

A Stylistic Analysis of John Steinbeck's

OF MICE AND MEN

by

Michael Henry Short

In two volumes

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of Master
of Arts in the University of Birmingham

May 1970

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

But Mousie, thou art no thy-lane,
In proving foresight may be vain:
The best laid schemes o' Mice an' Men,
Gang aft agley,
An' lea'e us nought but grief an' pain,
For promis'd joy!

Robert Burns

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Gorin, Ferdinand, "Nominative and
Nominative: A Study in Nominative
Nominative, Part I", Review of English
Linguistics, Vol XXIV No. 1, (1950)
pp. 69-77.
- Halliday, M.A.K., "Notes on
Transitivity in English: Part I",
Journal of Linguistics, (April 1967),
pp. 37-81.
- Jacobson, Sven, Adverbial Phrases in
English, (Uppsala 1964).
- Louch, "This Bread"
VOLUME I
Language and Interpretation,
A Review of English Linguistics,
Vol. 2, (April 1969), pp. 10-73.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude, A Critique of
the Structuralist Theory of Language,
Ch. 2, (Cornell University 1962).
- Lien, Peter, The Side World of John
Linguistics, (New Jersey 1930).
- Malinowski, Bronislaw, Malinowski, (N.Y. 1900),
unpublished.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw, "The Social
Structure of the Malinowski Society",
The Malinowski Society, (New Jersey 1930),
pp. 1-10.

ABBREVIATIONS

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Corin | Corin, Fernand, "Steinbeck and Hemingway: A Study in Literary Economy, Part I", <u>Revue des Langues Vivantes</u> , Vol XXIV No 1, (1958) pp.60-75. |
| Halliday, Notes" | Halliday, M.A.K., "Notes on Transitivity in English: Part I", <u>Journal of Linguistics</u> , (April 1967), pp.37-81. |
| Jacobson | Jacobson, Sven, <u>Adverbial Positions in English</u> , (Uppsala 1964). |
| Leech, "This Bread" | Leech, G.N., "'This Bread I Break' Language and Interpretation," <u>A Review of English Literature</u> , Vol VI No 2, (April 1965), pp.66-75. |
| Levant | Levant, H.S., <u>A Critical Study of the Longer Fiction of John Steinbeck</u> , Ph.D. thesis, (Cornell University 1962). |
| Lisca, <u>Wide World</u> | Lisca, Peter, <u>The Wide World of John Steinbeck</u> , (New Jersey 1958). |
| Sinclair, <u>Grammar</u> | Sinclair, J.McH., <u>Grammar</u> , (O.U.P.1965), unpublished. |
| Steinbeck,
"The novel" | "The novel might benefit by the discipline, the terseness of the drama. The drama might achieve increased openness, freedom and versatility....," Stage 15 (January 1938), pp.50-51. |

Contents of Volume I

Introduction		1
Chapter One	George and Lennie are Introduced	33
Chapter Two	George Rails at Lennie	48
Chapter Three	The First Dream Sequence	65
Chapter Four	The Bank House	82
Chapter Five	The Second Dream Sequence	97
Chapter Six	Candy Comes In	117
Chapter Seven	Curley Fights Lennie	134
Chapter Eight	Crooks is Persuaded	153
Chapter Nine	The Death of the Puppy	171
Chapter Ten	Lennie Kills Curley's Wife	188
Chapter Eleven	George Kills Lennie	211
Conclusion		232
Appendix I	Steinbeck's Representation of Spoken English	244
Appendix II	Lennie's Character	253
Bibliography		257

INTRODUCTION

All of us here, however, definitely realise that a linguist deaf to the poetic function of language and a literary scholar indifferent to linguistic problems and unacquainted with linguistic methods are equally flagrant anachronisms.¹

1. AIMS AND ASSUMPTIONS

At the beginning of his review of Style and Stylistics by Enkvist, Gregory and Spencer, David Crystal speaks of three distinct audiences who could use stylistics:

First there are those concerned with the study of language as an end in itself Second, a very important audience, as all three authors emphasise, is the professional literary scholar Thirdly, there is the interest in style shown by scholars in other fields than literary criticism, such as biblical scholars or literary historians.²

My interest falls into the second category, the use and application of stylistics in literary criticism. Most of the work done so far in stylistics has been on fairly short poems. This is understandable, for stylistic analysis is a lengthy business, and it is more practicable and thus most satisfying to do a complete analysis of a text. Moreover, the more obvious deviations from ordinary language take place in poetry, making it a happy hunting ground for the stylistic analyst.

.... poetry is more formal than prose, and thus more suitable for analysis which emphasises linguistic form; poetry is metrical in one way or another, and thus more available to a grammatical description which recognises stress as a significant formal characteristic; and poetry more than prose

has attracted the attention of literary critics who, like linguists, engage in minute examination of their texts. But prose, no less than poetry, is a language act. ³

This thesis is an attempt to analyse a long prose text, partly for its own value, and partly to investigate how useful stylistics can be in the study of longer prose works. The novel studied is Of Mice and Men by John Steinbeck. As the scope of an M.A. thesis is too small to permit analysis of the whole work, two alternative procedures seem possible:

- (i) To isolate a particular device of the author and examine its use throughout the novel. ⁴
- (ii) To examine a number of passages in detail.

The latter method is preferred here, as my main aim is to investigate how the novel develops its themes. ⁵ Eleven passages are chosen, each one for a specific reason.

The main theme of the novel is the attempt of Lennie and George to achieve their dream of a farm of their own. Passages III and V show them talking about their aspirations. Passage II shows a different kind of dream - George's vision of life without Lennie. It is a negation of the values set up and respected in the other dream. Passage I is at the beginning of the novel. We hear Lennie and George speaking for the first time. The first three passages are from the first chapter of the book. This gives us a chance to examine how Steinbeck introduces his characters and builds up "the world of the novel". Passage IV was chosen because it consists entirely of narrative.

Most of the novel is made up of speech, with some narrative interspersed. However each chapter begins with a large block of narrative, and so it was felt necessary to examine onesuch piece of writing. There was a bias towards choosing incidents to study, because they stand as entities in themselves. Passages VI and VIII help make the reader hope that the dream will be realised. VII, X, and XI are incidents which effectively dash those hopes. Passage IX comes just after an incident "offstage". It shows how Lennie's mind works and is integral in the manipulation of our feelings and associations in the passage where Lennie kills Curley's wife.

Describing only selected passages creates a problem of presentation. There must be a method of binding the analyses together into one coherent unit. This is solved by not restricting the arguments used to "pure" stylistics. Three main types of approach are made:
 (a) Stylistic e.g. the fact that George is railing at Lennie and not taking any notice of him in passage II is proved by stylistic evidence, namely an examination of the Sentence Types. ⁶

(b) Practical Criticism. e.g. in chapter V (p.103) of the thesis:

George vouches for Lennie's strength:
 "Lennie ain't no fighter, but Lennie's strong and quick and Lennie don't know no rules". The remark about Lennie not knowing any rules makes the comment particularly menacing. A lack of rules implies a chaotic, uncontrollable quality.

(c) More General Remarks. e.g. the reasons given for the presence of passage V in the novel (pp.103-104):

The book's interest centres around the possibility of Lennie and George achieving their dream. At this point things are becoming very one-sided, and so a revival of hope for the dream is needed.

These three types of argument are necessarily intermingled in order to produce a coherent whole.

That arguments other than stylistics are used needs some justification. It has been received opinion for some time that stylistic analysis is more objective than literary criticism can hope to be. M.A.K. Halliday for example:

There is a crucial difference between the ad hoc, personal and arbitrarily selective statements offered frequently in support of a preformulated literary thesis, as 'textual' or 'linguistic' statements about literature, and an analysis founded on general linguistic theory and descriptive linguistics. 7

There are two claims here, both of which need examination;

- (i) that literary analysis is by its very nature "ad hoc, personal and arbitrarily selective" and
- (ii) that statements founded on general linguistic theory are not.

The claim is often made that literary criticism is always subjective. Sometimes it is, but before condemning the whole discipline it will be wise to examine what subjectivity is. If I do not like carrots it is a subjective opinion, a matter of taste. But "literary judgements are not mere 'matters of taste', like preferring tea or coffee. We can give reasons for our literary opinions and be persuaded, and where we can give reasons we can hope to persuade, and so approach

a just conclusion." 8

Reason-based judgements cannot be purely subjective, though they can be wrong, or partly wrong, or (in the case of interpretation) one of a number of possible conclusions. Nor can we say that arguments based on linguistic techniques have some sort of absolute truth:

There are decisions of selection and presentation and arrangement which one makes subjectively, involving one's response to the text as a whole. Each fact thrown up by the analysis is considered, evaluated if you like, according to the following criterion: What contribution does this fact make to the meaning, impression, value, etc. of the total poem? Answers are always tentative. Often one mistakenly sets aside features which are of the utmost importance. Sometimes a minor feature gets far too much attention, particularly if it is difficult to explain. These mistakes arise from failures in critical awareness of the linguist and are not the fault of the linguistics. 9

That many people using stylistics can come to different conclusions as to the interpretation of texts can be seen in S.B.Greenfield's attack on S.R. Levin (among others), where he accuses him of "descriptive inaccuracy".¹⁰ Linguists can be wrong, and they can also be partly right, - that is if the aim is to describe a text completely. They may miss things out which are important, or produce only one interpretation where more are possible:

A grammatical analysis of a sentence is not a metalinguistic statement of its meaning. But presumably a difference in the analysis of one sentence and another, or of the same sentence by different people,

reflects a difference in meaning. This is why the study of a grammar that someone else has provided for a poem may throw light on possible meanings in it which would otherwise have escaped me. ¹¹

Thus it does not seem that either of the two claims (i) that literary analysis is entirely subjective or (ii) that stylistic analysis is entirely objective are true. Does stylistics have a use then? The answer to this lies in seeing objectivity and subjectivity as contraries rather than absolutes. The more detailed and well worked out an argument is, the more objective it will be. Stylistics, because it is based on systematic linguistic description and has a vocabulary for describing the language in detail thus becomes a very useful tool for the literary critic.

My aim as a critic is to show how the text affects the reader - to show what information he obtains and how his reactions are moulded. This involves a detailed and complete analysis, and stylistics helps achieve this aim. But it is only syntactic analysis which has been really well developed in linguistics so far, and the knowledge we gain from a text depends a great deal on its lexical and semantic properties. It is in this region that practical criticism and more general arguments are of use. ¹² Not to use such types of argument to make a point about what is "going on" in a text would be a critical solipsism.

The critic tacitly claims to be representative in his reaction, and often surely, he is. The linguist makes the same sort of recourse to 'unmeasured meaning'

when he talks of collocational clashes for example. He assumes a knowledge of the distribution of the lexical items involved which is certainly public and verified by one's intuitions, but which is not measured in any scientific manner.¹³ This is not to say that the assumption is subjective or a matter of taste.

Another argument for the inclusion of judgements based on evidence other than stylistic is that linguistics may not be able to cope with some of the things which we want to say about literary texts. Talking of Michael Riffaterre, W.O. Hendriks says:

He (Riffaterre) thinks it reasonable to assume that the poem may contain certain structures that play no part in its function and effect as a literary work of art, and that there may be no way for structural linguistics to distinguish between these unmarked structures and those that are literarily active. ¹⁴

This claim has not yet been substantiated, but it should be borne in mind as a possibility. Similarly, information conveyed in a linguistically unmarked manner may be important in the development of a long text. P.K. Saha quotes an interesting example:

.... in "On Baile's Strand" (Yeats, Collected plays, p.179) when Cuchulain picks up a handful of feathers to wipe his son's blood from his sword, the Fool says, "He has taken my feathers to wipe his sword". Stylistically this remark is of no great significance, but symbolically it is among the most important utterances in the play. The feathers came

from the fowl stolen by the Fool and symbolize, therefore, the baser side of human nature which is partially responsible for the tragedy symbolized by the blood. The Fool's remark helps us to forge a symbolic link between his world and Cuchulain's. ¹⁵

It is difficult to see how structural analysis alone would be able to bring out this point. One can use syntactic analysis to back up a point, but just producing a linguistic analysis of the sentences of the text will not do the trick. Riffaterre himself says: "No grammatical analysis of a poem can give us more than a grammatical analysis of the poem". ¹⁶

This is not strictly true, as a grammatical analysis can help one solve problems of meaning, indicate the nature of ambiguities etc. The grammar is, after all, part of "what goes on" in the poem. But much of stylistics must be involved in relating linguistic fact to the total meaning of the poem. This can be seen easily with the notion of foregrounding, which has been seen to be very important in the explanation of one's perception of a literary work of art. The idea is that a deviation from a linguistic norm is perceived by the reader as being potentially important. ¹⁷ The term 'foregrounding' is arrived at from an analogy with foregrounding in painting, where a foregrounded element is that which is "in the most conspicuous position" (O.E.D.). ¹⁸ To put a lexical item in an unusual position foregrounds it. But it is not enough just to notice this. Two things are necessary: (a) to interpret the phrase i.e. say what it means, and (b) to fit the

phrase with its interpretation into an interpretation of the text as a whole:

For the purpose of ordinary linguistic communication, it is justifiable to define 'intelligibility' as conformity to the linguistic code. A foregrounded feature, as an infringement of the code, is by this standard 'unintelligible' - indeed, it can be a positive disruption of the normal communicative process. From the linguistic point of view, literary interpretation can be seen as a negative process: a coming to terms with what otherwise would have to be dismissed as an unmotivated aberration - a linguistic 'mistake' We are thus invited to think of the foregrounded aspects of a poem as so many question marks, to which the reader, as interpreter, consciously or unconsciously attempts to find answers. The interpretation of the whole poem is built up from a consistency in the interpretation of individual features. 19

The noting of foregrounded features can be called linguistic fact. But the assignment of the interpretation cannot be objective in some Martian way, only reason-based in the same way that good literary interpretations are. Thus stylistic analysis is not objective in some peculiar way that literary criticism can never be. But arguments using stylistics can be more objective because the hypothesis put forward can be checked at a greater level of detail and because the evidence is based on observable and well-founded linguistic analysis. Over and above this, stylistics is important to the literary critic because it shows in detail what is happening in a text. This is an obvious but important point, and should not be overlooked just because it is not problematic and so does not get much discussion here.

Stylistics is also important because it puts greater weight on linguistic features in much the same way that the Medieval books on the 'figures of rhetoric' did.²⁰ There are two main ways to examine and interpret a text:

- (i) The examination of the reader's reaction to the text.²¹ This is the approach usually associated with the literary critic. The critic attempts to back up his 'intuitive' response with evidence from the text.
- (ii) The examination of overt devices and abnormalities in the text, followed by an attempt to explain how and why the particular features are incorporated into the work. This approach corresponds roughly to G.N. Leech's remarks on foregrounding and interpretation above. It is a very important and a good methodological way into a text which often throws up features missed by the first method. I use this approach in my analysis even though the thesis is not systematically presented as if this was so.

The above considerations prompt the kind of analysis undertaken in the body of this thesis. The literary interpretation is based on a syntactic analysis, and arguments which can be called 'stylistic' are used wherever possible because they add the greatest weight and because the analyses are considered as valuable in themselves. The text is not considered exclusively from the syntactic end however. One of the aims of the thesis is to show how the language of Of Mice and Men affects the reader. So hypotheses are put forward which

are based on a reading of a text and which are then backed up by arguments of all three types proposed earlier, stylistic evidence being used wherever possible.

2. THE TEXT AND ITS CRITICS

Of Mice and Men was first published in 1937. All page references to the text are from the Random House Modern Library edition of that year. Steinbeck's reputation was beginning to grow in the middle thirties, and Of Mice and Men finally brought him popular acclaim. "It appeared on best-seller lists, was a Book-of-the-Month-Club selection, and was sold to Hollywood".²² But despite its popular success it received a mixed reception from the critics. G.D. Snell called it: "... a negligible novel, seemingly written with a determined eye on the cash register".²³ And Steinbeck himself was dissatisfied:

The book Of Mice and Men was an experiment and, in what it set out to do, it was a failure Simply stated, Of Mice and Men was an attempt to write a novel that could be played from the lines, or a play that could be read It was a failure because it wouldn't play²⁴

Even so, the play version opened on November 23rd 1937 in New York and was received very well, winning the Drama Critics Circle Award for that year. H.T. Moore²⁵ tells us that the final stage form took 85% of its lines directly from the novel. That this was possible shows that the experiment was not so much a failure as Steinbeck thought. His accurate representation of natural speech²⁶ meant that the characters' lines

would not have to be 'doctored' to sound right.

The novel is like a play in other respects. It is divided into six "scenes" which have a fixed location. There are no scene changes within chapters. Each chapter begins with a piece of narrative which sets the atmosphere for the scene. This makes it structurally similar to plays by George Bernard Shaw, especially when we notice that elsewhere in the novel narrative is cut to a minimum.²⁷ The narrative itself is noticeably simple in structure. There is a conspicuous lack of complicated constructions; the favourite sentence structure by far is a number of Free clauses joined by a coordinating linker. The nominal groups are also relatively simple, with very little modification or qualification.²⁸ The overall effect is to give the impression that the narrative is objective, that truths are being stated. The author never intervenes.

This style is a product of Steinbeck's experiment. He was not just trying to write a play/novel. His theory was that the new form would have certain advantages:

.... the novel itself would be interfered with by such a method in only one way, and that is that it would be short. Actually the discipline, the necessity of sticking to the theme (in fact of knowing what the theme is), the brevity and necessity of holding an audience could influence the novel only for the better. In a play, sloppy writing is impossible, for an audience will not sit through it. ²⁹

The generally uncomplicated nature of the novel can be seen to be a direct result of this theory. There

is only one central theme running through the novel. There are no sub-plots and no authorial discussions or moral points. The reader has a scene set for him and then just watches the characters. He must extract the moral for himself. The original title for the novel was Something That Happened, which adequately sums up the relationship between reader and text. One witnesses a series of events and nothing more.

There is general critical agreement as to what the main theme of the novel is. Steinbeck himself made a good summary of it in a letter to Ben Abramson when he said, "... it's a study of the dreams and pleasures of everyone in the world".³⁰ We see the two main characters, Lennie and George trying to realise their dream of a farm of their own. They fail to manage because they cannot control events. Lester J. Marks sums up the situation adequately in the form of a comparison with Macⁱⁿ In Dubious Battle:

Both George and Mac want to believe that they control the great primordial forces with which their fates are bound; for only if they do control them can they make progress towards their dream worlds As we have seen, the carefully laid plans of Mac and George get nowhere because the forces they would manipulate are as unpredictable and uncontrollable as Nature itself³¹

The main points of critical disagreement are over (i) interpretations of particular elements which go to make up the main theme, and (ii) whether or not Of Mice and Men is a successful novel (which depends

partly on the conclusions under (i)).

There is a third area of disagreement which can be discussed first in order to clear the ground for the more important discussion mentioned above. If we say, like Steinbeck, that the novel is a study of the dreams and pleasures of everyone, we make a generalisation from the text. But critics also produce readings which are less directly related to the text. The various possible readings of Of Mice and Men are efficiently summarised by Peter Lisca:

There is the obvious story level on a realistic plane, with its shocking climax. There is also the level of social protest, Steinbeck the reformer crying out against the exploitation of migrant workers. The third level is an allegorical one, its interpretation limited only by the ingenuity of the audience. It could be, as Carlos Baker suggests, "an allegory of Mind and Body". Using the same kind of dichotomy, the story could also be about the dumb, clumsy, but strong mass of humanity and its shrewd manipulators. This would make the book a more abstract treatment of the two forces of In Dubious Battle - the mob and its leaders. The dichotomy could also be that of the unconscious and the conscious, the id and the ego, or any other forces or qualities which have the same structural relationship to each other that do Lennie and George. It is interesting in this connection that the name Leonard means "strong or brave as a lion" and that the name George means "husbandman". 32

Lisca's first or "realistic" level would include the sort of reading that Steinbeck made. The level of "social protest" is a more dubious hypothesis. It is certainly the case that the migrant workers in the novel

are not well off. This is a necessary condition of the portrayal of their dream. The dream world must have a real and less attractive world to contrast with. But the idea of the workers being exploited is not stressed at all in the novel. It seems that the critic has taken a general feature of Steinbeck's work and tried to force it on to Of Mice and Men. Because Steinbeck is famous for his writings about social injustices, it does not mean that he writes about them to the exclusion of everything else. One can say that the workers live in uninspiring conditions in Of Mice and Men, but it is not a protest novel in the same way that The Grapes of Wrath is for instance.

