Le Horla” was told in first person, which to him makes “the perceptive disturbances more believable and reinforce the narrative strength of the plot.” After summarizing the story, Alvaro analyzed the story even more and claimed that the first clinical detail in the story was a character inability to read. Alvaro concluded that the problem was “short, transient, probably acute, and emerging against a background of restlessness and anxiety bordering on a panic attack. He then pointed out the second clinical detail as be the allegedly feverish sleep the narrator took, which caused a hallucinatory syndrome that appear 2 or 3 hours after the narrator fell asleep. He goes on to the third which was to the third which he claimed to be paralysis, and then he supported his claim by saying “What ensues in the story supports this view: the character is unable to move or scream; he feels as if he is being suffocated, and finally awakens bathed in sweat.”

Skipping to the conclusion Alvaro stated that in 1882, Maupassant reported himself for using toxic substance that gave him hallucinogenic effect. Then he goes on saying his mixture of the drugs and his personality gave him experiences which he used to write his stories.