People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

University of 20th August 1955, Skikda

Faculty of Letters and Foreign Languages

Department of English

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment for the Requirement of the Doctor's Degree in Language, Civilization and Literature

The Human and Animal Bond in John Steinbeck's *Of Mice and Men* and *The Red Pony*

Presented by: **Mohamed Ben Ali Chaker**

Supervised by: **Professor Aboubou Hachemi**

Board of Examiners

Chairman: Prof. Ghouar Omar **University of Batna**

Supervisor: Prof. Aboubou Hachemi **University of Batna**

Examiner:Prof.Nedjai Mohammed-Salah **University of Batna**

Examiner:Prof. Saadi Hacene **University of Constantine1**

Examiner:Dr.HalimiMohamed-Seghir **Universityof Kasdi Merbah, Ouargla**

Academic Year: 2017 – 2018

Dedication

To my loving mother whose love and strength enrich my life.

Acknowlegments

First of all, I praise God Almighty for granting me the strength to fulfill my doctoral dissertation successfully. It appears in its form thanks to the help and guidance of some people and institutions.

I would like to thank most warmly Professor Nedjai Mohamed Salah, professor Ghouar Omar and professor Ammaria Lanasri for their invaluable academic advice and the hearty encouragement they have offered ever since we met at Skikda University.

Professor Hachemi Aboubou and professor Mimi Reisel Gladstein, my deep thanks for your warm encouragement, thoughtful guidance, critical comments, invaluable advice, correction and direction of the the dissertation. There is no doubt in my mind that without their support I could not have completed this dissertation.

I am thankful to the Martha Heasley Cox Center for Steinbeck Studies, San José, California, especially Director Nicholas Taylor and Archivist Peter Van Coutren for providing me with all Steinbeck- related materials and for inviting me to perform research there.

I am grateful to Leann Cherkaksy Makhni, Director of the International House in San José, California, and Jewell Palmer Rosales, Property manager for Student Housing at the University of Texas at El Paso, for

their warm welcome and for their endeavor to make a wonderful literary atmosphere for me where I really enjoyed my stay there.

I would like also to thank Professor Barabara Heavilin, Editor in Chief for Steinbeck Review, and Pennsylvania State University Press for publishing my article about Islamic Echoes in The Grapes of Wrath.

Finally, I take the opportunity to express my profound gratitude to my cousin Badr Eddine Mohamed Ben Ali for his continous support—both spiritually and materially.

Table of Contents

Abstract

The aim of this study is to highlight Steinbeck's main reasons for including animals in both his fictional and non-fictional works, most notably *Of Mice and Men, The Red Pony, The Log from the Sea of Cortez and Travels with Charley: In Search of America*. Indeed, there is a strong relationship that binds humans with animals in these works. Steinbeck makes use of such a bond: First, to reflect his lifelong experiences with animals through his writing. Keep in mind that Steinbeck himself raised a pony named Jill when he was a child and he also owned an array of breeds of dogs and developed a special affinity for marine biology during his matriculation at Stanford University and his friendship with Edward Ricketts; second, to emphasize that the lives of humans and animals are closely connected ; third, that animals are good companions and protection for man ; fourth, that the world surrounding the humans and animals is unforgiving, uncaring and above all predatory and is based on "the survival of the fittest." This dissertation is divided into four main chapters. The first chapter is dedictated to exploring Steinbeck's attachment to the animal world starting from his childhood to his death. The second chapter is devoted to delving into the effect of Edward Ricketts on Steinbeck's philosophy about animal behavior. In this context, I will jail myself within the scopes of the phalanx theory, man's animality and non-teleological

thinking and how these philosophies are inherent in his writing. The third chapter deals with the human and animal bond in *Of Mice and Men*. In this respect, I will diagnose the relationship between Lennie and small animals and that of Candy and his devoted dog. The last chapter revolves around the human and animal bond in *The Red Pony*. In this case, I will anatomize Jody Tiflin's behavior toward danimals in this predatory world and how he arises from boyhood to manhood. All these chapters are interwoven together for the sake of arguing the existence of the philosophies mentioned above and how some of them have their echoes in Islamic religion.

Key words:

John Steinbeck – The Human and Animal Bond – *Of Mice and Men* - *The Red Pony* - Islam

Introduction

John Steinbeck's fiction is full of ageless mysteries that ignite our inquiring minds to explore them. One of these mysteries that one might shed light on is the human and animal bond in *The Red Pony* and *Of Mice and Men*. In this respect, some questions should be asked: Why does Steinbeck incorporate animals specifically in these two works? Why are human characters endowed with animal traits in these two works? What binds humans and animals in these two works? What is the nature of this relationship? What does Steinbeck use animal imagery for? Does this bond have something to do with John Steinbeck's contemporary life?

One could hypothesize that all these suggested questions diverge on one main thesis which is Steinbeck reveals that the lives of humans and animals are closely connected and that their best laid schemes often go awry in this predatory world. The purpose of this study is to illuminate some of Steinbeck's philosophies about animals that lie behind this particular bond. So that this research comes into fruition, a combination of thematic, Darwinian, comparative and formalist approaches as well as Onomastics will be interwoven together subtly from the beginning to the end of this study.

It is worth noting that a literature review about Steinbeck and the animal world should be included here to justify the need for our dissertation and why our research is of value; that is, to acquaint our reader with what has been

written or researched on the subject before and why we will add to that in a significant way.

In her dissertation entitled "Animal Symbolism and Imagery in John Steinbeck's Fiction from 1929 through 1939," Joyce Compton Brown contends that Steinbeck uses zoological imagery in *The Red Pony* to emphasize, first, the cycle of life and death and that Jody Tiflin is a part of it. Second, Jody's collecting of animals symbolizes his boyhood and experience with animals reflects his changing moods. Third, the characters of Carl Tiflin and Billy Buck are revealed. The former hates weakness in animals and men and he feels compassion for animals, though. The latter expresses his love and understanding of animals. Besides, in *Of Mice and Men* Steinbeck uses such imagery to stress the animal side in all human beings.

Our dissertation focuses in part on how John Steinbeck perceives nature in *The Red Pony* as uncaring, unforgiving and predatory since it is full of predators which are in a constant conflict against one another. Such a conflict occurs either between animals and animals or between humans and animals or between humans and humans. At last it results in the survival of the fittest. Furthermore, Steinbeck demonstrates here his knowledge about little boys' behavior toward animals, and how they have to be taught not to be cruel to animals; Jody Tiflin is a good example. Steinbeck reveals also how Jody Tiflin ascends from boyhood to manhood. Jody's acquisition of the red pony lifts him above his friends. One

should remember that Steinbeck is keen on the Arthurian cycle and therefore Steinbeck believes that the horse is of key importance to the knight. This idea can clearly be seen in “The Leader of the People” when the grandfather tells the Tiflin family and Billy Buck about his knighthood when he was leading his people to fightthe Indians in the Great Plains.

In her article “Biological and Animal Imagery in John Steinbeck’s Migrant Agricultural Novels: A Re-evaluation,” Josephine Levy states that Steinbeck’s use of biological and animal imagery is attributed to the fact that he is obsessed with marine biology. Such interest stems from Steinbeck’s experience with his lifelong friend Edward Ricketts that resulted in the co-authorship of *The Sea of Cortez* in 1941. The use of such imagery is based on Steinbeck’s observations that any individual is also a part of a larger life form. The concept of “group-man” can be applied to various species. The trio of *In Dubious Battle, Of Mice and Men* and *The Grapes of Wrath* are good examples of this philosophy. Josephine Levy reveals that critics like Edmund Wilson and Frederick Hoffman attacked Steinbeck’s use of animal and biological imagery, for Steinbeck views man as no more than an animal.

In his article “The Global Appeal of Steinbeck’s Science: The Animal-Human Connections,” James C. Kelley follows Josephine Levy’s thread of thought. He points out that Steinbeck was vehemently attacked for endowing animals with human emotions and sensibilities and therefore he stripped humans

of all the noble qualities of humanity. James C. Kelley says that contemporary reviewers object to Steinbeck's treatment of humans and animals because of religion and philosophy. Western religion claims that humans are created in the image of God. However, secularists like Charles Darwin claim that humans are special because of their unique rationality. James C. Kelley proceeds that the human-animal relationship can also be explained by the idea that they represent points on a continuum or "The Great Chain of Being" which binds humans not only to animals, but also to different sorts of species. He adds that the human-animal connection is also ascribed to Steinbeck's influence by "is thinking" or non-teleological thinking.

Indeed, this dissertation comes to add up to this other reasons why Steinbeck uses animal imagery not only in Steinbeck's migrant novels, but also in all of his fictional works. First, Steinbeck lived on ranches and this paved the way for him to get in touch with different breeds of animals. Second, Steinbeck's inclusion of animals does not mean merely that he reduces humans to the level of animals but to show the reader that the lives of humans and animals are closely connected. This can also be interpreted as Steinbeck being a naturalist writer who is obviously influenced by Charles Darwin's evolutionary theory which is based on adaptation and natural selection. This Darwinian philosophy is strikingly seen in Steinbeck's works, especially *Of Mice and Men* and *The Red Pony*. Besides, naturalist writers view their characters as animal-like. More

interestingly, from an Islamic viewpoint, humans and animals are totally different. However, they might be similar or humans are inferior to animals when they are overcome by their urges and are far from religion. In this respect, God and the prophet Mahomet (peace be upon him) use animal imagery to exemplify this case.

In his article "The Best Laid Plans in Steinbeck's *Of Mice and Men*," Louis Owens asserts that Slim practices natural selection when he drowns four puppies and keeps the biggest. On the other hand, Carlson kills Candy's dog using his Luger to get him out of misery. This implies that Carlson is a believer in animal euthanasia. Louis Owens contends that dog and man are both annoyances and hindrances to the smooth working of the ranch, the dog stinks and Lennie kills too many things. Seemingly, Steinbeck associates Carlson's Luger with the theme of eugenics and the rise of Fascism in Germany since the Luger was named after George Luger who designed it in Karlsruhe, Germany, at the end of the nineteenth century. Furthermore, "Carl" not only reflects Karlsruhe, but also it stems from the German term "Karal" which means a peasant or bondman classing below a thane. Accordingly, Slim himself is the thane who undertakes the will of the boss whereas Carlson is the bondman of the ranch.

This dissertation comes to enlarge the scope of Darwinism in *Of Mice and Men*. This novel is not only based on natural selection, and this reflects Steinbeck's naturalistic trend in his writings. From a broader standpoint, the

ranch reflects nature wherein there is a constant conflict between the powerful and the powerless and this ends in the suppression of the weak at the hands of the strong. Slim's drowning of his puppies and keeping the biggest might lead us to say that this act gives the justification to the strong to kill his feeble people and let the strong ones live if he is unable to feed them all. Our study also accentuates the idea that the lives of humans and animals are closely intertwined. This theme is not specific to *Of Mice and Men*, but also it recurs in Steinbeck's fiction, most notably *The Red Pony*. In addition, this research shows that animal euthanasia recurs in all of Steinbeck's fictional works like *East of Eden* and *The Red Pony* and it has its analogue in Islam. Carlson wants to get the permission from Slim before killing Candy's dog. This leads us to think that Slim is the legislator; however, Carlson is the executor in this unforgiving world.

In her book *Carol and John Steinbeck: Portrait of a Marriage*, critic Susan Shillinglaw delves into Steinbeck's attachment to fauna during his first marriage to Carol Henning. She asserts that the dogs are so necessary in Steinbeck's household that both of them raised different breeds such as English Setters, Bull Terriers and Airdale Terriers. They did substitute for offspring in their childless marriage. Steinbeck himself was so fond of animals, especially dogs, that he wrote letters to his friends telling them meticulously about their behavior. This implies that Steinbeck's experiences are even recognized by his friends. In

addition, Carol's scrapbook is considered in part as a strong evidence of Steinbeck's childhood experience with animals.

In fact, this dissertation aims to bridge the gap in Susan Shillinglaw's work entitled *Carol and John Steinbeck: Portrait of a Marriage* by shedding light on Steinbeck's attitude toward animals during his first marriage to Carol Henning. In this stage of life, Steinbeck claims that the role of dogs has changed over time. They are as equally important as the use of fire by a first man. The dogs are also raised to serve as a good protection for Steinbeck's family. In fact, it was after his divorce from his second wife Gwyndolyn Conger and during his third marriage to Elaine Scott that Steinbeck traveled across the United States and so he took with him his beloved poodle named Charley. Steinbeck perceived that traveling alone would risk his life as the roads were dangerous and were open at any time to attack, robbery and assault. Meanwhile, Steinbeck felt also "alone, nameless, friendless, without any of the safety one gets from family, friends, and accomplices There is no reality in the danger. It's just a very lonely, hopeless feeling—a kind of desolate feeling" this suggests also that animals are a good companion for man. Besides, Steinbeck tends to think playfully about his dogs. For example, his dog named Toby tore the handwritten copy of *Of Mice and Men*. Steinbeck mused whimsically that his dog's behavior reflected his dissatisfaction with and his hate for the book. Also, In "Random Thoughts on

Random dogs" Steinbeck portrays fancifully another dog as a seer who roams somewhere and turns into a missionary.

In his article "Companions on the Road: Animals in Steinbeck's Texts," John J. Han describes Steinbeck as an "animal lover" who has an "extensive knowledge of animals" and who considers them as companions and friends. He also thinks of him as an "animal welfarist" who extensively uses animal imagery and, who stands in opposition to the rightists, believes that humans are superior to animals and who condemns any sort of animal abuse or cruelty and who advocates animal euthanasia simply because it brings relief and comfort to the ailing or suffering animal.

Our dissertation comes to add new insights to this work by arguing that Steinbeck's view of the superiority of humans to animals and merciful killing of animals and his condemnation of animal cruelty are not only found in animal welfarism but also they can be traced in Islamic religion in which the superiority of humans to animals can shift to the equateness of humans and animals and the superiority of animals to humans when humans are entirely driven by their instincts or impulses. This can clearly be seen in Lennie of *Of Mice and Men*. Furthermore, this thesis comes to add to this work by foregrounding Steinbeck's demonstration of his knowledge about Children's behavior toward animals and his penchant for horsemanship. In this context, one could find the ghosts of the noted knights King Arthur and Oqba Ibn Nafi in *The Red Pony*.

Eventually, it should be noted that all these various scientific theories mentioned above that Steinbeck was deeply interested in will be discussed more fully in the chapters that follow.

Chapter I: John Steinbeck's Attachment to the Animal World

It is of paramount importance to devote this whole chapter to shedding light on how John Steinbeck felt about animals during his lifetime and to what extent his feelings toward and his own experience with animals are reflected in his writings, both fictional and non-fictional. Those are many and cover from his childhood to his death. First, Steinbeck had a red pony named Jill when he was a boy. So, his novella *The Red Pony* can be considered as a bildungsroman in the sense that Jody Tiflin is Steinbeck's alter ego during his childhood and the red pony corresponds to his Jill. Keep in mind; this is indeed among Steinbeck's first interactions with an animal. In the Benson biography someone is quoted as saying that he wrote poems for many occasions, one when the family dog Jiggs was run over. Besides, Steinbeck may have lived on ranches briefly while working in summer which would put him in interaction with different kinds of animals. He lived in a house in Pacific Grove and one in Los Gatos that was ranch-like during his first marriage and this allowed him to keep in touch with animals. More amazingly, Steinbeck studied marine biology at the University of Stanford and this showed his deep interest in exploring the world of marine animals. Such an interest did surge especially during his acquaintance with Ed Ricketts. While Steinbeck was married to Carol Henning, Steinbeck raised different breeds of dogs like Airedales, Terriers, Setters and Poodles. When his dog Toby chewed up a part of the manuscript of *Of Mice and Men*, Steinbeck did not punish him because he explained humorously that the dog might have been a critic. Lastly, during his third marriage to Elaine, Steinbeck penned

"Random Thoughts on Random Dogs" which was first published in *Saturday Review* in 1955. Steinbeck observes in this essay how the role of dogs in society has changed over the years. He reflects fancifully on a dog he once owned, T-Dog, who he portrays as a seer who wandered away and became a proselytizer. He writes whimsically about his ideal dog, a white English bull terrier, and wonders if he still exists. Furthermore, Steinbeck's personal autograph "Pigasus" is a good evidence of Steinbeck's association with fauna. Keep in mind, Steinbeck himself uses it as a joke about Pegasus the winged horse in Greek mythology. Also, in 1960 Steinbeck traveled across the United States with his beloved poodle named Charley and the outcome was *Travels with Charley: In Search of America* in which Steinbeck uses humor in his description of this dog's behavior. After Charley, Steinbeck had another dog named Angel. So, this shows on the one hand that Steinbeck was in constant touch with the animal world. On the other hand, it proves that he was really a good companion of and a loyal friend to all the different breeds of animals that he lived with.

I.1. Steinbeck's Attitude toward Animals during his Boyhood and his First and Second Marriage

John Steinbeck was born in 1902, in Salinas, California. It is widely held that his place of birth wherein he grew to maturity functions as a biographical bridge between Steinbeck and his writing. It is also the fountainhead of his knowledge and love of nature, his biological perception of life, and many of his characters,

whether the paisanos and vagrants of *Tortilla Flat*, *Cannery Row* and *Sweet Thursday* or the migrant workers of the trio of *In Dubious Battle*, *Of Mice and Men* and *The Grapes of Wrath*.

Steinbeck dwelt most of his first forty years in the Salinas Valley, wherein his mother taught in the nearby public schools and his father was for many years treasurer of Monterey County. Steinbeck's childhood was likely much like that of Jody in one of his most popular stories, *The Red Pony*. At that time, the long valley was a series of small farms dedicated to cattle raising and the growing of both fruits and vegetables, among which were interspersed small towns where the farmers brought their produce to market. Young Steinbeck worked during school vacations for the neighboring farmers and ranchers. These early years of life being attached to nature certainly form the backdrop against which Steinbeck drew his graphic, and often beautiful, portrayals of natural phenomena.

Dogs were not a luxury but a necessity in the Steinbeck household, then and throughout the first marriage to Carol. When their dog named Bruga was poisoned in Los Angeles, John and Carol raised a "darling little Airedale," named "Tylie Eulenspiegel," after Till Eulenspiegel, the German trickster figure who, in picaresque stories, revealed the world's follies. Carol was actually very fond of dogs, not soupy but affectionate and kind. Although they denied a desire for children, dogs may have replaced children in the childless marriage. In

scrapbooks she had during the 1930s people are seldom identified beneath their photos, but dogs always are. On the other hand, Steinbeck tended to enforce dog behavior sternly and somewhat unpredictably. Shillinglaw points out that Ed Ricketts hailed Steinbeck as "very strict and Prussian… but affectionate with dogs," and another friend said, more darkly, that John needed a dog to be dominant. John was surely attentive to dog personality, nearly as much so as to human foibles. Shillinglaw states that Steinbeck was so interested in Tillie's actions that he once wrote to Richard Albee that this dog was "stalking a moth on the floor and she will eat it and it will make her sick because moths always make her sick. No other kind of bug does, only moths." Steinbeck taught Tillie, a dog that loathed waves, to dive into the ocean. A few months later, Steinbeck pulled out all of Tillie's whiskers to "strengthen their growth," as he wrote to Richard Albee. "She looks like hell now. We are ashamed to be seen with her." John reported all of Tillie's achievements, drawing humor from each. When she ate a quart of bacon grease, Steinbeck observed that a "stomach ache and a bad conscience are ruffling her ordinarily volatile disposition." Shillinglaw notes that when a Stanford friend, Bob Cathcart, once made a visit to Steinbeck's household, he noticed that "spoiled dogs and smelly dogs, family dogs and dignified dogs" are found in Steinbeck's writings: "That dog doesn't look so good." Steinbeck said of Tillie that "the dog's got a hell of a hangover." John intended to pen stories about Tillie as soon as she had puppies for him to watch (69). In another letter to Robert O. Ballou, Steinbeck's expresses his special

longing for Tillie and he portrays both her beauty and training. Although she died, she is still alive in Steinbeck's mind.

> Tillie, properly Tylie Eulenspiegel [who had recently died], was an Airedale terrier and a very beautiful one. She was beautifully trained—could point quail, retrieve ducks, brings in hares or clear a road of sheep. More important than these though, she had the most poignant capacity for interest and enjoyment in the world. It was much more important to us that she be alive than that people like Hearst and Cornelius Vanderbilt foul up the planet. She was house broken. (66)

Steinbeck wrote Robert O. Ballou once again in which he expresses his fondness of having a dog. Such a liking is so strong that he envisions some dogs in a circle peering at him "I need a dog pretty badly. I dreamed of dogs last night. They sat in a circle and looked at me and I wanted all of them" (69). Then, Steinbeck tells him that Tillie's demise still leaves a gap in his house; that's why he would like to bring a new dog to replace his big loss "But I do need a dog. Tillie haunts the house terribly" (70). These letters indicate that Steinbeck's experiences with animals are even recognized by his friends.

In 1931 John and Carol spent their "amusement quota for this month" on two mallard ducks for the garden, Aqua and Vita. Steinbeck wrote Richard Albee that Carol "hated to go to work this morning" as the ducks were "so interesting. They do not ever step on the plants—just edge between on their big clumsy feet…. You never saw anything so beautiful in all the greenness of our garden as these luxurious ducks." Alas, the ducks lived only for a few weeks. Despite being lovely, they dug up lobelias and muddied the pond. But the fact that John and Carol yearned for ducks points to the fun-loving sensibilities that stuck the couple together and helped push them through the slough of the Depression (Shillinglaw 69-70). So, this part reveals that both of Steinbeck and Carol were interested in raising ducks as well as dogs and are also conscious of what those ducks do.

Susan Shillinglaw asserts that Carol kept a scrapbook which was in fact her eye on the world. And that eye is not telling a linear story. The scrapbook contains photos of John when he was a child with his "Red Pony" named Jill which appears several times. John's sister fifteen-year old Esther is there and Mr. Steinbeck stands in front of the Eleventh Street cottage and Carol smiles beneath a bonnet as a small girl. One doubts she took out childhood photos from a drawer or a box and stuck them to fill random spaces—ever resourceful, ever practical, ever guarded (124). So, Carol's scrapbook can be considered in part as a concrete evidence of Steinbeck's childhood experience with animals.

But strands of this eclectic book show much more about his first marriage. Dogs are obviously beloved. The book contains photos of Bruga raised in 1930 and Tillie purchased in Pacific Grove in 1930 to substitute for Bruga who died pretty soon and Joggie in 1943 and Toby in 1936, and Airedales Omar I and Omar II. Dogs enjoyed an elevated position in Carol's book. A caption under a 1927 photo is emblematic, taken at Lake Tahoe and stuck twenty pages from the opening: John and his dog Jerry. On the following page, John's childhood's dog appears in the first line and then John with Mary on Jill in the second line. Dogs trump people in such captions. As explained before, with the exception of dogs, very little else is identified in these pages. So, neither sources are given nor dates are noted. Carol indeed rarely writes in her scrapbooks, avoiding any explications of what things are meant, and never contextualizing (Shillinglaw 124).

An amusing sequence of anecdotes, encompassing the different dogs that lived in the Steinbeck household from time to time, serves to measure the fast changing circumstances he experienced during the mid-1930s, especially when he wedded his first wife, Carol Henning. By 1933, dogs acted as an audience rather than a theme, but his novels had been such financial disappointments that he could no longer have a pet (Lisca 125).

Steinbeck wrote *Of Mice and Men* throughout 1935 and 1936, after having published four financially and critically unsuccessful novels (Bloom 13). While

Steinbeck was attempting to complete this work, his setter puppy Toby chewed about half of the only copy of the manuscript for *Of Mice and Men*. Steinbeck spared the puppy and tried to rewrite the lost words. Steinbeck now wrote humorously to his publisher about the dog as critic because, with the mixed reactions stirred by *In Dubious Battle*, hostile reviews, rather than indifferent sales, were his current preoccupation. Lisca quotes Steinbeck:

> Minor tragedy stalked. My setter pup, left alone one night, made confetti of about half of my manuscript book. Two months' work to do over again. It sets me back. There was no other draft. I was pretty mad, but the poor little fellow may have been acting critically. I didn't want to ruin a good dog for a manuscript I'm not sure is good at all. He only got an ordinary spanking. (125)

Lisca asserts that Steinbeck still felt that Toby might have been right. "I'm not sure Toby didn't know what he was doing when he ate the first draft. I have promoted Toby-dog to be lieutenant-colonel in charge of literature. But as for the unpredictable literary enthusiasms of this country, I have little faith in them" (125).

Steinbeck raised many dogs during his lifetime. In his early days there were English Setters and eventually there was an all-white Bull Terrier named Angel

who was one of his last dogs. He also had an Airedale Terrier about whom he had very blended feelings. Apparently, whenever his Airedale would go by the territory of a particular dog that Steinbeck hailed as a "shepherdsetter-coyote mix," a fight would break out. "Every week my dog fought this grisly creature and every week, he got licked." This continued for several months and then, once, Steinbeck's Airedale got fortunate. Surprisingly, he caught the tough mongrel and actually bit him very hard. In a sad tone Steinbeck notes what occurred next. The beaten dog then "hung his head in the loser's corner," and at this moment the Airedale deserted all chivalry. To the author's dismay, while the losing dog was lying on its back in subjugation, Steinbeck's dog abruptly returned to him and savagely assaulted his private parts. By the time the Airedale was pulled away from his victim, the latter "was finished as a father." Steinbeck culminates his tale by commenting that "there can be dogs without honor, even as with us." Steinbeck's feelings toward this Airedale were so negative that throughout this story he never even once mentioned the dog's name (Coren).