The third level that Lisca talks of is that of allegory. It is difficult to see if he accepts or rejects the sort of interpretation that Baker suggests. As he says, allegorical interpretation is limited only by the ingenuity of the interpreter. If you try hard enough you can make almost any work allegorical. There are no stylistic pointers in Of Mice and Men which force us into this kind of interpretation. The novel is explicable without recourse to this kind of procedure. But Lisca seems to qualify what is a just position when he says, "It is interesting in this connection that the name Leonard means "strong or brave as a lion" and that the name George means "husbandman".³³ These names are just as interesting on the story level itself in that they are appropriate to the roles of the two characters. They do not force us towards an allegorical study any

more than anything else in the novel. An allegorical interpretation is only helpful if it leads us to a better understanding of the novel, and I agree with H.S. Levant when he says, "I do not feel that clarity is gained if the novel is read as an allegory".³⁴

It now remains to discuss the interpretation of Of Mice and Men on what Lisca calls the realistic plane. It is the story of two rootless working men and their dream of having a farm of their own. Lennie, the simpleton, obviously depends upon George for his existence. It is George that looks after him. Some have called Lennie an idiot. E. Wagenacht referred to Of Mice and Men as "a glorification of idiocy"³⁵ Lennie is certainly simple-minded and childlike in his actions. The development of his characterisation will be discussed in the course of the analysis. But George also needs Lennie. Critics have spent some time discussing this. Burton Rascoe thought it perfectly natural for a more capable man to want to look after a less fortunate one:

George has toward Lennie the tenderness and the protective instinct which some of the most hard-bitten and most hard-boiled have toward the helpless, the maimed, the dependent.³⁶

This explanation is certainly credible, but does not give the complete answer. F.W. Watt thinks that George gains something from Lennie, though he never says what: "It is the reciprocal nature of the relationship between Lennie and George that rescues it from sentimentality and makes it convincing".³⁷ Peter Lisca also provides an

explanation of the relationship:

.... to some extent George needs Lennie as a rationalization for his failure. This is one of the reasons why, after the body of Curley's wife is discovered, George refuses Candy's offer of a partnership which would make the dream a reality and says to him, "I'll work my month an' I'll take my fifty bucks an' I'll stay all night in some lousy cat house. Or I'll set in some poolroom till ever'body goes home. An' then I'll come back an' work another month an' I'll have fifty bucks more". The dream of the farm originates with Lennie and it is only through Lennie, who also makes the dream impossible, that the dream has any meaning for George. An understanding of this dual relationship will do much to mitigate the frequent charge that Steinbeck's depiction of George's attachment is concocted of pure sentimentality. At the end of the novel, George's going off with Slim to "do the town" is more than an escape from grief. It is an ironic and symbolic twist to his dream. 38

This theory also seems to be partly true. Although George does not seem to want the "fifty bucks" life at the end, there are occasions when he does. In the second passage discussed in this thesis George puts forward a dream of what life would be without Lennie. He seems to want this dream as much as the farm with Lennie. This problem will be discussed in chapter II.

The main critical division over Of Mice and Men is concerned with its highly patterned effect. Lennie is so strong that he kills small animals without realising what he is doing. He is also attracted to pretty girls. We know these facts from the very

beginning of the novel. In the first passage discussed we learn that Lennie and George have just run away from their previous job because Lennie got into trouble with a girl in a red dress. It soon becomes obvious that George must control Lennie's strength if the dream is to be achieved. When Curley's wife enters the drama it is immediately apparent that Lennie will kill her and ruin their aspirations.

.... Lennie's killing of mice and later his killing of the puppy set up a motif of action, a pattern, which the reader expects to be carried out again. ³⁹

.... foreshadowing is overworked to the extent that it tends to increase the simplification of the materials. Lennie's murder of Curley's wife is the catastrophe that George has been dreading from the start. ⁴⁰

Certainly the foreshadowing is there. The question is whether or not it is successful. Because of it, we, like George, dread the coming of Curley's wife. But the novel does not just consist of a one-way trend towards disaster. Peter Lisca says:

Although the three motifs of symbol, action, and language build up a strong pattern of inevitability, the movement is not unbroken. About midway in the novel (chapters 3 and 4) there is set up a countermovement which seems to threaten the pattern. Up to this point the dream of "a house an' a couple of acres" seemed impossible of realization. Now it develops that George has an actual farm in mind (ten acres), knows the owners and why they want to sell it:

"The ol' people that owns it is flat bust an' the ol' lady needs an operation". He even knows the price - "six hundred dollars". Also, the old workman, Candy, is willing to buy a share in the dream with the three hundred dollars he has saved up. It appears that at the end of the month George and Lennie will have another hundred dollars and that quite possibly they "could swing her for that". In the following chapter this dream and its possibilities are further explored through Lennie's visit with Crooks, the power of the dream manifesting itself in Crook's conversion from cynicism to optimism. But at the very height of his conversion the mice symbol reappears in the form of Curley's wife, who threatens the dream by bringing with her the harsh realities of the outside world and by arousing Lennie's interest.

The function of Candy's and Crook's interest and the sudden bringing of the dream within reasonable possibility is to interrupt, momentarily, the pattern of inevitability. But, and this is very important, Steinbeck handles this interruption so that it does not actually reverse the situation. Rather, it insinuates a possibility. 41

Lisca's analysis seems perfectly just. The appropriate passages (VI, VII, and IX) will be analysed to help support his conclusions. This countermovement helps save the novel from becoming too mechanical. It does not make us think that the situation has been reversed, but it does arouse in us the hope that the inevitable will not happen. It is this hope that makes the latter part of the novel such compelling reading.

3. THE SYNTACTIC ANALYSIS

The grammar used is stratificational in type and is based on Grammar by J. McH. Sinclair.⁴² There is a great deal of speech in Of Mice and Men, and so the description used must be able to cope with "transcriptions" of speech as much as with formal written prose. The grammatical analysis of the passages can be found in tabular form in volume II. Interesting or difficult points are discussed in the notes following the analysis for each passage.

There is a difficulty in treating texts where narrative and speech are mixed. What one has, in effect, are sentences of speech written within sentences of narrative along with sentences purely of narrative or speech:

He said gently, "George I ain't got mine. I musta lost it".

(Passage I, sentences 15 and 16) ⁴³

Although "George I ain't got mine". is part of 15, it is also of the same status as 16 - that is, it is a sentence which Lennie utters. In order to treat these two phenomena alike each passage is divided into two texts, a narrative and speech text. The sentences of each passage are numbered 1, 2,, n. In the numbering, sentences are defined as those lengths of discourse between full stops or equivalent punctuation marks, so that "He said gently, "George I ain't got mine"." is numbered as one sentence, not two.

In the grammatical tables the two texts are placed side by side so that the interaction between narrative and speech can be seen.

The Sentence Structure Tables

Each sentence is assigned a contextual Sentence Type (ST),⁴⁴ which can be located in the ST column.

There are four main Sentence Types:

- (i) Statement (S) eg. "Lennie's face broke into a delighted smile". (I,6)
- (ii) Command (C) eg. "Give it here". (I,45)
- (iii) Question (Q) eg. "What'd you take outa that pocket?" (I,25)
- (iv) Response (R) eg. "Why sure, George". (I,7)

However not all of the sentences of the text fit into these four types, and so two further categories are introduced:

- (v) Exclamation (E). This is introduced to cope with sentences like "The hell with the rabbits". (I,1) and "O.K." (I,3) 45
- (vi) Completives (Y). In passage III among others Lennie breaks in on what George is saying and completes his sentence for him:

"O.K. Someday - we're gonna get the jack together and we're gonna have a little house and a couple of acres an' a cow and some pigs and -"
"An' live off the fatta the lan'", Lennie shouted. (III,23,24)

"An' live off the fatta the lan'" is analysed as a Completive. Its function is to do just that - complete another sentence.

Although the Sentence Types are generally mutually exclusive, there do seem to be occasions when the functions overlap. Statements sometimes also perform a response function or have exclamatory overtones for example. Such

mixings often correlate with the presence of an exclamatory or response Adjunct eg.

- (a) "Hell, I seen too many guys". (VIII,13)
and (b) "Well, it's ten acres". (V,14)

These two are labelled S^e and S^r respectively to indicate their dual function.

"George?" (V,2) is labelled E^q . It is merely an attempt by Lennie to gain George's attention, and because of this is labelled as E. We can tell the function of the sentence from its context. The preceding narrative sentence, "Lennie drummed on the table with his fingers". (V,1) also shows Lennie trying to get George's attention. The q superscript is added because of the question mark indicating the intonation contour of the sentence.

Sentences containing both narrative and speech Clauses are called mixed sentences. Often the narrative clause of a mixed sentence tends towards being lexically empty eg. "He said", "said George" etc. which are really just markers to remind the reader who is speaking. It is a device to avoid confusion. Because such narrative clauses are obviously not on a lexical par with the rest of the sentences of the text they are not assigned a Sentence Type. But where the narrative clause or clauses are fuller lexically they are given one. Thus "He said patiently, "I like 'em with ketchup". (II,3) is noted to be of SS type.

Each sentence is analysed in terms of the clauses which go to make up that sentence. Clauses are of two main types, Free (F) and Bound (B), exemplified in:

"We can make some money on them rabbits /
 $\begin{matrix} F \\ \text{if we go about it right} \end{matrix}$ ". (VIII,5)
 $\begin{matrix} B \end{matrix}$

The clauses are written in the Exponent columns, and the clause type in the corresponding space in the SS column which separates the two Exponent columns of the particular text. The third SS column gives the structure of the whole sentence. The co-ordinating clausal linkers "and" and "but" are shown by '&' at this level as well as the next. This accounts for the intuitive feeling that such linkers are less firmly attached to the clause they belong to than subordinating linkers. A discussion of the way Steinbeck uses the "and" linker will constitute part of the thesis, and noting them in this manner makes them easier to count.

Quote structures are indicated by '"', as in ".... we can say, "Get the hell out"...."(part of V,61) which is noted as FF".

A third clause is posited tentatively, which we shall call a Mid-clause because its status is midway between that of a Free and a Bound clause. An example would be the last two clauses in "I remember some girls come by and you says you say" (I,9). Although they are strictly subordinated to "I remember" they assume an independence uncharacteristic of Bound clauses partly because of the distance between them and the clause they are subordinated to, and partly because of the hesitation in delivery signalled by the orthography. Thus they represent a trend towards simplicity of linguistic expression. Mid-clauses are recorded in the Exponent of B column and are labelled as M. As there are only a few of them, it was not considered worthwhile to devote a whole column of the table to them.

The Clause Structure Tables

The text division into narrative and speech is kept at this level. The structure of the clauses can be seen under the three columns Free, Bound and R/S.⁴⁶

The following elements are recognised at clause level:

- (i) Subject (S). This category will include the dummy Subject as illustrated in, "There's enough beans for four men" (II,1), which is analysed as SPCⁱ.
- (ii) Predicator (P). A distinction is made here between a predicator followed by an Adjunct (exemplified in "He left after three o'clock") and a phrasal verb (as in ".... I got you to look after me" (part of I,14)). Prepositional verbs are recognised in the following way:

1. Prepositional type. The main criterion is the immobility of the preposition. One cannot say "For a book he looked". It is also difficult (though not always impossible by any means) to insert an adverb between verb and preposition.

2. Adverbial type. (a) where P is intransitive. Again the criterion of mobility is used. One cannot say "On he held".

(b) where P is transitive. The criterion here is privilege of occurrence. If the object of the verb has a noun head then the order SPAC^e is possible as well as SPC^eA, as in "He looked up the reference".

- (iii) Complement (C). The Complement is further subdivided into two categories, intensive Complement (Cⁱ) and extensive Complement (C^e). Broadly speaking, an intensive Complement refers to the same thing as the

Subject of the clause as in "She is nice". An extensive Complement refers to something other than the Subject, as in "John hit Mary".

(iv) An element which is the Complement of its own clause and also the Subject of what follows^(S/C), as in ".... I got you to look after me" (part of I,14).

(v) Vocative (Voc).

(vi) A Z element which is a nominal group present in a clause which is neither S, C, or C/S.

(vii) Adjunct^(A). This class includes adverbs, adverbial phrases and phrases like "Go on" and "Come on" when they are used in their more colloquial senses eg. "Go on George" (III,26) where Lennie is not telling George to go somewhere, but to continue with what he was saying.

Elements which occur within other clause elements appear after the element it is within and inside square brackets ([]). Tag structures have an appropriate superscript if they refer back to a previous element in the clause. For example, "Everybody wants a little bit of land, not much". (VIII,28) is analysed as SPC².

Groups

The third table is a list of nominal, verbal, and adverbial groups of each passage. The distinction between the narrative and speech texts is dropped at this point for simplicity's sake.

Members of different groups but of the same clause are put on the same line. Rankshifted nominal groups are put in round brackets. Rankshifted clauses are

repeated on a separate line after the clause they appear in, and are placed between square brackets ([]).

Group Structure

In this table all those items belonging to one "speaker" (including the narrative) are grouped together. The columns represent the six different functions of the nominal group in the passage - as S, C, Voc, Z, A, and R/S. A separate line is given to each clause, and groups belonging to the same clause appear on the same line. The structure of each group appears after it.

The following modifying positions are recognised in the nominal group:

- (i) Pre-deictic (x) eg. "Only the dog".
- (ii) Deictic (d). There are two types of deictic, both exemplified in "one of/the/two boys".
- (iii) Numerals (o) eg. "the two boys".
- (iv) Noun modifiers (n), as in "the brick wall".
- (v) Adjectives (e) eg. "the red wall".
- (vi) Sub-modifiers of adjectives (v) eg. "the very nice man".

The qualifying positions are filled by rankshifted clauses as in "the house that Jack built" (dhq(CSP)); or by prepositional phrases as in "the nature of my fear" (dhq(pc(dh))). In this last example "q" represents the entire qualification of the headword, "p" stands for "preposition" and "c" for "complement". (dh) is then the structure of the complement.

NOTES

1. Roman Jakobson, "Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics", Style and Language, ed. Thomas A. Sebeck, (Cambridge, Mass. 1960), p. 377.
2. Journal of Linguistics, Vol I No 1, (April 1965), pp. 173-179.
3. W.F. Bolton, "Structural Criticism: An Application to Literary Prose", Archivum Linguisticum, Vol 16 Fascicule 2, (1964), pp. 89-95.
4. Some work has been done on these lines. See Michael Gregory, "Speech in 'A Tale of Two Cities'", Review of English Literature, Vol VI No 2, (April 1965), pp. 42-55; and Charles Jones, "Varieties of Speech Presentation in Conrad's 'The Secret Agent'", Lingua, Vol 20 No 2, (August 1968), pp. 162-176.
5. Steinbeck himself thought the themes of the novel were important. In "The novel might benefit by the discipline, the terseness of the drama. The drama might achieve increased openness, freedom and versatility", Stage 15, (January 1938), pp. 50-51, he talks of, ".... the necessity of sticking to the theme (in fact of knowing what the theme is)"
6. The notion of Sentence Types will be discussed later in this introduction.
7. "The Linguistic Study of Literary Texts", Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists, ed. H.C. Lunt, (The Hague 1964), pp. 302-307.
8. G. Hough, An Essay on Criticism, (London 1966), p. 3. For the same point on aesthetic judgements in general see F.N. Sibley, (a) "Aesthetic Concepts", Philosophical Review, Vol LXVII (1959), pp. 421-450; and (b) "Aesthetic and Non-aesthetic", Philosophical Review, LXXIV, (1965), pp. 135-159.
9. J. McN. Sinclair, "A Technique of Stylistic Description", Language and Style, Vol 1 No 4, (Fall 1968), pp. 215-242.
10. "Grammar and Meaning in Poetry", PMLA Vol LXXX No 5, (October 1965), pp. 377-387.

11. J.P. Thorne, "Stylistics and Generative Grammars", Journal of Linguistics, Vol I No 1, (April 1965), pp.49-59.
12. "The attractiveness of a grammatical approach to the analysis of poetry is probably due in part to the relatively well-developed state of theory and analytic techniques in this area, in contrast to the relative absence of any sort of theoretical foundation for semantic analysis. Nevertheless, it is possible to carry out ad hoc lexical analyses of individual texts, perhaps based on some sort of loosely formulated 'theory'. For example, underlying Riffaterre's study of "Les Chats" is some sort of 'contextual' theory of meaning. Other lexically orientated analyses have been in terms of 'collocations' (or ' collocational clash')." W.O. Hendriks, "Three Models for the Description of Poetry", Journal of Linguistics, Vol 5 No 1, (April 1969), pp.1-22.
13. Some work has been done in this direction, but only the bare bones of the methodology has been published so far. Two important articles can be found in In Memory of J.R. Firth, ed.C. Bazell, (London 1966): M.A.K. Halliday, "Lexis as a Linguistic Level", pp.148-162; and J.McH. Sinclair, "Beginning the Study of Lexis", pp.410-430.
14. W.O.Hendriks, "Three Models for the Description of Poetry", Journal of Linguistics, Vol 5 No 1, (April 1969), pp.1-22.
15. Footnote 7 from "A Linguistic Approach to Style", Style, Vol 2 No 1, (Winter 1968), pp.7-31.
16. M. Riffaterre, "Describing Poetic Structures: Two Approaches to Daudelaire's 'Les Chats'", Yale French Studies, 36/37, pp.200-242.
17. There does seem to be a danger that stylistic analysts will talk of deviations and nothing else. The words of Rene Wellek have an admirable sobering effect here: "I want to return to the notion of literature viewed in terms of deviations - style as a degree of ungrammaticalness. Stylistics thus becomes a kind of counter-grammar. Is this not a tautology? It seems to me that it leads to

- an extraordinary emphasis on pure innovation, or tricks, or something that has not been established in the language. I don't think "deviation" can be accepted as an official definition of style and stylistics". From "Comments to Part Three", Style and Language, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok, (Cambridge Mass. 1960), pp.98-105.
18. The notion of foregrounding was introduced by the Czech School of linguists. For their formulation see Bohuslav Havranek, "The Functional Differentiation of Standard Language", pp.3-16; and Jan Mukarovsky, "Standard Language and Poetic Language", pp.17-30; both in A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style, selected and translated by Paul L. Garvin, (Washington D.C. 1964). More recent formulations of the notion by G.N. Leech can be found in (a) Linguistics and the Figures of Rhetoric, Essays on Style and Language, ed. Roger Fowler, (London 1964), pp.135-156; (b) "'This Bread I Break' - Language and Interpretation", A Review of English Literature, Vol VI No 2 (April 1965) pp.66-75; and (c) Chapters 2 and 4 of A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry, (London 1969).
 19. G.N. Leech, "This Bread".
 20. The formulation of G.N. Leech's little book A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry, (London 1969) is interesting here. Much of it is concerned with taking well-known poetic devices and explaining how they work in the light of modern linguistics.
 21. This would include the views of other critics and the author's intentions. All these can be verified by recourse to the text to see if the opinions are just. To examine the author's intention and check it against the text is not to commit the Intentional Fallacy.
 22. Peter Lisca, The Wide World of John Steinbeck, (New Jersey, 1958), p.142.
 23. The Shapers of American Fiction, (New York 1947), p.193.
 24. "The novel", p.50.

25. The Novels of John Steinbeck, (Chicago 1939).
26. See appendix I for a discussion of the speech representation of the novel.
27. Steinbeck also noticed the similarity. He refers to Bernard Shaw's plays in the Stage article.
28. See the Group Structure tables in Vol.2.
29. "The novel, p.51.
30. This letter was almost certainly written sometime in September 1936.
31. A Study of Thematic Continuity in the Novels of John Steinbeck, (Syracuse University Ph.D.1961), p.76.
32. Wide World, pp.138-139.
33. See previous quotation.
34. A Critical Study of the Longer Fiction of John Steinbeck, (Cornell University Ph.D.1962) p.276.
35. Cavalcade of the American Novel, (New York 1952), p.448.
36. "John Steinbeck", The English Journal, Vol.XXVII, (March 1938), p.208.
37. Steinbeck, (London 1962, reprinted 1966), p.61.
38. Wide World, pp.141-142.
39. Peter Lisca, The Art of John Steinbeck: An Analysis and Interpretation of its Development, (University of Wisconsin Ph.D. 1955), p.184.
40. H.S. Levant, A Critical Study, p. 215.
41. Wide World, pp. 137-138.
42. Number 3 in a series entitled "A Course in Spoken English", (O.U.P.1965).
43. Henceforth the passages will be numbered with Roman numerals, and the sentences of the passages with Arabic. Thus the above quotation, if it appears again in the thesis, will be numbered (I,15,16).

44. For a discussion of Sentence Types see J. McH. Sinclair, Grammar, p.1.
45. In context this is obviously not a Response. There is nothing for George to respond to. It may be argued that there is no such thing as an Exclamation ST, that one merely puts an exclamatory intonation pattern on Statements for example. But it would seem unjust to class "O.K." above as a Statement.
46. "R/S" stands for "rankshifted". A rankshifted clause is one that doesn't operate at sentence level. An example would be "that Jack built" in the Noun Phrase "the house that Jack built", where the clause is acting as a qualifier to the headword "house".

7. THE STORY (pgs. 13-15)

"The hell with the rabbits. (1) That's all you can remember is them rabbits. (2) U.S. (3) The you know and this time you got to remember me as I'm 'n' in trouble. (4) The remember again' in that corner on Howard Street and watchin' that blackhead? (5)"

Lennie's face broke into a delighted grin. (6) "My name, George. (7) I remember that (8) That's all as the- (9) I remember some girls come to and you say" **CHAPTER ONE**

"The hell with that I say. (10) You remember when we went to the beach? (11) That's all you can remember is them rabbits and the beach. (12) U.S. (13) The you know and this time you got to remember me as I'm 'n' in trouble. (14) The remember again' in that corner on Howard Street and watchin' that blackhead? (15)"

GEORGE AND LENNIE ARE INTRODUCED.

"Oh, name, George. (16) I remember that name. (17) The hands went down. (18) The side went down. (19) He said gently, 'George I ain't got him. (20) I don't want it. (21)' He looked down at the ground. (22) (23)"

"You know how hard it is, you know. (24) I was told as 'we helpin' him. (25) I'd let you carry him and look after him. (26)"

Lennie said with relief. (27) "I I thought I'd be as good as dead. (28) The hands went down. (29) The pocket went down. (30)"

George looked down at him. (31) "What's your name?"

"Lennie. (32) I'm Lennie. (33) I'm Lennie. (34) I'm Lennie. (35)"

"I know your name. (36) The hands went down. (37) The pocket went down. (38)"

"I ain't got him. (39) I don't want it. (40) I don't want it. (41)"

"The hands went down. (42) The pocket went down. (43)"

"The hands went down. (44) The pocket went down. (45)"

"The hands went down. (46) The pocket went down. (47)"

"The hands went down. (48) The pocket went down. (49)"

"The hands went down. (50) The pocket went down. (51)"

"The hands went down. (52) The pocket went down. (53)"

"The hands went down. (54) The pocket went down. (55)"

1. THE TEXT (pp.13-15)

"The hell with the rabbits.(1) That's all you ever can remember is them rabbits.(2) O.K.(3) Now you listen and this time you got to remember so we don't get in no trouble.(4) You remember settin' in that gutter on Howard Street and watchin' that blackboard?(5)"

Lennie's face broke into a delighted smile.(6)
"Why sure, George.(7) I remember that but what'd we do then?(8) I remember some girls come by and you says you say(9)"

"The hell with what I says.(10) You remember about us goin' into Murray and Ready's, and they give us work cards and bus tickets?(11)"

"Oh, sure, George.(12) I remember that now.(13)"
His hands went quickly into his side coat pockets.(14)
He said gently, "George I ain't got mine.(15) I musta lost it.(16)" He looked down at the ground in despair.(17)

"You never had none, you crazy bastard.(18) I got both of 'em here.(19) Think I'd let you carry your own work card?(20)

Lennie grinned with relief.(21) "I I thought I put it in my side pocket.(22)" His hand went into the pocket again.(23)

George looked sharply at him.(24) "What'd you take outa that pocket?(25)

"Ain't a thing in my pocket," Lennie said cleverly.(26)

"I know there ain't.(27) You got it in your hand.(28) What you got in your hand - hidin' it?(29)"

"I ain't got nothin', George.(30) Honest.(31)"

"Come on, give it here.(32)"

Lennie held his closed hand away from George's direction.(33) "It's on'y a mouse, George.(34)"

"A mouse?(35) A live mouse?(36)

"Uh-uh.(37) Jus' a dead mouse, George.(38) I didn't kill it.(39) Honest!(40) I found it.(41) I found it dead.(42)

"Give it here!" said George.(43)

"Aw, leave me have it, George.(44)"

"Give it here!(45)"

Lennie's closed hand slowly obeyed.(46) George took the mouse and threw it across the pool to the other side, among the brush.(47)

2. THE ANALYSIS

This first passage is from near the beginning of the novel. It forms a unit in the sense that it contains an altercation between Lennie and George which is resolved in George's favour. This is the first time that we see Lennie and George, and the passage is important in introducing them and their relationship. All the critics of Of Mice and Men agree that Lennie is simple and that George looks after him and, for the most part, controls him. This examination is an attempt to show how Steinbeck puts over these important features of the novel.

Lennie and George are working men. We know this not just from the fact that they are travelling to work on a ranch, but also from the language that they use.¹ Firstly, Steinbeck uses normal writing conventions to indicate the sub-standard pronunciation associated with the working classes. The 'g' is missing from words ending in '-ing', as in "watchin'"(5), and goin'"(11). Auxiliaries and prepositions are often run into the words that they follow. Thus "must have" becomes "musta"(16), and "out of" is written as "outs"(25). In "settin'"(5) there is a change in the root syllable vowel which parallels the way tenses are changed in strong verbs. Strong verbs are dying out, but they seem to be finding a resting place in sub-standard American speech. H.L. Mencken says, "In recent years the old strong verbs have shown a marked tendency to take refuse in the vulgar speech".² The double negative, so frowned

upon in "nice" circles is seen in "You never had none, you crazy bastard".(18) The choice of a taboo vocative also helps to delimit the social context. Grammatically the transcription of sub-standard usage can be seen in the lack of concord in "is them rabbits"(2), "some girls come by"(9), and in the mis-selection of "give" instead of "gave" in sentence 11. There are a number of shortened forms syntactically like "You remember"(4) for "Do you remember", which being nearer spoken English in structure, contrast with the normal written form and imply sub-standard users.³

One of the most obvious features of the language of Of Mice and Men is its simplicity. This can be seen most easily in the sentence structure of the passage. Every clause in the narrative is Free, and all but one of the sentences consist of a single clause. An analysis, of the speech sentences gives the following table:

	No OF SENTENCES	F	CLAUSES			No OF CLAUSES PER SENTENCE
			B	M	R/S	
LENNIE	19	19	2	2	0	1.26
GEORGE	18	21	5	1	2	1.61
TOTAL	37	40	7	3	2	1.40

In thirty seven speech sentences there are only seven Bound and two rankshifted clauses. The average number of clauses per sentence is 1.40.

Within this simplicity it can be seen that Lennie's speech is less complex than George's. This helps portray him as a simple character. A lack of complexity in the language of a character implies a lack of

sophistication in his thought. George produces all the rankshifted clauses in the passage, and has a higher incidence of clauses per sentence. Lennie produces only two Bound clauses compared with George's five. The disparity here is best seen in terms of percentages. Only 8.5% of Lennie's clauses are Bound, compared with 18% for George (who also has 7% of rankshift). 46% of Lennie's clauses are Simple sentences,⁴ whereas the corresponding figure for George is 28.5%.

Lennie's deviation towards the simple can also be seen at group level. Here it contrasts not just with George as a norm but also with the narrative. First of all, in terms of rankshift; George and the narrative both have fourteen rankshifted nominal groups. Lennie has only two - "my side pocket"(22), and "my pocket"(26). Similar results are obtained from an examination of the groups themselves. The narrative has five groups of greater complexity than deictic & noun, and George has nine. Lennie, on the other hand has only three.

A further feature helping to give the impression that Lennie is a simple person is a lack of variety in his speech. Every one of his six uses of the Vocative is expounded by the single headword "George". In Subject position he uses "I" twelve times out of seventeen instances. Both the narrative's and George's Subjects can easily be seen to be much more varied in this respect. George has seven different exponents

of his seventeen Subjects, the highest incidence of one particular exponent being six instances of "you". The narrative has five different exponents out of a total of twelve, the highest repeat-rate being "Lennie" and "George" at three each.

Connected with this notion of simplicity is a hint of Lennie's inability to control his own actions. Occasionally parts of his body do things of their own accord.⁵ Eight of the sentences refer to Lennie, and half of them show parts of his body doing things apparently of their own volition. They are:

Lennie's face broke into a delighted smile.(6)

His hands went quickly into his side coat pockets.(14)

His hand went into the pocket again.(23)

Lennie's closed hand slowly obeyed.(46)

In each case the relevant part of Lennie is Subject in the surface structure of the sentence and Initiator/Actor in the deep structure.⁶ This combination of roles is usually reserved for animal, if not for human referents. It is this fact that makes us think of Lennie's bodily parts as having a will of their own. This unusual assignment of role is made even more apparent in the last example because of the choice of verb. It is usually animals or men who obey, not limbs.

The passage is very important in its depiction of the relationship between Lennie and George. George is the dominant personality and Lennie the submissive one. This is portrayed partly in the construction of their sentences. George's are complete, coherent, uninterrupted, and without pauses. These features

mark him off as a person who is sure of himself. Lennie is the exact opposite. He pauses in mid-sentence, as in "I remember that but what'd we do then".(8), and he repeats elements of speech:

I I thought I put it in my
side pocket.(22)
I remember some girls come by and
you says you say(9)

This last sentence is uncompleted. All these elements help signal Lennie's uncertainty as contrasted with George. George interrupts Lennie's unfinished sentence, which makes the point even more positively. ⁷

An examination of the shared vocabulary is also useful in bringing out the dominance relation between the two characters. In real-life conversations a person uses the lexical items that a previous speaker has used if he is agreeing with what has been said or if he is taking a submissive role in the conversation. ⁸ If he wants to take the initiative he changes the items. In this passage it is George who introduces new lexical items and things to talk about. Lennie's speech contains many closed-system items - items with little lexical content - and he borrows some of his lexically fuller words from George. For instance, in sentences 4 and 5 George uses the verb "remember". Lennie picks it up in 8 and 9. George uses it again in 11, and Lennie follows suit in 13. In both instances Lennie is agreeing with what George says. In 20 George introduces "think", and Lennie repeats it in 22. These vocabulary "borrowings" help show that Lennie is dominated by George.

There are however more important elements which help give us the impression that the Lennie/George relationship is dominated by George. The main feature which guides us in this respect is the distribution of Sentence Types that the two characters use. The easiest measure is the number of Commands that a speaker employs. Commands indicate an attempt to control the situation, and a lack of them the reverse. The following table gives an analysis of the Sentence Types that Lennie and George use:

	S	E	C	R	Q	S&Q
GEORGE	5 ⁹	3	4	0	7	0
LENNIE	11 ¹⁰	2	1	4	0	1 ¹¹

George has four Commands against Lennie's one. And George's are all real Commands in the sense that the semantics of the sentence parallel the syntactic structure as in, "Give it here"(45) for example. This sentence is a pure Command. But Lennie's is not. He says, "Aw, leave me have it, George".(44). Commands are normally issued by people in a dominant position. But Lennie is not (though he is less under George's absolute control at this point, as will be argued later). He is pleading, and so although he uses a Command Sentence Type, we can qualify its use and say that it is not a pure Command. The initial "aw" makes a great difference to the interpretation of the sentence. It forces us to associate a particular intonation pattern with the sentence which signals a pleading rather than a commanding tone. The final Vocative lengthens the sentence, making

it less pert and hence less imperative.¹² Thus although Lennie employs a Command we can say that it is nothing like as imperative as the ones which George uses. This small attempt by Lennie at controlling the situation is good in that it prevents the dominance relation between the two characters from being depicted in too black and white terms.

Questions are not as plain-faced as Commands. They can show the speaker's dominant position as they do in this passage, or they can be used for various purposes - merely to gain information for example, or even to show that the speaker himself is in the submissive position. These three connotational meanings can be seen in the contrast between the following examples:

What do you think you're doing, you fool?
 What's the time?
 Is it all right if I leave now, sir?

The connotational role of a Question will depend largely on the context in which it occurs. Two of the above examples are "fixed" contextually by the use of particular Vocatives which have accepted connotations. In the context of George's Commands in the passage the reader interprets his Questions as being interrogational in type.¹³ Lennie's only Question is in sentence 8: "I remember that but what'd we do then?" It is not interrogational but merely asking for information. The pauses in the sentence indicate Lennie's inability to remember the incident they are talking about. He asks George to fill in the details for him. Lennie, the dominated person, uses four Responses and one Statement

in response position. George, on the other hand, has no Responses at all. He doesn't bother to answer Lennie's question. This is another indication of his command of the situation.

There is however one important qualification to be made to the claim that George is the dominant partner and Lennie the submissive one. They do have a quarrel, and Lennie does put up some resistance to George's control. We have already seen some indication that the relationship cannot be described in absolute terms when the Command sentences were examined.

At the beginning of the passage George is in complete control. The first five sentences are his, and they contain a Command and a pushing Question. He squashes Lennie's earlier mention of the rabbits with an Exclamatory sentence containing a taboo phrase, "the hell". The Exclamations break up the sentence flow, making the delivery seem brisk. The first two questions that he asks are followed by pure agreement Responses from Lennie, helping to show his submission:

Why sure, George.(7)
Oh, sure, George.(12)

George can call Lennie "you crazy bastard" in sentence 18 without arousing any protest at all. Up to 24 all the narrative sentences are about Lennie. All Lennie's utterances containing hesitation markers occur in the first twenty two sentences.

A change occurs at sentence 24 however. Lennie thinks he has lost his work card, but George has kept it for him. Lennie is relieved, and we are told:

His hand went into the pocket again.
George looked sharply at him. (23,24)

Lennie does something which on the surface looks

innocent. But George's reaction implies that it is not so. He looks at Lennie sharply which suggests that he has seen something that he does not approve of. The action is foregrounded because of the switch in the narrative from describing Lennie to describing George for the first time in the passage. When George asks "What did you take outa that pocket?" Lennie does not give a direct answer. Instead we get:

"Ain't a thing in my pocket", Lennie said cleverly. (26)

He employs a well known trick of saying that he has nothing in his pocket after he has secretly removed the offending object to his hand. George recognises this immediately, saying, "I know there ain't. You got it in your hand". (27,28). This makes the adverb "cleverly" of 26 ironic.¹⁴ Lennie may have been clever for a simpleton, but he was not clever enough for a full grown man.

When George asks what Lennie has in his hand, accusing him of hiding it, Lennie lies:

"I ain't got nothin', George.
Honest. (30,31)

Sentence 31 is a pathetic attempt to convince George that he is telling the truth. George ignores him and orders him to hand over the offending object. Again Lennie resists, but in doing so he tells George what he has got:

Lennie held his closed hand away from George's direction. "It's on'y a mouse, George". (33,34)

The depiction of his resistance in the narrative sentence is made to seem deliberate. Steinbeck achieves

this by inserting the modifier "closed" in the Complement group and by using "away from George's direction" instead of the more normal "away from George" for instance. In 34 Lennie plays down his transgression by the use of the predeterminer "on'y" in "on'y a mouse". "Only" has the effect of minimising the importance of the headword it modifies. "Jus'" is used in the same way in sentence 38.¹⁵

George's indignation is seen in his asking "A mouse?" - a question to which he already knows the answer. When he asks if it is alive Lennie replies that it is not:

"Uh-uh. Jus' a dead mouse, George. I
didn' kill it. Honest ! I found it.
I found it dead. (37-42)

Again Lennie minimises the importance of the mouse, and then he claims that he did not kill it. As in 31, he uses the Adjunct "honest" to try to convince George of the truth of what he is saying. He was lying then, and so it is reasonable to assume that he is lying now. He tries to persuade George by an explanation of how he came by it. George disregards all this and orders Lennie to "give it here". It is at this point that Lennie uses the pleading Command which has already been discussed. But again George overrides it with a more emphatic repetition of his order. Lennie now capitulates. He has no line of defence or resistance left:

Lennie's closed hand slowly obeyed.
George took the mouse and threw it
across the pool to the other side,
among the brush. (46,47)

Lennie's reluctance is seen in the fact that his

hand is still closed and because of the foregrounded use of the adverb "slowly",¹⁶ George's action in throwing the mouse away indicates his return to complete control of his relationship with Lennie. The point is emphasised by Steinbeck by the way in which he dwells on it. He devotes three sentence-final Adjuncts to it - an unusual construction - which describe in correct temporal sequence the journey of the mouse to the brush on the other side of the river.

Thus we have seen Lennie making some sort of resistance to George's dominance but nevertheless being crushed. This passage at the beginning of the book is not just interesting in itself but plays an important part in the novel as a whole. Firstly it illustrates the type of people involved and their position mainly in terms of the language they use. Secondly, it shows the dominance of George in his relationship with Lennie, and Lennie's simplicity. And Thirdly it shows that these two qualities are not absolute by portraying Lennie as resisting with at least some ingenuity. It is important because this resistance is over the mouse which we infer that Lennie has killed.¹⁷ This is the first of the killings which prefigure the eventual death of Curley's wife. Lennie's attempt at keeping the mouse is an attempt at breaking free from George's authority. It soon becomes plain that unless George can control Lennie completely he will be the cause of greater disasters.

NOTES

1. For a discussion of Steinbeck's portrayal of the language of the characters see appendix I.
2. The American Language, originally printed in 1919. The above quotation is from the 4th edition (with major revisions) revised by Raven I. McDavid Jr. (London 1963), p.529.
3. The conventions authors use to depict sub-standard pronunciation often make use of this tension between written and spoken English. "An'" seen in a novel would be interpreted as "lazy" or lower class pronunciation, when in fact it more closely represents the normal phonetic form/an/than "and".
4. A Simple sentence contains only one clause at sentence level.
5. This is part of the inclination to dehumanise his characters that so many critics have seen in Steinbeck.
6. The terms and distinctions used here are from M.A.K. Halliday, "Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English; Part I", Journal of Linguistics, Vol 3 No 1 (April 1967), pp.37-81.
7. This compares interestingly with III, where we see Lennie interrupting George. Passage III is one of those where Lennie's influence over George is at its greatest.
8. For examples of this phenomenon see appendix I.
9. One of these has an e superscript.
10. One of these has an r superscript.
11. The large amount of hesitation around the linker coordinating the two clauses combined with the difference in mood of the verbs prompts the ad hoc setting up of the S&Q category here.
12. It also seems that there is something about the verb "leave", as compared with its more normal paradigm "let", which suggests submissiveness. Other people, when asked, have noticed the same distinction. But there seems to be no way to measure and indicate the difference objectively. It may be the long vowel

and final plosive as against the short vowel and final plosive of "let" which suggests this. Another possibility is the half rhyme that /lɒv/ makes with /plɜːz/. This would remind us of the politeness marker "please". These possible explanations are only offered very tentatively indeed.

13. Three of George's Questions are slightly unusual in form. Sentences 5, 11 and 20 omit the interrogative "do", giving the Question the syntactical structure of a Statement or a Command. We know that they are Questions because of the question marks at the end of the sentences. The unusual syntax makes it seem as if George is pushing his opinions and attitudes at Lennie even when he is asking questions.
14. Though not completely so. Up to this point Lennie's words have always been prefaced by an introductory narrative quoting verb. But here the quoting verb is placed after Lennie's words, thus making it seem as if Lennie has reacted more quickly on this occasion.
15. The two nominal groups under discussion here are two of the three of greater complexity than dh which Lennie uses in the passage. They help to show a slight increase in the complexity of his thought at this point. He is having to work harder intellectually to resist George.
16. See Jacobson, Adverbial Positions in English, (Uppsala 1964). The second half of this book is a dictionary of adverb placings. By using this we can more accurately determine if an adverb is in an unusual position. Jacobson uses three place categories, Front(F), Middle(M), and End(E). He says that adverbs of manner ending in -ly all pattern in the same way. His figures for such an adverb (see pp.212-216) occurring in a clause without "said", "asked" etc. are F(22=4%), M(180=31%), E(375=65%). Thus we can say that the most normal position for "slowly" in the sentence under consideration would be at E. As it is at M it is foregrounded.
17. An incident similar to the one in this passage is enacted on pp.20-21 of Of Mice and Men. In that scene George actually says that Lennie broke the mouse's neck.