It is noteworthy that during his second marriage to Gwen, there were few in any pets, those were the war years and when he spent many years overseas. They lived mostly in apartments in New York. For instance, he visited England, Algeria and Italy to cover WWII for the *New York Herald Tribune*. Nevertheless, Renée Brouillette claims that Steinbeck's works still embody dogs

and he uses Susan Shillinglaw's quote to support his viewpoint "His books are full of affectionate and whimiscal portraits of dogs; even when he covered two major wars, Steinbeck wrote about dogs—the masscot of a bomber team in World Ward II and the bomb-sniffing dogs in Vietnam" (12). In addition, Steinbeck planned, when they would be able, to have a place where they could have animals, a horse in particular. In a letter he wrote to Webster F. Street in 1942, Steinbeck said :

> After the war is done, if I can, I know what I want if my domestic difficulties and my finances will permit it. I want about ten acres near the ocean and near Monterey and I want a shabby comfortable house and rooms for animals, maybe a horse, and some dogs and I want some babies. Maybe I can't ever get that but it's what I want. And I'm pretty sure it's what Gwyn wants too. (240)

Also, Steinbeck owned a dog named Willie that Gwyn raised since he was a puppy. Unlike the good treatment that Steinbeck used to carry to animals, this dog is an exception. Steinbeck got sick of him to the point that he punished him severely whenever he did not respect his commands. Steinbeck's unfamilar

behavior can be attributed to the fact that Steinbeck lived a hard emotional time with Gwyn and this made him pour his anguish on this dog.

> In Willie, though, he was completely frustrated. The sheep dog was totally irresponsible and could not be intimated. Whenever Steinbeck tried to show off his dog lore, Willie inevitably embarassed him, which in turn led Steinbeck to lose his temper and whack the dog on the rear, somtimes harder than he should have under any circumstances. Such beatings, totally contrary to a life-long kindness and respect for animals, seem to underline the severity of Steinbeck's own emotional derangement during this period. This was one area where he had thought he had maintained some mastery, and even it, in a sense, had failed him. (Benson 590)

One might understand that Steinbeck's unfamilar behavior can be attributed to the fact that Steinbeck lived a hard emotional time with Gwyn and this made him pour his anguish on this dog.

Since there has been so little to say about Steinbeck's association with animals during his second marriage to Gwyn except with his inclusion of dogs

in his books during WWII, and his dream of having a piece of land filled with animals, especially a horse, and his possession of a dog named Willie, we would better shed light on his treatment of animals during his third marriage to Elaine Scott.

I.2. Steinbeck's Attitude toward Animals during his Third Marriage

Steinbeck penned "In Random Thoughts and Random Dogs" during his third marriage to Elaine. This essay, first published in *Saturday Review* in 1955, is about "the emergence and development of our species" (03). Steinbeck claims that "the domestication of the dog was of equal importance with the use of fire to the first man" (03). In doing so, he could live a secure life "sleeping at dawn-man's feet—let him get a little rest undisturbed by creeping animals" (03). Steinbeck maintains that the dog's function changed in society over time. Unlike those ladies who used to use dogs "to draw the fleas away to theirselves'' (03), Man has started to use them in our day for the chase and racing. Besides, dogs have become "a sop for loneliness. A man's or a woman's confidant. An audience for the shy. A child to the childless" (3 - 4).

Steinbeck reflects fancifully in this essay on his sweet rememberance of a wonderful dog he once had. This dog used to eat grapes only when the grapes were picked, and he was accustomed to eat solely pears that fell off the trees during pear-picking. After a while he resolved to focus on the spiritual life and

so he summoned a group of dogs for the purpose of delivering them a sermon; then he went away to pursue his career in preachery.

> I have owned some astonishing dogs. One I can remember with pleasure was a very large English Setter. He saw things unknowable. He would bark at a tree by the hour, but only at one tree. In grape season he ate nothing but grapes which he picked off the vine, one grape at a time. In pear season he subsisted on windfall pears, but he would not touch an apple. Over the years he became more and more otherworldly. I think he finally came to disbelieve in people. He thought he dreamed them. He gathered all the dogs in the neighborhood and gave them silent letters or sermons, and one day he focused his attention on me for a full five minutes and then he walked away. I heard of him from different parts of the state. People tried to get him to stay, but in a day or so he would wander on. It is my opinion that he was a seer and that he had become a missionary. (05)

Steinbeck also describes whimsically his ideal dog, a white English bull terrier, and wonders if he still exists:

> I have owned all kinds of dogs but there is one I have always wanted and never had. I wonder if he still exists. There used to be in the world a white, English Bull Terrier. He was stocky, but quick. His muzzle was pointed and his eyes triangular so that his expression was that of cynical laughter. He was friendly and not quarrelsome, but forced into a fight he was very good at it. He had a fine, decent sense of himself and was never craven. He was a thoughtful, inward dog, and yet he had enormous curiosity. He was heavy of bone and shoulder. Had a fine arch to his neck. His ears were sometimes cropped, but his tail never. He was a good dog for a walk. An excellent dog to sleep beside a man's bed. He showed a delicacy of sentiment. I have always wanted one of him. I wonder whether he still exists in the world. (5 – 6)

Besides, Steinbeck's humorous use of "Pigasus" for the winged horse of Greek mythology testifies to Steinbeck's attachment to the animal world. Elaine

Scott claims that Steinbeck used to use it as his personal stamp in his both letters and books; and it was born out of his own imagination and it is considered as a token of his boundless ambitions and inspirations. She keeps saying that at first it had no shape, and it was written in Greek followed by a slogan.

> The Pigasus symbol came from my husband's fertile, joyful, and often wild imagination. After his signature on letters or inside his books, he would draw a fat little pig with wings, and lettered his name, "Pigasus." John would never have been so vain or presumptuous as to use the winged horse as his symbol; the little pig said that man must try to attain the heavens even though his equipment be meager. Man must aspire though he be earth-bound. At some point, he began to write "Pigasus" in Greek letters, and headed the motto, "Ad Astra Per Alia Porci," "to the stars on the wings of a pig." (sjsu.edu)

Elaine Scott adds that "Pigasus" became to have a shape when they befriended a Florentine noble family once they were in Florence, Italy, in the 1950s. A member of this family named "Count Foss," who majored in the Arts,

asked Steinbeck whether he could draw a Pigasus for him either in the pattern of Michael Angelo or that of Rafael, and Steinbeck opted for the second one.

> Once in the '50s whenwewere living in Florence, we became friends with a Florentine nobleman and his family. Count Foss was a delightful old gentleman, a student of the Arts, and his avocation was drawing. He proposed to John that he should draw a proper Pigasus, and he asked, "Should I draw it in the style of Michaelangelo or Rafaello?" John chose the latter. And here is the result. (sjsu.edu)

In 1960, when he was sixty years old, Steinbeck decided to travel across the United States with his beloved poodle named Charley and the outcome was *Travels with Charley: In Search of America*. Steinbeck was so attached to animals that his car Rocinante "was named after Don Quixote's horse" (07). He thought that such a name "would cause curiosity and inquiry in some places" (07). Besides, he compares it to a "turtle shell" (05) in the sense that it is well-equipped and self-contained. Steinbeck himself declares that he "had to be self-contained, a kind of casual turtle carrying his house on his back" (06). It should be noted that the turtle image appears earlier in the third chapter of *The Grapes of Wrath* in which the turtle ventures his life to cross the road. Indeed, Steinbeck

makes use of such an image to depict the saga of the migrant workers who traveled in ramshackle jalopies along Road 66 in hopes of looking for a better life. Also, this small animal emerges later when Tom Joad picks it up and put it in his pocket to give it to Ruthie and Winfield.

Steinbeck believed that traveling alone would risk his life because the roads were dangerous and so it was "open to attack, robbery, assault" (08). He felt also "alone, nameless, friendless, without any of the safety one gets from family, friends, and accomplices. There is no reality in the danger. It's just a very lonely, helpless feeling—a kind of desolate feeling" (08). For this reason, Steinbeck "took one companion on [his] journey—an old French gentleman poodle known as Charley. Actually his name is Charles le Chien" (08). This implies that animals are a good protector and companion of humans. This also reinforces the idea of "no man is an island". That is, Man shouldn't be isolated and alone. For Steinbeck, Charley's role in this journey is to relieve him from brooding loneliness.

Steinbeck says that "Charley was born in Bercy on the outskirts of Paris and trained in France" (08). And that "the dog had one advantage over most dogs. He was born and raised in France" (66). Besides, he informs us of his physical appearance as well as his moral qualities:

> While he knows a little poodle-English, he responds quickly to commands in French.

> Otherwise he has to translate, and that slows him down. He is a very big poodle, of a color called bleu, and he is blue when he is clean. Charley is a born diplomat. He prefers negotiations to fighting, and properly so, since he is very bad at fighting. Only once in his ten years has he been in trouble—when he met a dog who refused to negotiate. (09)

He goes on to say that Charley "is a bond between strangers" (09). And "is a mind reading dog" (12). Also, Charley is Steinbeck's ambassador and so he helps him establish his contact with strangers and fulfill his objectives:

> In establishing contact with strange people, Charley is my ambassador. I release him, and he drifts toward the objective, or rather to whatever the objective, or rather to whatever the objective may be preparing for dinner. I retrieve him so that he will not be a nuisance to my neighbors—et voila! A child can do the same thing, but a dog is better. (65)

Referring to the Roman legend of Romulus, Remus, and the she-wolf that nursed them, Steinbeck muses on how humans raised by wolves are reportedly

more animal-like, whereas dogs raised by humans like Charley almost become human, reflecting theology of C.S. Lewis (Benson 168). Steinbeck reinforces this idea in *Travels with Charley*:

> Now and then there appear accounts of babies raised by animals—wolves and such. It is usually reported that the youngster crawls on all fours, makes those sounds learned from his foster parents, and perhaps even thinks like a wolf. Take Charley, for example. He has always associated with the learned, the gentle, the literate, and the reasonable both in France and in America. And Charley is no more like a dog dog than he is like a cat. His perceptions are sharp and delicate and he is a mind-reader. I don't know that he can read the thoughts of other dogs, but he can read mine. Before a plan is half formed in my mind, Charley knows about it, and he also knows whether he is to be included in it. There's no question about this. I know too well his look of despair and disapproval when I have just thought that he must be left at home. (137-138)

This part suggests that both humans and animals understand and know about the thoughts of each other. So, Steinbeck is sensitive to the realm of animal thought. He can come into Charley' psyche easily to detect how he thinks, perceives, reacts and behaves. Charley also can do a similar thing.

Steinbeck points out that Charley has traveled several times during his lifetime. Often he has been left at home. Steinbeck goes on to say that Charley knows full well that they are about to make a journey before the preparation is unmade. More amazingly, Charley indulges in such an ecstatic state that he becomes hysteric. Steinbeck says of his dog's impression about the journey in the midst of the preparation that "he was underfoot the whole time and made a damned nuisance of himself. He took to hiding in the truck, creeping in and trying to make himself look small" (12). This also implies intuitiveness of Charley's part.

When Steinbeck started his journey, Charley "sat in the sea beside [him], his head was almost as high as [his]. He put his nose close to [his] ear and said 'Ftt'" (24). Steinbeck states that Charley "is the only dog [he] ever knew who would pronounce the consonant F" (24). According to Steinbeck, this occurs since Charley's "front teeth are crooked, a tragedy which keeps him out of dog shows; because his upper front teeth slightly engage his lower lip Charley can pronounce F" (24). Actually, the word "Ftt" denotes that Charley "would like to

salute a bush or a tree" (24). Steinbeck interprets this as Charley using this word to tell Steinbeck that he is hungry (28).

As far as his experience with Charley is concerned, Steinbeck can state ironically that Charley sometimes seems cleverer than he is, and sometimes he appears thoroughly the opposite. He can nearly do anything. However, no one can rival him in sniffing the marking of other dogs.

> It is my experience that in some areas Charley is more intelligent than I am, but in others he is abysmally ignorant. He can't read, can't drive a car, and has no grasp of mathematics. But in his own field of endeavor, which he was now practicing, the slow, imperial smelling over and anointing of an area, has no peer. Of course his horizons are limited, but how wide are mine? (24)

The quotation culminates in Steinbeck's assertion that Charley's horizons are less wide than his. By the way, Steinbeck himself says that Charley "never thinks of the future" (37). For argument's sake, when they stopped for a rest near a stream, they spotted a trout coming out of "the dark water of a pool" (37). And formed "outflowing silver rings" (37). So Charley plunged in and got dripping wet. This means that Charley is moved by his instinct; that is why he is not as far sighted as Steinbeck. So, animals cannot be promoted to humans since

they don’t have reason. Steinbeck is able to appreciate animals’ capabilities, but he understands the limitations.

Steinbeck’s deep interest in Charley’s behaviors can be seen in different instances. Steinbeck says that “Charley likes to get up early, and he likes [him] to get up early too” (37). And that after having his breakfast, Charley returns to sleep. Moreover, Charley made some “innocent-appearing” methods to wake Steinbeck up by either shaking himself and his “collar loud enough” or by getting “a sneezing fit” (33). Steinbeck asserts that Charley’s most vexatious way is when he sits calmly near the bed and looks sweetly and forgivingly at his face, which in turn takes his sleep away. Nevertheless, Steinbeck “keeps his eyes tight shut” (33). Steinbeck proceeds that even if he blinks Charley “sneezes and stretches, and that night is over for [him]” (33). Steinbeck concludes that Charley likes to wake up because he likes “to get started early, and early for Charley is the first tempering of darkness with the dawn” (33).

It is worth noting that Steinbeck really spends an enjoyable time when he travels across the United States with his beloved dog Charley. Whenever they stop for some time at different points, they experience some events. For instance, When Steinbeck comes across a pleasant-looking park man who checks him in and recommends him to keep his dog Charley away from being hurt by the bears, Steinbeck seizes the opportunity to tell him that Charley is a

specific, peace-loving dog. He does not harm anyone, and respects the right of such animals as cats and caterpillars.

> Charley is an unique dog. He does not live by tooth or fang. He respects the right of cats to be cats although he doesn't admire them. He turns his steps rather than disturb an earnest caterpillar. His greatest fear is that someone will point out a rabbit and suggest that he chase it. This is a dog of peace and tranquility. I suggest that the greatest danger to your bears will be pique at being ignored by Charley. (162)

The young man responds to him laughingly that he "wasn't so much worried about the bears. But our bears have developed an intolerance for dogs. One of them might demonstrate his prejudice with a clip on the chin, and then—no dog" (162). Steinbeck tells him that he will "lock him in the back" (162). And he promises him that "Charley will cause no ripple in the bear world, and as an old bear-looker, neither will I" (162). So, the pleasant-looking park man tells Steinbeck that:

> Just have to warn you. I have no doubt your dog has the best of intentions. On the other hand, our bears have the worst. Don't leave food about.

> Not only do they steal but they are critical of anyone who tries to reform them. In a word, don't believe their sweet faces or you might get clobbered. And don't let the dog wander. Bears don't argue. (162)

Another good example of Steinbeck's sensitivity to animal behavior that should be discussed here is that when Steinbeck went to Yellowstone, he discovered something about Charley he might never have known. Once he saw a bear near the road and he thought that it will flag him down. All of a sudden Charley snarled at the bear that lifted its front limbs into the air and seemed to Steinbeck that he would jump over Rocinante. Steinbeck closed the windows and turned hastily to the left and grazed the bear. Steinbeck wondered how a coward dog like Charley was so courageous that he wanted to kill the bear:

> Less than a mile from the entrance I saw a bear beside the road, and it ambled out as though to flag me down. Instantly a change came over Charley. He shrieked with rage. His lips flared, showing wicked teeth that have some trouble with a dog biscuit. He screeched insults at the bear, which hearing, the bear reared up and seemed to me to overtop Rocinante. Frantically I rolled the

> windows shut and, swinging quickly to the left, grazed the animal, then scuttled on while Charley raved and ranted beside me, describing in detail what he would do to that bear if he could get at him. I was never so astonished in my life. To the best of my knowledge Charley had never seen a bear, and in his whole history had showed great tolerance for every living thing. Besides all this, Charley is a coward, so deep-seated a coward that he has developed a technique for concealing it. And yet he showed every evidence of wanting to get out and murder a bear that outweighed him a thousand to one. I don't understand it. (162 – 163)

Following the same line of ideas, when Steinbeck stopped for some time near Livingston, he discovered that Charley was so exhausted and so terribly sick that he ate nothing and then he collapsed. In fact, Charley was unable to pee. This made him embarrassed and writhing in pain. Steinbeck said that "Consider this dog of great élan, of impeccable manner, of ton, enfin of a certain majesty. Not only did he hurt, but his feelings were hurt" (167).

In response to Charley's critical situation, Steinbeck had to stop by the road and let him walk alone and turn [his] back on him in kindness (168). Steinbeck said of him:

> It took him a very long time. If it had happened to a human male I would have thought it was prostatitis. Charley is an elderly gentleman of the French persuasion. The only two ailments the French will admit to are that and a bad liver. (168)

Steinbeck wishes he "knew something of veterinary medicine" (176). And he felt helpless with Charley. He wishes also "someone would write a good, comprehensive book of home dog medicine. [He] would do it myself if [he] were qualified (176).

Steinbeck gave Charley one and a half grains of seconal to relax him. When the medicament did not relieve Charley's pain, he looked for a veterinary until he found him. When he examined Charley, the veterinary said that it was a cold and gave Steinbeck pills to flush out Charley's kidneys (177-178). Steinbeck took the medicine and went away and said to himself:

> It wasn't that this veterinary didn't like animals. I think he didn't like himself, and when that is so the subject usually must find an area for dislike

> outside himself. Else he would have to admit his self-contempt. (178)

Steinbeck said that those people who talk baby talk to "mature and thoughtful animals" can inflict "long and natural tortures" on them and strip them off "their natural desires and fulfillments until a dog of weak character breaks down and becomes the fat, asthmatic, befurred bundle of neuroses" (187-188). Steinbeck maintained that Charley avoids people who address him in baby talk because he "is not a human; he's a dog, and he likes it that way. He feels that he is a first-rate dog and has no wish to be a second-rate human" (188).

Besides, Steinbeck told us how Charley felt about the veterinarian when he started examining him:

> When the alcoholic vet touched him with his unsteady, inept hand, I saw the look of veiled contempt in Charley's eyes. He knew about the man, I thought, and perhaps the doctor knew he knew. And maybe that was the man's trouble. It would be very painful to know that your patients had no faith in you. (188)

Within the same context, but this time in Amarillo another doctor examined Charley and told Steinbeck that the dog had prostatitis. Steinbeck said that "Charley put himself in this man's care, completely confident. I've seen this

instant rapport before, and it is good to see" (232). Steinbeck wondered how the doctor:

> Lifted charley and carried him and laid him in the front seat of the convertible. He was content and confident, and so was I. And that is how I happened to stay around Amarillo for a while. To complete the episode, I picked up Charley four days later, completely well. The doctor gave me pills to give at intervals while traveling so that the ailment never came back. There's absolutely nothing to take the place of a good man. (233)

When Steinbeck brought Charley back from "the good doctor," he sounded "half his age and felt wonderful" (248). He could also run, leap, roll, laugh and give "little yips of pure joy" (248). Steinbeck grew delighted and excited to have him once again, "sitting upright in the seat beside me, peering ahead at the unrolling road, or curling up to sleep with his head in [his] lap and his silly ears available for fondling. That dog can sleep through [his] amount of judicious caresses" (248). This leads us to say that Steinbeck is very caring about Charley's health and feels happy when Charley is restored to his old self.

Lastly, upon his arrival at New Orleans, Steinbeck bought a "poor boy" sandwich and then he took a rest. Charley realized that Steinbeck was inflicted

with sorrow. So, to relieve him, Charley "did not wander about but sat close and pressed his shoulder against his knee" (258). Steinbeck responded positively to his dog's attitude and said that Charley "does that only when [he is] ill." Therefore, he assumes that he was really sick with some sort of sorrow (258). When Steinbeck drove through New Orleans, he found that the black people were separated from American society and were also conceived as objects. He discussed with some people about those black people who writhed in such a bitter reality. For instance, Steinbeck stumbled over a man whom he invited for a coffee and whom he asked whether or not he was against Negroes. The man said no, and once again Steinbeck asked him whether or not he could allow the Negroes to be people. The man responded to him by making an analogy between Negroes and Charley. The man invited him to suppose that his dog "could talk and stand on his hind legs. Maybe he could do very well in every way" (261). Then the man asked him whether or not he perceived Charley as people. Steinbeck asked him what he meant, and how he would like his sister to marry his dog. The man responded laughingly to his comment that he was merely telling him "how hard it is to change a feeling about things". And also "it will be just as hard for Negroes to change their feelings about us as it is for us to change about them" (261). Concerning racial segregation, Steinbeck says that Charley "doesn't have our problems. He doesn't belong to a species clever enough to split atom but not clever enough to live in peace with itself. He doesn't even know race, nor is he concerned with his sisters' marriage" (266-267). Steinbeck

went on that Charley engaged in a romantic relationship with a dachshund, which was perceived by humans as “racially unsuitable, physically ridiculous, and mechanically impossible” (267). Steinbeck explained that Charley ignored all these problems, and “he loved deeply and tried dogfully” (267). Besides, Steinbeck showed that Charley cannot comprehend “the good and moral purpose of a thousand humans gathered to curse one tiny human” (267). For this reason, Steinbeck found disdain in the eyes of dogs like Charley and this made him convinced that dogs viewed humans as nuts (267). So, this part shows that Steinbeck wants to say that Charley is superior to humans since he does ignore racial prejudice.

At the end of the book, Steinbeck claims that he and Charley knew that the journey was over before they got back home. He concludes that Charley “at least is no dreamer, no coiner of moods. He went to sleep with his head in his lap, never looked out the window, never said “Ftt,” never urged [him] to turn out. He carried out his functions like a sleepwalker, ignored whole rows of garbage cans” (273). In fact, this part reveals that Charley has a highly developed sense of intuitive knowledge.

Some time after Charley’s demise, Steinbeck replaced him by a white bull terrier named Angel that sounded to him “the sweetest, best behaved dog” he had ever had (Benson 30).

To conclude, Steinbeck developed a very deep attachment to the animal world. His first interaction with animals was during his boyhood when he owned a red pony named Jill. Such an early experience is echoed in his coming-of-age novella *The Red Pony*. Steinbeck also raised different breeds of dogs during his marriages to Carol Henning, Gwyndolyn Conger and Elaine Scott. More interestingly, Steinbeck had fun about them. His dog Toby tore the first handwritten version of *Of Mice and Men*. Steinbeck mused humorously that the dog did not like the book. In addition, Steinbeck pondered fancifully on another dog that he once possessed. This dog left him since he decided to be a preacher. Steinbeck's keen interest in fauna can also be seen through his use of "Pigasus." Much later, Steinbeck took with him a poodle named Charley as a good life companion in his journey to explore the United States. Both of them did enjoy a good, adventurous time although they came across some critical situations most notably Charley's sickness. Steinbeck wrote about the trip in his non-fiction book titled *Travels with Charley: In Search of America*. After Charley's death, Steinbeck owned a bull terrier named Angel who was considered to be his last dog. Steinbeck said of him that he was indeed the sweetest, best behaved dog he had ever had.

Due to the fact that Steinbeck's attachment to the animal world predominated during his lifespan in two of his main fictional works *Of Mice and Men* and *The Red Pony*, there is peculiarly strong evidence of such an attachment.

Furthermore, one of his most important relationships had an everlasting influence on his attitudes toward the natural world.

Chapter II: The Effect of Edward Ricketts on Steinbeck's Philosophy about Animal Behavior

Undeniably, Edward Ricketts had a great effect on Steinbeck's philosophy about animal behavior. Such an effect can be obviously seen in the areas of phalanx theory, non-theological thinking, man's animality and biological naturalism. First, phalanx theory presents ideas about how any animal is a part of the larger group. Steinbeck and Ricketts did observe this fact when they made a trip into the Sea of Cortez. Second, the concept of non-teleological thinking is an outcry against systematic thought. It is also man's experiences and his sensed awareness of himself and his relation with the world. Last, but not least, man's animality in the work of Steinbeck can be shown through his use of figurative language and through the role that biological urges play in the life of his characters. Besides, Steinbeck claims that man's irrational drives are obviously to be understood as his biological inheritance from his animal ancestors.

In his article entitled "Critical Perspective on John Steinbeck's Fiction," Cliff Lewis claims that Richard Astro's *Steinbeck and Ricketts* (1973) is a pivotal analysis of the bond between Edward Ricketts and John Steinbeck which culminates with the idea that Ricketts had a great effect on the author. Steinbeck's characterization of Ricketts is reflected through some books and stories like "The Snake", In *Dubious Battle*, *Cannery Row*, and *Sweet Thursday*. And that Ricketts was the first to introduce such main thematic issues as: "the concept of ecological relationship, the analogy of animal and human behavior, the idea of breaking through and the expression of anti- materialism" (73).

Cliff Lewis further says thatAstro admits that Steinbeck's finest writing as well as some of his fiascoes are the outcomes of Ricketts' effect. Astro also maintains that the unfavorable writing such as *Cup of Gold* and East *of Eden* have nothing to do with Ricketts's impact on Steinbeck (73). This claim could in part be supported by David Wyatt's assertion in his introduction to John Steinbeck's *East of Eden* that Ricketts leaves no imprints in *East of Eden*, except perhaps in the continual flow of Samuel Hamilton's and Lee's wisdom that inspires Adam. And that by the time Steinbeck started the book his need for mentoring had weakened, as had his interest in the collective. "I think I believe in one thing powerfully," he wrote to John O' Hara in 1949 "that the only creative thing our species has is the individual, lonely mind. Two people can create a child but I know of no other thing created by a group" (xii). Indeed, Cliff Lewis highlights that Astro asserts that Steinbeck's innovation faded away due to Ricketts' death in 1948 (73). However, that does not mean that *East of Eden* was a bad book. It also does not illustrate that Steinbeck was lacking creativity in that book. After all, it was many years after Ricketts' death that Steinbeck won the Noble prize for literature.

Steinbeck met Edward Ricketts in 1930. After he suffered a great deal from the publication of *The Grapes of Wrath*, which was banned and burned in different parts of the world, Steinbeck decided to lean to the sea as a relief. In the meantime, they worked in collaboration together, and in 1940 they planned

to explore the Sea of Cortez so they hired Captain Tony Berry and his purse seiner, the Western Flyer (Gidmark 377). Hiring such a boat was costly. Steinbeck thus asked Elizabeth Otis to see whether any person could pay for a "day-by-day account of what happens" on the trip in the form of a boat's log. But Otis attempted in vain to find who could financially support the trip. Editors could not understand why Steinbeck desired to waste his money on a time wasting, worthless trip (Parini 241- 242).

It is worth mentioning that Steinbeck and Ed Ricketts had discussed many of the ideas I write about – phalanx, non-teleological thinking, and man's animality before their trip. However, it would be better to focus first and foremost on their expedition since it gives us a spotlight on how they really did interact with and respond to sea animals' behavior and how they did contribute greatly to this wonderful sea world through their publications. In fact, the journey started in the last week of March. They set off from Monterey and they first stopped in Loreto, which was a very small Mexican village. The purpose was to collect marine creatures, to name and store them. Besides, their trip was full of adventures. For instance: they traveled on muleback high into the mountains to chase bighorn sheep (Parini 242). The trip scientifically resulted in the description of up to fifty species previously unknown to the field of science. Besides, different kinds of known organisms collected by both of Ricketts and Steinbeck are kept at the California Academy of Science in San Francisco

(Gidmark 377). It also resulted in a book titled *Sea of Cortez* that Steinbeck co-authored with Ricketts in 1941. The second part of the book can be considered as scientific treatise; That is, it includes an annotated phyletic catalog and bibliography of the species encountered as well as illustrations of the creatures. The first part of the book, the "Log from the Sea of Cortez," remarkably describes the trip and is a mix of marine biology, mysticism, humor, adventure, and speculative metaphysics. Steinbeck seems to have authored the "Log" from Ricketts' expedition journal and unpublished essays. In doing so, he makes use of a layout and collaboration developed by both writers (Gidmark 377-378).

The "Log from the Sea of Cortez" is pregnant with meticulous observations of nature: the lives of ghost shrimp, sponges, crabs, oysters, worms, sea urchins, snails, and very many specimens are lovingly evoked. During this trip which lasted for four successive weeks both Steinbeck and Ricketts sat on a bridge in a clear star-lit night contemplating the nature of the world and how it was united in a single biosphere (Parini 243). Such contemplation reflects the synthesis of their trip which concludes that everything in the universe, humans or non-humans, tends to be one or is symbiotically related.

Steinbeck himself tells us in the "Log" from the *Sea of Cortez* of this expedition:

> We made a trip into the gulf; sometimes we dignified it by calling it an expedition. Once it

> was called the Sea of Cortez, and that is a better-sounding and a more exciting name. We stopped in many little harbors and near barren coasts to collect and preserve the marine invertebrates of the littoral. One of the reasons we gave ourselves for this trip—and when we used this reason, we called the trip an expedition—was to observe the distribution of invertebrates, to see and to record their kinds and numbers, how they lived together, what they ate, and how they reproduced…. We wanted to see everything our eyes could accommodate, to think what we could, and out of our seeing and thinking, to build some kind of structure in modeled invitation of the observed world reality. (1- 2)

The publication of Steinbeck's and Ed Ricketts book, which was a synthesis of their trip, faced some difficulties. Viking Press was not deeply interested in *Sea of Cortez* because it perceived it as "a minor and eccentric book that would attract a limited audience. More out of duty than real conviction, it published it in 1941" (Parini 245). In the wake of Ricketts's demise, his co-authorship of the "Log" was obscured. Viking Press took out the scientific part of *Sea of Cortez*

and published *The Log from the Sea of Cortez* in 1951 as a new book, with only Steinbeck's name on the cover and in the headers. However, Ricketts' name remained on the title page, and Steinbeck's "About Ed Ricketts" served as preface to the book. Despite the fact that the publication was done in part to skyrocket sales and make Ricketts's philosophies widely known, it prompted the newly widespread misconception that the biologist was responsible only for the second part and that *The Log from the Sea of Cortez* was specific to Steinbeck (Gidmark 378). Whereas many critics suppose that Steinbeck's contribution to *The Sea of Cortez* was only the log part and Ricketts' the phyletic catalogue, the log was indeed based largely on Ricketts' notebook (Rodger xii). This also leads us to say that although Ricketts' influence was on both parts, Viking Press intended to gain money and to take advantage of the power of Steinbeck's name.

Besides this adventurous trip, Ricketts and Steinbeck were also planning to travel to the Queen Charlotte Islands off the coast of British Columbia in order to make further scientific research on marine fauna's behavior. Ricketts died in 1948 when his car was hit by a train in Monterey by the Del Monte Express. Ricketts's demise was actually a great loss to Steinbeck (Gidmark 378).

Despite both their intensive, collaborative work and their mutual understanding, they do not always share the same ideas. Cliff Lewis accentuates that according to Astro, Steinbeck and Ricketts had contrasting thoughts. For instance: Ricketts is inclined to analyze the reality objectively. However,

Steinbeck had faith in both human purpose and social activism. Also, Ricketts stressed individualism whereas Steinbeck regarded the essence of group identity. Besides, Ricketts took his holistic philosophy from the biologist W.C. Allee while Steinbeck reached his organismic concepts through—among others—John Elof Boodin's philosophy (73). Such a distinctive feature between the two figures sounds very important because it shows us the fact that even though Ed Ricketts' influence on Steinbeck is great, they do not share thoroughly the same thoughts and the same convictions. Within this context, in his earlier novel *The Grapes of Wrath* Steinbeck's conviction in human purpose and social activism is strikingly evident. So, the Joads endure their travails during their journey from Oklahoma to California for the purpose of leading a good life. Besides, Tom Joad, whose ideas are inspired by Jim Casy, is a true believer in social activism. This makes him desert his family to help the workers. Seemingly, Astro contradicts himself when he asserts that Ricketts focuses on individualism and that he believes in holistic philosophy because the two ideas don't go hand in hand. Furthermore, although Steinbeck got his organismic concepts mainly through John Elof Boodin's philosophy, Ricketts remains the ever-lasting influence on Steinbeck's thought.

In Lewis's viewpoint, the revelation of Astro's research on the relationship of the two figures is helpful. For example: Astro consulted Ricketts' manuscripts to understand just what Ricketts believed, and by contrasting modern philosophers'

ideas with those of Steinbeck, he ascertains Steinbeck's sources. Astro asserts more than he verifies. However, he writes succinctly and endeavors to remain within the scope of his own materials (74). This implies that Astro's claims about Ed Ricketts and Steinbeck are not always reliable and thus misleading. This in turn can be supported by Lewis' assertion that Astro does run a risk in making use of the Ricketts and Steinbeck versions of the manuscript *The Sea of Cortez* as a background for the interpretation of material written prior to that joint project. Also, it leads Astro to perceive *In Dubious Battle* as an examination and refusal of Ricketts's philosophy, to regard *The Grapes of Wrath* as Steinbeck's counter argument too. Lewis proceeds that Steinbeck wrote *In Dubious Battle* when he had no political leaning and when he showed his commitment to the aesthetic values of the previous decade. Furthermore, two years later, Steinbeck developed a sense of social conscience after writing a newspaper report on the Okies in 1936; and through his influence by Marxism, he found a political and literary solution that he dramatized as *The Grapes of Wrath* (74-75). In fact, Lewis' opinion of *The Grapes of Wrath* is not convincing since this book has been vehemently criticized for being a communist or Marxism propaganda simply because of its call for social activism. But the book had in fact nothing to do with this issue because not every book which calls for social reform is necessarily a communist or Marxist propaganda. The book can be considered as a crucible of American Transcendentalism since this philosophy is also associated with social activism. So why is it a communist

propaganda and not a transcendental work? *The Grapes of Wrath* was published during the Great Depression; that is why it was conceived as a revolt against the American mainstream, capitalism.

As a conclusion, whatever arguments are, both Steinbeck and Ricketts were good friends and shared some ideas. In addition, no one can deny Ricketts's influence on Steinbeck's thought, especially about animal behavior, in the areas of phalanx theory.

II.1. Phalanx Theory

In fact, Steinbeck's use of phalanx theory can be seen extensively in his different major works. This theory is applied to both human and animal worlds. Rodger states in her book entitled *Renaissance Man of Cannery Row: The Life and Letters of Edward F. Ricketts* that Steinbeck's keen interest in marine biology ignited with the class he attended at Hopkins Marine Station in 1923. Indeed, the class was taught by C.V. Taylor, who was immensely inspired by William Emerson Ritter's notions of "organismal conception of life" and the "superorganism". So, Ritter asserted that when individuals form a group, the group significantly turns into a separate unit from which those individuals is constituted: "wholes are so related to their parts that not only does the existence of the whole rely on the orderly cooperation and interdependence of its parts, but the whole exercises a measure of determinative control over its parts." Also, Ritter aimed to apply his theory to all organisms in nature. However, Steinbeck

was interested in applying it to humans and how they interact among themselves. In the early 1930s, Steinbeck developed his "phalanx theory," which delved into the dynamic between the community and the individual. He was drawn by how "group man's" behavior differs from those of the group's individuals (Rodger xxiii-xxiv).

It would be better to discuss the Phalanx theory chronologically in some of Steinbeck's works. So, phalanx is reinforced first in *To a God Unknown*. In chapter two, while Joseph was riding on horseback through the forest of Our Lady, "he heard an agonizing squealing", and when he turned the grove's shoulder, he spotted "a huge boar with curved tusks and yellow eyes and a mane of shaggy red hair." The boar was devouring "the hind quarters of a still-squealing little pig" (05). And in the nearby "a sow and five other little pigs bounded away, crying their terror" (05). Collectively but helplessly, they lamented the loss of their brother. In other words, their grievance is unified but they could not change such a horrifying scene.

In the same chapter, when Joseph rode on horseback through the forest of Our Lady, central California, a piece of mist emerged and flew on top of the trees. Gradually, see-through parts accumulated and grew bigger and bigger and then they rose to the firmament until they turned into small clouds which are akin to the souls of the dead coming of a graveyard:

> Among the branches of the trees a tiny white fragment of mist appeared and delicately floated along just over the treetops. In a moment another translucent shred joined it, and another and another. They sailed along like a half-materialized ghost, growing larger and larger until suddenly they struck a column of warm air and rose into the sky to become little clouds. All over the valley the flimsy little clouds were forming and ascending like the spirits of the dead rising out of a sleeping city. They seemed to disappear against the sky, but the sun was losing its warmth because of them. (06)

Those little clouds were continuously gathering together in the sky. And a large group of them moved fast eastward to unite with a larger one which has already been created on the hill line. The wind eventually helped form a big thunderous, dark cloud that burst into heavy rain. Steinbeck thus compares the little clouds to legions which evolve into a colossal dark phalanx.

> The little clouds were massing in the sky; a legion of them scurried to the east to join the army already forming on the hill line. From over

> the western mountains the lean grey ocean clouds came racing in. the wind started up with a gasp and sighed through the branches of the trees…. The Cavalry of clouds had passed and a huge black phalanx marched slowly in from the sea with a tramp of thunder. (07)

In "The Leader of the People," crossing the continent or "westering" exemplifies the phalanx theory. Jody's grandfather explains how the soldiers unify themselves into a large animal, in which he acts as the head, that starts crawling westward to fight the Indians.

> It wasn't Indians that were important, nor adventures, nor even getting out here. It was a whole bunch of people made into one big crawling beast. And I was the head. It westering and westering. Every man wanted something for himself, but the big beast that was all of them wanted only westering. I was the leader, but if I hadn't been there, someone else would have been the head. The thing had to have a head. (119)

In *Tortilla Flat*, the Pirate and his five dogs form a good phalanx. Their sharing of the cookie together, in chapter seven, testifies to the fact that their mutual love is so strong that they act as one.

> The Pirate broke his cookie into seven pieces. The first he gave to Pilon, who was his guest. "Now, Enrique," he said. "Now Fluff. Now Señor Alec Thompson." Each dog received his piece and gulped it and looked for more. Last, the Pirate ate his and held up his hands to the dogs. "No more, you see," he told them. Immediately the dogs lay down about him. (46)

Although Ricketts and Steinbeck showed keen interest in the phalanx theory, Steinbeck used it both positively and negatively. In *Dubious Battle* human beings function as group man to deny the individuality of its members and the outcome is a negative application of the theory. Peter Lisca mentions in *The World Wide of Steinbeck* that the main characters "voluntarily renounce their individuality," and shows a "renunciation of humanity." Richard Astro acknowledges "that a person must use the phalanx experience to fashion his own individuality", and that at the beginning of this novel, "friendship, tolerance, and brotherly love" are hindrances to the people involved (Levy 68).

The essence of community as being a part of the whole is explored in *Of Mice and Men*. In this novelette, George and Lennie can fulfill solely a temporary and artificial sense of tranquility through their reveries of how they will live in the future. However, they are conscious of the unique nature of their friendship, and they realize that this is what makes them different from other humans. Their commitment to and dependence on one another, even though focused on a dream, is spiritually more essential than the almost technical bonds of the strike organizers in *In Dubious Battle* (Levy 69). Also, the phalanx theory is obviously seen in the dream which bonds not only George and Lennie but also Candy and Crooks later. Although Lennie was killed at the end of the novel, there is still a gleam of hope that George can reunite with Slim and Candy and Crooks to fulfill his dream. It is important to say that Ricketts's influence on Steinbeck in *Of Mice and Men* is apparent in the character of Slim, the prince of the Ranch, who represents wisdom.

The phalanx theory is strikingly used by Steinbeck in his masterpiece *The Grapes of Wrath*. For instance, the title per se is so expressive. The grapes are made up of small united balls and so they are part of the whole. Besides, the title also indicates that there is unified or collective wrath. The title can be viewed as a physical form of the phalanx theory.

In the third chapter of *The Grapes of Wrath*, John Steinbeck doesn't mention the land tortoise randomly that struggles to cross the high way randomly, but he

uses it specifically to depict the hardships of the migrant workers and families who travel along the road 66. Besides, the shelf of the land tortoise is a physical example of group idea or phalanx theory in the sense that it comprises packs and these ones made the whole shell.

Ma is deeply influenced by the phalanx theory. She realizes that togetherness or oneness is the only key to survival. Her main concern is to prevent the family from falling apart in the face of hardships. In chapter 13, Al and Tom offer to fix the Wilson's car and propose that the two families travel together, sharing the cars. At first the Wilsons are reluctant, but Ma convinces them that "You won't be no burden. Each'll help each, an' we'll all git to California" (155).

In chapter 16, as the family drives through New Mexico, Rosasharn tells her mother about her and Connie's plans once they reach California. They want to live in town, with Connie taking correspondence courses and getting a job in a factory or a store. Ma responds to her "We don't want you to go way from us". It ain't good for folks to break up" (172). But she eventually realizes that it is just a dream. And when the Wilsons' broken- down car prompts Tom to suggest that the family splits up for a short while, Ma reacts violently, grabbing the jack handle and demanding of the family to remain intact. She realizes that outside forces are tearing them apart; without their home, nothing is left to bind them together. With such recognition, Ma again restates the theme of survival through sticking-together: "All we got is the family unbroken. Like a bunch a cows,

when the lobos are ranging, stick all together. I ain't scared while we're all here, all that's alive, but I ain'tgonna see us bust up" (177).

Also, Tom is the second character influenced by the phalanx theory. In chapter 28, after Casy's death, Tom meditates for a long period in the cave and then resolves to follow Casy's lead as a union organizer. Inspired by the group idea, Tom tells Ma that "a fella ain't no good alone" (437). He states that:

> Two are better than one, because they have a good reward for their labor. For if they fall, the one will lif' up his fellow, but woe to him that is alone when he falleth, for he hath not another to help him up. That's part of her…. Again, if two lie together, then they have heat: but how can one be warm alone? and if one prevail against him, two shall withstand him, and a three-fold cord is not quicklybroken. (438)

Tom Joad expresses his longing for helping people: "I been thinkin' how it was in that gov'ment camp, how our folks took care a theirselves, an' if they was a fight they fixed it theirself; an' they wasn't no cops wagglin' their guns, but they was better order than them cops ever give. I been a-wonderin' why we can't do that all over. Throw out the cops that ain't our people. All work together for our own thing—all farm our own lan'" (438).

But when Ma tells him that the cops will kill him like what they did with Jim Casy, Tom says that he can't stay hands-cuffed in the midst of prejudice, misery, disparity and marginalization. And he has to protest and make his voice heard as a key to social change.

> He didn' duck enough. He wasn' doing nothin' against the law, Ma. I been thinkin'a hell of a lot, thinkin' about our people livin' like pigs, an' the good rich lan' layin' fallow, or maybe one fella with a million acres, while a hundred thousan' good farmers isstarvin'. An' I been wonderin' if all our folks got together an' yelled, like them fellas yelled, only a few of'em at the Hoope ranch (438).

Tom's conviction in the group idea makes of him ready to sacrifice for it. There is no fear from being suppressed since all people are connected to each other and they belong to the same soul and thus they share the same fate. He comments: "they gonna drive me anyways. They drivin' all our people" (438).

Steinbeck's group idea can be also found in John Donne's meditation that emphasizes the idea of people's connectedness. That is, we are not isolated islands. We are all a part of a larger thing, and if one person dies, everyone is affected.

> No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main. If a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less, as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a manor of thy friend's or of thine own were. Any man's death diminishes me, because of I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee. (69)

Because of no man is an island; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main, Tom makes up his mind to get involved in labor unions. The end of the poem tells us that when we hear the bell ringing to indicate that someone has died, we don't need to ask who they are. It is as if a part of us died as well because we are all connected to each other. In *The Grapes of Wrath*, the Joad family is affected by the death of Grampa, Granma and Rose of Sharon's still - born baby. In other words, the death of those people diminishes the family. This poem beautifully expresses John Steinbeck's group idea, in *The Grapes of Wrath*, which is the fountainhead of social activism and unionization in particular.

The phalanx theory can also be apparent in *Cannery Row*. For instance, while Gay was driving Mack and his boys to Carmel Hill, the exhalation of the truck's engine "thickened, gulped, and strangled" (60). And all of a sudden "the motor

was still" (60). Mack asked Gay what happened and Gay responded it was the carburetor. Steinbeck describes the carburetor of this Model T as "not complicated but it needs all of its parts to function. There is a needle valve, and the point must be on the needle and must sit in its hole or the carburetor does not work" (61). Such description illustrates the phalanx theory; that is, this piece has its constituent parts and if a part is damaged, the whole car does not start. So when a new carburetor is installed, the car reaches the Carmel Valley. Also, the trip stresses the phalanx theory when Mack doesn't want to travel alone but he takes his boys with him. The trip is made in a group and its individuals help one another so that they can collect the frogs for Doc.

On their way to Carmel Valley Eddie hit a dust Rhode Island rooster. Mack and his boys made a stew and they shared it together and then they drank the juice and coffee. This gathering is a good example of the phalanx theory.

> They ate long and daintily, spearing out pieces of chicken, holding the dripping pieces until they cooled and then gnawing the musled meat from the bone. They speared the carrots on pointed willow switches and finally they passed the can and drank the juice. And around them the evening crept in as delicately as music. The quail called each other down to the water. The trout jumped in

> the pool. And the moths came down and fluttered about the pool as the day-light mixed into the darkness. They passed the coffee can about and they were warm and fed and silent. (72-3)

In the penultimate chapter of *Cannery Row,* a male gopher dwells in "a thicket of mallow weeds in the vacant lot on Cannery Row" (175). The gopher yearns for having a life partner to procreate and so he looks for a female by sitting " in the entrance of his hole in the morning and made penetrating squeaks that are inaudible to the human ear but can be heard deep in the earth by other gophers" (176). But he found none. After a while, he came across a gopher hole and then he "squeaked provocatively in the entrance" (176-177). As a response to that action, another male gopher came out of the hole and hit him so severely that the first gopher "lost two toes from one front paw from that fight" (177). Despite the fact that the place of the wounded gopher is perfect, he determined to move away until he reached "a dahlia garden where they put out traps every night" for the purpose of finding a female (177).

So, John Steinbeck highlights his phalanx theory by dedicating a whole chapter to speaking of the gopher's struggle to find his life companion to make his own family. The gopher doesn't want to be an isolated island. His life is actually endangered by moving to a less secure place in hope of finding a female that will share him his destiny. Steinbeck says that the gopher lived in a place

“where he could settle down and raise any number of families and the burrow could increase in all directions” (176). Steinbeck proceeds that the gopher “made little side chambers for the babies who would inhabit them. In a few years there might be thousands of his progeny spreading out from this original hearthstone” (176). The gopher wanted to make the nucleus of his family from which so many generations of gophers would come into existence and thus the second generation would be part of the first and the third generation would part of the second and so and so forth. These generations would certainly constitute a phalanx.

In the same novel, an integrated society can be epitomized in the party for Doc. The first party ended in vain, but the second one did succeed. Despite the fact that the two parties were organized for Doc, the second one was a birthday party so everyone gave a gift. Mack and the boys brought cats that Doc yearned to have at that time, whereas Dora and the girls made a patchwork quilt. This party is indeed an ideal embodiment of Steinbeck’s phalanx theory in which at the climax, the feelings of the guests are so united that everyone loses himself or herself in the midst of happiness. The second party more closely symbolizes this phalanx than the first one, and so it leads to its success. Besides the climax, the preparation, the setting, and the intention to make Doc pleased, reflects the phalanx theory (Nakashima 18). This quotation below illustrates how love and

friendship bring about the goup idea in its truest meaning, and how giving gifts strengthens it and prevents it from dissipating.

> Doc held the door open and Mack made a little speech. Doc held the door open and made a little speech. "Being as how it's your birthday, I and the boys thought we would wish you happy birthday and we got twenty-one cats for you for a present" …. They were just seated formally, sipping delicately at the whisky, when Dora and the girls came in. They presented the quilt. Doc laid it over his bed and it was beautiful. And they accepted a little drink. Mr. and Mrs. Malloy followed with their presents…. And now people began to arrive in droves. Henri came in with a pincushion three by four feet. He wanted to give a lecture on his new art form but this time the formality was broken. Mr. and Mrs. Gay came in. Lee Chong presented the great string of firecrackers and the China lily bulbs (168-169).

The phalanx theory is also expressed through Steinbeck's in-depth observation. When he made a trip to collect marine creatures in 1940, the aim of

his mission differed from those of most people. His interest was more focused on the distribution of individuals than on the individuals themselves and he was also fascinated with the bonds of all the species of animals. After stressing ecological groups, Steinbeck became less sure about the independence of the individual. Ultimately, he formulated what is called "Steinbeck's Ecology Declaration", stemmed from the phalanx theory, and he makes use of this way of thinking everywhere in *Sea of Cortez*. When he was in La Paz, he felt as though he were getting back to it rather than visiting it for the first time. He was so pleased, almost emotional during his stay there. He makes his own observations, "Sometimes one has a feeling of fullness, of warm wholeness, wherein every sight and object and odor and experience seems to key into a gigantic whole." Such a unity is likely akin to what the people of *Cannery Row* experience in the second party. The power of the phalanx makes it successful, and Doc is portrayed as feeling thoroughly content for the first time in the tale. The phalanx theory, which was often deduced in *Sea of Cortez*, is now apparent in *Cannery Row* (Nakashima 18). During the preparations for the party, Doc "was feeling a little mellow. It seemed a nice thing to him that they would give him a party. He played the Pavane and to a Dead Princess and felt sentimental and a little sad" (166). In the midst of the party, Doc was so excited that he served everyone the meat and "played Ardo and the Armor from an album of Monteverdi" and read a part of a book clearly and deeply (170). When he

paused “a little world sadness had slipped over all of them. Everyone was remembering a lost love, everyone a call” (171).

It is important to discuss “Argument of Phalanx” in this chapter because it gives us hints about how phalanx works in different biological organisms. It was written around 1936 when Steinbeck debated with Richard Albee over the relation of the individual to mass movements. The ideas in the essay were partly stimulated by John Elof Boodin’s *The Social Mind* and W.C. Allee’s *Animal Aggregations,* books that Albee recommended to Steinbeck. The books had a great impact on both Steinbeck and Richard Albee’s brother, George Albee, the novelist. The essay bears some relation to the ideas in *In Dubious Battle*. This typescript has been revised by Center for Steinbeck Studies to facilitate its reading.

So, Steinbeck in this essay believes that “men are not individuals but units in the greater beast, the phalanx.” And that the cell, which is the constituent part of man, suffers and perishes and can be also substituted or killed. Steinbeck states that Man “has a nature new and strange to his cells”. And that the so-called phalanx “has pains, desires, hungers and strivings as different from those of the unit-man’s as man’s are different from the unit-cells.” And that it has emotions and memories too profound for men to contain or to experience as individuals.”

Steinbeck asserts also that Man cannot live in isolation from his own society; otherwise he condemns himself to destruction:

> Man cannot defy the phalanx without destroying himself. Let a man go into a wilderness away from all contact with any phalanx and his mind will dry up, his emotions will leave him, he will become incapable of ecstasy, his body will grow lean and hungry and at last he will die of starvation for the food he can only get from participation in the phalanx.

Steinbeck highlights that all forms of life including animals are part of the phalanx. But unit-men are more special:

> All life forms from protozoa to antelopes and lions, from crabs to lemmings form and a part of phalanxes, but the phalanx of which the units are men, are more complex, more variable and powerful than any other.

The phalanx theory is also clearly expressed in *The Log from the Sea of Cortez*. Steinbeck and his crew observe in the region of Magdalena Bay that various sorts of fish like bonitos, purpoises and turtles live together in groups.

> During the night we crossed a school of bonito, fast, clean-cut, beautiful fish of the mackerel family…. A new kind of purpoise began to

> appear, gray, where the northern purpoise had been dark brown. They were slim and very fast, the noses long and paddle-shaped. They move about in large schools, jumping out of the water and seeming to have a very good time. The abundance of life here gives one an exuberance, a feeling of fullness and richness. They playing purpoises, the turtles, the great schools of fish which ruffle the water surface like a quick breeze, make for excitement. (40-41)

This quotation implies that like humans, marine animals feel rejoiceful when they are stuck together. So, such togetherness is, for them, the source of bliss, vitality and bounty.