1. THE TEXT (pp.23-25)

"There's enough beans for four men," George said.(1)
 Lennie watched him from over the fire.(2) He said
 patiently, "I like 'em with ketchup."(3)
 "Well, we ain't got any," George exploded.(4) "Whatever
 we ain't got, that's what you want.(5) God a'mighty, if I
 was alone I could live so easy.(6) I could go get a job an'
 work, an' no trouble.(7) No mess at all, and when the end
 of the month come I could take my fifty bucks and go into
 town and get whatever I want.(8) Why, I could stay in a
 cat house all night.(9) I could eat any place I want,
 hotel or any place, and order any damn thing I could think
 of.(10) An' I could do all that every damn month.(11) Get
 a gallon of whisky, or set in a pool room and play cards
 or shoot pool."(12) Lennie knelt and looked over the fire
 at the angry George.(13) And Lennie's face was drawn with
 terror.(14) "An' whatta I got," George went on furiously.(15)
 "I got you!(16) You can't keep a job and you lose me ever'
 job I get.(17) Jus' keep me shovin' all over the country
 all the time.(18) An' that ain't the worst.(19) You get
 in trouble.(20) You do bad things and I got to get you
 out."(21) His voice rose nearly to a shout.(22) You crazy
 son-of-a-bitch.(23) You keep me in hot water all the time.(24)"
 He took on the elaborate manner of little girls when they
 are mimicking one another.(25) "Jus' wanted to feel that
 girl's dress - jus' wanted to get it like it was a mouse (26)
 Well, how the hell did she know you jus' wanted to feel
 her dress?(27) She jerks back and you hold on like it was a
 mouse.(28) She yells and we got to hide in a irrigation
 ditch all day with guys lookin' for us, and we got to sneak
 out in the dark and get outta the country.(29) All the time
 somethin' like that - all the time.(30) I wisht I could put
 you in a cage with about a million mice an' let you have
 fun.(31)" His anger left him suddenly.(32) He looked across
 the fire at Lennie's anguished face, and then he looked
 ashamedly at the flames.(33)

2. THE ANALYSIS

In general terms this passage is very different from passage I. A table will best show the discrepancy:

ASSIGNMENT OF WORDS (To nearest one per cent)

<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>PASSAGE I</u>	<u>PASSAGE II</u>
LENNIE	30%	1%
GEORGE	44%	79%
NARRATIVE	26%	20%

The percentage of narrative in both passages is about the same, but the figures for Lennie and George vary considerably. In the first passage the word totals for Lennie and George were approximately the same. Here, nearly all the words that are spoken belong to George. In fact, after sentence 3 Lennie says nothing at all. What we have, then, is a monologue spoken by George which I have entitled "George rails at Lennie". It can be divided into five main parts:

1. George gets angry with Lennie over a trivial matter.(4,5)
2. He produces a vision of how he could live without Lennie, implying that he would be better off.(6-12)
3. He complains at the way Lennie is always making his life difficult for him.(15-24)
4. He gives a concrete example of how Lennie does this.(26-29)
5. A summing up and a wish.(30-31)

George's anger is displayed in much the same way as it was in the first passage. An obvious similarity is the use of Z elements acting as Free clauses, helping to give an explosive, off the cuff effect:

- (a) I could go get a job an' work,
an' no trouble (7)
- (b) No mess at all,(8)
- (c) You crazy son-of-a-bitch.(23)
- (d) All the time somethin' like that -
all the time.(30)

From the sentence numbering it can be seen that these Z elements are distributed throughout the length of the passage, helping to uphold the impression of George's anger from beginning to end. The narrative tells the reader that George is angry and the Z elements help depict the mood in his speech.¹ Sentence 23, "You crazy son-of-a-bitch", is very similar in form and vocabulary to ".... you crazy bastard" used by George in passage I. Here the vocative has a sentence to itself, giving more force to his anger.

The passage is a monologue and so Steinbeck needs to "keep it going". It must feel spontaneous and quick moving. This is achieved in a number of different ways:

1. The use of the Z elements already discussed.
2. The fact that George changes 'topic' five times in twenty six sentences.
3. The use of exclamatory Adjuncts to give an air of spontaneity. They give the impression that George is thinking aloud. There are four in the passage:

- (i) Well, we ain't got any(4)
- (ii) God a'mighty, if I was alone(6)
- (iii) Why, I could stay in a cat house all
night.(9)
- (iv) Well, how the hell did she know
(27)



It will be noticed that three of these examples are in the first six sentences of the monologue. Steinbeck needs to set up the unpremeditated, exclamatory nature of the speech, and he achieves this partly by the use of these obvious markers. "God a'mighty" especially conveys an impression of heightened emotion on the part of the speaker.²

4. There are a number of tag-like constructions often tacked on to the end of clauses. Examples are "... - all the time".(30) and the appositional "... hotel or any place".(10) These again make it seem as if George is really involved in what he is saying because they make his words seem more spontaneous than written prose.

5. The use of shortened forms.³ There are a number of syntactically shortened forms which give the impression of a speedy (and hence, in context, angry) delivery. We have already noted the Z elements. Besides this there are:

(a) "I could go get a job an' work (7) where "go and get" becomes "go get", and the "I could" is missing (as it often is in conversation) from the second clause. Sentence 8 also has two instances of the "could" modal being taken as understood.

(b) "Get a gallon of whisky, or set in a pool room and play cards or shoot pool". Here there is a list of actions where even the first clause has the "I" Subject and "could" modal understood.

(c) "I got you".(16) The auxiliary "have" is missing.

(d) The mimicking "jus' wanted" in sentence 26 has no Subject in both of its occurrences.

In all of these cases the forms used are nearer to spoken than written English. They contrast with the written norm and make George's delivery seem speedy.

6. Variety is produced by changes in verb form, which correspond with the changes in topic. Section I is in the present tense. Then, George's vision of existence without Lennie is hypothetical and couched in modals as in ".... I could live so easy".(6) At sentence 15 we are brought back to the present situation and George explains the effect of Lennie's companionship on him. This is done in the present tense. A further variety is produced by the mimicry of Lennie's voice in sentence 26, which is marked off from the rest by the use of the past tense. This is followed by a description of what happened when Lennie tried to feel the girl's red dress, along with its consequences. It is described in the present tense, helping to make it more vivid. The monologue ends with a summing up, "All the time somethin' like that - all the time".(30) followed by a wish for a remedy. This is accompanied by a return to the modal "could".

All the features discussed so far help to keep the passage moving. They reflect spoken rather than written English, helping to give the idea that George is committed to what he is saying. His thoughts spill out as they come to him, producing a disjointed effect reminiscent of speech. George is so involved in what he is saying that he ignores Lennie entirely. The only

sentences during the monologue that connect Lennie and George are 2 and 13, where in both cases Lennie watches George over the fire. In both cases Lennie is Subject in the surface structure and Initiator/Actor in the deep structure.⁴ It is always Lennie who is trying to make some sort of contact with George. The narrative tells us of no effort of George's to look at Lennie.

The encapsulation of George in his monologue is further demonstrated by the fact that Lennie is the only person it affects:

Lennie knelt and looked over the fire
at the angry George. And Lennie's
face was drawn with terror. (13,14)

Lennie's face becomes drawn with terror because of George's diatribe. The impersonal effect created by the use of the deictic in "the angry George" helps show why he is terrified.⁵ We are not told of the monologue having any effect on George until the end of the passage. The notion of George's encapsulation and his non-attempt to make contact with Lennie is borne out by an analysis of the Sentence Types which he uses. He is not trying to dominate Lennie as he did in Passage I. He produces mainly Statements, which are neutral in terms of an attempt to control the situation. There are no Commands in the passage at all, and Commands are the most obvious way in which a speaker tries to control someone else. The Question form can also be used as an attempt at control. There are two Questions in the monologue, but neither of them are used in this way. Both are rhetorical. In sentences

15 and 16 we get:

"An' whatta I got", George went on
furiously. "I got you!"

George answers his own question and so ignores any reaction Lennie might have. The second question, "Well, how the hell did she know you jus' wanted to feel her dress?" (27) comes in the middle of Lennie's "assault" on the girl in the red dress, is full of Adjuncts indicating George's anger, requires no answer, and does not get one. George just carries straight on with his description.

It is not only the Sentence Types which make the reader feel that George is ignoring Lennie even though Lennie is the object of his anger. A comparison of the noun phrases that George uses as exponents of S in passages I and II is revealing:

	Number of Noun Phrases as S	Those with "I" as exponent	Incidence of "I" per Noun Phrase as S
Passage I	15	3	1 in 5
Passage II	32	12	1 in 2.66

From these figures it is obvious that George is much more concerned with himself in passage II than passage I.

George's impassioned attitude towards Lennie's effect on his life is brought out by the marked theme and word order choices in sentences 5 and 30, the two general statements that George makes about their relationship:

Whatever we ain't got, that's what
you want. (5)

An unmarked form of this sentence would be "You want whatever we ain't got". Thus "whatever we ain't got", is marked by being placed in theme position. This would produce, "Whatever we ain't got you want". But the object of Lennie's desire is stressed even more by George's use of a double Subject. By using the verb "is" he is able to use "that" as a dummy Subject referring anaphorically to "whatever we ain't got". Sentence 5 is thus central in the depiction of George's attitude towards Lennie.

Similarly with sentence 30:

All the time somethin' like that -
all the time. (30)

That it is a verbless clause with a X element has already been mentioned. But on top of this there is a repetition of the adverbial phrase "all the time". Moreover, its first instance is in an unusual position. The adverbial phrase "all the time" is usually prohibited from occurring in initial position in a sentence because of the existence of a parallel prepositional phrase as in "All the time I was baking the cat kept looking at me". The unusualness of the structure stresses both George's commitment to what he is saying and the real cause of his anger.

To sum up, what we have is a situation where George rails at Lennie in an impassioned way. There is no attempt at conversation. Instead, we have a constantly changing monologue where George is concerned primarily with himself and his position in society.

But in terms of motivation the passage at first sight looks inconsistent. The thing which sparks off George's rage is Lennie's seemingly innocent statement "I like 'em with ketchup".(3) It would be implausible if the author was suggesting that George became angry over such a small thing. And of course we know that he does not. The real reason appears both in the monologue itself with the vivid description of Lennie and the girl with the red dress, and also a few paragraphs earlier:

A light of understanding broke on Lennie's face. "They run us outa Weed", he exploded triumphantly.(p.17)

The effect here is obviously ironic. Lennie is triumphant at remembering a bad thing for them. Lennie was the cause of their need to flee from Weed and George needs to get his anger out of his system. He chooses the flimsiest of pretexts to do so. Because the reader is forced to find a plausible explanation for George's anger he takes special notice of it.⁷ This is important as it raises an important element of character and theme. Critics have often pointed out that George needs Lennie to realise his dream of the farm.⁸ But they seem to ignore the passage under discussion, in which George is saying that he wants to get rid of Lennie and live the life of a typical ranch hand. In this sense George is producing a vision which is completely opposed to the one which is generally held to be the one around which Of Mice and Men pivots.

Either George believes in what he is saying in this passage or he does not. If we take the simplified view that George needs Lennie, then the latter explanation would be the desirable one. The evidence in favour of this view is twofold:

1. That George joins wholeheartedly in the later dream sequences. One could then say that in the light of this later evidence we can see that George was not really sincere in wanting to be rid of Lennie.
2. George uses the modal "could" instead of "would" in his hypothetical description of life without Lennie. And "could" usually implies physical capability rather than intention on the part of the speaker.

Both these points are flimsy. It seems that George can (and does) join wholeheartedly in both types of dream.⁹ Perhaps this is inconsistent, but if so, it is human. George is, I think, carried away by the mood of the moment. We must remember that he does join in the ranch hand pastimes. He goes into town to the whorehouse and he plays horseshoes with the boys for instance. Thus it seems that at least part of him is attracted by the free, amoral, living for the moment attitude of the normal ranch cowboy.

Secondly, to base one's view on a consistent use of "could" instead of "would" would not be the wisest of decisions. It is only one small element among a large number of weighty features already pointed out which indicate George's real anger and involvement in

what he says. At this point he is ignoring Lennie, as I have already shown. A simple explanation of George needing Lennie completely does not square with this. Does the use of "could" preclude volition anyway? I think not. If I am going shopping the next day, I could easily say "We could go to Heal's", meaning not just that it would be possible for us to go, but that I want to. It is interesting to note that the most persuasive of the two dream passages (passage V) also uses the "could" modal a great deal. If one used that verb as evidence of George's ability to act here one would also have to say that George does not believe in the farm dream in passage V - the dream passage where he is most convinced that there is a chance of getting the farm.

George does seem to mean what he says. The narrative describes him as angry; there are many stylistic markers of his fury - the Z elements, explosive Adjuncts, theme structures etc. And the last two sentences of the narrative foreground this fact by describing the exact opposite to the mood we have just examined:

His anger left him suddenly. He
looked across the fire at Lennie's
anguished face, and then he looked
ashamedly at the flames.(32,33)

George's anger leaves him as suddenly as it came, and the narrative now connects George and Lennie with George as Actor for the first time (He looked at Lennie's anguished face). There is a sudden change of mood

at both ends of the passage. The conclusion is that George means what he says when he says it, but then becomes sorry for what he has said. He has, if you like, a moral sense which cuts in on him when the ranch hand side of his nature tries to gain control. It is interesting that his anger leaves him.¹⁰ This gives the reader an intimation of the uncontrolled nature of George's anger.

This view does not conflict with the notion that George needs Lennie to achieve his farm dream. Instead it makes George a less simple, less schematised, and hence more satisfying character.¹¹ He is attracted by two types of life, one of which we as readers feel is more worthwhile than the other. This explication helps explain the end of the novel, where George walks off with Slim:

Curley and Carlson looked after them.
And Carlson said, "Now what the hell
ya suppose is eatin' them two guys?"
(p.186)

George goes off with Slim and thus becomes equated with him. His attempt to realise the dream has failed. At the end of the novel George has no choice but to become totally a ranch hand with its typical aspirations. Certainly Slim and George are a cut above Curley and Carlson, as the last sentence of the book shows us; but even though Slim has been depicted (rather unnaturally) as the perfect ranch hand,¹² he is a ranch hand nonetheless. He understands George's position but cannot help him. The only person who could help George was an idiot.

The Development of the Lennie Theme

The passage is also important for its account of the episode of the girl with the red dress. By putting it in the unusual form of a monologue Steinbeck ensures that the incident will be foregrounded and remembered. We know that Lennie is attracted to bright things like red dresses, and that his innocent reactions have almost produced one disaster already. We know of his phenomenal strength because of the way he kills mice by accident. This passage is remembered when Curley's wife enters the drama, and so helps to give us the feeling that somehow Lennie's attraction for her will produce disaster.

Lennie's simple mind and his complete ignorance of evil intentions is brought out in George's mimicry of what Lennie presumably pleaded at the end of the incident with the girl with the red dress. We get:

He took on the elaborate manner of little girls when they are mimicking one another. "Jus' wanted to feel that girl's dress - jus' wanted to pet it like it was a mouse -- Well, how the hell did she know you jus' wanted to feel her dress?" (25,26,27)

We are told specifically that George is mimicking Lennie,¹³ and so he is, of course, repeating Lennie's words. From this we know that Lennie's reason for frightening the girl was a purely innocent one. He just wanted to feel her dress. The phrase "jus' wanted to" is repeated five times in three clauses to make sure that the reader grasps the point.¹⁴

NOTES

1. George's mood is first set up by a contrast between sentences 3 and 4:
 "He said patiently, "I like 'em with ketchup".
 "Well, we ain't got any", George exploded".
 George's statement is a direct antagonistic response to Lennie's statement. The difference is brought out mainly by the narrative. Lennie's quoting verb tends towards being lexically empty and the way in which he speaks is conveyed by the sentence final Adjunct "patiently". George's anger is shown by an appropriately shorter form - a lexically full verb "exploded".
2. The method used here is similar to the Coleridgian "willing suspension of disbelief" technique. Once the audience has been persuaded that an impassioned speech is taking place then some of the stylistic markers can be dropped. In fact, an abundance of them would get in the way of the information that Steinbeck is trying to convey. Less obvious markers pervade through the passage to uphold the effect - the use of swear words in a position in nominal groups for example, as in "every damn month".
3. Little stress can be laid on the shortened forms of words like "jus'", "a'mighty" and "lookin'" for example as these are mainly attempts to convey the idea that George speaks a lower class dialect. In fact 6.5% of George's words have shortened forms in this passage compared with 7.3% in passage 1.
4. The terminology used is M.A.K. Halliday's. See "Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English; Part I", Journal of Linguistics, Vol 3 No 1 (April 1967), pp.37-81.
5. Sentence 14 has a peculiar use of the word "and". It is sentence initial and in this position presupposes a relation with the previous sentence - one which is causal and/or sequential. And this is of course the case.

There is a causal connection - Lennie's terror is caused by George's anger. But the relational construction is odd. Usually if a sequence is being described one gets two sentences of the form "X did a. And then he did b". If a causal relation is being explored it is normal to have two different Subjects: "X did a and Y did/became b". Here, however there is a causal relation described with the same person as both logical and grammatical Subject. The movement is not from one person to another, but from a person as grammatical Subject to a part of that person as grammatical Subject. This oddness of inter-sentential relations stresses Lennie's fear, which in turn contrasts with the fact that George has no reaction to the monologue. His emotional mood merely causes it. He is static during the monologue whereas Lennie is not, both in terms of reaction and his attempt to make contact with George.

6. The sentence has no question mark, thus giving further weight to the thesis that George did not intend the question to be answered.
7. This method of making sure that the reader notices certain points has obvious affinities to the method of foregrounding that linguists have so far examined only on a small scale i.e. within linguistic units. Here it is used on a larger scale.
8. The dream of the farm will be discussed more particularly in chapters III and V.
9. This is not quite true. He does not seem completely willing in the third passage examined. But he is definitely committed in passage V. See chapters III and V for a discussion of this.
10. Thus Steinbeck is using the same effect as was used to show Lennie's uncontrollable nature in passage I. George has got to control Lennie if they are to achieve the dream of the farm. But here we are shown that he is not even in complete control of himself.

11. An interesting part of Steinbeck's characterisation of George is that he is complex in a self-contradictory way, and naturally so. This marks him off from every other character in the novel.
12. See especially pp.61-62 of the novel.
13. The narrative account is long and brings in an irrelevant comparison with little girls, thus helping to foreground the fact that George is mimicking Lennie.
14. This is important because Lennie has the same sort of motives when he kills Curley's wife in passage X. We remember the incident of the girl in the red dress when we read that passage, which helps us to see early on that disaster is about to occur and that Lennie is not to blame for what happens.

1. THE TEXT (pp.28-30)

Lennie was delighted.(1) "That's it - that's it.(2)
Now tell how it is with us."(3)

George went on.(4) "With us it ain't like that.(5)
We got a future.(6) We got somebody to talk to that gives
a damn about us.(7) We don't have to sit in no bar room
blowin' in our jack jus' because we got no place else to
go.(8) If them other guys gets in jail they can rot for
all anybody gives a damn.(9) But not us."(10)

Lennie broke in.(11) "But not us!(12) An' why?(13)
Because....because I got you to look after me, and you
got me to look after you, and that's why.(14) He laughed
delightedly.(15) "Go on now, George!(16)"

"You got it by heart.(17) You can do it yourself.(18)"

"No, you.(19) I forget some a' the things.(20) Tell
about how it's gonna be.(21)

"O.K.(22) Someday -- we're gonna get the jack
together and we're gonna have a little house and a couple
of acres an' a cow and some pigs and ---"(23)"

"An' live off the fatta the lan'." Lennie shouted.(24)
"An' have rabbits.(25) Go on George!(26) Tell about what
we're gonna have in the garden and about the rabbits in the
cages and about the rain in the winter and the stove, and
how thick the cream is on the milk like you can hardly cut
it.(27) Tell about that, George.(28)"

"Why'n't you do it yourself?(29) You know all of
it.(30)"

"No....you tell it.(31) It ain't the same if I tell
it.(32) Go on....George.(33) How I get to tend the
rabbits.(34)"

"Well," said George, "we'll have a big vegetable patch
and a rabbit hutch and chickens.(35) And when it rains in
the winter, we'll just say the hell with goin' to work,
and we'll build up a fire in the stove and set around it an'
listen to the rain comin' down on the roof - Ruts!(36)"

2. THE ANALYSIS

In this passage Lennie and George envisage what their life together would be like in perfect circumstances. This is the first of the two dream passages to be discussed, the second one being passage V. The dream passages are noticed by the reader as being different from the rest of the novel because they have certain stylistic features which mark them off and which the narrative makes sure that we notice. A few lines before the passage begins the narrative tells us:

George's voice became deeper. He repeated his words rhythmically as though he had said them many times before. (p.28)

The implication is that George is about to begin a sort of formal chant. The tone of his voice changes (as most peoples do if they are going to read poetry aloud for example), and becomes rhythmical. The trend is away from natural speech and towards a more formal register. The sequence is obviously one that George and Lennie go through quite often. The formalised nature of the chant is seen in its balance. We are given a contrast between "us" and "them". George's speech immediately after the above piece of narrative and preceding the chosen passage has eleven clauses. Eight of these have the phrase "guys like us" or an anaphoric substitute for it ("they" or "that") as the Subject of the clause. Of the other three, two have the same subject understood. The purpose of this is

to set up an adversative relation between "guys like us" (i.e. ranch workers) and "us" (i.e. a special class of ranch workers).