Steinbeck notices that some sort of fish like tunas and sardines live in groups, and whenever they conform to the norms of the entity they belong to they become strong and united and whenever they disobey this order they either perish or go astray, and this happens to the horned shark that he and the crew caught at San Francisquito. He further says that the humans follow the same pattern.

> A fish, like the tuna or the sardine, which lives in a school, would be less likely to vary than this

> lonely horned shark, for the school would impose a discipline of speed and uniformity, and those individuals which would not or could not meet the school's requirements would be killed or lost or left behind. The overfast would be eliminated by the school as readily as the over-slow, until a standard somewhere between the fast and slow had been attained. Not intending a pun, we might note that our schools have to some extent the same tendency. A harvard man, a Yale man, a Stanford man—that is, as easily recognized as a tuna, and he has, by a process of ilimination, survived the tests against idiocy and brilliance. (176-177)

One could find interesting that this core idea has its counterpart in Islamic religion. Here are some prophetic sayings which urge muslims to perform their prayer not isoltated but in groups so that that they become powerful.

> It was narrated that Abu'l-Darda' said : I heard the Messenger of Allaah (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) say : "There are no three men in a town or in the desert among whom

> prayer is not established, but the shaytaan has taken control of them, so you must adhere to the jamaa'ah, for the wolf only eats the sheep that wanders away on its own." (Islamqa.info)

In another prophetic saying which has the same meaning as the above mentioned, and in which the same narrator Mu'aadh ibn Jabal recites that the Messenger of Allaah (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) said : "The shaytaan [Satan] is the wolf of man like the wolf of sheep takes the stray sheep and the one that wanders far. Beware of division, and adhere to the jamaa'ah" (islamqa.info).

An influential Islamic scholar Al-Manaawi comments upon these hadiths by saying that Satan "corrupts man, by tempting him, and he destroys him, like a wolf running loose among a flock of sheep " (islamqa.info).

By this quotation "He takes the stray sheep, " the same scholar explicates :

> This is a metaphor for the one who is separated from the jamaa'ah (main body of Muslims) and keeps away from them, then the shaytaan [the Satan] overpowers him, like the sheep that wanders away from the flock, then the wolf catches it because it is alone. The metaphor ends with a warning : "beware of division" i.e., beware

> of separation and dissent. "And adhere to the jamaa'ah", affirmation after affirmation, i.e., cling to it, stay with the main group, for the one who drifts away will end up in the Fire. (Islamqa.info)

Going back to *The Log from the Sea of Cortez*, Steinbeck foregrounds this philosophy of group idea by saying that animals, humans, plants and objects like rocks, stars, etc. are interdependent parts of nature:

> Our own interest lay in relationship of animal to animal. If one observes in this relational sense, it seems apparent that species are only commas in a sentence, that each species is at once the point and the base of a pyramid, that all life is relational to the point where an Einsteinian relativity seems to emerge…. Then one can come back to the microscope and the tide pool and the aquarium. But the little animals are found to be changed, no longer set apart and alone. (178)

Steinbeck further says that this group idea is proven true in religion, science and physics. In other words, it is found in all perceptions thoughout the world.

> And it is a strange thing that most of the feeling we call religious, most of the mystical outcrying

> which is one of the most prized and used and desired reactions of our species, is really the understanding and the attempt to say that man is related to the whole things, related inextricably to all reality, known and unknowable. This is a simple thing to say, but the profound feeling of it made a Jesus, a St. Augustine, a St. Francis, a Roger Bacon, a Charles Darwin, and an Einstein. Each of them in his own tempo and with his own voice discovered and reaffirmed with astonishment the knowledge that all things are one things and that one thing is all things. (178-179)

To conclude, Ricketts' influence on Steinbeck's thought is not only seen in the areas of the phalanx theory, but also it extends to the scope of man's animality.

II. 2. Man's Animality

Steinbeck expresses man's nature as animal nature. And he also "has either to ignore differences between man and animal or to explain them away. He establishes his artistic focus in such a way that only the animal inheritance of man can clearly be seen." In his non-teleological thinking, Steinbeck strictly limits the scope of reason which in turn makes man and animal thoroughly

different. Despite the fact that Steinbeck is aware of the limited efficacy of the human mind, he still believes it to be less important than man's biological urges (Taylor 84-85).

Taylor asserts Steinbeck's focus on man's animality can be displayed in two ways: First in his language use, and second in the role that biological urges play in his characters' lives. He also claims that:

> The great extent of these influences can easily be shown in Steinbeck's consistent emphasis on the irrational forces that motivate the Steinbeck man and in the almost corresponding lack of purely rational and spiritual motivations to be observed in him. These irrational forces are not designated as irrational simply because Steinbeck only dimly recognizes the importance of the irrational element in man. On the contrary, Steinbeck has a very clear idea of the nature of the irrational: man's irrational drives are clearly to be understood as his biological inheritance from his animal ancestors. Man cannot outgrow his inherited animal nature, Steinbeck seems to say:

he can only modify or direct it in a very small way. (85)

In fact, Taylor's assertion leads us to *Of Mice and Men* in which Lennie is compared to different animals. For instance, sometimes he is a bear-like and sometimes he is a horse-like. Lennie's name is the derived from the German word "leonard", meaning a lion. Also, Steinbeck describes Lennie as a mentally feeble character who cannot control his urges and who almost forgets anything that George tells him about. Many critics compare Lennie to Benjy in Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury*. They assume that Steinbeck himself is influenced by Faulkner's book. Steinbeck uses Lennie to stress man's animality. Also, in the 17th chapter of *The Grapes of Wrath* Steinbeck compares the migrant workers who traveled along the Road 66 to bugs. Steinbeck says, "In the daylight they scuttled like bugs to the westward; and as the dark caught them, they clustered like bugs near to shelter and to water" (212). This illustrates how Steinbeck's animal imagery prevails in his works.

Besides animal imagery, Steinbeck has given his ideal portrayal of man through the picture of the biologist in *The Log*. The biologist leads a serene life which is free from the constraints of repressive customs and mores since he comprehends their biological origins in man's group instincts. Besides, he is a true philosopher because he knows full well that his existence is meaningful (Taylor 86). Doc in *Cannery Row* reflects Ed Ricketts's life. He epitomizes the

ideal biologist in Steinbeck's world. His keen interest in biology, poetry, music, metaphysics, and ecology makes of him a man of no horizons.

Man's role in Steinbeck's biological naturalism is to do the dictates of his animal nature. Indeed, the two biological dictates that Steinbeck's works show are both the impulses of survival and reproduction. Man's function can thus be summed up in his attempt to make his species perpetual (Taylor 87). This implies that Steinbeck's biological naturalism is an extension of Darwinism which is based on adaptation and natural selection.

Taylor keeps arguing that Steinbeck refuses to recognize the usual sense of a teleological aim. He quotes Steinbeck's acknowledgment of a limited validity to teleology as it is shown belowin *The Sea of Cortez*:

> What we personally conceive by the term "teleological thinking,"…is most frequently associated with evaluating causes and fact, the purposiveness of events. This kind of thinking considers changes and cures—what "should be" in the terms of an end pattern (which is often a substitute or an anthropomorphic projection); it presumes the bettering of conditions, often, unfortunately, without achieving more than a most superficial understanding of those conditions. In

> their sometimes intolerant refusal to face facts as they are, teleological notions may substitute a fierce but ineffectual attempt to change conditions which are assumed to be undesirable, in place of the understanding—acceptance which would pave the way for a more sensible attempt at any change which might still be indicated. (87)

This quotation testifies to Steinbeck's inspiration of Ed Ricketts' non-teleological thinking. Steinbeck himself learned from Ed Ricketts how to observe phenomena objectively, without looking for the causes, for the purpose of improving or changing their conditions.

Taylor points out that the purpose of human existence recognized by Steinbeck is survival which is not specific to humans, but rather it is shared by all life forms. He uses Steinbeck's passage below in *The Sea of Cortez* to stregnthen his standpoint.

> There would seem to be only one commandment for living things: Survive! And all the forms and species and units and groups are armed for survival, fanged for survival, timid for it, fierce for it, clever for it, poisonous for it, intelligent for it. This commandment decrees the death and destruction of

> myriads of individuals for the survival of the whole. Life has one final end, to be alive; and all the tricks and mechanisms, all the successes and all the failures are aimed at that end. (87-88)

This quotation also shows us how Steinbeck is hugely influenced by Charles Darwin's evolutionary theory. The struggle for the fittest is shared by all species whatever they are.

Some critics severely criticized Steinbeck's animalizing tendencies. They assert that "he was obsessed with animals and reduced humans to the level of animals, stripping them of all the noble qualities of humanity as we know it" (Kelley 256). According to his critics, Steinbeck's major flaw was when he described animals and humans as part of a continuum of life forms (Kelley 256). For instance, Edmund Wilson and Frederick Hoffman seemingly presume that Steinbeck's use of the biological indicates a static view of human nature represented through simplistic rendering of nonhuman animals." From this standpoint, humans are no more than a sophisticated physical form of animal urges and instincts which lack the nobler human features (Levy 67).

As a response to those critics, the trio of *In Dubious Battle*, *Of Mice and Men* and *The Grapes of Wrath* show that Steinbeck's use of biological and animal imagery doesn't obscure the human experience, but rather it defines it. Steinbeck himself acknowledges that the existence of a "core" animal nature

exists in all human beings. Pascal Covici. Jr. argues that Steinbeck believes that "human beings…have consciousness, choice, and awareness as animal do not. Yet people are also animals". Such Acknowledgment not only delves into unique human characteristics, but also factors shared by both humans and nonhumans. Consequently, it helps emerge of a fuller definition of human nature than would otherwise exist (Levy 67).

Besides, these three works "develop the human journey from an inability to function as individuals to a harmony between individual and group". And biological and animal imagery are used to highlight the uniqueness of our species. Steinbeck perceives the unity of people, nonhuman animals, and the environment as an essential element in human progression; and his use of animals in these novels establishes the evolutionary backdrop against which human events are fashioned. In Steinbeck's realm, humans possess an animal nature which in turn helps the journey, in the three novels, toward a peculiarly spiritual fulfillment (Levy 67).

To conclude, Steinbeck was inspired throughout his life by some iconic figures such as John Elof Boodin and C.V. Taylor in the arena of biological organismic jargon, and W.C. Allee in the field of marine biology; however, Edward Ricketts had a great effect on Steinbeck's philosophy about animal behavior. On the one hand, Steinbeck uses Ricketts as a protagonist in such works as "The Snake", *In Dubious Battle, Cannery Row* and *Sweet Thursday*.

On the other hand, Ricketts' philosophies most notably the phalanx theory, non-teological thinking and man's animality can clearly be seen in Steinbeck's writings. Firstly, phalanx theory is based on the author's empirical research which concludes that any individual is a part of larger life forms. It expresses the yearning of a group to act together as one. This inter-relation of community and individual is a biological notion that can be applied to fauna as well. Secondly, the concept of non-teological thinking is a revolt against systematic thought. It is also defined as man's experiences and his consciousness of himself and his relation with the world. Lastly, man's animality indicates that man's nature parallels animal nature. Steinbeck emphasizes this philosophy through the use of both language and the role that biological drives play in the lives of his characters.

Chapter III: The Human and Animal Bond in *Of Mice and Men*

This chapter illuminates some of Steinbeck's philosopihies in his novelette *Of Mice and Men*. In doing so, First, we will identify the bond between Lennie and animals. This character likes petting small and soft animals like mice, rabbits and puppies but he accidently kills them. Second, we will shed light on Candy's relationship with his dog. This old man loves his dog very much because he has had him for a long time and the dog dutifully served him during most of his ranch life. Despite the fact that the dog becomes old and toothless, Candy incessantly looks after him. Last but not least, we will focus on how Carlson executes Candy's dog. Carlson tries to convince Candy that his dog becomes useless and thus his existence is meaningless. He insists that he has to shoot the dog in the back of his head to get him out of his misery. Candy eventually surrenders to Carlson's demand. Much later on, he confides to George that he shouldn't have allowed a stranger to kill his dog.

III. 1. Lennie and the Animal World

For some reasons John Steinbeck compares Lennie, throughout the novelette, to a number of animals. First, his name is taken from the old German word "Leonard," meaning "Lion." In this respect, it is known that the lion watches over his territory whereas the lioness takes care of him and brings food for him. When she sees the lion doing his role, she feels secure. Furthermore, the lion cannot live without the lioness because he is not as good a hunter as she is.

Likewise, in the novelette, Lennie offers security for George whereas George brings food for him.

Next; he appears in the opening scene “dragging his feet a little, the way a bear drags his paws” (4). In fact, Steinbeck characterizes Lennie similarly to the way he describes Johnny Bear. The latter “look[s] like a great, stupid, smiling bear” (13). Johnny Bear also creeps the same way as Lennie, “he move[s] forward and for all his bulk and clumsiness, he seem[s] to creep” (14). And he “move[s] to the door and then he came creeping back” (14). Then, the bearlike man becomes equine when they got to the grove: flinging himself down, he drinks from the pool there, “snorting into the water like a horse” (4). The horse is associated with energy, strength, war and victory. However, the water is linked with life. So, the scene of Lennie snorting like a horse indicates that he is full of life or energy. In other words, Lennie is sustaining himself with the necessary fuel to pursue his long, hard way to triumph over the hardships of the Great Depression to reach his dream. This also echoes the scene in “Johnny Bear”. The narrator tells us that when he looked at Johnny Bear under the card table, he saw “a big fly landed on his head, and then [he] swear the whole scalp shiver the way the skin of a horse shivers under flies” (14). Then once again like a bear, he soaks his whole head, “hat and all” (5), sits up so the hat drips down his back, and “dabble[s] his big paw in the water” (5).

After that, in another scene, Lennie becomes like a terrier when he refuses to hand George the dead mouse, “slowly, like a terrier who doesn’t want to bring a ball to its master, Lennie approached, drew back, approached again” (10). The terrier preys on rabbits. Likewise, Lennie likes petting them. Also, George tells the boss that he is “strong as a bull” (23). In fact, the bull is used in teams for plowing the land. So, George compares Lennie to such a specific animal to inform the boss that Lennie is a good, enduring ranchhand. And Slim says of him, “it just seems kinda funny a cuckoo like him” (40). In the English language, the word cuckoo is used to refer to a silly or mentally deficient person. That would be another good instance of Lennie being compared to part of the animal world since Lennie, as we will show this later, is a mentally deficient character. Besides, when Curley “step[s] over to Lennie as a terrier” and smashes Lennie’s face, George asks Lennie to hit him. So, Lennie grinds Curley’s fist with his paw and Curley is “flopping like a fish on a line” (63). This shows that Lennie is indeed a life’s hunter. It suggests even that the bear feeds on fish. This scene parallels that of “Johnny Bear.” Alex splats into Johnny Bear’s mouth. And in response to such a violent attack, Johnny Bear’s “arms enfold Alex as the tentacles of an enomone enfolde a crab” (30).

Finally, Lennie becomes once again bear-like. When he accidently kills Curley’s wife, “he paw[s] up the hay until it partly cover[s] her” (90). And he comes into the clearing in the brush “as silently as a creeping bear” (98).

Steinbeck might have used the bear specifically partly because this animal is similar to humans in the sense that it is omnivorous and it can walk on its hind legs too, and partly because the bear is associated with childhood since kids like playing with teddy bears. So, Steinbeck uses the bear to emphasize Lennie's childlish behavior.

We understand from this whole part that Lennie metamorphoses into different animals depending on the situations he confronts with. This suggests that Steinbeck might also have stressed that metamorphosis can occur in all species since Lennie metamorphoses into a bear and that bear also metamorphoses into a horse and that horse changes into the bear then that bear changes once again into a terrier then that terrier turns into a bull then that bull turns once again into a cuckoo then that cuckoo evolves into the bear. This understanding leads us to say that Steinbeck himself is influenced by Charles Darwin's evoutionary theory. And this in turn is not surprising since Steinbeck is a naturalist writer. In fact, the association of metamorphosis with Darwin's evolutionary theory is supported by Gillian Beer's assertion: "In some ways, evolutionary theory looks like the older concept of metamorphosis prolonged through time, transformation eked out rather than emblazoned. Both ideas seek to rationalize change but through diverse means" (59).

It should be acknowledged that such animal imagery is attributed, as Levy asserts, to the fact that animality is hardwired in all humans (68). Wilson also

argues that " Steinbeck does not have the effect, as Lawrence or Kipling do, of romantically raising the animals to the stature of human beings, but rather of assimilating the human beings to animals" (786). Steinbeck himself in his essay entitled "Some Thoughts on Juvenile Delinquency" points out "I believe that man is a double thing—a group animal and at the same time an individual. And it occurs to me that he cannot successfully be the second until he has fulfilled the first" (22). So, we can assert that Steinbeck compares Lennie to a varierty of animals to describe his physical strength. Such animal imagery also indicates that Steinbeck is indeed a naturalist writer. And Naturalists often describe their characters as animal-like. Furthermore, one can argue that such animal imagery reflects Steinbeck's attachment to the animal world since he was a child. This attachment truly shapes his thought and inspires him to include animals in his fiction and to use his characters as animal-like.

One could find interesting that Lennie is described as a mentally feeble, child-like man who enjoys both emulating George and petting soft and furry little animals such as mice, rabbits, and puppies, but he accidently and unknowingly kills them. This basic desire like a baby and his pet blanket fulfills a very basic security need. Lennie is happy to pet a soft piece of cloth or soft hair for that matter. Lennie's repeated killing of mice is associated with his bear-like character because the bear prey on mice which it captures with its paw (Compton Brown 172-173). The softness and innocence of the small animals

that Lennie loves represent the fragility and delicacy of the dream that he endeavors to reach. Although the dream has never been fulfilled, it helped unite characters with one another (Levy 68).

In fact, Susan Shillinglaw points out in her introduction to *Of Mice and Men* that in using Lennie as a character, Steinbeck was inspired by a huge, troubled man whom he worked with on one of California ranches:

> Working as a bindle stiff himself in the early 1920s, Steinbeck saw a huge and troubled man killed a ranch foreman. "Lennie was a real person," he told a *New York Times* reporter in 1937. "He is in an insane asylum in California right now. I worked alongside him for many weeks. He didn't kill a girl. He killed a ranch foreman. Got sore because the boss had fired his pal and stuck a pitchfork through his stomach. I hate to tell you how many times. I saw him do it. We couldn't stop him until it was late." (xiii)

This quotation refutes the idea that Steinbeck himself might have used the character "Benjamin" in William Faulkner's *The Sound and the Fury* to describe Lennie's limited mental capacity. Benjamin and Lennie are totally different characters. The former does not speak but he moans whenever he wants to

respond to the happenings that come to realize in his mind. In addition, he has a very strong memory and he perceives the past and the present as one thing. Above all, he is not an animal-like character. The latter, however, is not speechless but he has a feeble memory. And he leans to the future rather than the past, for he has a dream he wants to target.

John Steinbeck associates mental deficiency or insanity with animality. This can be ascribed to the fact that both mentally retarded and insane people and animals are equal in the sense that they have no reason and therefore they are overcome by their instincts. Another reason behind this association is that Steinbeck aims to tell us that humans might be as equal as animals when they are driven by their urges and sometimes they might be inferior to animals. Such a mental deficiency also illustrates Steinbeck's concept of non-teleological thinking since it is an outcry against systematic thought. In this context, people must notice that Lennie's response to Aunt Clara's blame at the end of the novella: "I tried, Aunt Clara, ma'am. I tried and tried. I couldn't help it" (178). This leads us to say that like animals, Lennie cannot control his passions. It should be noted that Lennie and Tularecito, in *The Pastures of Heaven*, share some animalistic traits.

Tularecito's name is "Little Frog" though his takecarer Franklin Gomez often calls him "coyote" since "there is in this boy's face that ancient wisdom one find in the face of a coyote" (36). This indicates that he is an-animal like character.

Besides, Tularecito seems as mentally retarded and strong as Lennie. The only trait that makes them different is that Tularecito's hands are skillful and those of Lennie are destructive; that is, Tularecito's hands carve animals deftly whereas Lennie's hands kill small animals unmistakably.

> The boy grew rapidly, but after the fifth year his brain did not grow any more. At six Tularecito could do the work of a grown man. The long fingers of his hands were more dexterous and stronger than most men's fingers. On the ranch, they made use of the fingers of Tularecito. Hard knots could not long defy him….With his thumbnail he could carve remarkably correct animals from sandstone. Franklin Gomez kept many little effigies of coyotes and mountain lions of chikens and squirrels, about the house. (36)

In fact, Tulerecito is so enamored of his carved animals that whoever dares destroy them, he will lose his temper and then he will attack them as a dangerous animal. Indeed, he is more like an animal guarding its children or home.

> Only one thing could provoke anger in Tularecito. If any person, man, woman or child, handled

> carelessly or broke one of the products of his hands, he became furious. His eyes shone and he attacked the desecrator murderously. On three occasions when this had happened, Franklin Gomez tied his hands and feet and left him alone until his ordinary good nature returned. (37)

His teacher Miss Martin is so impressed by his carving of animals that one dayshe asks him to draw some animals on the blackboard and when she finishes she praises him in front of his classmates and she says “It is a great gift that God has given you” (38). When it comes to arithmetic, she asks her pupils to erase the board and this makes Tularecito furious and he starts fighting them with all his might.

> The Fourth grade struggled out, seized erasers and began to remove the animals to make room for their numbers. They had not made two sweeps when Tularecito charged. It was a great day. Miss Martin, aided by the whole school, could not hold him down, for the enraged Tularecito had the strength of a man, and a madman at that. The ensuing battle wrecked the schoolroom, tipped over the desks, spilled rivers of ink, hurled

> bouquets of Teacher's flowers about the room. Miss Martin's clothes were torn to streamers, and the big boys, on whom the burden of the battle fell, were bruised and battered cruelly. Tularecito fought with Miss Martin guarding its rear, fled from the building, leaving the enraged Tularecito in procession. When they were gone, he locked the door, wiped the blood out of his eyes and set to work to repair the animals that had been destroyed. (38-39)

Indeed, the idea that humans might equate with animals when they are controlled by their instincts and sometimes they might even be lower than animals has its counterpart in Islamic religion. God Almighty says in verse 43 of the chapter "The Criterion" "Have you seen him who chose his desire as his god? Would you be an agent for him?" And in verse 44 of the same chapter God says: "Or do you assume that most of them hear or understand? They are just little cattle, but even more errant in their way" (186). Also, in verse 175 of the chapter "The Revelations" God says: "And relate to them the story of him to whom We delivered Our signs, but he detatched himself from them, so Satan went after him, and he became one of the perverts" (85). God further says in verse 176 of the same chapter:

> Had We willed, We could have elevated him through them, but he clung to the ground, and followed his desires. His metaphor is that of a dog: if you chase it, it pants, and if you leave it alone, it pants. Such is the metaphor of the people who deny Our signs. So tell the tale, so that they may ponder. (85)

In their book entitled *Tafsir al-Jalalayn*, Jalal al-Din al-Mahalli and Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti, two Islamic scholars, point out that the two verses revolve around Bal`am bin Ba`ura who was a scholar from the children of Israel, whom God had granted him some knowledge of the Scriptures. Once, the children of Israel asked him to invoke God against Moses. In doing so, the supplication turned against him and he became the comrade of Satan and thus one of the wrongdoers. God shows us the similaritiy between the person who runs after his urges and a dog "in terms of condition and vileness" (179).

It is worth noting that God emphasizes such a philosophy in verse 179 of the same chapter.

> We have destined for Hell multitudes of Jinn and humans. They have hearts with which they do not understand. They have eyes with which they do not

hear. These are like cattle. In fact, they are further

astray. These are the heedless. (85)

The same commentators Jalal al-Din al-Mahalli and Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti interpret this verse as “These, they are like cattle, in their failure to understand, perceive or listen—nay, rather they are further astray, than cattle, because at least they cattle seek what is beneficial to them and stay away from what is harmful to them” (180).

One could say that the title *Of Mice and Men* per se would help our argument about analogies between the human and animal worlds. John Steinbeck picks out a line from Robert Burns’s poem “To a Mouse” which says “The best laid schemes o’ mice an’ men / gang aft agley” (xxi). This passage reveals that the lives of humans and mice are closely connected in the sense that their plans and dreams often go awry. Accidentally, Robert Burns destroys the field mouse’s nest when he is plowing the soil. Likewise, in *Of Mice and Men*, George’s and Candy’s and Crooks’ shared dream of living together on a farm is destroyed by Lennie’s accidental killing of Curley’s wife. Also, this woman’s dream of being a movie actress is destroyed by a man, probably trying to seduce her, who told her that he could get her in the movies. She is so innocent that she thinks he wrote and her mother destroyed the letter. This only shows how naïve Curley’s wife is.

In fact, Lennie's last name is Small. This implies not only the small creatures that he likes petting, but also suggests that his mind is figuratively smaller than his huge body. This surname leads us also to focus on George's physical appearance. He is described as "small and quick, dark of face, with restless eyes and sharp, strong features. Every part of him was defined: small, strong hands, slender arms, a thin bony nose" (4). This also suggests that Lennie likes George because he is as small as a mouse. In this context, George's eyes are as red-rimmed as those of a laboratory mouse. Undoubtedly, Steinbeck's friendship with Ed Ricketts makes him familiar with the white mice used in biological laboratories, as his story "The Snake" shows. White mice have red-rimmed eyes (Compton Brown 178). So, George's red-rimmed eyes signal either the danger that awaits him and Lennie in the ranch or that George endangers Lennie's life. Furthermore, both George and Lennie constitute the microcosm of California ranchers' ordeal during the Great Depression. In fact, the idea of smallness is highlighted in "To a Mouse" in which Robert Burns uses diminutives such as "beastie," "breastie," and "mousie," which shows endearment too. One might thus assume Steinbeck meant that Lennie is a beastie since Steinbeck describes him as an animal-like baby.

The mouse image is introduced in the first chapter when George ascertains that Lennie is hiding something. George asks him to show it and finds out soon that it is a dead mouse. Lennie insists, "I didn't kill it. Honest! I found it. I found

it dead" (7). This implies that Lennie did kill small creatures when he had them (Bloom 19). In addition, Lennie explains to George how he has unintentionally killed mice; "I'd pet'em and pretty soon they bit my fingers and I pinched their heads alittle and then they was dead" (7). Such an explication heralds the killing of Curley's wife since it reminds us of a time when he frightened a girl in Weed in attempting to pet her red dress "like it was a mouse" (13).

Emila Pavel says in her article entitled "Myths, Symbols and Motifs in *Of Mice and Men* by John Steinbeck" that the mouse symbolizes "a subconscious means of communication with the sacred. Through the dead mouse, Lennie communicates with the wild nature that calls him back as the land of the humans cannot accept him as he is, just as the human world cannot accept the race of mice and rejects it." Lennie keeps on playing with the mice like a child, and despite the fact that he keeps on killing them out of love, he feels delighted when he enjoys the touching of them as that of a velvet. Lennie has no family but George whom he cannot pet and so his need for love makes him use the elements of nature such as mice, rabbits or puppies (292). It seems to me that the dead mouse foreshadows that Lennie will kill his dream by himself.

George says to Lennie that as soon as he gets a puppy, he will give it to him since puppies are not easily killed by petting. But Lennie seizes this opportunity to tell him about their dream "an' live off the fatta the lan,'" Lennie shouted. "And have rabbits. Go on, George! Tell about we're gonna have in the garden

and about the rabbits in the cages and about the rain in the winter and the stove…" (16). Then George tells him about vegetables and the small stove and the drumming of the rain on the roof, but what Lennie reminisces about are the rabbits, "the fatta the lan,'" and how he and George look out for each other. This implies that Lennie's strong memory regarding such stuff is refreshed by his animalistic instinct.

Furthermore, as they settle in to sleep, George informs Lennie that they will have millions of different colored rabbits one day saying, "Red and blue and green rabbits, Lennie. Millions of 'em" (18). In fact, such colored rabbits don't exist in nature. This leads us to say that their dream is far beyond reality since neither of them have enough money and are not well-paid enough to pursue their dream. Such colored rabbits can only be found in Lewis Carol's *Alice in Wonderland.* It also suggests that George makes fun of Lennie's dream because he knows that it is unattainable under the harsh circumstances they are living in. It is interesting to say that the last name of George is Milton which reminds us of John Milton's *Paradise Lost*. Steinbeck might have used such a name to show that the American Dream in general and George's and Lennie's shared dream is lost.

In fact, the rabbit has different connotations and so it does not reduce its effectiveness as a symbol. Emila Pavel shows in the article that as explained by *Chevalier's Dictionary of Symbols*, the rabbit represents the moon, and so the

"savior" of life's endless cycle. However, the Amerindians consider this animal as a civilized hero, and stands between the world of the humans and that of the dead. It also symbolizes abundance, happiness, goodness and pleasure. Therefore, the rabbits in Lennie's dream are the token of the Edenic Garden that he and George wish to attain one day (291). It seems to me that the rabbit represents fertility and richness since it is a reproductive animal. So Steinbeck might have used the rabbits in Lennie's garden to describe the rich fertile Salinas Valley. More interestingly, the rabbit may also represent beauty, feminity and sexuality. One could argue that the rabbits in Lennie's dream reveal either Lennie's longing for a beautiful wife or his homosexual love for George. If Lennie used "hares," one would say that they represent masculinity. In this case, Lennie symbolizes the obedient, submissive wife of George. Moreover, the rabbit also represents chastity and purity. This indicates that Lennie is chaste since he has never had sex with women. In Algerian culture, the rabbit is the symbol of a lie. So, the American dream in general and Lennie's dream is a lie!

Mimi Reisel Gladstein asserts that Edenic Gardens "loom large" in John Steinbeck's work. It is sometimes compared to "the Promised Land" in which milk and honey flow bountifuly. It is often disappointing and destructive, however. It is not surprising that garden images predominate in his fiction since he grew up in the rich fertile Salinas Valley. Besides, the Edenic Garden can be

reflected through couple-like status, the same as Adam and Eve prior to their fall. Lennie stresses this sort of relationship when he repeatedly says to George "I got you and you got me." Both Slim and Curley doubt the intimacy of George and Lennie's relationship (2-6). It is important to say that Lennie can be considered as the husband since he enjoys both the virility and physical strength of such animals like the bear, the horse and the lion. Or, one could argue that Lennie is the Eve figure since he is the one who commits the sin that gets them kicked out of the garden (in this case loses the dream of the garden).

At the middle of the novelette, Lennie bursts out violently when he envisions that the cat might intrude his garden of rabbits. And he says that he will smash the cats and "break their God damn necks" (95). Harold Bloom asserts that "while the violent outburst quickly subsides to grumbling, it is a flash of anger and violence in Lennie that brings the story of the dream and thus, symbolically, the dream itself to a halt" (33). Indeed, the cats represent the impending doom of Lennie and George's dream. This cat image has its counterpart in "The White Quail." Like Lennie, Mrs. Mary imagines how the cat intrudes her garden and keeps the birds from drinking from the pool, saying, "They don't come down to drink. Not many of them. I wonder what's keeping them away. Maybe they aren't used to it yet. They'll come later. Maybe there's a cat around" (117). This passage strengthens the idea discussed in *Of Mice and Men* that the cat is associated with doom.

One could also argue that the cats represent the prostitutes by whom Lennie fears that they could come into his and George's garden and they will spoil it. This idea can be reflected through the presence of Curley's wife in the ranch. On the one hand, most of the ranchers think of her as a "lousy tart" and Lennie indeed breaks this cat's neck. So her death brings about the death of their dream. On the other hand, Steinbeck himself uses the term Susy's "cat-house" which means a whore house. Therefore, the cat is also associated with prostitution.

The rabbit image recurs at the culmination of the novelette. A huge rabbit comes out of Lennie's head and speaks in Lennie's voice, rebuking him for his bad deeds and telling him threateningly that George is so sick of him that he would not allow him to tend the rabbit anymore and that he would hit him with a stick and that he would leave him alone. This gigantic rabbit symbolizes Lennie's prick of conscience; that is, he is blaming himself for bringing problems to George all the time. It also heralds the end of Lennie's dream.

Besides the rabbits, Lennie has a penchant for tending puppies. For instance: in chapter three, George asks Slim to give one of his puppies to Lennie and the skinner acquiesces. In the meantime, Lennie comes into the bunkhouse and George realizes that he is hiding a puppy. George rebukes Lennie, and Lennie puts the puppy away. We understand from this scene that Lennie cannot take soft and pretty things whenever he wants, and that he is still not aware of the mother's need for her puppies (Bloom 33). But it seems to me the opposite; that

is, his desire of having a puppy is so strong that he took it with him despite the fact that he knows that the puppy needs his mother and that it cannot live without her. So, this can be interpreted that Lennie is indeed driven by his impulsesin the sense that he does what his urges dictates to him without considering the repercussions of his actions.

In chapter five, Lennie is alone in the barn on Sunday afternoon, sitting in the hay and tending the dead puppy. He asks the animal for what reason it died, "You ain't so little as mice. I didn't bounce you hard" (84). He starts to bury it in the hay because he worries that George will be so angry at him that he will not allow him to tend the rabbits. He resolves to tell George that he found it lying dead, and then realizes that George will ascertain that it is a lie. So he started cursing the puppy for dying and hurls it across the room. And then, Lennie picks up the puppy and tends it once again, and thinks maybe George will not be bothered since puppy means nothing to George. One could argue that, unlike Lennie, George has no feelings toward animals.

It should be stated that this mutt section is significant because it has different connotations regarding Steinbeck's philosophy that the lives of humans and animals are closely connected and that animals are a reflection of human conditions. So, as Lennie speaks to himself, Curley's wife comes into the barn and sits near him. He hurriedly hides the puppy and tells her that Gorge warned him not to talk to her. She makes him sure that it is safe for him to speak to her,

pointing out that the other ranchers will not pay attention to them since they are busy with the horse-shoe tournament outside the barn. She discovers the puppy and relieves him about its demise, saying that "the whole country is fulla mutts" (86). This implies that either Curley's wife has no emotional attachment towards animals or she seizes the opportunity to tell Lennie that the ranchers are mutt-like because she hates them. Besides, Curley's wife identifies the dead puppy to Lennie as a mutt, which means a dog that has no recognized breed. This leads us to say that the mutt is a reflection of Lennie and so he is an illigitimate person; that is, Lennie's identity is not recognized since he has no family. For argument's sake, George uses the word "bastard" when he tells Slim who Lennie is. Also, Aunt Clara makes use of the term "sonofabitching" when she blames Lennie for his bad deeds, and the gigantic rabbit scornfully addresses Lennie twice as a "bastard." In fact, the terms "mutt," "son of a bitch" and "bastard" are connected in the sense that the person who belongs to one of these categories is considered to be illigitimate or born out of wedlock. Furthermore, the dead puppy may also represent the awful circumstances under which the ranchers lived in the teeth of the Great Depression. In fact, they led a mutt-like life in the sense that they were homeless, unprotected, dispossessed, degraded and above all they had no family. This interpretation is solidly supported by Susan Shillinglaw's assertion in her introduction to *Of Mice and Men*:

> From the 1870s until about 1930, California's wheat and fruit crops were harvested in large part by intinerant workers, mostly single men for whom roving became habitual. Some toted blanket rolls on bindles on their backs; others slept unprotected in the roadside "jungles." Wages were low, living quarters squalid, and opportunities for advancement practically non-existent. Even the most resolute and ambitious work typically met with failure and perforce took to roving. One study conducted that about twenty-five percent were feeble-minded, forced out on the road. To be a farmworker was to be among California's dispossessed, a powerless, degraded, ill-paid fraternity. (xii)

It is worth saying that the dove that flies out of the barn upon Curley's wife's death symbolizes both freedom and peace. Through her experience of catharsis with Lennie inside the barn, Curley's wife is now relieved from her brooding loneliness and thus she turns into an emotionally pure woman when she died. We can deduce that her death may descend upon the ranchers as a relief in the sense that her danger that awaits the ranchers dwindles to nothing.

To conclude, it is important to focus on how Lennie is compared to various animals and how he feels toward small creatures, but it is also crucial to diagnose the bond between Candy and his dog to stress Steinbeck's philosophy that animals are a good companion for man and that the lives of both humans and animals are closely connected and that animal euthanasia is permissable.

III.2. Candy and His Dog

Candy is a "tall, stoop-shouldered old man" (19). His name means "sweet." This implies that he is not only sweet to the ranch hands, but also to his dog. Indeed, Candy's relationship with his dog is based on reciprocal love and devotion. However, Candy's life is anything but sweet. He is old, crippled, and expects to be sent to the poor house. The dog is his only source of affection. Indeed, Candy loves his dog a great deal because he has had him for long and he dutifully served him during his ranch life. Candy tells George, "Yeah. I had'im ever since he was a pup. God, he was a good sheep dog when he was younger" (26). Despite the fact that the dog becomes old, lame, half-blind and toothless, Candy incessantly takes good care of him. So, since Candy and his dog lived together and aged together, they can serve as a good specimen of true friendship for the ranchers in the bunkhouse like George and Lennie.

One could find interesting that both Candy's dog and Curley's wife are nameless; that is, they don't deserve a name because they are unproductive in the sense they don't have children. However, Slim's bitch has deservedly a

name “Lulu” since she is productive. This leads us to deduce that Slim’s bitch is more important than Candy’s dog and Curley’s wife, for her puppies will be used as sheep dogs in the ranch. One could also infer from this whole part that in such an unforgiving world, humans and animals are evaluated in terms of their production. If they are productive, they are viewed as the best. And if they are unproductive, they are damned.

Candy’s dog likely reflects Steinbeck’s dog named “Toby.” Steinbeck himself has sweet memories with him. He never forgets once this dog chewed the manuscript of *Of Mice and Men*. So, Steinbeck probably pours his deep feelings toward this dog onto this novelette.

In fact, Candy’s relationship with his dog is also compared to that of the Pirate and his five dogs in *Tortilla Flat*. The dogs serve as a good companion and as a source of warmth for the Pirate. For instance, in chapter 07, the dogs follow lovingly their master whenever he goes to the woods to cut pitchwood in order to sell it for a quarter.

> Eveyday people saw him wheeling his barrow of pitchwood about the streets until he sold the load. And always in a cluster at his heels walked his five dogs…When he sat down to rest from wheeling his barrow, they all tried to sit on his lap and have their ears scratched…The dogs lived on

> top of him, and the Pirate liked this, for his dogs kept him warm on the coldest nights. If his feet were cold, he had only to put them against the belly of Señor Alec Thompson. (42)

Interestingly, the dogs are also a good protection for the Pirate from any extraeous violence that looms large in *Tortilla Flat*. The Pirate is escorted through woods by by his dogs when he digs up the quarter somewhere in the forest. “In the night, guarded from danger by his dog, he went into the woods and hid the day’s quarter with hundreds of others. Somewhere he had a great hoard of money” (43).

Another instance, within the same chapter, when Pilon comes to the Pirate’s house, the dogs growl at him. But the Pirate quietens them by saying that Pilon does not mean any harm to him. “As he advanced through the weeds, Pilon could hear the Pirate talking softly to his dogs, explaining to them that it was only Pilon, who would do no harm. Pilon bent over in front of the dark doorway and scratched a match and lighted his candle” (43).

Besides, in chapter 12, the Pirate feels for the first time in his life that he is exposed and unarmed since he leaves them at Danny’s house to attend Father Ramon’s sermon. Nevertheless, the dogs cannot help stay home without their master and therefore they break a window and come into the Church to look for him.

> As he walked down the street, he felt naked and unprotected without his dogs. He was frightened to be out alone. Anyone might attack him. But he walked bravely on, through the town and out to the Church of San Carbos…Suddenly a rushing sound came from the door. A furious barking and scratching broke out. The doors swung wildly and in rushed Fluff and Rudolph, Enrique, Pajarito, and Señor Alec Thompson. They raised their noses, and then darted in a struggling squad to the Pirate. They leaped upon him with little cries and whinings. They swarmed over him. (101-102)

Candy's relation with his dog is also compared to that of Mack and his friends and their dog named Darling. Her name implies that they are very fond of her. They take good care of her, for they think that she is wonderful. Darling appreciates such a cordial treatment toward her and starts coquetting and playing with them. Although she makes a mess of their blankets, mattresses and pillows, they ponder humorously about that.

> They were in love with her. They found the little puddles she left on the floor charming. They bored all their acquaintances with her cuteness

> and they would have killed her with food if in the end she hadn't had better sense than they. Jones made her a bed in the bottom of the grandfather clock but Darling never used it. She slept with one or another of them as the fancy moved her. She chewed the blankets, tore the mattresses, sprayed the feathers out of the pillows. She coquetted and played her owners against one another. They thought she was wonderful. Mack intended to teach her tricks and go in vaudeville and he didn't ever house broke her. (108)

In fact, such a bond echoes also that of Rip Van Winkle, and his dog is named "Wolf." Rip is accustomed to strolling away with his dog into the forest to eschew the farm work and the nagging of his wife Dame Van Winkle. The dog sympathizes, with his master, "fellow-sufferer in persecution" (Irving 51). Rip would address him: "Thy mistress leads thee a dog's life of it; but never mind, my lad, whilst I live thou shalt never want a friend to stand by thee!" (51). Then, Rip admits that his dog reacts positively to his speech by wagging his tail and looking wistfully in his face. So, Rip says "if dogs can feel pity, I verily believe he reciprocated the sentiment with all his heart" (51). It is worth noting that Rip's speech can directly be applied to Candy's dog since he lives in the

ranch under an awfully bad condition, and no one takes care of him but his friend Candy. Steinbeck might have read “Rip Van Winkle” and based, in part, hisstory on it. So, “Rip Van Winkle” is brought here to support Steinbeck’s philosophy that animals are a necessity and a good companion for man and that the lives of humans and animals are closely intertwined.

More interestingly, loyalty and devotion that bind Candy with his dog have its parallel in the *Holy Quran*. The people of the cavern had a dog that befriended them and became truly their fellow-sufferer in persecution. Because of this, God gives him honor by mentioning him in the *Holy Quran*. In the 18th verse of chapter “The Cave,” God says of the people of the cavern and their dog “You would think them awake, although they were asleep. And We turned them over to the right, and to the left, with their dog stretching its paws across the threshold” (147-148).

Apparently, Washington Irving based himself on this account when he wrote his short story “Rip Van Winkle” because he read about the life of the Prophet Mahomet (peace and blessings of Allah upon him) and this led him to author *Mahomet and His Successors.* This part also strengthens Steinbeck’s philosophy that animals are a good companion for man.

Slim also raises a bitch named “Lulu.” Her name indicates that she is as outstanding and as remarkable as her master. Unlike Candy, he does not have any affection or love toward her. When Carlson comes into the bunkhouse and

asks Slim about his bitch since he has not seen her as usual under his wagon this morning, Slim responds to him that she has given birth to nine puppies and that he has drowned four of them and now he is keeping the rest which are the biggest. “She slang her pups last night,” said Slim. “Nine of ’em. I drowned four of ’em right off. She couldn’t feed that many.” “Got five left, huh?” “Yeah, five. I kept the biggest” (36). It should be noted that there is an analogy between Slim’s behavior toward his bitch and that of the captain toward his pointer in *Cannery Row*. In chapter 15, Mack proposes to the captain to wean the puppies, for his bitch can’t feed all of them “I don’t want to tell you about your business, sir, but these pups ought to be weaned. She ain’t got a hell of a lot of milk left and them pups are chewing her to pieces” (81). The captain responds to him “I s’pose I should have drowned them all but one. I’ve been so busy trying to keep the place going. People don’t take the interest in bird dogs they used to. It’s all poodles and boxers and Dobermans” (81). Then he invites him to select one “take your pick” (82). Then Mack goes to the puppies and begins to examine them and takes the best “He went to the pups, looked them over carefully, felt bone and frame, looked in eyes and regarded jaws, and he picked out a beautifully spotted bitch with a liver-colored nose and a fine dark yellow eye” (87).

Harold Bloom argues that the passage that revolves around Slim’s drowning of the puppies and keeping the best is “the first instance where death is posited

as a solution for too much independence" (31). One can also perceive that Slim represents nature which selects the best. It is not surprising to contend that Steinbeck himself, in this novelette, is seemingly influenced by the idea of natural selection, which lies at the heart of Charles Darwin's evolutionary theory, for he is indeed a naturalist writer.

Steinbeck emphasizes this idea once again when Carlson suggests that Candy would better shoot his lame, half-blind and toothless dog. In return, Slim hands him one of his puppies. Or this also implies, as Harold Bloom claims, that "all lame and dependent creatures should be disposed of and replaced" (31). It also implies that Slim wants to convey the message that there are nine people who live on the ranch and four of them should be disposed of partly because they are feeble and dependent and partly because the ranch cannot feed them. In addition, this passage gives the justification to the ruler to kill his feeble people and let the strong ones live if he is unable to feed them all. This interpretation in turn leads us to say that Slim's strong features make him appear as a good practitioner of such a philosophy.

> He moved with a majesty only achieved by royalty and master craftsmen. He was a jerkline skinner, the prince of the ranch, capable of driving ten, sixteen, even twenty mules with a single line to the leaders. He was capable of killing a fly on

> the wheeler's butt with a bull whip without touching the mule. There was a gravity in his manner and a quiet so profound that all talk stopped when he spoke. His authority was so great that his word was taken on any subject, be it politics or love. This was Slim, the jerkline skinner. His hatchet face was ageless. He might have been thirty-five or fifty. His ear heard more than was said to him, and his slow speech had overtones not of thought, but also of understanding beyond thought. His hands, large and lean, were as delicate in their action as those of a temple dancer. (31)

This quotation shows that Slim is a king-like figure or rather "the prince of the ranch" whose ageless "hatchet face" and his strength, gravity, far-reaching vision and authority indicate that he is so influential that the ranch hands take his word highly into consideration. For instance, when Slim welcomes Carlson's suggestion and invites Candy to have a pup if he wants to "Carl's right. That dog ain't no good to himself. I wisht somebody'd shoot me if I got old an' cripple" (46), Candy feels helpless because he knows full well that "Slim's opinions were law" (46). At the same time, this part reveals that Slim is the legislator;

however, Carlson is the executioner of the ranch. On the other hand, it shows that Steinbeck uses the two characters to advocate animal euthanasia.

In *East of Eden,* Samuel Hamilton has a horse named Doxology whose condition is as awfully bad as Candy's dog. Samuel Hamilton declares to Adam that he must "feed him [the horse] warm mash with [his] fingers" because "his teeth are worn off" (307). His horse also "has bad dreams. He shivers and cries sometimes in his sleep" (307). When Samuel Hamilton bought him, he ascertained that "everything was wrong with him, hoofs like flapjacks, a hock so thick and short and straight there seems no joint at all" (307). Samuel Hamilton tells Adam some of his horse's flaws:

> I have never in thirty-three years found one good thing about him. He even has an ugly disposition. He is selfish and quarrelsome and mean and disobedient. To this day I don't dare walk behind him because he will surely take a kick at me. When I feed him mash he tries to bite my hand. And I love him. (307)

In response to such a declaration, Adam advises Samuel Hamilton to put his horse out of his misery since he has "aches and pains" (307). However, Samuel Hamilton refuses the advice and tells him despite his infirmities, Doxology is "one of the few happy and consistent beings [he]'ve ever met (307). Then he

asks Adam if he does not mind shooting his horse and taking the responsibility for doing so and Adam replies yes. This whole part leads us to say that through *East of Eden* Steinbeck emphasizes on animal euthanasia discussed in *Of Mice and Men*.

Let's go back again to the discussion of *Of Mice and Men*. When Carlson strives hard to convince Candy to put an end to his dog, "a triangle began to ring outside, slowly at first, and then faster until the beat of it disappeared into one ringing sound. It stopped as suddenly as it had started" (37). This passage reminds us of John Donne's meditation "Any man's death, diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee" (69). So, the triangle calls for Candy's dog and his death per se diminishes Candy himself since they are closely connected.

Carlson takes a little leather thong from his pocket and ties it around Candy's dog. He says apologetically to Candy that the dog won't feel the killing since he will be shot at the back of his head. Then Slim asks him to take a shovel to bury the dog and Carlson says yes. This part reveals that both Slim and Carlson respect the corpse. It also suggests that we the humans are a part of nature and we will be back to nature sooner or later. In addition, it shows that all of Candy's sweet memories are buried with his dog.

It is worth saying that animal euthanasia that Steinbeck alludes to in this novelette has its analogue in Islam. Most scholars perceive it as permissible. For

instance, Imam Haskaf who belongs to the Hanafi school points out in *Al-Fatawa al- Hindiyya* "If a donkey becomes ill such that one is unable to benefit from it, there is nothing wrong with slaughtering it to end its suffering" (Daruliftaa. com). In addition, Imam al-Dardir who belongs to the Maliki school asserts in his commentary of *Mukhtasar al-Khalil with Hashiat Dasuqi* "It is permitted to slaughter a donkey or mule if one loses hope in its recovery [due to its illness], rather it is recommended to end its suffering" (Daruliftaa. com). Also, an influential scholar Muhammad ibn Saalih al-'Uthaymeen who belongs to the Hanbali school says in Fataawa Manaar al-Islaam:

> If an animal gets sick, if it is an animal whose meat is not permissible to eat, and there is no hope that it will recover, then there is no sin on you if you kill it, because if it is kept alive it will become a burden on you which may be a waste of your money, as you will have to spend on it and this spending will be a waste of your money. Keeping it alive until it dies without giving it food and drink is haraam [ill-gotten], because the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) said: "A woman went to Hell because of a cat which she detained. She did not feed it when

> she detained it, and she did not let it free to eat of the vermin of the earth." But if it is an animal whose meat may be eaten, and it reaches a state where you cannot benefit from it or give it to someone else who can benefit from it, then the ruling is the same as that concerning an animal whose meat is haraam, i.e., it is permissible to kill it, whether you slaughter it or kill it with bullets. Do whatever is easiest on the animal, because the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) said: "If you kill, kill well, and if you slaughter, slaughter well. Let each one of you sharpen his blade and let him spare suffering to the animal he slaughters." (islamqa.info)

Candy draws a parallel between him and his dog. He declares this to George "I got hurt four years ago. They'll can me purty soon. Jus' as soon as I can't swamp out no bunk house" (60). This passage reveals that the lives of humans and animals are closely intertwined in the sense that what happens to animals may happen to humans and vice versa.

Indeed, Steinbeck emphasizes this core idea by using two instances. First, George shuffles the cards and lays his solitaire hand and then Lennie picks up a

face card and examines it, and he turns it upside down and he says in wonder to George, “Both ends the same. George, why is it both end’s the same?” (57). Second, Candy confides to George, “I ought to of shot that dog myself. I shouldn’t ought to of let no stranger shoot my dog” (61). The two quotations suggest that the death of Lennie will be the same as that of Candy’s dog. George is inspired by Candy’s confession and he eventually decides that he should kill Lennie rather than he gives the opportunity to the lynch mob to do so. The second quotation shows Candy’s remorse toward his dog. In other words, Candy has been tormented by his conscience since he let a stranger kill his dog. His anguish dwindles when he expresses his penchant for joining George’s and Lennie’s best laid scheme of living “off the fatta the lan’” wherein “they’re gonna have a dog an’ rabbits an’ chickens” (76).

One might well assert that George’s and Lennie’s shattered dream of living together as a couple on a farm is compared to that of the gopher in *Cannery Row*. This gopher would like to make his own family. In doing so, he builds a well-equipped house and starts looking for a partner by moving from one hole to another until he finds a male gopher who thinks that he seduces his female and so he hits him awfully. The gopher moves away where he settles in a place full of traps.