The passage begins with Lennie's reaction and returns to George's speech at sentence 5. Before Lennie breaks in (at sentence 11) we get first of all four clauses using "we" as Subject, a return to "them other guys" in sentences 8 and 9, and then the setting up of the adversative relation in sentence 10 with "But not us". Another feature which helps make the passage seem balanced is the parallel SPC^e clause structure of sentences 6 and 7. The special nature of "us" is emphasised by the fact that they have "somebody". This "somebody" is qualified by two rankshifted clauses, thus foregrounding it. Thus the dream marks itself off from the other texts by starting with an antithetical balance not seen in other passages. It uses this antithesis to mark off Lennie and George as a special sort of people.

The fact that this envisaging of the dream is a regular thing for Lennie and George - as is implied in the two narrative sentences quoted above - is brought out by Lennie's position as regards what George is saying. He obviously knows it off by heart. He breaks in and takes over the dream description twice in the passage - first at sentence 11 and secondly at sentence 24. Moreover, when he orders George to go on

after his interruption, he is in a position to tell George exactly what he is going to say:

Tell about what we're gonna have in the garden and about the rabbits in the cages and about the rain in the winter and the stove, and how thick the cream is on the milk like you can hardly cut it. Tell about that, George. (27,28)

Thus both stylistically and situationally we have an odd state of affairs. The passage begins in a balanced manner, and produces a situation where the participants know exactly the words that are to be said before they are produced. This is obviously not the case with ordinary conversations. It soon becomes apparent that Lennie envisages the dream in a rather simplified form. For him it means a chance to have some rabbits to look after. He uses the word "rabbits" three times in this passage alone. When he asks George to tell him about the farm and when he interrupts he always wants to know about the rabbits. In this way we see that the rabbits symbolise the farm for Lennie. Rabbits crop up whenever Lennie talks about the dream.

The two dream passages can also be marked off statistically from the rest of the passages studied. The total number of speech words was contrasted with those involved in list structures. A list was defined as any number of co-ordinated headwords greater than one in any nominal group. The two dream passages were compared to the others with respect to this feature.

The following results were obtained:

<u>PASSAGES TESTED</u>	<u>CHISQUARED FIGURE</u>	<u>SIGNIFICANT AT</u>
CONTROL	33.6263	0.1%
CONTROL V DREAMS	28.2738	0.1%
DREAM 1 V DREAM 2	0.2395	NOT SIGNIFICANT

The control in each case was all those passages containing speech other than the two dream passages i.e. all the passages discussed in this thesis except numbers III, IV and V. The higher the chisquared figure, the higher the significance. Thus the higher the chisquared figure, the more heterogeneous the passages under examination with respect to this particular feature. In this type of test there are three significance levels, 0.1%, 1% and 5%; 0.1% being the figure of highest significance and 5% being that of lowest significance.

From the results the following conclusions can be drawn:

- (a) The control passages showed a significance of 0.1% and so were not homogeneous. This is to be expected as some of the non-dream passages have bits of dream in them;¹ or have the dream discussed.² One would also expect a few list structures to crop up randomly.
- (b) We can say that more use of the list construction is made in the dream passages. The comparison between the dream passages and the control produced a significance figure of 0.1%.
- (c) The two dream passages were homogeneous as regards the feature under discussion. Thus the two dream passages are marked off from the others with respect

to this feature.

In the explication of passage I the dominance relation of Lennie and George was discussed. It was suggested that the novel turned upon this relationship - that to achieve the dream, it was necessary for George to control Lennie completely, to stop him getting into trouble. In passage II George was obviously dominant. When the farm dream is being produced we would expect Lennie to be more dominant. It is only because of Lennie that George can envisage the dream. A word count shows that Lennie and George have roughly equal portions of the dialogue. Thus:

Narrative	Lennie	George
5%	43%	52%

From these figures it will be seen that the relationship between the number of words used by Lennie and George is roughly the same as in the first passage. That George will say quite a lot is to be expected, even if Lennie is dominant, merely because he is getting George to tell him of the farm that they are dreaming about.⁵ Lennie's favourite word in this passage seems to be the imperative "tell". He uses it six times. His attempt at dominance can best be seen in an examination of the Sentence Types:

SENTENCE TYPE	S	C	R	Q	S&E	E	R&C	Y
GEORGE	10	0	2 ⁴	1	1	0	0	0
LENNIE	3	9 ⁵	1	1	0	2	1	1 ⁶

If we compare this table with the one for passage I,

the most apparent feature is the difference in the distribution of the Commands. In the first passage George was dominant but Lennie did attempt to challenge that authority. George had four Commands to Lennie's one. Here, however, the situation is markedly reversed. Lennie uses nine Commands, and one sentence of R&C⁷ structure, whereas George has no Commands at all. Thus George makes no really strong attempt to control the situation, and the reader correlates Lennie's dominance with the dream passage.

Another feature associated with the dream passages in the novel is Lennie's excited state. That Lennie does become involved and excited when the dream is evoked is shown in a number of different ways:

1. His use of exclamatory sentences. He has two in this passage, "That's it - that's it".(2) where he repeats his exclamatory phrase, and "But not us!"(12), which is seen to be exclamatory by its minor sentence form and its exclamation mark. Putting some of his words in italics also helps stress them, making it seem as if they are uttered more forcefully.
2. The way he breaks in on George's description. It will be useful here to notice the guiding that the narrative gives us. In sentence 1 we are told that Lennie is delighted. That is, he is delighted at the fact that George has started the dream chant. He orders George to go on, and George does so for five sentences. Then at sentence 11 the narrative tells us that "Lennie broke in". He breaks directly into George's speech by repeating his

last sentence "But not us!" This is followed by the short minor sentence "An' why?"(13) Lennie answers the rhetorical question himself. We get some insight into the excited state of his mind by the framing of the Response. He has to repeat the subordinating Adjunct at the beginning of the sentence:

"Because because"

He is obviously fighting to get his thoughts into words. When he manages to do so they come in a rushed, clichéd expression: ".... I got you to look after me and you got me to look after you". The impression that the words come out in a gabble is produced by the contrast with the slowed up production of the Adjuncts noted above and the shortness of the words. They are all monosyllabic. The "learn't off formula" impression is created by the parallelism of the two clauses. They are both of ASPC^c/SPC^c construction and use the same words in a different combination. Because of this the last half of the second phase construction becomes easily predictable.⁶

Sentence 15 again tells us of Lennie's state of mind: "He laughed delightedly". Lennie interrupts again at sentence 24. This time Steinbeck makes the effect even more abrupt. Firstly, there is no guiding narrative between the speech of the two participants. Lennie breaks straight in. The effect is made more startling because he actually breaks into one of George's grammatical constructions. In the previous example he began by repeating a sentence that George had just uttered. Here, George is in the process of producing

a noun phrase of *hq & hq &* structure. Lennie interrupts this and also changes the type of construction which George has set up. He uses the "and" linker, making it seem as if he is going to continue the list, but the item which he co-ordinates for George is not another nominal group but a Free clause. This effect is made possible by the two different functional uses of the "and" linker - both inter-clausally and inter-phrasally. George has been producing a list of the sorts of things that they are going to have; Lennie completes the sentence with an action that they are going to perform.⁹

3. The way that his interruptions themselves become a part of the dream description. This is why the dream sequences are so "learnt off".¹⁰ These descriptions of Lennie's tend to move along the cline towards ungrammaticality, again indicating his excitement and involvement. These two points have already been illustrated with reference to Lennie's first interruption. A similar process can be seen at work with the second one. In sentence 27 Lennie orders George to carry on with the dream, but in effect does so himself, producing a list of his own. The first B clause is normal grammatically but the next three are verbless. Of these three, the first two have the Adjunct "about" which ties them as B clauses to the initial Free one. This link is dropped with "and the stove" however, and then Lennie goes off onto another tack in the last two clauses of the sentence, which for this reason take on an autonomous air.¹¹ Here Lennie wants George to produce a measure of

thickness rather than a list of things that they are going to have. This change in direction helps to point Lennie's enthusiasm.

When Lennie says ".... and how thick the cream is on the milk like you can hardly cut it." (27), he is using a rather clichéd hyperbole. His use of exaggeration at this point has two effects. First it helps portray Lennie's enthusiasm even more - he is so excited that he exaggerates. And second, it produces a sense of unreality. The exaggeration helps the reader disbelieve in the dream. This is an important point. It is true that Lennie is both dominant and excited and involved in the dream picture which is evoked. But the situation is not as simple as that. The reader is not to regard the ideal of Lennie and George as realistic. Their situation in life at that moment weighs heavily against any hope of their achieving what they want. They are penniless, drifting ranch hands, and to have a farm of one's own costs money. Secondly, we have already had foregrounded hints of Lennie's phenomenal strength and child-like attraction for certain things. We know that he has got into trouble before, and feel that he may well do so again. Such an event would obviously prevent them from achieving their aims.

But perhaps the most important influence on our judgements at this point in the novel is the belief structure of the two participants involved. Lennie is totally absorbed and committed to the story. But he is an idiot. George has already been displayed as the

controlling character, as the one with the capabilities and the common sense, as the analysis of passage I showed. He is the one that looks after Lennie and chides him for doing stupid things, as seen in the mouse incident. Thus George is the only character introduced so far in whom we can have confidence when decisions or judgements are to be made. We have already seen his commitment and involvement in what can be called the anti-dream of passage II. We have seen that he is attracted, at least at certain times, by the idea of living without Lennie in the mindless, drifting ways of the "guys like us" whom he has contrasted with Lennie and himself at the beginning of passage III.

Thus, from the information that we as readers of the novel have already gathered we must doubt George's commitment to the dream at this point in the novel. This feeling is reinforced by the attitude of George in this passage, where Lennie is dominant, the dream is being evoked and so the dream's influence should be at its highest. After reading the passage we feel that George is by no means convinced that the dream is feasible. He only produces the description to please Lennie as he has hurt him (in passage II). He says:

You get a kick outta that, don't you?
Awright, I'll tell you and then we'll
eat our supper(p.28)

I have already said that George's production of the description is made to sound like a learnt piece. His disbelief in what he is saying is shown most, however, in his reluctance to carry on with the description after

Lennie's interruptions. Lennie first breaks in at sentence 11. He orders George to carry on: "Go on now, George". It is at this point that George produces his only Response in the passage. It is a challenge to Lennie's dominating position: "You got it by heart".(17) This is followed by a Statement of parallel structure to the Response: "You can do it yourself".(18) Both sentences are of SPCA structure. It is noticeable that George does not directly oppose Lennie with a Response like "No". Instead, he implies that he does not wish to carry on by stressing Lennie's capabilities of doing so himself. This feature, along with the parallelism of the structure makes George's resistance seem rather weak. Lennie replies with a Command: "No, you".(19) followed by a Statement and another instruction to carry on. George then capitulates, as is registered by his Response: "O.K. Someday".

After Lennie's second interruption George again resists Lennie's order to "Tell about that, George".(28) This time the resistance is stronger. It appears as the only Question form that George uses: "Why'n't you do it yourself?"(29) The Question form is obviously stronger than having an implied resistance within a sentence telling of Lennie's capabilities, as we had before. Here, the next sentence "You know all of it".(30) gives that information as support for the resistance produced in 29. It is noticeable that the two sentences comprising George's opposition are not parallel in form as they were in the first instance. The lack of

parallelism makes this instance of resistance more insistent.

Lennie needs to call on greater resources to get George started again. First of all, he produces an immediate reaction in sentence 31: "No you tell it". which is of R&C form, an unusual combination. Besides this he needs two more Commands to produce the desired effect on George's part; "Go on George. How I get to tend the rabbits".(33,34) The second sentence is a prompting of the exact sort of thing required. The analagous sentence in the quelling of George's first resistance was much less specific: "Tell about how its gonna be".(21)

A comparison of George's return to the description of the dream is also telling. In the first instance he acquiesced easily and started off with "O.K.". This time he is much less sure. He begins his sentence with "well", which is separated from the continuance of the description by one of the rare pieces of narrative in the passage, "said George". Thus the narrative here produces an arresting effect which makes us feel a little more of George's reticence in carrying on with the description of the dream.

The final and most forceful instance of George's growing resistance to telling the dream (and hence his dubiousness as to its possibility) is of course at the end of the passage when he refuses to say any more. This is seen in the exclamation "Nuts!" at the end of 36. This exclamation is a complete reversal of the rest of the sentence and thus produces an unusual Sentence Type (S&E) which foregrounds George's increased resistance. The final resistance is stronger than the

others not just in terms of its effect but also because it does not follow an interruption of Lennie's. In the other two instances Lennie has interrupted, and George has attempted a refusal when told to restart. Here he stops himself and then refuses to carry on with a sentence typical of a parent talking to a child: "I ain't got time for no more." which reasserts his control over Lennie. He is thus once again in charge and reverses the state of Lennie's dominance which we have seen pervading the dream sequence as a whole.

NOTES

1. cf. passage X
2. cf. passage VIII
3. It follows from this that despite what one would expect *prima facie*, one cannot use word counts as a measure of dominance. George was on top in passage II and said nearly all of the words. But in I and III the figures are the same even though the roles are reversed. Passage V highlights this point. Lennie is dominant there, but George says most. This is because Lennie is getting George to "tell about" the farm. The figures for V are:

Narrative	George	Lennie
11%	77%	12%
4. This sentence could perhaps be classified as a Statement. It is a statement acting as a Response.
5. This includes one sentence with an r superscript.
6. The sentence also has an e superscript.
7. This classification is preferred because there is a hesitation marker between the response and the command parts of the sentence.
8. There is also a tendency towards the freeing of Bound clauses in this sentence. "And you got me to look after you" seems more free than the usual B clause, and is given the appropriate notation. The sentence ends with a Free clause, so that there is a tendency from B→F which in fact brings us full circle, The "that's why" being a triumphant explanation of the original question "an' why?".
9. It is a feature of Steinbeck's writing that he makes very economical use of the "and" linker. "And" implies a natural connection between the two items it co-ordinates. We expect to see two items of equivalent grammatical rank and with some obvious semantic connection. This expectation is broken here by Lennie co-ordinating a structure of a different rank to the one that George was using. In later passages we will

see how Steinbeck is able to gain particular effects by using "and" to combine two elements which are inappropriate semantically.

10. The situation is rather like that of children and bed-time stories. Children can tell you the exact wording of stories that have been read aloud to them several times. This similarity helps give the impression that Lennie is a child-like figure.
11. Here the mid clauses and their more and more tenuous link with the clause that they are subordinated to helps give the feeling that Lennie is getting carried away with the dream.

1. THE TEXT (pp.34-35)

The bunk house was a long, rectangular building.(1) Inside, the walls were whitewashed and the floor unpainted.(2) In three walls there were small, square windows, and in the fourth, a solid door with a wooden latch.(3) Against the walls were eight bunks, five of them made up with blankets and the other three showing their burlap ticking.(4) Over each bunk there was nailed an apple box with the opening forward so that it made two shelves for the personal belongings of the occupant of the bunk.(5) And these shelves were loaded with little articles, soap and talcum powder, razors and those Western magazines ranch men love to read and scoff at and secretly believe.(6) And there were medicines on the shelves, and little vials, combs; and from the nails on the box sides, a few neckties.(7) Near one wall there was a black cast-iron stove, its stovepipe going straight up through the ceiling.(8) In the middle of the room stood a big square table littered with playing cards, and around it were grouped boxes for the players to sit on.(9)

At about ten o'clock in the morning the sun threw a bright dust-laden bar through one of the side windows, and in and out of the beam flies shot like rushing stars.(10)

The wooden latch raised.(11) The door opened and a tall, stoop-shouldered old man came in.(12) He was dressed in blue jeans and he carried a big push-broom in his left hand.(13) Behind him came George, and behind George, Lennie.(14)

2. THE ANALYSIS

The passage under consideration comes at the beginning of chapter two. It is 263 words long and consists entirely of narrative. A feature of Steinbeck's work in general and of Of Mice and Men in particular is that the author uses blocks of narrative, set apart from the rest of the novel, to set the backcloth for each new scene:

The division of the story into descriptive and narrative parts is the rule in Steinbeck.¹

From his article in Stage² we know that Steinbeck was experimenting with the notion of writing a novel as much like a play as possible. The result in Of Mice and Men is a novel comprised mainly of speech (note the small amount of narrative in the previous passage) with stretches entirely of narrative at the beginning of each chapter. This general structure reminds one of the plays of George Bernard Shaw, who always prefaced each act with a long and detailed description of what that scene must look like. Steinbeck evidently noticed the similarity himself, for he mentions Shaw in the Stage article, saying that Shaw used the technique for tone-setting purposes.

Steinbeck is also using his narrative descriptions to set the tone of each scene. But the method seems to have only limited success. Because the descriptive passages provide such a stark contrast with the rest of the novel, and because they appear in very predictable

places, they assume an air of great significance:

Steinbeck usually starts a chapter with the creation of the proper atmosphere, generally conveyed by a long description of the surroundings; such descriptions can also be found, inside the chapter, just before important events are going to take place.³

These descriptions are thus heavily foregrounded, and yet on examination they do not seem to justify the claim to careful attention that they have made. The reader feels that he is being given "a description" because the technique obtrudes so obviously. Ideally, things should be described to us without our noticing the mechanics involved in the description. This is not so with the narrative passages of Of Mice and Men. Many of the points that Corin makes about The Pearl can also be applied to Of Mice and Men. He says:

The reader will be struck also by the great number of details in Steinbeck's description. Not only do we get this impression from the precise enumeration of little, everyday actions which are as such devoid of interest, or at least not new and not presented in a way that might make them interesting to the reader, but also from the number of words used in the description of these tiny actions, as if all the details, whether relevant or not, were necessary to render the movement, the gesture, the expression of the face. We cannot help feeling that this description is a little too elaborate compared to the effect that it is meant to produce.... Of course, there is nothing wrong, in theory, with the description of ordinary things, but a real artist would have been much more rigorous in his selection and would not have

insisted on depicting the minutest details of each simple gesture as Steinbeck does in sentences like this:-

Juana went to the fire pit and uncovered a coal and fanned it alive while she broke little pieces of brush over it".⁴

Although it is not true that the passage under discussion has no good qualities and no thematic relevancies (I shall point out its merits in the second half of this explication), much of what Corin says above about the descriptive passages in The Pearl is applicable here.

The "great number of details" can be seen if we look at the exponents of S and C. The eight nominal groups expounding C are all different, and very few of the exponents of S display repetition of reference. There are twenty Subjects at clause level and only five of these refer to previously mentioned subjects. There are two instances of anaphoric "he" and one of "it". The dummy Subject "there" is used three times, and if we discount these as they do not refer to anything, then there are only three instances of repetition of reference in the S category. These figures provide a sharp contrast with the state of affairs in other passages. In passage II for example there are eleven noun phrases as exponents of S. In this eleven, "George", "Lennie", and "Lennie's hand" are used three times each and "he" twice. The only Subject which is referred to just once is "Lennie's face". In the C column, two of the three exponents refer to the same thing, the mouse.

Thus there is a comparatively great and unusual variety of things referred to in passage IV. The detailed effect is also conveyed by a tendency to pick out sub-classes from a class already mentioned. We are told that there are eight bunks; next we are told what five of them are like; and then finally information is given about the other three.

Corin also talks of "the great number of words used in the description of these tiny actions". Again, his observation seems to be correct. If we look at the noun phrases expounding S and C for modification and qualification we obtain the following figures:⁵

	TOTAL	NUMBER INVOLVING m	NUMBER INVOLVING q
As S	21	8 (38%)	2 (10%)
As C	8	7 (87.5%)	2 (25%)

The corresponding figures for the narrative in passage II are:

	TOTAL	NUMBER INVOLVING m	NUMBER INVOLVING q
As S	12	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
As C	3	1 (33%)	0 (0%)

Thus in all cases, the figures for passage IV are higher. This conclusion endorses Corin's point. Moreover, it should be noticed that the qualification in the all-narrative passage is often very long. There is an unusually high incidence of five rankshifted clauses out of a total of thirty one.⁶ In some cases, sentences 5 and 9 for example, it seems as if a less normal sentence structure has been employed merely to allow modification at q.

Certainly we are given a great number of details and a lot of information about those details. We are invited to examine very closely the scene inside the bunk house, but there seems to be little reason for doing so. We learn very little about ranch life when we consider the amount of detail that is laid before us. Many of the words seem to be completely superfluous. They bear little extra information. Below is a list of items which appear to be irrelevant:

Sentence 4

"..... five of them made up with blankets"
We know what "five" refers to anaphorically, and "of them" doesn't tell us anything about "five" even though it looks as if it does.

Sentence 5

".... it made two shelves for the personal belongings of the occupants of the bunk".
This clause could easily be expressed as "it made two shelves for the occupant's personal belongings". without losing any information. We know from the first phrase of the sentence "over the bunk" that the bunk is being referred to. Thus "of the bunk" is superfluous.

Sentence 6

".... soap and talcum powder, razors and those Western magazines"
As Steinbeck is giving a list here there is no need for the first "and". The linker gives the sentence an internal balance that it does not seem to need.

Sentence 7

Similarly here; the initial "and" serves no useful purpose. Again, Steinbeck has imposed an unusual rhythm on the first clause of this sentence by giving it a balance - with "on the shelves" as a pivot. Instead of saying, ".... there were medicines, little vials and combs on the shelves" he produces the more unusual ".... there were medicines on the shelves and little vials, combs" The result of this is that the sentence becomes foregrounded. The foregrounding arouses an expectation of significance which is not satisfied by the content of the sentence.

Sentence 8

"Straight" in "straight up through the ceiling" seems to be superfluous. It adds nothing to the atmosphere of the scene. The omission of "straight" or its replacement by "crookedly" would not alter our reaction to the sentence at all.

Sentence 9

".... and around it were grouped boxes for the players to sit on".

"To sit on" is unnecessary. In the context of playing cards on a table one would assume that "boxes for the players" implied that they were to be sat upon, rather than stood upon, vaulted over etc.

Sentence 10

The whole sentence seems to me to be superfluous. It is not out of place in that it endorses the general air of inactivity that has been evoked in the passage, but in

the main, it just seems to satisfy Steinbeck's desire for the picturesque description.

Sentence 13

"He was dressed in blue jeans and he carried a big push-broom in his left hand".

The instance of "he" at the beginning of the second clause is completely unnecessary.⁷

So, besides the large amount of detail and words used in those details, there is also a lot of redundancy.

Redundant items do not add to the reader's knowledge in any way. No attempt has been made to see if any of the information conveyed is irrelevant or not as there is no reasonable way of measuring this. But the large amount of redundancy alone indicates literary padding and hence a lack of control by Steinbeck over his material. The passage under scrutiny seems to be representative of the author's narrative descriptive blocks of writing and so it seems fair to say, as Corin implies, that generally Steinbeck's writing of this type is partly uncontrolled and unsuccessful.

This judgement cannot of course be an absolute one. As I said earlier, there are certain features of the passage which do help in the development of the story. Indeed one would not expect to find a totally irrelevant passage. The description is relevant in two different ways, one incidental and one not. We can discuss this under two headings:

- (1) The effects gained incidentally merely because a passage of narrative as such is being used.

(ii) Those effects which are a product of the way that Steinbeck writes.

(i) Incidental Effects

The narrative descriptions form a contrast term with the rest of the novel in terms of language. They help us notice and appreciate points in the speech of the characters which we might otherwise have missed. The narrative sentences in these blocks are generally longer and more complex than the speech sentences, as indeed one would expect. There are no one-word sentences for example. The large amount of modification, qualification and rankshifting has already been mentioned. All the sentences of the narrative are Statements, whereas the passages of speech are composed of sentences of varying Sentence Types. The sentences of the narrative are grammatically well-formed. This is not the case with "You crazy bastard".(II,23) for example.

These perfectly normal features of prose narrative, by contrasting with the structure of the speech in the novel help us to appreciate that Steinbeck is rendering spoken language. The contrast helps us to believe in the language as naturalistic. The conversations with inter-reaction seen largely in terms of the Sentence Types, the reactions of anger, surprise etc. achieved by short verbless sentences for example, and the lower class speech forms marked by devices like lack of concord between Subject and Predicator all become more pointed because of the standard English that the narrative provides.

(ii) Non-incidental Relevance

Passage IV does have some helpful effects and in some ways aids the development of the themes of the novel. We can usefully divide the passage into two parts, sentences 1-10 and sentences 11-14. The first section gives a picture of the empty bunk house and the second is concerned with the entry of Candy, George and Lennie into the scene. The second part contrasts with the first in that it contains an element of movement not in the first. Steinbeck's main objective is to set the tone of a typical ranch by describing the bunk house. He gives the impression that the ranch hand's life is slow, Spartan and unexciting by describing his living quarters in those terms. When the three men come in the accompanying movement forms a contrast term with the depicted scene, thus helping to stress its static quality.

In sentence 1 the adjectives used to describe the bunk house are purely visual - "long" and "rectangular". Steinbeck could have used emotional epithets like "friendly". By not doing so he keeps the building devoid of life giving it this Spartan quality. This observation is true of the whole passage. In sentence two we are told that the walls are whitewashed and the floors unpainted - the barest of decorations. The adjectives give the impression of barrenness and sterility.

In sentence 3 the room becomes prison-like. The windows are small and square, the door solid. The image is claustrophobic. One feels that the building would

be difficult to escape from. These connotations make us feel that the place is definitely not cosy. The burlap ticking on the bunks is the coarsest of materials. One associates warmth and luxury with beds, but the only article we are told of on these beds is a kind of sacking. The shelves above the beds are made of apple boxes. The articles listed in sentences 6 and 7 are commonplace possessions - soaps and razors. They contrast with the lists of proposed possessions for Lennie and George in their dream sequences. We may not feel that the dream is particularly feasible at this point in the novel, but the comparison with the life that Lennie and George are about to enter certainly makes it seem more desirable. The table in the middle of the room is big and square. There is no hint of gentility. On the contrary, everything is rough and ready. The table is "littered with playing cards", which gives one a total impression of untidiness. The players sit on boxes. Everything in the room is bare. We are shown a static, unexciting way of life. The traditional picture of farm life is a rough and ready but healthy and cheerful existence. This description carefully excludes these latter elements, giving a telling contrast with the dream visions of Lennie and George which are full of images of plenty, warmth and security:

Tell about what we're gonna have in the garden and about the rabbits in the cages and about the rain in the winter and the stove, and how thick the cream is on the milk like you can hardly cut it. (III, 27)

The images are more precise and exude even more well-being in passage V as we shall see later. It is the contrast of atmosphere that the narrative description under discussion evokes which helps make us feel that the dream of Lennie and George is desirable. Life as an ordinary ranch hand certainly does not seem very attractive.

The first section can also be contrasted with the second in terms of structure. The sentences evoking the static description often have an Adjunct theme. This feature of arrest adds to the lack of movement. The Adjunct theme choice is not taken up until the last sentence of the second section. Steinbeck uses this contrast in other passages for similar effects.⁸

Passage IV has two other features of interest: (i) The last of the list of items in sentence 6 is "those Western magazines ranch men love to read and scoff at and secretly believe". This phrase is foregrounded because of the very unusual structure at q - that of three rankshifted clauses. The phrase is analysed as $\text{dehq}((\text{SPP})(\&\text{PA})(\&\text{AP}))$. In this way Steinbeck makes sure that the reader grasps the standard of literacy of the ranch workers. It is obviously low. They only read Western magazines, and what is more, they believe in them. This becomes important later when Crooks is won over to seeing the dream as a possible project. He, unlike the rest of the workers, reads books, and so his challenge to the conceivability of the dream is important. The fact that he is won over goes a long way in convincing the reader that Lennie and

George stand a chance of achieving their dream.

(ii) It is interesting to note the power structure implied in the entry of the three men into the bunk house. The old man, Candy, comes first. He is au fait with the surroundings and is showing the others around. Next comes George, and Lennie follows behind George rather like a dog follows its master. Steinbeck makes a point of this by devoting the two parallel F clauses of sentence 14 to it:

Behind him came George, and behind
George came Lennie.

The sentence is very balanced, pivoting about the co-ordinator "and", making sure that we realise that Lennie is in the lowest position. This is consistent with the view of the Lennie/George relationship that we have seen in operation in the previous passages.

NOTES

1. Fernand Corin, "Steinbeck and Hemingway: A Study in Literary Economy", Revue des Langues Vivantes, Vol XXIV (1958) No 1, pp.60-75. The article is continued in No 2, pp.153-160. All references in this chapter are to the first part however. The subjects of the article are The Pearl by John Steinbeck and The Old Man of the Sea by Ernest Hemingway.
2. "The Novel" p.50.
3. Corin, p.65.
4. Corin, p.66.
5. The figures for constructions involving *m* do not include those which are of *dh* structure. Obviously they do not have any significant modification and so were excluded.
6. There are no instances of rankshifted clauses at all in the narrative of the passages already examined.
7. It has been suggested by a colleague that what Steinbeck was striving for in these all-narrative passages was the feeling that a person as narrator was trying to describe exactly the scene before him. If this is so, the narrator does not seem to have made a very good job of it. But there are reasons for not wanting to take this supposed way out. We get no linguistic indication that a person is telling a story - no references to "I", no questions in the narrative etc. Moreover, such an assumption would upset the tone of the narrative. In the later passages especially one gets the impression that the narrative is totally objective. The narrator does not come through at all; events are described as fact. This can be seen in passage XI especially. Thus there are no hard and fast reasons for supposing the presence of a narrator, and if we do so it produces difficulties later in the novel.
8. In passage X for example, he uses it to help contrast Lennie and the situation around him.

1. THE TEXT (1892-1931)

Lennie dreamed on the table with his fingers. (1)

"George?" (2)

"Huh?" (3)

"George, how long's it gonna be till we get that little place an' live on the fatta the lan' - an' rabbits?" (4)

"I don't know," said George. (5) "We gotta get a big stake together. (6) I know a little place we can get cheap, but they ain't gonna let us have it." (7)

Old Candy turned slowly. (8) His eyes were wide open. (9) He watched Lennie carefully. (10)

Lennie said, "Tell me, George." (11)

"I jus' don't know." (12)

"Go on - tell again, George." (13)

"Well, it's ten acres," said George. (14) "Up to a little win'mill. (15) Got a little house on top an' a chicken run. (16) Got a kitchen, bedroom, bathroom, apples, peaches, 'n' lots, n' a big barn. (17) They's a place for alfalfa and grain, water to flood it. (18) They's a pig pen -" (19)

"An' rabbits," George. (20)

"We gonna get rabbits too, but I ain't sure we'll get a lot of them and we can't have rabbits in the house." (21)

"That's right, I could," said Lennie. (22) "I can get 'em right I could." (23)

George's hands stopped. (24) He was looking at Lennie with a strange expression. (25)

"You pigs," (26) Lennie said. (27) "You pigs, you pigs, you pigs." (28)

"You pigs," Lennie said. (29) "You pigs, you pigs, you pigs." (30)

"You pigs," Lennie said. (31) "You pigs, you pigs, you pigs." (32)

"You pigs," Lennie said. (33) "You pigs, you pigs, you pigs." (34)

"You pigs," Lennie said. (35) "You pigs, you pigs, you pigs." (36)

"You pigs," Lennie said. (37) "You pigs, you pigs, you pigs." (38)

"You pigs," Lennie said. (39) "You pigs, you pigs, you pigs." (40)

"You pigs," Lennie said. (41) "You pigs, you pigs, you pigs." (42)

1. THE TEXT (pp.99-103)

Lennie drummed on the table with his fingers.(1)

"George?"(2)

"Huh?"(3)

"George, how long's it gonna be till we get that little place an' live on the fatta the lan' - an' rabbits?"(4)

"I don' know," said George.(5) "We gotta get a big stake together.(6) I know a little place we can get cheap, but they ain't givin' it away".(7)

Old Candy turned slowly over.(8) His eyes were wide open.(9) He watched George carefully.(10)

Lennie said, "Tell about that place, George".(11)

"I jus' tol' you, jus' las' night".(12)

"Go on - tell again, George".(13)

"Well, it's ten acres", said George.(14) "Got a little win'mill.(15) Got a little shack on it, an' a chicken run.(16) Got a kitchen, orchard, cherries, apples, peaches, 'cots, nuts, got a few berries.(17) They's a place for alfalfa and plenty water to flood it.(18) They's a pig pen --"(19)

"An' rabbits, George".(20)

"No place for rabbits now, but I could easy build a few hutches and you could feed alfalfa to the rabbits".(21)

"Damn right, I could", said Lennie.(22) "You God damn right I could".(23)

George's hands stopped working with the cards.(24) His voice was growing warmer.(25) "An' we could have a few pigs.(26) I could build a smoke house like the one gran'pa had, an' when we kill a pig we can smoke the bacon and the hams, and make sausage an' all like that.(27) An' when the salmon run up river we could catch a hundred of 'em an' salt 'em down or smoke 'em.(28) We could have them for breakfast.(29) They ain't nothing so nice as smoked salmon.(30) When the fruit come in we could can it - and tomatoes, they're easy to can.(31) Ever' Sunday we'd kill a chicken or a rabbit.(32) Maybe we'd have a cow or a goat, and the cream is so God damn thick you got to cut it with a knife and take it out with a spoon".(33)

Lennie watched him with wide eyes, and old Candy watched him too.(34) Lennie said softly, "We could live offa the fatta the lan'".(35)

"Sure," said George.(36) "All kin's a vegetables in the garden, and if we want a little whisky we can sell a few eggs or something, or some milk.(37) We'd jus' live there.(38) We'd belong there.(39) There wouldn't be no more runnin' round the country and gettin' fed by a Jap cook.(40) No, sir, we'd have our own place where we belonged and not sleep in no bunk house".(41)

"Tell about the house, George," Lennie begged.(42)

"Sure, we'd have a little house an' a room to ourself.(43) Little fat iron stove, an' in the winter we'd keep a fire goin' in it.(44) It ain't enough land so we'd have to work too hard.(45) Maybe six, seven hours a day.(46) We wouldn't have to buck no barley eleven hours a day.(47) An' when we put in a crop, why, we'd be there to take the crop up.(48) We'd know what come of our planting".(49)

"An' rabbits," Lennie said eagerly.(50) An' I'd take care of 'em.(51) Tell how I'd do that, George".(52)

"Sure, you'd go out in the alfalfa patch an' you'd have a sack.(53) You'd fill up the sack and bring it in an' put it in the rabbit cages".(54)

"They'd nibble an' they'd nibble", said Lennie, "the way they do.(55) I seen 'em".(56)

"Ever' six weeks or so," George continued, "them does would throw a litter so we'd have plenty rabbits to eat an' to sell.(57) An' we'd keep a few pigeons to go flyin' around the win'mill like they done when I was a kid".(58) He looked raptly at the wall over Lennie's head.(59) "An' it'd be our own, an' nobody could can us.(60) If we don't like a guy we can say, 'Get the hell out', and by God he's got to do it.(61) An' if a fren' come along, why we'd have an extra bunk, an' we'd say, 'Why don't you spen' the night?' an' by God he would.(62) We'd have a setter dog and a couple stripe cats, but you gotta watch out them cats don't get the little rabbits".(63)

2. THE ANALYSIS

The fifth extract chosen is the second of the two dream passages referred to earlier.¹ The two passages are about the same topic - the life that George and Lennie want to lead, a life with distinct advantages over the one that they lead now. But there are features other than the similarity of subject matter which tie the two sequences together. It is noticeable that Lennie uses the phrase "live offa the fatta the lan'" in both texts.² The phrase is of course a cliché. But even clichés occur much less often than common vocabulary words; and the effect here is of an individual set of clichés that has grown up in George and Lennie's frequent, almost ritualistic discussions. There is also a well-worn image which occurs in both passages. In the first dream sequence Lennie uses it; in the second George does:

Tell about and how thick the cream
is on the milk like you can hardly cut it.
(III, 27)

and
..... and the cream is so God damn thick
you got to cut it with a knife and take
it out with a spoon. (V, 33)

The formulation is slightly different, but the principal elements of the image are the same in both cases. The cream is so thick that it has to be cut with a knife.

There are other features repeated in the two dream passages which mark them off as similar. Firstly there is the significant incidence of list structures mentioned in chapter III.³ Just as important is the dominance

relation between Lennie and George. Lennie is assuming dominance here as he was in III. He uses four Command sentences whereas George has none. Tied up with this is the repetition of some of Lennie's verb phrases in the two passages. In III he used the verb "tell" twice (III, 31, 32) and the phrasal verb "tell about" three times (III, 21, 27, 28). This usage is echoed in the passage under discussion, where "tell" is used in sentences 13 and 14, and "tell about" in 11 and 42. In all but one of the nine instances the relevant word or phrase is the imperative verb of a Command sentence.

The former dream sequence was prefaced by a reference to George's voice:

George's voice became deeper. He repeated his words rhythmically as though he had said them many times before. (p.28)

George is affected in a similar way in passage V:

George's hands stopped working with the cards. His voice was growing warmer. (24,25)

This reminds us of the earlier implication that talking of the dream is a regular event for Lennie and George. Indeed, all the features of similarity mentioned so far help endorse this feeling. They tell the reader not just that he is getting another dream about the farm, but that the tellings of the dream vision are ritualistic in the sense that much of their structure is predictable. They use the same words, cliches and images, and contain the same power structure between the two participants. In III we saw that Lennie knew what George was going to say before he said it. By this time so does the reader.

It is essential to note why we are given another dream passage at this point in the novel. There is a need to strengthen the attractiveness of the dream to prevent those features which work against it from outweighing it. The interest of the novel centres around keeping the hope of achieving the dream alive. The first dream sequence was not a particularly strong one. George himself obviously did not think it plausible. From the beginning of chapter 2 of the novel up to passage V the influence of ranch life - the existence opposed to the ranch life - has been dominant. In fact, all those elements which weigh against the achievement of the dream have been developed. George has shown his attraction for some aspects of ranch life. When Whit asked George if he was going to Suzy's place with the boys (pp.92-94) George showed interest. He agreed to go along with them. This represents a threat to the amassing of money which is so necessary if Lennie and George are going to get a farm.

The dangers centering around Lennie have also been developed considerably. Curley's wife has been introduced, and has made a deep impression on Lennie, who we know is attracted to bright, pretty things:

Lennie still stared at the doorway where she had been. "Gosh, she was purty". He smiled admiringly. George looked quickly down at him and then he took him by an ear and shook him.

"Listen to me, you crazy bastard", he said fiercely. "Don't you even take a look at that bitch. I don't care what she says and what she does. I seen 'em poison before, but I never seen no piece of jail bait worse than her. You leave her be".(p.59)

Indeed George recognises the danger inherent in the situation. It is not just that Lennie might repeat the incident of the girl in the red dress. There is also the problem of Curley. He has been depicted not only as a jealous husband, but also as a man continually spoiling for a fight in an effort to prove himself to other men. He runs out after Slim because he is afraid the skinner is with his wife, and he picks on Lennie just because Lennie is bigger than him. Candy says:

S'pose Curley jumps a big guy an' licks him. Ever'body says what a game guy Curley is. And s'pose he does the same thing and gets licked. Then ever'body says the big guy oughtta pick somebody his own size, and maybe they gang up on the big guy. Never did seem right to me. Seems like Curley ain't givin' nobody a chance. (p.50)

We know of Lennie's phenomenal strength. We have seen how he kills mice by accident. The introduction of some more animals, the puppies, helps keep this in our minds, especially as Lennie is given constant warnings not to harm the pup that Slim gave him. George vouches for Lennie's strength: "Lennie ain't no fighter, but Lennie's strong and quick and Lennie don't know no rules". (p.50) The remark about Lennie not knowing any rules makes the comment particularly menacing. A lack of rules implies a chaotic, uncontrollable quality.⁴

It can be seen from the above evidence that at this stage the novel seems to be moving inevitably to a pessimistic conclusion. The book's interest centres round the possibility of Lennie and George achieving

their dream. At this point things are becoming very one-sided, and so a revival of hope for the dream is needed. It is necessary to increase its attractiveness and feasibility as a practical enterprise. The first dream sequence was largely unconvincing as a thesis for the success of the venture. The second one is rather more hopeful and attractive, and the contrast with the former passage helps the reader to see this. Thus, although passage V is very like passage III in many ways, its most important features are its differences as compared with III.

Passage V produces a more sumptuous picture of farm life than III. The first dream sequence assigns the farm nine attributes which make it pleasant to live on. The second, on the other hand, has at least twenty four.⁵ Moreover, these are attributes of a real farm. At the beginning of the passage George says, "I know a little place we can get cheap"(7) This is a major step forward in the attempted achievement of the dream. George's vision is no longer based entirely on fantasy. There is an actual farm which they could buy if they can raise the money. An air of luxury is added to the description by George's saying that the farm will have things other than those needed in order to make it a going concern. George tells Lennie that they could have smoked salmon for breakfast. "Ever' Sunday we'd kill a a chicken or a rabbit".(32) They would be able to get whisky by selling some produce.⁶ There would be pigeons "to go flyin' round the win'mill," a setter dog, and "a

couple stripe cats". This element of luxury contrasts not just with the first dream passage but also with the barrenness of ranch life:

There wouldn't be no more runnin' round
the country and gettin' fed by a Jap cook.
No, sir, we'd have our own place where we
belonged and not sleep in no bunk house.