> Finally in a sweat of impatience he went up across the track until he found another gopher hole. He

> squeaked provocatively in the entrance. He heard a rustling and smelled female and then out of the hole came an old battle-torn bull gopher who mauled and bit him so badly that he crept home and lay in his great chamber for three days recovering and he lost two toes from one front paw from that night. Again he waited and squeaked beside his beatiful burrow in the beautiful place but no female ever came and after a while he had to move away. He had to move two blocks up the hill to a dahlia garden where they put out tramps every nights. (177)

This quotation reinforces the idea that the best laid schemes of humans and animals often go astray and therefore their lives are indeed interrelated.

To conclude, each character views the animal and human bond through his own perspective. First, Lennie is enamored of petting soft, furry animals. But he accidently kills them. Second, Candy loves his dog because he has owned him for many years. He is also devoted to serve him even if his dog is now half-blind, toothless and lame. This implies that animals are a necessity and a good companion for man. Candy confides in George that he shouldn't have allowed a stranger to kill his dog. This inspires George at the end of the novella to kill his

friend Lennie. Besides, Candy's condition is similar to that of his dog. He is old, crippled, and expects to be sent to the poor house. This leads us to say that the lives of humans and animals are closely connected. Third, Slim drowns four puppies because he thinks that his bitch couldn't feed them all and so he keepsonly the biggest. This implies that he is a believer in Darwinism, most notably natural selection. Finally, Carlson kills Candy's dog in order to put him out of his misery. This suggests that Steinbeck uses Carlson to advocate animal euthanasia or the merciful killing of animals which is also permissible in Islamic religion.

Chapter IV: The Human and Animal Bond in *The Red Pony*

John Steinbeck perceives the natural world in *The Red Pony* as uncaring and unforgiving and predatory since it is full of predators which are in a constant conflict against one another. Such a conflict occurs either between animals and animals or between humans and animals or between humans and humans. At last it results in the survival of the fittest. Steinbeck demonstrates here his knowledge about little boys' behavior toward animals, and how they have to be taught not to be cruel to them; Jody Tiflin is a good example. Also, Steinbeck shows us how human and animal lives are closely connected. In this case, old Gitano and old Easter are good examples. Besides, Steinbeck reveals how Jody Tiflin ascends from boyhood to manhood. Jody's acquisition of the red pony lifts him above his friends. One should remember that Steinbeck is enamored of the Arthurian cycle and so Steinbeck believes that the horse is of key importance to the knight. This idea can clearly be seen in "The Leader of the People" when the grandfather tells the Tiflin family and Billy Buck about his knighthood when he leads his people across the plains to fight the Indians.

IV. 1. Jody Tiflin and the Predatory World

It should be noted that Steinbeck perceives the natural world as predatory. This insight can clearly be seen in *The Red Pony*; that is, Jody Tiflin lives on a ranch wherein there is an endless struggle between the powerful and the powerless. Some instances are given here to support this philosophy. In the opening pages of "The Gift," Jody's dog named Smasher loses one ear when he

kills a coyote (5). Then, Jody spots a "great black kettle under the cypress tree. That was where the pigs were scalded" (5). Next, Jody sees two big black buzzards over the hillside move downward to the ground. He knows that there might be a dead animal like a cow or the remains of a rabbit in the nearby. The buzzards take carrion and fly away. In fact, "Jody hated them as all decent things hate them" (5). After that, Mrs. Tiflin asks Jody to fetch some eggs in the grass otherwise the dogs will eat them (6). When Jody goes to bed, he "heard the hoot-owls hunting mice down by the barn" (9). Finally, both Carl Tiflin and Billy Buck sell six old milk cows to the butcher and replace them with a red pony colt.

Steinbeck uses the red pony's name "Gabilan," the black and red colors and the triangle as well to stress the danger that awaits the red pony in such a predatory world. The word "Gabilan" is Spanish for a "hawk." The red pony is named after "Gabilan Mountains." Steinbeck in *East of Eden* asserts that they are called so because the Spaniards found the hawks "flew in those mountains" (10). The name "Gabilan" foreshadows the scene of the black buzzards at the end of "The Gift." In the evening, Jody goes to the the dark brush line and drinks water from the tub. Overhead he sees a "hawk flying so high that it caught the sun on its breast and shone like a spark. Two blackbirds were driving him down the sky, glittering as they attacked their enemy" (33). Also, Steinbeck says that when the ailing Gabilan is in the barn, "the owls flew through the

hayloft, shrieking and looking for mice" (42). The buzzards are black and therefore they signify death. Furthermore, the red pony and his saddle are red, and his eyes "have big sparks of red fire in them like oakwood embers" (17). This is suggestive of the impending doom of the red pony himself. The ringing of the triangle signals the red pony's demise. The triangle tolls for Gabilan when he is in the midst of his agony. One might say that Steinbeck takes the idea of the triangle from John Donne's meditation:

> No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main. If a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less, as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a manor of thy friend's or of thine own were: any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind, and therefore never send to know for whom the bells tolls; it tolls for thee. (69)

From this lens, we understand that the death of Gabilan diminishes Jody Tifly since they are closely connected.

At the culmination of "The Gift," the black buzzards encircle the dying Gabilan to feed on it. Howard Levant points out "the imagery indicates that nature is an indifferent process to which men assign meaning" (88). This interpretation is so crucial since it shows us the naturalistic trend of Steinbeck

that characterizes his fiction. Besides, one might also argue that Steinbeck himself uses this scene to assert that nature is so unforgiving that the strong lives at the expense of the weak.

Other writers in American literature have featured scenes in which predatory nature is highlighted. The black buzzards can be compared to the black ants that the private Henry Fleming, in the seventh chapter of Stephen Crane's *The Red Badge of Courage*, finds running over the dead soldier's face.

> The mouth was open. Its red had changed to an appalling yellow. Over the gray skin of his face run little ants. One was trundling some sort of a bundle along the upper lip…At last he burst the bonds which had fastened him to the spot and fled, unheeding the underbrush. He was pursued by s sight of the black ants swarming greedily upon the gray face and venturing horribly near to the eye. (119)

Also, the black buzzards are compared to the mako shark and the shovel nosed sharks that devour the marlin in Ernest Hemingway's *The Old Man and the Sea*.

Jody Tiflin endeavors to prevent the buzzards from eating Gabilan and he eventually kills one.

> Jody brought up his knee and fell on the great bird. He held the neck to the ground with one hand while his other found a piece of sharp white quartz. The first blow broke the beak sideways and black blood spurted from the twisted, leathery mouth corners. He struck again and missed. The red fearless eyes still looked at him, impersonal and unafraid and detached. He struck again, until the buzzard lay dead, until its head was red pulp. (43)

Like Jody Tiflin, Santiago hits the Mako shark on the head and kills him.

> He did not like to look at the fish anymore since he had been mutilated. When the fish had been hit it was as though he himself were hit. But I killed the shark that hit my fish. (103)

This striking comparison is important since it allows us to understand that nature is indeed full of predators.

In addition, Carl Tiflin wants to tell Jody that he should not put the blame on the buzzard because it “didn't kill the pony” (44). And Jody confirms to him that he knows that. This part is similar to that in *Cannery Row*. In chapter 24, Mary Talbot’s cat named Kitty Casini “stabbed the mouse through the back and drew

it wriggling to her tail flicked with tense delight" (141). So, her husband Tom Talbot "shouted and killed the mouse"and then he aimed at the cat; so he "picked up a rock and hit her in the stomach and knocked her off the fence" (141). His wife Mary Talbot reacted to his action by telling him that she "can't blame Kitty Casini" since she "knows how cats are" (141). We understand from this part that Carl Tiflin's response to Jody is similar to that of Mary Talbot. They mean that the act is purely natural and so we should not revolt against it.

Indeed, predatory philosophy is also highlighted in Steinbeck's earlier novels like in *The Pastures of Heaven*. Raymond Banks raises five thousand white chickens and one thousand white ducks in his farm wherein they lead a blissful and peaceful life. The chickens enjoy eating and scratching in the alfalfa patches whilst the ducks are swimming in the silver water of the pond since there are no predators for the time being. However, their lives turn into a nightmarish mess when the hawk emerges, hovering over them. They start scuttling hurriedly toward their houses and when the hawk flies away under the menace of Raymond Banks's gunshot, their lives return to normalcy.

> Then perhaps a red-tail hawk soar over, carefully watching Raymond's house. The white specks instantly stopped their meaningless movements and scuttled to the protecting roosters, and up from the fields came the despairing shrieks of

> thousands of hawk-frightened chickens. The back door of the farmhouse slammed, and Raymond sauntered out carrying a shot gun. The hawk swung up a hundred feet in the air and soared away. The little white bunches spread out again and the eddying continued. (117-118)

In *To a God Unknown*, the ranch wherein the Wayne family lives is full of predators. In chapter 02, on his way toward Nuestra Señora, Joseph Wayne finds a very big boar preying on a small pig. Far away, a sow and her small pigs are terrified of the incident since their turn is coming for sure. Joseph gets angry at this sort of cannibalism. So he aims his guns to shoot him, but he changes his mind when he remembers instantly that he should not intervene to stop this act because nature works like this and so he can't overcome it.

> Joseph jerked up his horse. His face contracted with anger and his eyes paled until they were almost white. "Damn you," he cried. "Eat other creatures. Don't eat your own people." He pulled his rifle from its scabbard and aimed between the yellow eyes of the boar. And then the barrel lowered and a firm thumb let down the hammer. Joseph laughed shortly at himself. "I'm taking too

> great power into my hands," he said. "Why he's the father of fifty pigs and he maybe the source of fifty more." The boar wheeled and snorted as Joseph rode on by. (5-6)

One might assert that some predators will certainly feed on their own kind if they don't find any other animals to eat. This critical situation can also be applied to humans in times of hunger or when they live in a jungle-like community where "the survival of the fittest" is the motto of life.

In chapter 21, Joseph Wayne takes his wife Elizabeth to the pine grove to see the old moss covered rock. On their way they stumble over two predatory scenes. First, they see "a dead cow, almost covered by slow gluttonous buzzards." Joseph comments "they don't give meat a chance to spoil. I've seen them standing in a circle around a dying animal, waiting for the moment of death. They know that moment" (125). Second, they spot a hawk flying downward and picking up the rabbit and fly away speedily. The scene is so awful for Elizabeth that she cannot bear it.

> As she spoke a hawk shot from the air with doubled fists. They heard the shock of flesh, and in a second the hawk flew up again, bearing a screaming rabbit in its claws. Elizabeth dropped her reins and covered her ears until the sound was

> out of hearing. Her lip trembled. “It’s all right; I know it is. I hate to see it, though.” (127)

In response to her reaction, Joseph reassuringly says to Elizabeth that “he missed his stroke. He should have broken its neck with the first blow, but he missed” (127).

Shortly after Elizabeth’s death, Joseph goes hurriedly away until he reaches a pool. While he gazes into it, he finds five wild pigs and a boar coming closer to drink water and to catch fish. Two pigs catch an eel and share it together. All of a sudden, a lion emerges from the brush and kills the boar and the other pigs run away. Joseph addresses the lion shrilly that if he had a gun he would shoot it. And then he leaves it with his prey.

> There came a sharp grunting from the brush. Joseph lost his thought and looked toward the beach. Five learn wild pigs and one great curved-tusked boar came into the open and approached the water. They drank cautiously, and then wading noisily into the water they began to catch the eels and to eat them while the slimy fish slapped and struggled in their mouths. (131)

This scene shows that life in nature is based on the constant struggle for survival. Those pigs prove to be the strong since they can feed on the eels that resist in vain to get rid of their predators.

> Two pigs caught one eel and squalling angrily tore it in two, and each chewed up its portion. The night was almost down before they waded back to the beach and drank once more. (131)

This part reveals that some predatoars share their prey equally when they chase it together. This leads us to say that selflessness and collectivism can be animalistic traits also.

> Suddenly there came a flash of yellow light. One of the pigs fell under the furious ray. There was a crunch of bone and a shrill screaming, and then the ray arched its back as the lean and sleek lion looked around and leaped back from the charging boar. The boar snorted at its dead and then whirled and led the four others into the brush. (131)

Steinbeck demonstrates that this struggle shifts from the powerful and the powerless to the powerful and the powerful and how it ends in the domination of the most powerful.

> Joseph stood up and the lion watched him, lashing its tail. “If I could only shoot you,” Joseph said aloud, “there would be an end and a new beginning. But I have no gun. Go on with your dinner.” (131)

Here the author stresses once again that humans are aware of the reality that nature is so harsh that it is governed by “the survival of the fittest,” and they can do nothing to fight against it.

In chapter 22, Thomas Wayne tells his brother Joseph that he saw ten dead cows over the ridge and the buzzards were feeding on them. “I found ten dead cows. I don’t know what killed them. The buzzards are working on them. They are over the ridge there. In the morning there will be only a little plot of bones” (140). This passage leads us to say that nature feeds on nature.

In chapter 23, on their way home, Thomas asks Joseph to look down the slope. The coyotes have just left the bones of some animals on the ground and go away whereas the buzzards are now eating the leftover “Fifteen or twenty little piles of picked bones lay on the sidehill, and grey coyotes were slinking away toward the brush, and vultures roosted on the ribs and pulled off the last strips of flesh” (152).

This view is awfully terrible for Thomas who fears that the whole ranch, in the dry years, will be a bone yard governed by the buzzards sooner or later.

> Thomas' face was pinched. "That's what I saw before. That's why I hate the country. I'll never come back," he cried. "Come on, I want to get to the ranch. I want to start away tomorrow if I can." He swung his horse down the hill and spurred it to a trot and he fled from the acre of bones. (152)

In chapter 25, while Joseph Wayne is on horseback, he hears three coyotes laughing loudly from different directions. He figures out that they are hungry and there is some carrion in the nearby. Then he hears a calf moaning in the brush. He follows the sound until he finds a cow lying dead and the starved calf struggles to suck his mother's udder. The coyotes are waiting for the calf to die. So Joseph dismounts and examines the dead cow and carries the calf with him and leaves behind him the coyotes to feed on the carrion.

> A head, a coyote barked a staccato question, and another answered from the other side of the road. Then the two voices drew together into a high shrieking giggle that rode down the wind. A third sharp question, from a third direction, and all three giggle. (176)

The Coyotes' giggle testifies to the fact that the powerful tend to be happy about the death of the weak since it becomes food for him.

> Joseph shivered a little. “They’re hungry,” he thought, “There’s so little carrion left to eat.” Then he heard a calf moan in the high brush beside the road, and he turned his horse and spurred it up and broke through the brittle brushes. In a moment he came to a little clearing in the brush. A dead cow lay dead on its side and a skinny calf butted frantically to find a teat. The coyotes laughed again, and went away to wait. (176)

Humans apprehend how animals respond to their biological needs. The clearing where the cow is found lying dead represents that the weak should be cleared by the strong. The coyotes’repeated giggle indicates that the powerful tends to mock at the weak. It also implies that those coyotes are looking forward to having their banquet with gleeful delight.

> Joseph dismounted and walked to the dead cow. Its hips was a mountain peak, and its ribs were like the long water-scars on the hillsides. It had died, finally, when bits of dry brush would not support it any more. The calf tried to get away, but it was too weak with hunger. It stumbled and

> fell heavily and floundered on the ground, trying to get up again. Joseph untied his riata and roped the skinny legs together. Then he lifted the calf in front of the saddle and mounted behind it. "Now come for your dinner," he called to the coyote. (176-7)

Joseph is so sympathetic with the critical situation of the meagre calf that he takes it with him in order not to be fed on by the coyotes.

Indeed, Steinbeck emphasizes also this philosophy of the predatory world in the last section *Of Mice and Men*:

> A water snake glided smoothly up the pool, twisting its periscope head from side to side; and it swam the length of the pool and came to the legs of a motionless heron that stood in the shallows. A silent head and beak lanced and plucked it out by the head, and the beak swallowed the little snake while its tail waved frantically. (88)

Steinbeck mentions that "the heron stood in the shallows, motionless and waiting. Another little water snake swam up the pool, turning its periscope head from side to side" (88). As soon as the heron was about to prey on it, Lennie

emerges silently as “a creeping bear.” Thus, “the heron pounded the air with its wings, jacked itself clear of the water and flew off down river. The little snake slid in among the reeds at the pool’s side” (88).

This scene represents that the weak has no room in the realm wherein the strong lives. The heron feeds itself on the snake and it disappears when the bear-like Lennie comes. Furthermore, it signals the impending doom of Lennie himself. Lennie is powerless and so he also has no room in the ranch since it is dominated by the powerful.

The philosophy of the predatory world recurs in “The Snake.” Under the woman’s request, Dr. Phillips takes out a male rattlesnake and puts it in the feeding cage. And then he goes to the rat cage and selects one randomly and moves to the feeding cage and puts the rat in. At last he invites her to see the scene (54).

> Now the snake came out of its corner again. There was no striking curve in its neck, but it approached the rat gingerly, ready to jump back in case it attacked. It nudged the body gently with its blunt nose, and drew way. Satisfied that Itwas dead, the snake touched the body all over with its chin, from head to tail. It seemed to measure the body and kiss it. Finally it opened its mouth and

> unhinged its jaws at the corners. The snake fitted its jaws over the rat's head and then with a slow peristaltic pulsing, began to engulf the rat. The jaws gripped and the the whole throat crawled up, and the jaws gripped again. The rat was swallowed, all except an inch of pink tail that stuck out of the snake's sardonic tongue. The throat heaved again and the tail disappeared. (56)

Steinbeck uses Doc who feeds the snake the rat to stress the idea that the laboratory is a microcosm of the predatory world; that is, what happens here in this laboratory might happen out in the wilds.

In chapter two of *Cannery Row,* Steinbeck equates Mack and his boys with animal predators:

> In the world ruled by tigers with ulcers, rutted by strictured bulls, scavenged by blind jackals, Mack and the boys dine delicately with tigers, fondle the frantic heifers, and wrap up the crumbs to feed the sea gulls of Cannery Row. (12)

This analogy explains the lives of both animals and humans are interconnected in terms of predation.

Steinbeck describes also the Great Tide Pool in *Cannery Row* as predatory. Steinbeck says that when there is no tide, the pool becomes full of predators all of which arepreocupied with hunting their preys. For instance, starfish stick to their enemy and then rise with great strength so that they remove it from the rocks.

> Starfish squat over mussels and limpets, attach their million little suckers and then slowly lift with incredible power until the prey is broken from the rock. And then the starfish stomach comes out and envelops its food. (92)

In chapter 17, Steinbeck moves to describe the tide pool at La Jolla between Los Angelos and San Diego where small octopi live among rocks and they like the bottom, for it is muddy and full of small caves and crevices so they might well be immune from predators.

> The little octopi live among the boulders imbedded in sand. Being timid and young, they prefer a bottom on which there are many caves and little crevices and lumps of mud where they may hide from predators and protect themselves from the waves. (92)

However, in chapter 18, Steinbeck manifests that there is no escape from predators in this harsh world where the best laid schemes often scatter under the influence of some extranuous variables which are beyond our control. In this case, the life of the small octopi is disrupted by the intervention of Doc and when they are unable to runa way from such a predator, they start attacking one another.

> Then he turned over the boulders with his crowbar and now and then his hand darted quickly into the standing water and brought out a little angry squirming octopus which blushed with rage and spat ink on his hand. Then he dropped it into a jar of sea water with the others and usually the newcomer was so angry that it attacked its feollows. (99)

The predatory world is also highlighted in *The Pearl*. In the first chapter, Steinbeck describes how Kino watches the ants move busily on the ground and how a dusty ant attempts to avoid that trap that an ant lion set for him "The ants were busy on the ground, big black ones with shiny bodies, and little dusty quick ants. Kino watched with the detachment of God while a dusty ant frantically tried to escape the sand trap an ant lion had dug for him" (4). Within the same chapter, Steinbeck tells us that a scorpion emerges and heads towards the box

where Kino's baby Coyotito lays. Although Kino stretches his hand to catch it, the scorpion falls and stings Coyotito's shoulder.

> The thorned tail jerked upright. And at that moment the laughing Coyotito shook the rope and the scorpion fell. Kino's hand leaped to catch it, but it fell past his fingers, fell on the baby's shoulder, landed and struck. Then, snarling, Kino had it, ha dit in his fingers, rubbing it to a paste in his hands. He threw it down and beat it into the earth floor with his fist, and Coyotito screamed with pain in his box. But Kino beat and stamped the enemy until i twas only a fragment and a moist place in the dirt. (6-7)

One could claim that the scorpion foreshadows the danger that awaits Kino's family, particularly the impending doom of Kino's baby Coyotito at the hands of one of the pearl dealers. Kino's destruction of the scorpion signals on the one hand Kino's killing of Coyotito's killer; and on the other hand, it mirrors his triumph over his enemies at the culmination of the fight although his baby is dead.

In the second chapter, Steinbeck stress this philosophy of the predatory world by revealing to us how the starving dogs and pigs sniff on the beach for any

carrion floating on the surface of the sea “On the beach the hungry dogs and the hungry pigs of the town searched endlessly for any dead fish or sea bird that might have floating in on a rising tide” (18).

In the third chapter, Steinbeck even depicts the estuary of the Gulf as predatory wherein a swarm of small fish flees from another swarm of big fish so that they will not be preyed upon. However, the townspeople can hear in their houses how the predation is made by the big ones. At the same time, Steinbeck demonstrates how predation shifts from the Gulf to the ground where hawks chase mice at night.

> Out in the estuary a tight woven school of small fishes glittered and broke water to escape a school of great fishes that drove in to eat them. And in the houses the people could hear the swish of the small ones as the slaughter went on. The dampness arose out of the Gulf and was deposited on bushes and cacti and on little trees in salty drops. And the night mice crept about on the ground and the little night hawks hunted them silently. (42)

In the fourth chapter, the pearl makes Kino a prey of the dealers who surround him like wolves and vultures encircle an animal and wait for his death

to come to feed on him. In this case, Kino is compared to the red pony since both of them are encircled by vultures. “But Kino had grown tight and hard. He felt the creeping of fate, the circling of wolves, hover of vultures He felt the evil coagulating about him, and he was helpless to protect the himself” (66).

In the final chapter, Steinbeck describes the pool in the stone mountains makes animals meet because of water and prey on each other.

> And in the pool lived frogs and water-skaters, and water-worms crawled on the bottom of the pool. Everything that loved water came to these few shallow places. The cats took their prey there, and strewed feathers and lapped water through their bloody teeth. The little pools were places of life because of the water, and places of killing because of the water, too. (104)

One might say that Steinbeck’s depiction of the predatory world in *The Pearl* aims to exemplify the struggle between the strong represented by the pearl dealers, and the weak represented by Kino’s family. The pearl dealers turn into ruthless animals whose greed moves them to deceive Kino into thinking that his pearl is valueless and how they plan to put an end to him so that they can possess the pearl. This idea is suggestive of how the strong wants to live at the expense of the weak.

It is noteworthy that Steinbeck writes about the predatory in his non-fiction also and *The Log from the Sea of Cortez* is an excellent example. This book is based on a scientific expedition that he made with Edward Ricketts and the crew to explore the sea of Cortez where they could see many marine animals feed on one another. When they arrive at Santa Barbara Channel, they find seagulls are eating a school of sardines voraciously "Near to us was the greasy mess where a school of sardines had been milling, and on it the feathers of gulls which had come to join the sardines and, having fed hugely, had sat on the water and combed themselves" (34-35). And in the region of Magdalena Bay, they catch a sea turtle and they cut its bell open to know what it feeds on, and they find it full of bright-red lobsters.

> We were eager to examine the turtle's intestinal tract, both to find the food it had been eating and to look for possible tapeworms. To this end we sawed the bell open at the sides and opened the body cavity. From gullet to anus the digestive tract was crammed with small bright-red rock-lobsters; a few of those nearest the gullet were whole enough to preserve. The gullet itself was lined with hard, sharp-pointed spikes, not of bone,

> but of a specialized tissue hard enough to macerate the small crustacae the turtle fed on. (39)

Steinbeck emphasizes that this area of Magdalena Bay is so full of predators that animals eat other animals ferociously “There was food everywhere. Everything ate everything else with a furious exuberance” (41).

In Cape San Lucas, they see people using the fish bait to catch tuna. In the meantime, the cormorants make a disturbance in the area by interfereing to catch fish and drive the schools away to get the bait.

> The cannery cans tuna; the entrails and cuttings of the tuna are thrown into the water from the end of the pier. This refuse brings in schools of small fish which are netted and used for bait to catch tuna. This closed and tight circle is interfered with by the cormorants, who try to get the bait-fish. They drive and catch fish, but also they drive the schools away from the pier out of easy reach of the bait-men. Thus, they are considered interlopers, radicals, subversive forces against the perfect and God-set balance on Cape San Lucas. (48)

At Concepion Bay, they observe that the anemones, while they are in the tide pool, spread their tentacles and feed on a lot of micro-organisms, and when a small crab touches them, they attack it and swollow it into their stomach and throw off the shell as well as the unedible substances. They make the observation when they put the anemones and a small crab inside an aquarium. The anemones pounce on the crab the same as the snake attacks its enemy.

> In their natural place in the tide pool they are thick and close to the rock. When the tide covers them they extend their beautiful tentacles and with their nettle-cells capture and eat many micro-organisms. When a powerful animal, a small crab for example, touches them, they paralyze it and foldit into the stomach, beginning the digestive process before the animal is dead, and in time ejecting the shell and other indigestible matter. On being touched by an enemy, they fold in upon themselves for protection…Then one day, after three months, we dropped a small crab into the aquarium. The anemones, moving on their new long necks, bent over and attacked the crab, striking downward like slow snakes. (156-157)

Going back to *The Red Pony* now, it interesting to point out that the scene of the black buzzards as well as Jody's grief over Gabilan's death make him abuse animals. This idea is supported by critic Derek Gladwin's assertion "when he later sees the buzzard feeding off of the pony's dead carcass, Jody is filled with rage and a rebellion against nature. Grief for Gabilan motivated Jody's killing of the buzzard" (69). Furthermore, Jody's cruelty to animals can be attributed to what Howard Levant says, "his fascination with death. Having become aware of it, he must understand its human meaning" (89). The death of Gabilan signifies Jody's discovery of death per se. Accordingly, Jody aims to experience it through abusing animals. From a naturalist lens, the demise of Gabilan is inevitable and thus it is beyond our control since it is determined by nature.