(40,41)⁷

.... we'd have a little house an' a room
to ourself.(43)⁸

It ain't enough land so we'd have to work
too hard. Maybe six, seven hours a day.
We wouldn't have to buck no barley eleven
hours a day. An' when we put in a crop,
why, we'd be there to take the crop up.
We'd know what come of our planting.

(45-49)⁹

They would have a place of their own and be able to
choose their own company:

An' it'd be our own, an' nobody could can
us. If we don't like a guy we can say, 'Get
the hell out', and by God he's got to do it.
An' if a fren' come along, why we'd have an
extra bunk, an' we'd say, "Why don't you
spen' the night?" an' by God he would.(60-62)

It is noticeable that it is George who produces this
more attractive vision. Lennie does not interrupt as
he did in III because there is no real need. In chapter
III a discussion of the belief structure of the passage
under discussion proved fruitful. Because George did
not believe in the dream the reader could not either.
Here, once again, Lennie assumes control of the situation.
An analysis of the Sentence Types of the passage gives
the following table:

	S	Q	R	C	E	Y
LENNIE	6	1	0	4	2 ¹⁰	1
GEORGE	37 ¹¹	1	2	0	0	1

Lennie has four Commands, but George has none, showing that George is allowing himself to be dominated by Lennie. George has a greater part of the conversation than he did in III. His words account for 77% of the passage here, compared with 52% in passage III.¹² Lennie's portion decreases from 43% to 12%. Yet Lennie is in control in that he is getting what he wants - a telling of the dream description by George. He does not interrupt because he does not need to. George seems to have more faith in the dream. With much less prompting he produces a more sumptuous vision than before.

That George is more enthusiastic and hence believes in what he is saying can be seen in a number of ways. The dream is prompted by Lennie as before, "Tell about that place, George". This time George resists the prompting only nominally. He has two Response sentences, and neither of these show any reluctance to produce the dream description. His only resistance to Lennie's attempt to control the situation is in sentence 12, "I jus' tol' you, jus' las' night". The resistance is obviously weak. The omission of the final plosives in four of the words in the sentence helps the feeling that the response is rather flaccid. All the bite is removed from the sentence. And when Lennie repeats his command George does as he is told:

"Go on - tell again, George"

Well, it's ten acres", said George. (13,14)

The initial "well" is much less hesitant than those used in III. If we compare with III,35 for example, it will be noticed that the absence of an intervening narrative clause eliminates the strong sense of arrest noted there. So George resists Lennie's dominance only once, and even then the resistance is weak.

George's involvement in what he is saying is also brought out by an examination of the status of Lennie's interruptions during George's description. In passage III they were quite long¹³ and formed integral parts of the description. Here, Lennie's comments are much shorter, and George responds differently. In three cases George replies with the agreement Adjunct "sure" and a continuance of the dream description. Twice he ignores Lennie altogether. The first instance is Lennie's words in sentences 22 and 23:

"Damn right, I could", said Lennie. "You
God damn right I could".

George's first sentence after the interruption is not a Response but a Completive statement. It begins with "an'" and carries on the list of things that they could do which he was making before Lennie interrupted. The same sort of situation can be seen with Lennie's interruption in sentences 55 and 56. Again George just carries on regardless with his own account. Lennie's interruptions thus take on the status of asides. George is so wrapped up in the dream that he takes little notice of his partner.

The general use of the co-ordinating linkers "and" and "or" in the passage is interesting. An examination of the speech sentences produces the following results:¹⁴

	PASSAGE III	PASSAGE V
Total of and/or linkers	14	33
Number uttered by George	6=43%	28=82%
Number of clauses uttered by George	27	82
Number of sentences uttered by George	14	39
Incidence of and/or linkers per clause in George's speech	1 in 4.5	1 in 2.5
Number of sentence-initial and/or linkers uttered by George	1	7
Incidence of sentence-initial and/or linkers in George's speech	1 in 14	1 in 5.6

From these figures it can be seen that:

- (a) George uses a greater percentage of the and/or linkers in passage V.
- (b) In George's speech the incidence of these linkers per clause is noticeably higher in passage V.
- (c) The incidence of sentence initial and/or linkers in George's speech is also noticeably higher in passage V.

The increase of and/or linkers in V as compared with III, especially in sentence-initial position makes the passage flow more easily and readily. In this way they help portray George's eagerness to produce the dream description in this passage.

Perhaps the most obvious way in which George's enthusiasm is indicated is seen in the narrative sentences which refer to him. The first instance is in sentences 24 and 25:

George's hands stopped working with the cards. His voice was growing warmer.

In both sentences a part of George is Subject in the surface structure and Initiator/Actor in the deep structure. This implies that it acts of its own accord.

George is getting involved in spite of himself. His aimless fiddling with the cards stops as he does so. The past tense of "was growing" in sentence 25 helps convey the gradual nature of the change.

The other narrative reference to George is in sentence 59, "He looked raptly at the wall over Lennie's head". We can see from this sentence that by now he is completely involved in the dream. He looks at the wall without seeing it, as one does when daydreaming. He is completely unaware of Lennie.

George has been portrayed as the sensible character in the novel. It may look as if his reaction in this passage is inconsistent with this characterisation, but this is not the case. Even when he announces his knowledge of a farm for them to buy he does not get carried away. He says, "I know a little place we can get cheap, but they ain't givin' it away". He realises that just knowing of a farm is not enough. They still have to raise the money to buy it. Indications of common sense like this help us to believe in George as a sensible person and hence helps us to believe in the dream.

In the first twenty sentences of the passage George tells Lennie what the farm will be like. From sentence 21, however, a change occurs in George's description. Instead of saying what things the farm will have he begins to talk about the things that he and Lennie will do. George will build a few hutches; Lennie will feed the rabbits. He talks about the amount of work they

will have to do. This produces yet another contrast with passage III, where the dream farm was described mainly by giving a list of the things it would have. The only proposed action of Lennie and George in that passage was a decidedly passive one - that when it rained they would sit around the stove and listen to the rain on the roof. The contrast can best be seen in terms of the number of transitive verbs used by George:

	PASSAGE III	PASSAGE V
Total number of verbs	24	74
Number of transitive verbs	6	31
Incidence of transitive verbs	1 in 4	1 in 2

From these figures we can say that in the second passage George has a more positive attitude. He is thinking in terms of the things he is going to do rather than the things he might have. He envisages himself as an active rather than a passive agent and so obviously has more faith in the vision he is propounding. One does not work for lost causes. In turn this makes the reader more readily disposed towards the dream.¹⁵

Lennie of course is as keen as ever. He instigates the telling of the dream by drumming on the table with his fingers and asking, "George how long's it gonna be till we get that little place an' live on the fatta the lan' - an' rabbits?"(4) The trend towards ungrammaticality in the sentence marked by the two Mid-clauses helps mirror his enthusiasm. The final clause is a verbless, tag-like construction. This disjointedness typical of spoken language, with each clause seemingly growing out of the

preceding one, helps convey Lennie's keen attitude.

So far this explication has largely ignored what Lennie says, except where it helps show what is happening to George. Lennie is involved in much the same way as George, but on a much more limited scale. For Lennie the proposed future existence is simply a life of luxury with plenty of rabbits. His vision is summed up in the cliché "live offa the fatta the lan'" and the word "rabbits". He brings rabbits into the conversation three times, in sentences 4, 10 and 50. Whenever rabbits are mentioned he comes alive. When George talks about the rabbits in sentence 21 we get, "Damn right, I could", said Lennie. "You God damn right I could". (22,23)

As with George, the narrative makes sure that we interpret the linguistic data correctly.¹⁶ Four pieces of narrative need to be taken note of. Sentence 1, "Lennie drummed on the table with his fingers". helps set Lennie's eager, almost impatient mood. He is also referred to in sentences 34 and 35:

Lennie watched him with wide eyes and
old Candy watched him too. Lennie said
softly

Wide eyes are commonly associated with wonderment - what we would expect as George has been "telling" the dream for some time. In this context the clause final adverb "softly" is also seen as a sign of wonder. Steinbeck uses another clause final adverb, "eagerly" to indicate Lennie's mood in 51. The last feature of the

narrative to be noted is the quoting verb "begged" used in sentence 42. Steinbeck shows Lennie's involvement by departing from the neutral quoting verb "said".

No mention has been made so far of the third person in the scene, Candy, the silent onlooker. We learn of him exclusively through the narrative. George has obviously forgotten that the old man is in the room when he starts the dream description. But when he mentions the "little place we can get cheap" the narrative turns to Candy:

Old Candy turned slowly over. His eyes were wide open. He watched George carefully. (8,9,10)

Candy has been lying inert, brooding over the shooting of his useless old pet dog. Candy is hardly more useful on the ranch than the dog. He is old and has only one hand.¹⁷ Thus he is likely to be attracted by the dream. He regulates his action so as not to disturb the two dreamers. He turns over "slowly" and watches "carefully". The adverb "slowly" in sentence 8 is foregrounded by being put in an unusual position.¹⁸ In this way Steinbeck stresses that Candy is regulating his action in order not to attract the attention of Lennie and George. His interest is implied by the cliché expression of sentence 9 associated with wonderment. Sentence 10 shows this interest even more clearly. Candy in a sense becomes active. He makes a Goal-directed effort with George as Goal.

The only other reference to Candy is in sentence 34,

"Lennie watched him with wide eyes, and old Candy watched him too". The first clause refers to Lennie and the second to George. Both clauses are of SPC^{CA} construction and in both cases the Subject of the clause is watching George. In this way Steinbeck equates Candy with Lennie, showing that Candy is just as interested in the dream.

From the foregoing analysis it can be seen that passage V does much to restore the balance of the novel. The dream life is seen to be more attractive than the ranch life that George and Lennie are leading at present. Lennie is as interested in the dream as ever. But besides this another person, Candy, has shown interest; George and Lennie know of a real farm which would suit their purpose; and, most important of all, George himself is seen to have much more interest and faith in the hypothetical venture. In this way Steinbeck encourages the reader to hope for the success of the venture.

NOTES

1. See chapter III *passim*.
2. See III, 24; V, 4, 35. See also XI, 22 where Steinbeck is using an evocation of the dream to ironic effect. Included in these figures is the slight variation "live on the fatta the lan'" which Lennie uses interchangeably with "live offa the fatta the lan'".
3. see pp. 69-70.
4. The piece of conversation just before passage V begins is particularly interesting. A possible fight between Slim and Curley is in the air because Curley thinks his wife is attracted to Slim. George says, "You give me a good whore every time Andy's in San Quentin right now on account of a tart". Prostitution implies non-involvement. Lennie is likely to get involved with Curley's wife. The fact that Lennie and George know of one person who is in gaol already because of such a woman emphasises the dangers of the situation.
5. Passage III: a little house, a couple of acres, a cow, some pigs, rabbits, hutches, a stove, thick cream on the milk, a vegetable patch and chickens. Passage V: ten acres, a windmill, a shack, a chicken run, orchard, cherries, apples, apricots, nuts, a few berries, a place for water and plenty of water to flood it, salmon in the river, tomatoes, chickens, rabbits, a cow, a goat, thick cream, a garden, a stove, pigeons, a dog and a couple of cats.
6. See sentence 37.
7. The construction of sentence 40 is unusual. Both "running round the country" and "gettin' fed by a Jap cook" are analysed as exponents of C¹. George is saying that he dislikes the drifting life and the lack of home comforts. He does this by putting the two abstract ideas into actual terms. The oddity of the grammar helps emphasise his antipathy to these aspects of ranch life. He also signals this by beginning his next sentence with a response, "No, sir". It is as if he is holding a conversation with himself. The stress is on belonging somewhere.

"Place" is modified by "our own" and qualified by the rankshifted clause "where we belonged". Thus the same idea is put over in both the modifier and the qualifier to the headword. The double negative in the last clause of 41 again helps stress George's antipathy towards ranch life.

8. The cosiness of the place is stressed. The collocation of "little" with "house" does not have a diminutive connotation as it does with other nouns. Instead the house is made more desirable. The fact that they will have a room each with the privacy it gives (contrast the bunk house) is stressed by the qualification of "room" by "to ourselves". "To ourselves" has a connotation of intimacy that "a room each" or "our own room" does not have. A typical context for it would be the sentence, "We've got the place to ourselves at last".
9. The fact that they will not have to work too hard is foregrounded by a switch to the present tense and an unusual use of "enough" in sentence 45. "Enough" is usually used in the sense of "a sufficient quantity for a particular purpose" and usually predicts the prepositions "to" or "for" as in: "Is it big enough to get us all in?" and "Is there enough butter for us all?" Here, however, it is used in the sense of "a quantity more than is desired" and is followed by the linking Adjunct "so".
10. One of these has a q superscript.
11. Five of these have an r superscript.
12. The figures are as follows:

	NARRATIVE	LENNIE	GEORGE
PASSAGE III	5%	43%	52%
PASSAGE V	11%	12%	77%

13. cf. III, 24-28 for example.
14. The figures include all inter-clausal "and" linkers and all those in sentence-initial position. The one occurrence of "or" in passage V is also included. The two instances of the "so" linker in passage V are not included even though they would strengthen my case here. They seem to have a strong causal

sense in this passage. The other commonly noted co-ordinating linker "but" is omitted as it is *adversative* in function. What I am interested in are those linkers which help carry on the flow of information without indicating a change of attitude on the part of the speaker. George uses one instance of "but" in each passage.

15. Even Lennie's rabbits are active in passage V. "They'd nibble an' they'd nibble", said Lennie, "the way they do." (55) George sees them as productive: "Ever' six weeks or so", George continued, "them does would throw a litter so we'd have plenty rabbits to eat an' to sell". (57)
16. It is apparent that certain features could be used to indicate different things. For example shortened grammatical constructions e.g. "got to" for "I've got to" could indicate either enthusiasm or boredom. Narrative must be used to push the reader to the required interpretation. In this passage there is little narrative (11%) but what there is is very important. If it was not for the narrative we would not know of Candy at all.
17. We are constantly reminded that Candy is old. When he was first introduced in passage IV he was described as "a tall, stoop-shouldered old man". Both of the references to Candy in the passage under discussion also describe him as old.
18. Jacobson gives the following figures for "slowly": F(22=4%), M(180=31%), E(375=65%).

1. THE TEXT (pp.103-106)

George sat entranced with his own picture.(1)

When Candy spoke they both jumped as though they had been caught doing something reprehensible.(2) Candy said, "You know where's a place like that?"(3)

George was on guard immediately.(4) "S'pose I do", he said.(5) "What's that to you?"(6)

"You don't need to tell me where it's at.(7) Might be any place".(8)

"Sure", said George.(9) "That's right.(10) You couldn't find it in a hundred years".(11)

Candy went on excitedly, "How much they want for a place like that?"(12)

George watched him suspiciously.(13) "Well - I could get it for six hundred bucks.(14) The ol' people that owns it is flat bust an' the ol' lady needs an operation.(15) Say - what's it to you?(16) You got nothing to do with us".(17)

Candy said, "I ain't much good with on'y one hand.(18) I lost my hand right here on this ranch.(19) That's why they give me a job swampin'.(20) An' they give me two hundred an' fifty dollars 'cause I los' my hand.(21) An' I got fifty more saved up right in the bank, right now.(22) Tha's three hundred, and I got fifty more comin' the enda the month.(23) Tell you what --"(24) He leaned forward eagerly.(25) "S'pose I went in with you guys.(26) Tha's three hundred an' fifty bucks I'd put in.(27) I ain't much good, but I could cook and tend the chickens and hoe the garden some.(28) How'd that be?"(29)

George half-closed his eyes.(30) "I gotta think about that.(31) We was always gonna do it by ourselves".(32)

Candy interrupted him, "I'd make a will an' leave my share to you guys in case I kick off, 'cause I ain't got no relatives nor nothing.(33) You guys got any money?(34) Maybe we could do her right now"(35)

George spat on the floor disgustedly.(36) "We got ten bucks between us".(37) Then he said thoughtfully, "Look if me an' Lennie work a month an' don't spen' nothin', we'll have a hundred bucks.(38) That'd be four fifty.(39) I bet we could swing her for that.(40) Then you an' Lennie could go get her started an' I'd get a job an' make up the res', an' you could sell eggs an' stuff like that".(41)

They fell into a silence.(42) They looked at one another, amazed.(43) This thing they had never really believed in was coming true.(44) George said reverently, "Jesus Christ!(45) I bet we could swing her".(46) His eyes were full of wonder.(47) I bet we could swing her," he repeated softly.(48)

2. THE ANALYSIS

Although this passage begins only six lines after the end of passage V it is very different in type. The dream has gone and so has Lennie. Lennie does not speak at all, and the only indication that he is present is in sentence 2, "When Candy spoke they BOTH jumped as though they had been caught doing something reprehensible." The conversation is entirely between George and Candy. 1

Lennie's disappearance from the conversation is accompanied by the disappearance of Vocatives ² and 3 constructions from the text. In the passages examined so far, George has only used these types of construction when expressing his anger at Lennie. Similarly there are no Mid-clauses or Completive sentences. Thus now that Lennie is not an active participant in the scene there is a reversal of the trend away from grammaticality noted earlier.

In passage V George did most of the talking. Here, however, the situation is different. A word count produces the following figures:

<u>NARRATIVE</u>	<u>CANDY</u>	<u>GEORGE</u>
23%	41%	36%

George has only half the speech sentences, and the narrative increases from 11% to 23%. This is mainly because passage VI is much more of a conversation than the dream passages.³ The narrative is needed to keep the reader informed of the reactions of the characters

to what is said. Those reactions are continually changing in this passage. In this respect the text under discussion is similar to passage I, the figures for which were:

NARRATIVELENNIEGEORGE

26%

30%

44%

The narrative percentage and the ratio between the two speakers are very similar. The comparison is a fair one, for now, as then, a conversation between two people with different standpoints is being depicted. Candy is trying to persuade the reluctant George to let him join the scheme.

The stratagem seen in passage V of making the reader more hopeful about the dream is carried on in VI but in a different way. In V we heard about the farm and witnessed the beginning of Candy's interest. Here that interest becomes a bid to get in on the scheme. An integral part of the bid is the announcement that Candy has a large amount of money, enough to get the scheme off the ground. This in turn makes the attainment of the dream more feasible.

The physical connection with passage V can be seen in the first sentence, "George sat entranced with his own picture". That is, the picture he has just evoked in V. The description of George is static. The Predicator is intransitive and the Complement intensive.

This inaction contrasts with the state of affairs when Candy reveals himself:

When Candy spoke they both jumped as though they had been caught doing something reprehensible. (2)

Candy just wants to get in on the dream scheme, but George has some guilt feelings and is on the offensive. Candy needs to find out more about the dream and to try and persuade George that he could be a useful partner. Thus neither man is in a submissive mood. Both are circumspect. This is brought out in an examination of the Sentence Types:

	S	Q	C	R
GEORGE	14 ⁴	2	0	2
CANDY	12	5	1 ⁵	0

Neither speaker uses Commands to try and control the situation. This is because neither of them are really sure of themselves. There is little difference in the figures for Statements, as one would expect as Candy and George say roughly the same amount. But Candy has more Questions than George, and George produces nearly all the sentences with response elements in them. Neither man picks up the other's lexical items - indicating a resistance to each other's dominance.⁶

Candy starts off the conversation; but we are told that he has spoken and see Lennie and George's reaction before we hear his words. By doing this Steinbeck can use the description of George after Candy's words to show a

different reactions:

George was on guard immediately. "S'pose I do", he said. What's that to you?"(4,5,6) 7

George's speech reinforces the attitude described in the narrative. The Response and Question are hardly friendly ones. He is clearly wary of giving anything away to Candy because he might spoil their plans. By splitting up the two speech clauses Steinbeck produces an arresting effect, helping to give the feeling that George is choosing his words carefully. Candy's reply, "You don't need to tell me where it's at. Might be any place". (7,8) is conciliatory. George responds to this with:

"Sure", said George. "That's right. You couldn't find it in a hundred years".(9,10,11)

The narrative quoting clause once again separates George's response word from the rest, again helping to convey his caution. The construction of sentence 9 is thus similar to V,36. He agrees with Candy's analysis. Sentence 10 repeats what has been realised in 9, and 11 elaborates on it with a clichéd hyperbole. This emphasises the fact that George has accepted Candy's intimation that he cannot ruin the scheme. At this point ^{he} tries to elicit information:

Candy went on excitedly, "How much they want for a place like that?" (12)

The reader's reaction to Candy's words is piloted by the final adverb of the narrative clause. Of the twenty three narrative clauses in this passage, seven have an adverb of manner in final position. It is the only real indication of George's reaction in sentence 13, "George watched him suspiciously".