As far as animal abuse is concerned, it is worth saying that Steinbeck uses Jody Tiflin to demonstrate his knowledge about little boys' behavior toward animals which is indeed contradictory; that is, their behavior is blended with love and sadomasochism. Sometimes he is enamored of raising and taking care of animals. And sometimes he shows sadomasochistic feelings toward animals. For argument's sake, in "The Gift," Steinbeck tells us that Jody Tiflin is a good hand with the red pony and he loves him a great deal to the point that his masochistic nature comes to the surface:

> By thinking, imagining that Gabilan would be in the stall, and worse, would never have been there.

> And he had other delicious little self-induced pains. He thought how the rats had gnawed ragged holes in the red saddle, and how the mice had nibbled Gabilan's tail until it was stringy and thin (16).

Besides, Jody Tiflin's behavior toward animals is usually very sadistic. For instance, in "The Gift," Jody throws a "hard black clod" at Doubletree Mutt that goes "yelping away to nurse a bruised paw" (36). After a while, Jody Tiflin "put his arm about the dog's neck and kissed him on his wide black nose" (41).

Jody's sadistic side can also be revealed in "The Great Mountains." He is in the barn, hethrows rocks at the swallow's nest under the eaves until every one of the little mud houses broke open and droppedits lining of straw and dirty feathers (45). At the ranch, he tortures his dog named Doubletree Mutt by baiting a rat trap with stale cheese and setting it where Doubletree Mutt gets his nosed snapped. The dog "put his nose in the trap and got smacked, and shrieked with agony and limped away with blood on his nostrils (45). Then, Jody Tiflin takes his slingshot and picks up a stone and then he shoots successfully at a little bird which falls dead on the ground. First, Jody beheads it. Then, he disembowels it. After that, he takes off its wings. Finally, he tosses all the pieces into the brush (47).

Also, in “The Promise,” on his way to the home ranch, Jody Tiflin starts his hunting game by putting a horny toad into his bucket. By the time he gets to the fork road, Jody Tiflin also hunts “two more horny-toads, four little grass lizards, a blue snake, sixteen yellow-winged grass-hoppers and a brown damp newt from under a rock. This assortment scrabbled unhappily against the tin of the lunch bucket” (69). One could argue that this passage indicates that Jody is either sadistic or thoughtless toward his mother.

In fact, Jody recovers from his grief when his father Carl Tiflin promises to give him a colt since he was a good hand with the red pony. So, Jody’s attitude toward animals changes positively. For instance, Jody stops torturing the chickens by dumping the can of grain. Now, the chickens no longer jump over each other and struggle to get the grain (72). Furthermore, he promises himself and his mother not to fill his lunch bucket with “suffocated reptiles, and bugs” any more (72-73).

However, in the opening pages of “The Leader of the People” we see that Jody’s abusive behavior toward animals returns once again. This emphasizes the schizophrenic or contradictory nature of Jody. Hegets out of the house and he sees Billy Buck raking the old haystack. JodyTiflin moves toward him, and on his way he starts his hunting game once again. Jody picks up a stone and wants to aimit at a cat that hides under the porch before the shooting is done. So, Jody

throws the stone at the white pigeons that huddle together in the cypress tree, and they fly away (96-97).

Following the same thread of thought, Jody Tiflin gets to Billy Buck and expresses his penchant for hunting the mice that:

> For eight months they had lived and multiplied in the haystack. They had been immune from cats, from traps, from poison and from Jody. They had grown smug in their security, overbearing and fat. Now the time of disaster had come; they would not survive another way." (97-98)

Jody Tiflin tells his grandfather that mice hunt is no more than a game for him. And he invites him to watch the scene when he is going to drive out the mice to the dogs" (106). Jody explains to his grandfather that "the dogs eat them" (106). The quotations given here also argue the philosophy that the predatory world is disastrous and chaotic. The whole scene is also a reminiscent of the poem "To a Mouse" when Robert Burns turns up a mouse nest while plowing the land. So, the best laid scemes of the mice that Billy Buck spoils when he removes the haystack go astray.

The mice hunt is analoguous to the frogs hunt. In chapter 15 of *Cannery Row*, Mack and his friends ravages the frogs' pool and turn it from a safe haven

to a wasteland. The horrified frogs crawl, leap, pop and scramble over the bank of the pool to escape such an execution that they have never experienced before.

> But never in frog history had such an execution taken place. Frogs by the pound, by the fifty pounds. They weren't counted but there must have been six or seven hundred. (86)

Furthermore, Jody's best laid scheme of hunting mice is interrupted twice. Firstly, when Billy Buck tells him "You better come back. It's only a couple of minutes till breakfast" (115). And secondly, when his grandfather changes his mind not to accompany him in his expedition "I think I'll just sit in the sun, Jody. You go kill the mice…I'll just sit here a while. Jody gave up and went to sit on the steps at the old man's feet. He said "I'll kill them some day" (118).

In fact, Jody Tiflin's behavior toward animals is compared to that of Thomas Wayne, in *To a God Unknown*, who likes collecting different kinds of animals.

> Thomas had always a collection of half-wild animals. Before he had been a month on the new land he had collected a raccoon, two half-grown coyote pups that slunk at his heels and snarled at everyone else, a box of ferrets and a redtailed hawk, besides four mongrel dogs. He was not

> kind to animals; at least no kinder than they were to each other. (19)

Also, although Thomas Wayne likes and understands animals, he behaves sadistically toward them. “He gets pleasure from his dogs’ suffering when pulling their ears “He pulled dogs’ ears until they cried with the pain his strong slender fingers induced, and, when he stopped, they put their ears up to be pulled again” (19).

Such Jody Tiflin’schildish behavior can be found in many countries. In Algeria, for instance, little boys behave the same as Jody Tiflin. They use such tools as traps, slingshots, stones, clods, pails or whatever they find on the ground to hurt or hunt animals. They stomp on ants, and pull puppy dog and cat tails, and throw stones at lizards and birds, etc.

It is worth saying that the quail is the only animal which is not tortured or abused by Jody Tiflin. One could argue that his father Carl Tiflin perceives the quail as the token of bounty. If Jody abuses him, bounty will die away and therefore a curse will descend upon the ranch. Steinbeck writes in “The Gift” that:

> Jody, still eating, went out and did his chores. He saw the quail came down to eat with the chickens when he threw out the grain. For some reason his father was proud to have them. He never allowed

any shooting near the house for fear the quail might go away. (07)

In fact, this specific bird is related to the account of the children of Israel who were rescued by the prophet Moses (peace be upon him) from the pharaonic persecution. Once in Sinai, they starved for 40 years. The Israelites started to fill themselves up. *The Holy Quran* refers to this incident in some chapters. For instance, in the 57th verse of chapter "The Heifer" God Almighty says: "And We shaded you with clouds, and We sent down to you manna and quails: "Eat of the good things We have provided for you." They did not wrong Us, but they used to wrong their own souls" (04).

Steinbeck uses Mrs. Tiflin to convey his philosophy that little boys have to be taught not to be cruel to animals. This philosophy is shown in "The Great Mountains." Mrs. Tiflin hears Doubletree Mutt yelping and she asks Jody to "stop torturing that dog and find something to do" (46). In the same narrative, Jody Tiflin cuts the little thrush into shreds. Truly, he does not bother at all about his grotesque act. However, he feels ashamed when he knows what older people like his mother and his father and Billy Buck will say if they see him kill the bird inhumanely. In "The Promise," Mrs. Tiflin expresses her rage when she finds the lunch pail full of scrabbling small animals. So, Jody "trotted away toward the barn, conscientiously not hearing the angry voice that called him from the house" (70).

This philosophy of teaching little boys not to be cruel to animals lies at the heart of Islam. There are some prophetic sayings which urge us to treat animals humanely, or we will surely experience a painful punishment in the Hereafter. Imam An-Nasa'i points out in his book entitled *Sunan An-Nasai*, especially inchapter forty-two pertaining to "One Who Kills A Small Bird For No Reason" some hadith about this particular issue. For instance, 'Abdullah bin Amr reported that the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) said:

> There is no person who kills a small bird or anything larger, for no just reason, but Allah will ask him about it. "It was said: "0 Messenger of Allah, what does just reason mean?" He said: "That you slaughter it and eat it, and do not cut off its head and throw it aside. (250)

Imam An-Nasa'i mentions another hadith which is similar to the previous one in which 'Amr bin Sharid said: "I heard Sharid say: I heard the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) say: 'Whoever kills a small bird for no reason, it will beseech Allah on the Day of Resurrection saying: O Lord, so and so killed me for no reason, and he did not kill me for any beneficial purpose" (251). Besides, in his book entitled *Sahih Muslim*, Imam Muslim states some hadith which follow the same line of thought. For example, chapter ten entitled "It is

Permissable to Make Use of Things Necessary for Hunting but the Use of Small Pebbles is Disapproved":

> Ibn Buraida reported that Abdullah b. al-Mughaffal saw a person from amongst his companions throwing small pebbles, whereupon he said: Don't throw pebbles. For Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) did not like it, or he forbade flinging of pebbles since neither the game is taken thereby, nor an enemy defeated. But it may break a tooth or put out an eye. He, afterwards, again saw him flinging pebbles, and said to him: I inform you that the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) did not approve or he forbade flinging of pebbles, but if I see you again flinging pebbles. I will not speak with you. (1212)

Imam Muslim states another hadith in chapter thirty-six entitled "The Prohibition of Killing the Ant" under which Abu Huraira reported that the prophet Muhammed (may peace be upon him) said:

> An ant had bitten a Prophet (one amongst the earlier Prophets) and he ordered that the colony of

> the ants should be burnt. And Allah revealed to him: "Because of an ant bites you have burnt a community from amongst the communities which sings My glory. (1375)

And in chapter 37 entitled "It is Forbidden to Kill the Cat," scholar Muslim includes a hadith in which Nafi' reported from Abdullah that the prophet Muhammed (may peace be upon him) said: "A woman was punished because she had kept a cat tied until it died, and (as a punishment of this offence) she was thrown into the Hell. She had not provided it with food, or drink, and had not freed her so that she could eat the insects of the earth" (1375). However, it is meritorious to treat animals kindly and respectfully. Scholar Muslim states in chapter 38 entitled "The Merit of Supplying Water and Food to Animals" some hadiths which revolve around this crucial point. For instance, Abu Huraira reported that the prophet Muhammed (may peace be upon him) Allah's Messenger said:

> A person suffered from intense thirst while on a journey, when he found a well. He climbed down into it and drank (water) and then came out and saw a dog lolling its tongue on account of thirst and eating the moistened earth. The person said: This dog has suffered from thirst as I had suffered

> from it. He climbed down into the well, filled his shoe with water, then caught it in his mouth until he climbed up and made the dog drink it. So Allah appreciated this act of his and pardoned him. Then (the Companions around him) said: Allah's Messenger, is there for us a reward even for (serving) such animals? He said: Yes, there is a reward for service to every living animal. (1376-1377)

The same companion reported another hadith which is similar to one given above. The prophet Muhammed (may peace be upon him) said in the first hadith: “There was a dog moving around a well whom thirst would have killed. Suddenly a prostitute from the prostitutes of Bani Isra'il happened to see it and she drew water in her shoe and made it drink, and she was pardoned because of this” (1377).

John Steinbeck advocates animal euthanasia in *The Red Pony* to support his philosophy about the predatory world. Carl Tiflin echoes Carlson in *Of Mice and Men* since both of them share a similar name and show their desire to execute the merciful killing of animals. Besides, Steinbeck uses Carl Tiflin to emphasize his philosophy about the analogy of the human and animal worlds; that is, what might happen to man, it might happen to animals and vice versa. In

this context, and in “The Great Mountains,” Carl Tiflin captures the last words of Gitano when he tells Jody that the horse Easter is “too old to work. Just eats and pretty soon dies” (57). So, Carl Tiflin seizes the opportunity to draw the parallels between Gitano and Easter since both of them are old and useless and thus their lives end the same. Carl Tiflin tells Billy Buck that he wants to put old Easter out of his misery “It’s a shame not to shoot Easter. It’d save him a lot of pain and rheumatism.” (57). He further says, “Old things ought to be put out of their misery. One shot, a big noise, one big pain in the head maybe, and that’s all. That’s better than stiffness and sore teeth” (57). There is also an analogy between Gitano and the red pony. When the latter feels that his death is unevitable, he leaves the barn to live in “one of the little clearings in the brush” where Jody Tiflin finds him lying dead (43). Likewise, when the former feels that his end is coming, he resolves to leave the great mountains and to die on the ranch where he and his father were born. He is not allowed to do so by the Tiflin family, however.

It is also worth mentioning that Gitano’s condition is similar to that of Candy and Candy’s dog’s condition is akin to that of old Easter. In fact, Carl Tiflin admits to Billy Buck how old Easter was a good horse “High neck, deep chest, fine barrel. He could jump a few-bar gate in stride. I won a flat race on him when I was fifteen years old. I could of got two hundred dollars for him any time. You wouldn’t think how pretty he was. But he ought to be shot now” (58).

This quotation reflects Candy's confession that his dog was a good shepherd and he had him since he was a pup. However, unlike Carl Tiflin, Candy is still loyal to him. We undersrtand from Carl's idea of shooting his old Easter that this natural world is so harsh that the strong tends to dispose of the weak. Also, it reveals his utilitarian philosophy in the sense that when you are productive you are good and when you get old and useless you are damned.

Animal euthanasia recurs in "The Promise." When the colt's birth comes, the mare Nellie stands "rigid and stiff" and her whole body writhes in spasmodic movements that pass and start over again. This shows Nellie crying with acute pain. Besides, the colt's position is so wrong that Billy Buck cannot take it out. Therefore, Billy Buck resolves to crunch Nellie's head with a horseshoe hammer to put Nellie out of her misery and to save the colt since he promised Jody to give it to him when the time comes. In fact, Steinbeck aims to teach us some of his philosophies about animal behavior behind this scene. First, Steinbeck emphasizes animal euthanasia by putting Nellie out of her deadly pain. Second, from a Darwinist's viewpoint, Billy Buck appears to be a true believer in natural selection since he selects the newborn colt and eliminates the weak, ailing Nellie. In this context, Billy Buck can be seen as a determiner of life and death. This interpretation leads us to say that Billy Buck is analogous to Slim in *Of Mice and Men*. Third, the title of this story "The Promise" in which this scene is mentioned is significant. Billy Buck succeeds in keeping his promise to give

Jody the colt. Steinbeck aims to teach us that man should not break his promise. This idea also lies at the heart of Islam. There are many Quranic verses and prophetic sayings that support this crucial philosophy.

In fact, the philosophy of the predatory world can also be seen among humans themselves in which "the fittest of the fittest shall survive." There are some instances in *The Red Pony* which support this idea. In "The Leader of the People," Jody compares the mouse hunt to hunting Indians. His grandfather confirms that "no, not much —but then later, when the troops were hunting Indians and shooting children and burning teepees, it wasn't much different from your mouse hunt" (106). The grandfather further says, "we carried life out here and set it down the way those ants carry eggs. And I was the leader" (119). So, the title per se as well as these two passages reveal that the Americans triumphed over the Indians at the end of the struggle and they became the leaders of the people. Besides, the idea of how "westering" was done is compared to animals. This implies that the lives of humans and animals are indeed closely connected.

To conclude, John Steinbeck demonstrates how Jody Tiflin behaves and responds to the predatory word. Now let's delve into how Steinbeck shows Jody Tiflin's shift from boyhood to manhood.

IV. 2. Jody Tiflin's Ascension from Boyhood to Manhood

The first story of *The Red Pony* is entitled "The Gift" which indicates that animals in general and the red pony in particular are a gift granted by God to us to serve our lives. This viewpoint is strengthened by the eighth Quranic verse of chapter "The Bee" in which Allah says "And the horses, and the mules, and the donkeys—for you to ride, and for luxury. And He creates what you do not know" (133). The title also reveals that Carl Tiflin offers Jody Tiflin a red pony as a gift. Carl Tiflin tells him that "he needs a good currying... and if I ever hear of you not feeding him or leaving his stall dirty, I'll sell him off in a minute" (10-11). This explains that Jody Tiflin is taught to look after animals and to treat them mercifully. It can also be interpreted as whatever the gift is, it should not be spoiled but protected.

In response to Jody Tiflin's questions about the red pony, Billy Buck says he "bought him at a sheriff's auction. A show went broke in Salinas and had debts. The sheriff was selling off their stuff" (11). The circus pony reflects Steinbeck's childhood fascination with the circus that used to come to his hometown Salinas to show the townspeople different kinds of animals, clowns, equestrians and acrobats. In his article "Circus," taken from *America and Americans and Selected Nonfiction*, Steinbeck himself expresses his deep impression toward that show.

> I remember the smells of lion and goat and wolf and torn grass and the smell of coffee from the cookhouse tent. Some of us, the lucky ones, were allowed to help, water carrying, horse holding and even leading certain of the more amiable animals in the parade, and as though just doing it weren't enough, we were rewarded with breakfast in the cookhouse and a free pass to the show. Kids would pay a small sum just to stroke my pony on the neck. I have often wondered what those circus men would have done if I had consented to sell. (136-7)

The circus pony also mirrors Steinbeck's pony Jill that he had when he was as young as Jody. In the same article, Steinbeck tells us that although the circus men offer him fantastic prices to tempt him to sell his pony to them; he refuses to do so because he is so attached to it. This increases some sort of holiness in the pony and in himself.

> I had a pony in those days, part Shetland and part Cayuse and no great shucks for looks as I realize now, and every year those lovely circus men tried to buy my pony from me and offered fantastic

> prices. This would be whispered about for weeks and conferred a kind of holiness on both the pony and on me. (137)

Indeed, Bill Buck offers Jody Tiflina “show saddle” of “red morocco leather” (12). It foreshadows that Billy Buck will show Jody Tiflin horse training. This also implies that through the show red pony and his show saddle Steinbeck aims to reveal Jody Tiflin’s rise to manhood. This interpretation can be supported by the fact that Jody Tiflin wants to exhibit the red pony to his classmates. In other words, Jody Tiflins appears so luxurious with the red pony that he wants to show it off to his peers. In doing so, Jody Tiflin evolves from a little boy into manhood. Therefore, he is lifted above his classmates who begin to regard him with respect, awe and admiration. This suggests that horsemanship is indeed worthy in the ranch life.

> They stood selfconsciously before the pony, and then they looked at Jody with eyes in which there was a new admiration and a new respect. Before today Jody had been a boy, dressed in overalls and a blue shirt—quieter than most, even suspected of being a little cowardly. And now he was different. Out of a thousand centuries they drew the ancient admiration of the footman for the

> horseman. They knew instinctively that a man on a horse is spiritually as well as physically bigger than a man on foot. They knew that Jody had been miraculously lifted out of equality with them, and had been placed over them. (13)

In addition, Jody Tiflin's transformation into manhood can also clearly be seen through the eyes of her mother. "Jody didn't hear his mother enter the barn. She was angry when she came, but when she looked in at the pony and at Jody working over him, she felt a curious pride rise up in her" (15).

Carl Tiflin aims to teach Jody Tiflin horse riding. Since Billy Buck is "a fine hand with horses" he dedicates himself to making Jody Tiflin a good horseman. He explains that "they were terribly afraid for their feet, so that one must make a practice of lifting the legs and patting the hoofs and ankles to remove their terror" (17). Also, he tells him "how horses love conversation. He must talk to the pony all the time, and tell him the reasons for everything. Billy wasn't sure a horse could understand everything that was said to him, but it was impossible to say how much was understood" (17). This information is useful for such a little boy as Jody, for it makes him aware of the physical and psychological sides of horses' lives which in turn warm him up for the pony training.

Billy Buck teaches Jody Tiflin the pony training in the early fall. The first stage is the halter breaking in which Jody Tiflin "held a carrot and coaxed and

pulled on the rope" (19). The pony "followed him unled wherever they went" (19). The second stage is the long halter in which Jody Tiflin makes the pony "stop and start and trot and gallop" (20). In addition, Billy Buck shows Jody Tiflin how to "work at the hair tail" (20). The third stage is saddling and cinching the pony. And the last stage is bridling the pony.

From the pony training, we understand that there is an analogy between Jody Tiflin and the red pony. Both of them are untrained and little. This is a suggestive of the connectedness of human and animal lives. Besides, the red pony is a reflection of Jody Tiflin's life. Jody Tiflin is untrained and the pony training is perfectly done, however. This paradox mirrors Jody Tiflin's training himself to become a horseman so that he can confront the cruelties of the ranch life.

Furthermore, Billy Buck instructs Jody Tiflin how to ride the pony:

> Now when you get up there, just grab tight with your knees and keep your hands away from the saddle, and if you get throwed, don't let that stop you. No matter how good a man is, there is always some horse can pitch him. You just climb up again before he gets to feeling smart about it. Pretty soon, he won't throw you no more, and pretty soon he can't throw you no more. (23)

This quotation shows that Billy Buck wants to teach Jody Tiflin how he copes with the ups and downs of the ranch life. Jody Tiflin mustn't surrender to the difficulties that afflict him from all sides. He should keep in mind that life is akin to horsemanship. If the horseman is afraid of getting thrown on the ground, he never mounts on his horse. And if he gets thrown, he ought to consider it as a good lesson in his life. Such an experience will enable him to move forward.

Furthermore, through horsemanship, Billy Buck endeavors to make Jody's life well-balanced and independent in the sense that he can master any situation that he faces without relying on the others. Hence, being self- restrained and self-reliant, Jody will bring honor not only to his family and Billy Buck, but also to the whole ranch:

> He practiced on the sawhorse how he would hold the reins in his left hand and a hat in his right hand. If he kept his hands thus busy, he couldn't grab the horn if he felt himself going off. He didn't like to think of what would happen if he did grab the horn. Perhaps his father and Billy Buck would never speak to him again, they would be so ashamed. The news would get about and his mother would be ashamed too. And in the school-yard—it was too awful to contemplate. (23)

Jody Tiflin is not allowed to ride the pony until on Thanksgiving. He hopes it won't rain before that day; however, it does. He keeps the pony in the box stall during the week of rain, except for sometimes when he takes him out " for exercise and to drink at the water-trough in the upper corral" (25). One morning the sun shines on the ranch, and Jody Tiflin asks Billy Buck to watch over the pony since he is going to leave him in the corral when he goes to school. Billy Buck assures him that it probably won't rain today and if it does, a little rain doesn't hurt the pony (25-26). Nevertheless, Jody Tiflin insists on him to keep the pony. In fact, Billy Buck's assurance doesn't come true because the rain resumes to fall. When school is out, Jody Tiflin rushes for the pony through the slanting rain and the gusty wind, and eventually he finds him "standing miserably in the corral" (26). Jody Tiflin hurriedly opens the barn door and puts the dripping, shivering pony in and starts to rub him all over with a gunny sack and brings him a hot mash (26). From a naturalist standpoint, we understand from this whole part that nature is unforgiving and indifferent to animal and human lives; that is, nature doesn't care about the pony's miserable situation, and it doesn't bother about Jody's reaction toward such a situation. The rain is an extraneous variable which represents that nature is far beyond our control and it can be a hindrance to our wishes. However, from an Islamic viewpoint, this scene can be interpreted as our best laid schemes go astray since God does not will that. In other words, God's will overcome man's will. There are some Quranic verses that revolve around this particular issue. For instance, in the

23rdverse of "The Cave," Allah says: "And never say about anything, 'I will do that tomorrow.'" And in the 29th verse of the same chapter, Allah says: "Without saying, 'If God wills'. And remember your Lord if you forget, and say, 'Perhaps my Lord will guide me to nearer than this in integrity'" (148). Also, in the 09th verse of chapter "The Rolling," Allah says: "But you cannot will, unless God wills—The Lord of the Worlds" (317). And in the 16th verse of chapter "The Constellation," Allah says: "Doer of whatever He wills" (320).

Truly, Billy Buck's teaching of Jody Tiflin, under Carl Tiflin's request, to make of him a good horseman has its analogue in Islam. Allah says in the 60th verse of chapter "The Spoils":

> And prepare against them all the power you can muster, and all the cavalry you can mobilize, to terrify thereby God's enemies and your enemies, and others besides them whom you do not know, but God knows them. Whatever you spend in God's way will be repaid to you in full, and you will not be wronged. (60)

And besides, Umar bin Al-Khattab who is considered as the second khalifa of Muslims said, "Teach your children swimming, archery and horse riding." This proves how horsemanship is of key importance to a knight since Muslims used to use horses in wars.

One could find interesting that Steinbeck's loss in his personal life is reflected in *The Red Pony*. Jody Tiflin and his red pony represent Steinbeck and his dying mother. Both Steinbeck and Jody lost what they loved. This claim is evidenced by the fact that: first, Steinbeck himself wrote a letter to George Albee in 1933 saying that he was overwhelmingly grieved owing to his ailing mother. Meanwhile, he was in the midst of writing *The Red Pony*.

> This is a very sad time. Mother seems to be slipping badly. Every other day she seems to be a little better and then the next she slips back a little weaker. My father doesn't know how sick she is and we aren't telling him. He has enough worries as it is. Don't tell anyone down there what I just said. I am sometimes astounded at the way things get about, unbelievable. Anyway we are expecting the worst and hoping it may not be the very worst, that is a paralysis…I have the pony story about half written. [*The Red Pony*] I like it pretty well. It's more being written for discipline than for any other reason. I mean if I can write any kind of a story at a time like this, then I can write stories. (70-71)

Secondly, in another letter that Steinbeck wrote to George Albee in 1934, he expressed his deep despondency over the worsening of his mother's health condition and his father's gnawing pain about it.

> Two things I really want and I can't have either of them and they are both negative. I want to forget my mother lying for a year with a frightful question in her eyes and I want to forget and lose the pain in my heart that is my father. In one year he has become a fumbling, repetitious, senile old man, unhappy almost to the point of tears. But these wants are the desire to restore the lack of ego. They are the only two things which make me conscious of myself as a unit. (93)

Thirdly, Steinbeck noted in "My Short Novels," excerpt from *America and Americans and Selected Nonfiction*, that he intended to write this novelette to talk about his personal empending loss.

> *The Red Pony* was written a long time ago, when there was desolation in my family. The first date had accurred. And the family, which every child believes to be immortal, was shattered. Perhaps this is the first adulthood of any man or woman.

> The first tortured question "Why?" and then acceptance, and then the child becomes a man. *The Red Pony* was an attempt, an experiment if you wish, to set down this loss and acceptance and growth. (158)

Unanimously, critics agree that Steinbeck was enamored of the Arthurian legend since his childhood when his aunt offered him a copy of Lanier's *The Boy's King Arthur* (1880) as a gift during his birthday. In her article "Parallels With Our Own Times: Ethan Allan Hawley as Lancelot Grotesque," Barbara Heavilin asserts that Steinbeck stayed for a year in Somerset, England, to conduct extensive research on the Arthurian cycle basing himself on the Winchester Manuscript of Sir Thomas Malory and the outcome was *The Acts of King Arthur and His Noble Knights* which is in fact a transformation and a translation into what the author hailed as "American English." Some pitfalls prevented Steinbeck from completing this book and thus he decided to get back to it when the circumstances are fit. Barbara Heavilin keeps saying:

> Intentionally or not, however, the Arthurian legend had so informed Steinbeck's thinking that it appears in some form or another in everything that he writes from that year in Somerset until his

> death, but particularly in The Winter of Our Discontent. (49-50)

This assertion is supported by Steinbeck's acknowledgment in his article "My Short Novels," taken from his book *America and Americans and Selected Nonfiction*, that "*Tortilla Flat* grew out of my study of the Arthurian cycle" (159). In fact, Barbara Heavilin's claim that it is so useful for dissecting the echoes of King Arthur in other Steinbeck's works, especially *The Red Pony* since it is related to knighthood or horsemanship.

In "The Great Mountains," old Gitano sits next to Billy Buck, Carl Tiflin and Jody Tiflin all of whom are around the table eating their supper. This image reminds us of King Arthur and his round table knights. Shortly after, Jody Tiflin spies on old Gitano when he is in the bunkhouse. He finds out that old Gitano is holding a rapier in his hand. Jody Tiflin is awfully thrilled at his discovery.

> Jody picked his way across the dark yard. He could see a light through the window of the little room of the bunkhouse. Because the night was secret he walked quietly up to the window and peered in. Gitano sat in the rocking-chair and his back was toward the window. His right arm moved slowly back and forth in front of him. Jody pushed the door open and walked in. Gitano

> jerked upright and seizing a piece of deerskin, he tried to throw it over the thing in his lap, but the skin slipped away. Jody stood overwhelmed by the thing in Gitano's hand, a lean and lovely rapierwith a golden basket hilt. The blade was like a thin ray of dark light. The hilt was pierced and intricately carved. (62)

One could see that the rapier represents King Arthur's Excalibur. On the one hand, this sword existed in Medieval Europe; that is in Malory's epoch. On the other hand, like King Arthur, old Gitano got the rapier from his father. "I got it from my father," he says (62). Jody Tiflin's fascination with such a discovery echoes his fascination with his discovery of Arthurian legend during his childhood.

The Arthurian legend is also apparent in "The Leader of the People" since the image of the round table recurs in this tale. The grandfather sits at the table and around him are Billy Buck, Carl Tiflin and Jody Tiflin. This recurred image symbolizes King Arthur and his noble knights.

Through this reverberation of Arthurian legend, Steinbeck shows how the horse is all important to a knight. The grandfather tells the Tiflin family and Billy Buck how he leads the people across the plains to fight the Indians and

how the Indians drive off their horses. He also tells them the story of the iron plates.

> When the Indians attacked, we always put the wagons in a circle and fought from between the wheels. I thought that if every wagon carried a long plate with rifle holes, the men could stand the plates on the outside of the wheels when the wagons were in the circle and they would be protected. It would save lives and that would make up for the extra weight of the iron. But of course the party wouldn't do it. No party had done it before and they couldn't see why they should go to the expense. They lived to regret it, too. (111)

In fact, Jody Tiflin shows his deep interest in his grandfather's stories about crossing the continent and fighting the Indians.

> Jody lay in his bed and thought of the impossible world of Indians and buffaloes, a world that had ceased to be forever. He wished he could have been living in the heroic time, but he knew he was not of heroic timber. No one living now, save posibly Billy Buck, was worthy to do the things

> that had been done. A race of giants had lived then, fearless men, men of a staunchness unknown in this day. Jody thought of the wide plains and of the wagons across like centipedes. He thought of Grandfather on a huge white horse, marshalling the people. Across his mind marched the great phantoms, and they marched off the earth and they were gone. (113)

Jody's Tiflin interest in such tales signifies the nine-year- old Steinbeck's special longing for reading the story of King Arthur. When Jody tells his grandfather that he would like to "lead the people some day," his grandfather replies him that "There's no place to go. There's the ocean to stop you. There is a line of old men along the shore hating the ocean because it stopped them" (119). One could argue that there is an analogy between Jody's grandfather and the renowned Arab knight Uqba ibn Nafi (622--683) since the ocean prevents them from moving westward. This idea can be supported by what Allen Fromherz says in his article "The Making of the Maghrib: 600-1060 CE" that in 682 AD Uqba ibn Nafi led his army westward to spread Islam over North Africa, which was under the Byzantine rule, until he reached the Atlantic Ocean on horseback and said, "O God, if the sea had not prevented me, I would have galloped on forever like Alexander the Great, upholding your faith and fighting

the unbelievers!" (5). This leads us to say that although there is no evidence of Steinbeck's familiarity with Uqba ibn Nafi, we find this echo.

To conclude, John Steinbeck views nature in *The Red Pony* as harsh, indifferent and predatory. The ranch whereupon Jody Tiflin lives is a bowl of an endless struggle between the weak and the strong. Steinbeck uses the name "Gabilan" as well as color symbolism and the ringing of the triangle to strengthen his viewpoint. Steinbeck demonstrates his knowledge about little boys' behavior toward animals. For some reasons like the scene of the black buzzards and his grief over Gabilan's demise, Jody Tiflin starts to abuse animals. In addition, Jody's attitude toward animals is schizophrenic and sadomasochistic. Steinbeck also shows how little boys have to be taught not to be cruel to animals. Such a philosophy lies at the core of Islam, for there are some prophetic sayings which urge us to treat animals humanely; otherwise we will certainly experience a painful punishment in the Hereafter. It is worth saying that Steinbeck writes that Jody Tiflin's life shifts from boyhood to manhood. This evolution paves the way for him to adapt to the cruelties of the ranch life. In this respect, the backdrop against which Steinbeck points out that the horse is of key importance to a knight is that he is enamored of the Arthurian legend. This standpoint is obviously seen in "The Leader of the People." The grandfather tells Tiflin and Billy Buck about his knighthood experience when he leads his people to cross the plains to fight the Indians. Jody shows his burning

longing for following his grandfather's lead by being a good knight who will marshall his people some day. His grandfather responds to him that the ocean will prevents him from doing so. This mirrors the famous Muslim figure Uqba Ibn Nafi's saying when he got to the Atlantic Ocean.

So, this in-depth discussion brings to light all these pivotal philosophies that Steinbeck may well aim to convey to the reader behind his use of the human and animal bond in *The Red Pony*.

General Conclusion

All in all, we have seen in the first chapter that Steinbeck showed an in-depth attachment to the world of animals. It was his childhood that marked his associative mind with animals. Among other things, this is evidenced by the fact that Steinbeck had a red pony whose name was Jill. Furthermore, during his first marriage to Carol Henning and his third marriage to Elaine Scott, Steinbeck enjoyed having various breeds of dogs. Indeed, both Steinbeck and Carol thought of animals as a necessity. More amazingly, Steinbeck was playful with them. His English Setter called Toby chewed on the manuscript of *Of Mice and Men*. Steinbeck did nothing to him because he thought funnily that the dog might have acted as a critic. In addition, Steinbeck pondered whimiscally in "Random Thoughts on Random Dogs" over another dog whom he viewed as a seer who wanders away and became a missionary. Too much later, Steinbeck was accompanied by his poodle named Charley for the purpose of exploring the United States. Even though they stumbled over some pitfalls, especially Charley's malady, their voyage was really enjoyable and full of adventures. In this occasion, Steinbeck took his pen to describe such a trip meticulously in his non-fictional book entitled *Travels with Charley: In Search of America*. When Charley died, Steinbeck had a bull terrier called Angel. He admitted that it was the sweetest, best behaved dog he ever owned.

We have discussed also in the second chapter that Steinbeck's keen interest in the exploration of the marine world was indeed ignited by his friend Edward

Ricketts who cast his shadows on Steinbeck's philosophy about animal behavior. Steinbeck made use of Ricketts as a focal character in such works as "The Snake", *In Dubious Battle, Cannery Row* and its sequel *Sweet Thursday*. Also, Ricketts' philosophies: the phalanx theory, non-teleological thinking and man's animality are strikingly engraved in Steinbeck's works. Firstly, the phalanx theory states that any individual is a part of larger life forms. It focuses on the idea that both human and animal social groups tend to act together as one. Secondly, non-teleological thinking can be considered as a reaction against systematic thought. It is based on the idea that phenomena related to the human and animal worlds should be observed objectively. Lastly, man's animality denotes that man's nature is analoguous to animal nature. Steinbeck sheds light on this philosophy through the use of both language and the role that biological impulses play in the lives of his characters like Lennie.

We have said in the third chapter that *Of Mice and Men* revolves around two bosom friends George and Lennie who dream of "living off the fatta the lan'". It is important to show how the naturalist writer John Steinbeck equates animal and human behavior. First, we have identified the bond between Lennie and animals. Lennie likes petting small and soft animals like mice, rabbits, puppies, etc. and he accidently kills them. Second, we have shed light on Candy's relationship with his dog. This old man loves his dog very much because he had him for long and he dutifully served him during most of his ranch life. Despite

the fact that the dog becomes old and toothless, Candy incessantly looks after him. This implies that animals can be a necessity and a good companion for man. Third, we have focused on how Carlson executes Candy's dog. Carlson tries to convince Candy that his dog becomes useless and thus his existence is meaningless. He insists that he has to shoot the dog in the back of his head to get him out of his misery. Candy eventually surrenders to Carlson's demand. This suggests that Steinbeck uses Carlson to advocate animal euthanasia or the merciful killing of animals. Much later on, Candy confides in George that he shouldn't have allowed a stranger to kill his dog. This foreshadows George at the end of the novella to kill his friend Lennie.One could argue that the life of both Candy's dog and Lennie have the same end. Besides, Candy's condition is similar to that of his dog. He is old, crippled, and expects to be sent to the poor house. This leads us to say that the lives of humans and animals are closely connected. At last, we have shown that Slim drowns four puppies because he thinks that his bitch couldn't feed them all and so he keeps only the biggest. This can be interpreted that he is a believer in Darwinism, most notably natural selection.

In the last chapter, we have stressed how Steinbeck sees Jody Tiflin's ranch as harsh, uncaring, unforgiving and predatory. It is indeed a crucible of an unterminable wrangle between the powerful and the powerless over the survival of the fittest. Steinbeck himself makes use of the name "Gabilan" together with

color symbolism and the toll of the triangle to emphasize this peephole. On the one hand, through Jody Tiflin Steinbeck shows his knowledge about little boys' behavior toward animals which is most of the time abusive, schizophrenic and sadomasochistic. On the other hand, Steinbeck reveals how they must be taught not to treat animals ruthlessly. Such a thought is analoguous to Islamic teachings. Furthermore, Steinbeck parallels old Gitano with old Easter. This implies that the lives of both humans and animals are tightly intertwined. It is worth noting that Steinbeck throws light on how the cruelties of ranch life as well as Jody Tiflin's experiences with animals, most notably the red pony, Nellie and the colt help him evolve from boyhood to manhood. Also, Steinbeck asserts that a horse is of key importance to the knight's life. Jody's grandfather tells the Tiflin family and Billy Buck his tales about how he leads his knights to cross the plains and triumphs over the Indians. Indeed, Jody is a lover of such stories. This reflects Steinbeck's fascination with the Arthurian legend since his childhood. Jody Tiflin himself becomes so ambitious that he yearns to be a great horseman some day. Besides this, Jody's grandfather informs his family that although he wants to keep going westward, the ocean impedes him. This also mirrors the renowned Muslim leader Uqba Ibn Nafi's saying when he reached the Atlantic Ocean.

So the significance of our current research is apparent through its contribution to the body of knowlege, especially to the field of Steinbeck studies

since it displays one aspect of Steinbeck's life which is based on his long-lived experience with the animal world and how it is reflected through his writings, most notably *Of Mice and Men* and *The Red Pony*. One could find interesting that Steinbeck’s philosophies behind the use of the human and animal bond have their echoes in Islam.

Works Cited

Ahmed ibn Ali, An-Nasa'i. *Sunan An-Nasa'i*. Vol. 5. Translated by Nasiruddin al-Khattab. Riyadh: Maktaba Dar-us-Salam, 2007. Print.

Beer, Gillian. *Darwin's Plots: Evolutionary Narrative in Darwin, George Eliot and Nineteenth-Century*. 1983. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, Print.

Benson, Jackson J. *John Steinbeck, writer: A Biography*. New York, N.Y., U.S.A: Penguin Books, 1990. Print.

—. *Looking for Steinbeck's Ghost*. University of Nevada Press, 2002. Print.

Bin Uthaymeen, Muhammad Saleh. "Killing old and sick animals." Islamqa.info, https://islamqa.info/en/8814. Accessed 6 February 2016.

Bloom, Harold. *Bloom's Guide: John Steinbeck's Of Mice and Men*. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2006. Print.

Brouillette, Renee. "Dogs Smile on Steinbeck Centennial: They Ran through His Stories and into His Legacy." *Dog Fancy*. 2002, 12-13. Print.

Brown, Compton Joyce. *Animal Symbolism and Imagery in John Steinbeck's Fiction From 1929 through 1939*. Dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1972. Print.

Coren, Stanley. *Why We Love The Dogs We Do: How To Find The Dog That Matches Your Personality*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2012. Print.

Crane, Stephen. *The Red Badge of Courage*. England: Puffin Classics, 1986. Print.

Din al-Mahalli, Jalalal-Din, and Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti. *Tafsir al-Jalalayn*. Translated by Feras Hamza. Jordan: Amman. Royal Aal al-Bayt Institute for Islamic Thought, 2007. Print.

Donne, John. *Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions Together with Death's Duel*. 1st ed. The United States: The University of Michigan, 1959. Print.

Edmund, Wilson. "The Californians: Storm and Steinbeck." *The New Republic*. Vol. 103 (1940): 784-87. Print.

Ford. Corey. "Random Thoughts on Random Dogs." *Cold Noses and Warm Hearts*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall c., 1958, 1-6. Print.

Fromherz, Allen. "The Making of the Maghrib: 600–1060 CE." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of African History*. USA: Oxford University Press. (2018): 1-26. Print.

Gidmark, Jill B. *Encyclopedia of American Literature of the Sea & Great Lakes*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press. City Westport, 2000. Print.

Gladstein, Mimi Reisel. "Edonic Ironies: Steinbeck's Conflicted Vision." *Steinbeck Review*. Vol. 11, no. 1. (2014): 1-13. Print.

Gladwin, Derek. “The Steinbeckian Land Ethic: Environmentalism and *The Red Pony*.” *Steinbeck Review*. Vol. 4, no.1. (2007): 64-78. Print.

Heavilin, Barbara A. “Parallels With Our Own Times: Ethan Allan Hawley as Lancelot Grotesque.” *Steinbeck Review*. Vol. 5, no.1. (2008): 49-61. Print.

Hemingway, Ernest. *The Old Man and the Sea*. New York: Scribner’s. 1952. Print.

Ibn Adam al-Kawthari, Muhammed. “Mercy Killing of Animals to End their Suffering.”Daruliftaa.com, http://www.daruliftaa.com/node/673. Accessed 6 February 2016.

Ibn Al-Hajjaj, Muslim. *Sahih Muslim*. Translated by Abd-al-Hamid Siddiqui. Mika'il al-Almany, NP. 2009. Print.

Irving, Washington. *The Sketch Book of Geoffrey Crayon*. New York: G.P. Putnam, 1861. Print.

Levant, Howard. “John Steinbeck’s “*The Red Pony*”: A Study in Narrative Technique.” *The Journal of Narrative Technique*. Vol. 1, no. 2. (1971): 77-85. Print.

Levy, Josephine. “Biological and Animal Imagery in John Steinbeck’s Migrant Agricultural Novels: A Re-evaluation.” *Between the Species*, (Winter & Spring 1994): 66-70. Print.

Lewis, Clifford L. “Critical Perspectives on John Steinbeck's Fiction.” *American Examiner: A Forum of Ideas*. Vol. 6, no. 1. (1978-1979): 69-86. Print.

Lisca, Peter. “Patterns that Make Meaning in *Of Mice and Men*,” *Readings on John Steinbeck*. Edited by Clarice Swisher. San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, Inc., 1996, 122-129. Print.

Mooney, Joshua. “A ‘Non-Lanier’ Approach to Arthur: The Influence of Steinbeck’s Childhood Edition of Malory.” *Steinbeck Review*. Vol.7, no.1. (2010): 71-75. Print.

Nakashima, Michiko. “From Sea of Cortez to Cannery Row: The Development of Steinbeck's Ecological Community.” *Steinbeck Studies of Japan*. Vol. 26. (2003): 11-21. Print.

Parini, Jay. *John Steinbeck: a biography*. New York: H. Holt, 1995. Print.

Pavel, Emilia. “Myths, Symbols and Motifs in *Of Mice and Men* by John Steinbeck.” *Annales Universitalis Apulensis Philologica*. Tome 2, (2003): 289-296. Print.

“Pigasus: Elaine Steinbeck's explanation of the origins of Steinbeck's trademark symbol.” Martha Healsey Cox Center for Steinbeck Studies, March 1983. http://www.sjsu.edu/steinbeck/biography/biography_pigasus/ Accessed 24 April 2018.

Rodger, Katharine A. *Renaissance man of Cannery Row: the life and letters of Edward F. Ricketts*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2002. Print.

Shillinglaw, Susan. *Carol and John Steinbeck: Portrait of a Marriage*. University of Nevada Press, 2013. Print.

Kelley, James C. "The Global Appeal Of Steinbeck's Science: The Animal-Human Connections." *Beyond Boundaries: Rereading John Steinbeck*. Susan Shillinglaw Kevin and Hearle. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 2002. 255-65. Print.

Steinbeck, John. *Argument of Phalanx*. 1936. The Martha Heasley Cox Center for Steinbeck Studies , San Jose State University Room 590, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Library San Jose, California. Unpublished paper.

—. *Cannery Row*. New York: The Viking Press, 1951. Print.

—. "Circus." *America and Americans and Selected Nonfiction*. New York: Viking Press, 2003. Print.

—. *East of Eden*. New York: USA: Penguin, 1992. Print.

—. "Johnny Bear." *The Long Valley*. New York: Avon Book Company, 1947. Print.

—. Introduction. *East of Eden*, by David Wyatt, USA: Penguin Putnam Inc., 1992, vii-xxvii. Print.

—. Introduction. *Of Mice and Men*, by Susan Shillinglaw, New York: Penguin, 2000, vii-xxvi. Print.

—. *Of Mice and Men*. New York: Penguin, 2000. Print.

—. "Short Novels." *America and Americans and Selected Nonfiction*. New York: Viking Press, 2003. Print.

—. "Some Thoughts on Juvenile Delinquency." *The Saturday Review*. Vol. 38, no. 22. (1955): 22. Print.

—. "The Gift." *The Red Pony*. Great Britain: Puffin, 2011. Print.

—. *The Grapes of Wrath*. 10th ed. New York: Viking Press, 1970. Print.

—. "The Great Mountains." *The Red Pony*. Great Britain: Puffin, 2011. Print.

—. "The Leader of the People." *The Red Pony*. Great Britain: Puffin, 2011. Print.

—. *The Log from the Sea of Cortez*. New York: The Viking Press, 1951. Print.

—. *The Pearl*. New York: The Viking Press, Inc., 1947. Print.

—. "The Promise." *The Red Pony*. Great Britain: Puffin, 2011. Print.

—. "The Snake." *The Long Valley*. New York: Avon Book Company, 1947. Print.

—. “The White Quail.” *The Long Valley*. New York: Avon Book Company, 1947. Print.

—. *To a God Unknown*. New York: The Viking Press, Inc., 1955. Print.

—. *The Pastures of Heaven*. New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1951. Print.

—. *Tortilla Flat*. New York: The Viking Press, Inc., 1962. Print.

—. *Travels with Charley: In Search of America*. New York: The Viking Press, Inc., 1963. Print.

Steinbeck, Elaine, and Robert Wallsten, eds. *Steinbeck: A Life in Letters*. New York: The Viking Press, 1975. Print.

Taylor, Horace P. Jr. “The Biological Naturalism of John Steinbeck.” *McNeese Review*. Vol. 12. (Winter 1960-61): 81-97. Print.

The Qur'an. Trans.TalalItani. Dallas: ClearQuran, 2009. Print.

Abstract in French

Notre travail tente de comprendre le choix de John Steinbeck d'inclure les animaux comme élément narratif dans ses romans et ses œuvres non-romanesques: des *Souries et des Hommes, le Poney Rouge, Dans la Mer de Cortez*, et *Voyage avec Charley*. Il y'a dans l'œuvre de Steinbeck une relation forte entre les hommes et les animaux. Les pistes d'explications sont multiples: d'abord, la longue expérience de l'auteur avec les animaux. Enfant, il avait un poney nommée Jill, sans parler de ses visites des refuges des chiens abandonnés. Ensuite, lors de son entrée à l'Université de Stanford, il avait montré un intérêt particulier pour la biologie marine d'où son amitié avec Edward Ricketts. Son écriture atteste de la certitude que les hommes et les animaux ont un lien psychologique relativement fort. En outre Steinbeck reste persuadé que les animaux sont une bonne compagnie pour l'homme et qu'ils le protègent. Enfin le déterminisme Darwinien fait des hommes et des animaux des partenaires dans je jeu de la survie du plus fort. Ce travail est organisé en quatre chapitres: le premier chapitre traite de l'attachement de Steinbeck au monde animal de sa naissance à sa mort. Le deuxième chapitre expose les effets de la pensée d'Edward Rickett sur la philosophie de Steinbeck sur le comportement animal. La phalanx theory, l'animalité de l'homme et la pensée non téléologique sont les les principaux paradigmes de l'étude de son écriture. Le troisième chapitre analyse le lien homme/animal dans *Des Souris et des Hommes*: Candy et son

chien fidèle. Le dernier chapitre explore le lien entre les humains et les animaux dans le Poney Rouge. Pour comprendre ce lien, il faut comprendre le comportement prédateur de Jody Tiflin envers les animaux qui accompagnent sa marche dans le temps. Les chapitres sont échafaudés dans la logique que l'écriture et la philosophie de Steinbeck soient influencées par l'Islam.

Mots clés

John Steinbeck – Lien Humains / Animaux – *Des Souris et des Hommes* – *Le Poney Rouge* - Islam.

Abstract in Arabic

تهدف هذه الدراسة الى تسليط الضوء على أهم الأسبا ب التي جعلت جون ستاينبيك يدرج الحيوانات في أعماله الخيالية و غير الخيالية لاسيما *فئران و رجال* ، *المهر الأحمر* ، *بحر كورتيز و رحلات مع تشارلي في البحث عن أمريكا*. والواقع أن هناك علاقة وثيقة تربط كل من الإنسان و الحيوان في هذه الأعمال الأدبية. بادئ ذي بدء، إستعمل جون ستاينبيك هذه العلاقة ليعكس تجاربه الطويلة مع الحيوانات من خلال كتبه ، مع العلم أنه ربى مهرا إسمه جيل عندما كان طفلا و كان يملك أصنافا متعددة من الكلاب و كان له حبا كبيرا لعلم الأحياء البحرية عندما كان طالبا في جامعة ستانفورد وصديقا لإدوارد ريكيتس. ثانيا، ليو كد بأن هناك ترابط محكم بين حياة الإنسان و الحيوان. ثالثا، أن الحيوان صاحب جيد للإنسان و يحميه من المخاطر التي يواجهها. رابعا ، أن عالم الإنسان و الحيوان لا يرحم ولا يرحم و أنه مبني على فكرة "البقاء للأصلح". تنقسم هذه الأطروحة إلى ثلاثة فصول. الفصل الأول هو مخصص لدراسة مدى إحتكاك جون ستاينبيك بعالم الحيوان منذ طفولته إلى غاية وفاته. يتعلق الفصل الثاني بالأثر الذي كان يلعبه إدوارد ريكيتس على فلسفة ستينبيك حول السلوك الحيواني. في هذا المقام، سأركز على نظرية الكردوسة، حيوانية الإنسان، و التفكير غير الغائي، وكيف أن هذه الفلسفات هي متأصلة في كتاباته. يتناول الفصل الثالث العلاقة بين الانسان و الحيوان في رواية *فئران ورجال*. في هذا الصدد، سوف نقوم بتشخيص العلاقة بين لينـي والحيوانات الصغيرة و كاندي وكلبه المخلص. الفصل الأخير يدور حول العلاقة بين الإنسان و الحيوان في رواية *المهر الأحمر*. في هذه الحالة، سندرس سلوك جودي تيفلين تجاه الحيوانت في هذا العالم الذي يسوده منطق الإفتراس ونشأته من مرحلة الطفولة الى مرحلة الرجولة. تهدف هذه الفصول الأربعة المتلاحمة الى إثبات وجود

الفلسـفات المـذكورة أعـلاه فـي كتبـه وكيـف أن بعضـها لهـا مرجعيـة فـي الـدين الإسـلامي.

الكلمات المفتاحية

جون ستاينبيك – العلاقة بين الإنسان و الحيوان – *فئران ورجال* – *المهر الصغير*

الإسلام