It is noticeable that Steinbeck does not always use quoting verbs to introduce new stretches of speech. This avoids monotony. He indicates a change of speaker not just by using "he said" and its variants (e.g. "Candy went on."(12)) but also by using descriptive sentences with the next speaker as Subject. This can be seen not just in sentence 13 but also in the following:

George was on guard immediately.(4)
 George half-closed his eyes.(30)
 George spat on the floor disgustedly.(36)

In each case the narrative sentence introduces a new speaker and indicates his attitude.

George's renewed suspicion after Candy's eagerness is reflected in his reply, "Well - I could get it for six hundred bucks".(14) The initial "well", separated from the rest of the sentence by a dash indicates hesitancy on the part of the speaker. George does go on to tell about the farm however. For the first time a price is quoted, "six hundred bucks". Moreover, the people that own the farm are ripe for an offer:

The ol' people that owns it is flat
 bust an' the ol' lady needs an
 operation.(15)

The adjective "ol'" is used to modify both "people" and "lady", thus stressing their inability to keep the farm going. At this point George realises that he is giving away rather a lot of information. He interrupts the flow of speech with the Adjunct "say", and then asks a question very similar to sentence 6, "Say - what's it to you?"(16) He was reacting against Candy's inquisitiveness in 6 as well.

George now comes out with the point that has been at the back of his mind for some time, "You got nothing to do with us".(17) It is this outright statement that gives Candy his chance to explain his position. His speeches become longer in the second half of the passage as he shows his use to Lennie and George, and becomes more confident. He begins by demeaning himself to gain sympathy:

Candy said, "I ain't much good with on'y one hand. I lost my hand right here on this ranch. That's why they give me a job swamin'".(18,19,20)

His position in life separates him, like Lennie and George, from the rest of the cowboys. He makes a point of saying that he lost his hand on that very ranch. The two adverbial phrases in sentence 19 both refer to the same place. When he tells of the job that he was given after he lost his hand he switches from using "I" to unspecified "they" as Subject. "They" are obviously the ranch owners. By referring to them in this way Candy keeps them remote and impersonal, helping to get sympathy for himself.

But it was not just a new job that Candy was given:

"An' they give me two hunderd an' fifty dollars 'cause I los' my hand. An' I got fifty more saved up right in the bank, right now. Tha's three hunderd, and I got fifty more comin' the enda the month.
(21,22,23)

The old man has a large lump sum which the reader realises could be used to help buy the farm. Candy is beginning to get excited again. His sentences are given

a run-on appearance by the use of initial "and" linkers in 21 and 22. Of the six clauses in sentences 21, 22 and 23, three begin with "and". The very feature which made Candy seem useless before has in fact made him extremely useful. He makes the most of this advantage. He does not just tell Lennie and George that he has three hundred and fifty dollars. Instead, he talks of having two hundred and fifty and then of two other amounts of fifty, adding these on as he goes along. This gives him the chance of making two summing-up totals, thus emphasising his importance to the project. Candy's excitement and his effort to impress upon the others that he has the money at that very moment can be seen in his use of the specifying modifier "right" in sentence 22. He has three hundred dollars "right in the bank right now". The omission of the two instances of "right" would not alter the amount of information conveyed. They stress the fact that he actually has the money in his possession.⁸ It is only after that he has set things up in this way that Candy puts forward the proposal that the reader has known to be coming for some time:

"Tell you what--" He leaned forward eagerly. "S'pose I went in with you guys". (24, 25, 26)

The intervention of the narrative in the middle of the speech helps the arresting effect indicated by the dash. In this way Candy makes it seem as if his proposal is spontaneous. It will be noticed that Candy uses two lead-ins before he actually gets to the proposition. This indicates his excitement at putting the all-important question.

After his proposal Candy changes tack. He comes back to his original claim of sentence 18, "I ain't much good"(28), which statement he has since disproved. He now goes about disproving it in another manner by enumerating the ways he could help on the farm, ".... but I could cook and tend the chickens and hoe the garden some".(28) He shows how active he could be by describing what he could do in terms of three transitive verbs.⁹ Candy has tried everything he can now, and there is nothing left but to ask outright to join the in-group: "How'd that be?"(29)

George deliberates. This can be seen in the narrative description of him, "George half-closed his eyes".(30) He does not want Candy to think he has been won over just like that. He says, "I gotta think about that. We was always gonna do it by ourselves".(31,32) He shows that he has still not accepted Candy into the scheme by using the Subject "we" and the adverbial phrase "by ourselves", where "ourselves" is appositional to "we". Candy is not included in this grouping. He has never been able to use "we" at all throughout the passage so far.

But Candy is not done yet. He interrupts, saying that he will leave his share of the ranch to them in his will, "'cause I ain't got no relatives nor nothin'". He stresses the absence of anyone else for him to give his share to by using a double negative and also by co-ordinating "nothin'" with "relatives" by "nor". Then he swings attention away from himself towards the possibility of putting the scheme into practice immediately.

He does this with two questions:

"You guys got any money? Maybe we could do her right *now*?" (34,35)

Characteristically he modifies "now" by "right" to make it seem more immediate. When he asks if they have got any money he feels confident enough to use "we" for the first time. George is obviously disappointed:

George spat on the floor disgustedly.

"We got ten bucks between us". (36,37)

This seems to dash all hopes for the moment. But then George has a change of mood, "Then he said thoughtfully, "Look, if me an' Lennie work a month an' don't spen' nothing, we'll have a hundred bucks" (38). The initial "then" of the narrative predicts a change of some kind, and the clause final adverb "thoughtfully" contrasts with the "disgustedly" of 36. The initial Adjunct of George's speech indicates interest. The Free clause is preceded by two conditioned Bound clauses, thus showing that George is trying to reason things out logically. If they try, he and Lennie can amass a hundred dollars in a month. He then adds that amount to Candy's, showing that has accepted the old man into the scheme, "That'd be four fifty". (39) In doing so he uses Candy's method of mentioning a sum and adding it on to the rest to produce a total. His total-producing sentence is also of the same structure as the ones that Candy used, SPCⁱ with "that" as Subject, P expounded by the verb "to be" and Cⁱ by a number. Thus George's acceptance of Candy is seen not just by his adding their money together, but also in his using the same type of

construction as Candy.

This acceptance of Candy can be seen in 40, where George uses "we" to include him for the first time, and in 41, where George talks of "you an' Lennie", thus bracketing them together:

I bet we could swing her for that. Then you an' Lennie could go get her started an' I'd get a job an' make up the res', an' you could sell eggs an' stuff like that.(40,41)

Sentence 41 is similar to 28. It has the same overall sentence structure, F&F&F&F, and, like 28, the verbs of the last three clauses are all transitive. It is also talking about the farm. As with passage V, we feel that the scheme has more chance of success because the participants are prepared to do something to make things happen rather than just sit and hope.

Now the importance of the money has been made clear, the situation becomes analagous to that at the beginning of this section. There George was entranced by the dream vision he had evoked. Here we are told that, "They fell into a silence".(42) The sentence is odd because of the unusual adverbial phrase construction. "They fell silent." would be more normal. The state of affairs is underlined by the next two sentences:

They looked at one another, amazed.
This thing they had never really
believed in was coming true.(43,44)

The phrase "one another" implies more than two people, again showing that Candy is now a member of the scheme. Their amazement is foregrounded by the

final position of the one-word B clause "amazed". It is followed by a bald statement of the situation. The dream is coming true. It is noticeable that the narrative tells us that it is coming true, not merely that George and the others think it is. By using a form akin to free direct speech Steinbeck can omit the quoting verb, thus increasing the reader's faith in the dream.¹⁰

The last four sentences of the passage are very important. They concentrate on George, the only person whose judgement the reader can trust:

George said reverently, "Jesus Christ! I bet we could swing her". His eyes were full of wonder. "I bet we could swing her", he repeated softly. (45-48)

The adverb "reverently" tells us of George's attitude. He is full of awe at the prospect of achieving his dreams. Reverence suggests quietness and has slight religious connotations, indicating that the exclamatory clause "Jesus Christ!" is said softly.¹¹ The attitude of reverence takes one's attention off the colloquial nature of George's speech and pinpoints the reader's attention on the main thesis of George's words - his belief that they can make the dream come true (again, note the element of active participation involved in 45 and 48).

Thus it can be seen that this passage continues the work begun in passage V of making the dream of the farm seem more practicable. In that passage the idea of a real farm was introduced; Candy, an outsider was seen to be interested; and George was seen to believe in

the dream's reality more than at any other time in the novel. Here, Candy becomes actively involved in the scheme, and offers to provide a large amount of the money needed to pay for the farm; and George's belief in the success of the dream becomes so great at the end of the passage that he actually puts it into words. Because George believes in the dream so can we. In this way Steinbeck restores the balance of the novel. At this point it no longer seems that the dream is futile, thus keeping the interest of the novel going. Moreover, by bringing the achievement of the dream closer Steinbeck helps to heighten the eventual tragic outcome of the story.

NOTES

1. My capitals
2. The vocative is characteristic of Lennie's speech. George uses one in the first six passages, "you crazy bastard" of I, 18. Lennie on the other hand uses six in passage I, four in III and seven in V. He only has one sentence in II, and IV is composed entirely of narrative. In every case, the vocative that Lennie uses is "George". This stresses Lennie's dependence on his friend. His use of the vocative is odd in that it is always in a one-to-one situation.
3. This observation also holds for the anti-dream in passage II.
4. This figure includes two sentences with r superscript.
5. The sentence in question is 26. It is labelled as a Command, but unhappily so. It is really a lead-in to what Candy is going to say. He is not producing an order.
6. For a note on lexical repetitions see appendix I.
7. According to Jacobson "immediately" is in a somewhat unusual position. His figures are F(3=10%), M(20=65%), E(8=26%). But as these percentages are over a rather small sample of 31 items it would not be wise to say that it is foregrounded.
8. Candy also used "right" in this way in sentences 19 and 35. Thus it seems to be characteristic of his speech.
9. We have seen already that the use of transitive verbs helped make the dream seem more realistic in passage V.
10. Michael Gregory, "Old Bailey Speech in 'A Tale of Two Cities'", A Review of English Literature, Vol VI No 2, (April 1965) pp.42-55, says:
 "Free indirect speech is seen to have features in common with both direct and indirect speech. It tends to follow the 'rules' of indirect speech as regards both verb tense and pronoun

person; on the other hand it tends not to exhibit subordination to a reporting verb and it preserves in Ullman's words, 'various emotive elements which have to be sacrificed in indirect reporting: questions, explanations, interjections; adverbs which give the utterance a subjective colouring; colloquial, vulgar and slang terms which are expressive of the speakers character.'

The reference to Ullman is Style in the French Novel, (O.U.P.1957), p.97.

11. The play on words produced by the collocation of "reverently" and "Jesus Christ" is not helpful. It takes the reader's attention away from what is happening at this point in the passage. Steinbeck puts reverence and blasphemy close together for no apparent reason.

1. THE TEXT (pp.110-113)

Curley stepped over to Lennie like a terrier.(1)
 "What the hell you laughin' at?"(2)

Lennie looked blankly at him.(3) "Huh?"(4)

Then Curley's rage exploded.(5) "Come on, ya big bastard.(6) Get up on your feet.(7) No big son-of-a-bitch is gonna laugh at me.(8) I'll show ya who's yella".(9)

Lennie looked helplessly at George, and then he got up and tried to retreat.(10) Curley was balanced and poised.(11) He slashed at Lennie with his left, and then smashed down his nose with a right.(12) Lennie gave a cry of terror.(13) Blood welled from his nose.(14) "George", he cried.(15) "Make 'um let me alone, George".(16) He backed until he was against the wall, and Curley followed, slugging him in the face.(17) Lennie's hands remained at his sides; he was too frightened to defend himself.(18)

George was on his feet yelling, "Get him, Lennie.(19) Don't let him do it".(20)

Lennie covered his face with his huge paws and bleated with terror.(21) He cried, "Make 'um stop, George".(22) Then Curley attacked his stomach and cut off his wind.(23)

Slim jumped up.(24) "The dirty little rat," he cried, "I'll get 'um myself".(25)

George put out his hand and grabbed Slim.(26) "Wait a minute," he shouted.(27) He cupped his hands around his mouth and yelled, "Get 'im, Lennie!"(28)

Lennie took his hands away from his face and looked about for George, and Curley slashed at his eyes.(29) The big face was covered with blood.(30) George yelled again, "I said get him".(31)

Curley's fist was swinging when Lennie reached for it.(32) The next minute Curley was flopping like a fish on a line, and his closed fist was lost in Lennie's big hand.(33) George ran down the room.(34) "Leggo of him, Lennie.(35) Let go."(36)

But Lennie watched in terror the flopping little man whom he held.(37) Blood ran down Lennie's face, one of his eyes was cut and closed.(38) George slapped him in the face again and again, and still Lennie held on to the

closed fist.(39) Curley was white and shrunken by now, and his struggling had become weak.(40) He stood crying, his fist lost in Lennie's paw.(41)

George shouted over and over, "Leggo his hand, Lennie.(42) Leggo.(43) Slim, come help me while the guy got any hand left."(44)

Suddenly Lennie let go his hold.(45) He crouched cowering against the wall.(46) "You tol' me to, George," he said miserably.(47)

Curley sat down on the floor, looking in wonder at his crushed hand.(48) Slim and Carlson bent over him.(49) Then Slim straightened up and regarded Lennie with horror.(50) "We got to get him in to a doctor," he said.(51) "Looks to me like ever' bone in his han' is bust."(52)

"I didn't wanta," Lennie cried.(53) "I didn't wanta hurt him."(54)

2. THE ANALYSIS.

This passage contains the first real incident on the downward slope of the novel towards its tragic conclusion. We have often been told about Lennie's phenomenal strength and his tendency to get out of control. This is the first time that we actually see what we have been told about. It also represents the next step up in Lennie's list of unseemly transgressions. Every time he gets out of George's control he produces chaos on an increasingly larger scale. He has killed mice and molested a girl. Now he gets pushed into a fight with Curley and crushes his opponent's hand. During the fight he is completely out of control. This helps develop the theme of Lennie's preventing the realisation of his own dream because of what he is. The fight is also important in the plot structure of the novel as it gives Curley a hate motive for his actions at the end of the book when he pushes for Lennie's "execution".

This is the first passage containing speech which also has a relatively high proportion of narrative. The narrative accounts for 340 out of 469 words, or 72% of the passage. This is because there are a lot of actions to be described rather than a number of opinions to be enunciated. Thus the difference in situation is reflected in the narrative/speech ratio. The speech itself also reflects the change. An analysis of the Sentence Types gives:

	S	C	Q	R	E
LENNIE	3	2	1	0	1
SLIM	3 ¹	0	0	0	0
CURLEY	2	2	1	0	0
GEORGE	0	10	0	0	0

The S.T. distribution is much more clearly defined than in previous passages. Conversation markers are conspicuously absent. There are no Responses at all, and no sentences with response Adjuncts in them. There are only two Questions, and these are both at the beginning of the passages (sentences 2 and 4). Only eight out of the twenty six speech sentences are Statements.² 54% of the sentences are Commands. Every sentence that George utters is a Command. The high incidence of this Sentence Type reflects the attempts of the various participants to exercise control over the situation. Another measure indicating this situation is the high incidence of Vocatives. 8% of the speech words are Vocatives.³ George uses five Vocatives in this passage whereas he has only used one in all of the passages examined so far.

The fight is started in a manner consistent with the characters of Curley and Lennie as we know them. Earlier (p.49) Candy said of Curley, "He's all the time picking scraps with big guys". Just before the beginning of this passage he has been made a fool of by Slim, and all the other ranch hands have been getting at him. Curley is enraged and sees Lennie "still smiling with delight at the memory of the ranch". He uses this as an excuse to pick on the bigger man, "Curley stepped over to Lennie like a terrier".(1) Curley is likened to a terrier. This is the beginning of a dehumanising trend associated with the two fighters which helps show how uncontrolled they are. The quick action associated with terriers is also reflected in the phrase "stepped over to". It implies one quick action not seen in "walked over to" for example.

Steinbeck's use of animal imagery is interesting. It is not consistent or iterative. That is, images associated with a particular animal or sort of animal are not consistently used to describe one person, nor does the imagery change appropriately in accordance with the themes of the novel. Instead, the characters are likened to animals only when particular associations are needed for a specific local effect:

Curley stepped over to Lennie like a terrier.(1)

Lennie covered his face with his huge paws and bleated with terror.(21)

The next minute Curley was flopping like a fish on a line (33)

He [Curley] stood crying, his fist lost in Lennie's paw.(41)

He Lennie crouched cowering against the wall.(46)

In sentence 1 Curley is likened to a terrier. But by 33 he is "flopping like a fish on a line". He is also described as flopping in sentence 37. The imagery has little to do with his character but is very appropriate to the immediate state of affairs. Curley has changed from being hunter to victim.

Sentence 21 likens Lennie to two different sorts of animal at the same time. Paws belong to dogs, bears, lions etc. Sentence 41 also refers to Lennie's fist as a paw. His hands are large and so we associate them with a bear's paws. But he bleats with terror, which associates him not with a bear but with a sheep, thus transferring that animal's defenceless characteristics

to him. Both pieces of imagery, though inconsistent, are appropriate. Lennie has tremendous physical strength but is mentally weak, and allows himself to be subjected to a beating. Thus he is both a bear and a sheep at the same time. After he has broken Curley's hand Lennie is described as "cowering". This is a verb associated generally with animals who expect to be hurt, which again is exactly appropriate to Lennie's condition. He thinks he has done something wrong and expects to be punished for it. Thus it can be seen that Steinbeck uses animal imagery randomly to bring in particular associations and to get over specific local effects.

When Curley deliberately attacks Lennie he uses Lennie's smiling as an excuse. Lennie, of course, does not understand what is going on:

"What the hell you laughin' at?"

Lennie looked blankly at him. "Huh?" (2,3,4)

Curley is angry but Lennie does not understand why. The narrative makes sure that we see that Lennie does not comprehend what is going on. From the very beginning it is obvious that Curley is on the offensive whereas Lennie is completely bewildered. The "title" chosen for the passage reflects what is going on. Curley is fighting Lennie, not vice versa. The situation can best be seen by looking at the Goal-directed actions of the two fighters.⁴ Below is a list of those actions:

(A) LENNIE AS ACTOR

<u>SENTENCE</u>	<u>ACTOR</u>	<u>VERB</u>	<u>GOAL</u>
3.	Lennie	looked	at him [Curley]
10.	Lennie	looked	at George
21.	Lennie	covered	his [Lennie's] face

29. Lennie took his [Lennie's] hands away from his face
29. he looked about for George
32. Lennie reached for it [Curley's fist]
37. Lennie watched the flopping little man [Curley]
39. Lennie held on to the closed fist [Curley's]
45. Lennie let go his hold

(B) CURLEY AS ACTOR

<u>SENTENCE</u>	<u>ACTOR</u>	<u>VERB</u>	<u>GOAL</u>
1.	Curley	stepped over	to Lennie
12.	He	slashed	at Lennie
12.	[Curley]	smashed	down his [Lennie's] nose
17.	[Curley]	slugging	him [Lennie] in the face
23.	Curley	attacked	his [Lennie's] stomach
23.	[Curley]	cut off	his [Lennie's] wind
29.	Curley	slashed	at his [Lennie's] eyes

A comparison shows the two lists to be different in two respects. The verbs describing Curley's actions are much more forceful than those describing Lennie. Curley slashes, attacks and slugs, whereas Lennie looks and watches. All Curley's actions have Lennie or a part of Lennie as their Goal, whereas only three of the constructions with Lennie as Actor have Curley as Goal. Of the fourteen extensive Complements in the passage, ten have Lennie or a part of Lennie as exponent. This shows how much he is on the receiving end. Thus Curley is shown to be attacking Lennie specifically whereas Lennie

is portrayed as much more passive, and by the variety of Goals for his Goal-directed actions, as not really alive to the situation.

After Lennie's bewildered enquiry we are told, "Then Curley's rage exploded.(5) By having "Curley's rage" as both Subject in the surface structure and Initiator/Actor in the deep structure of the sentence, Steinbeck helps convey the uncontrolled nature of the explosion. The initial Adjunct "then" makes the effect sudden. It implies that although Lennie's reaction immediately precedes the advent of Curley's rage there is no necessary causal connection between the two. This is in fact the case. Curley is looking for an excuse to vent his anger, and Lennie is the excuse, not the cause:

"Come on, ya big bastard. Get up on your feet. No big son-of-a-bitch is gonna laugh at me. I'll show ya who's yella".(6-9)

Curley's anger is indicated by the "names" he calls Lennie, "ya big bastard" and "big son-of-a-bitch". In both cases the headword of the nominal group is modified by "big". Curley is emphasising to the others that he is taking on someone bigger than himself. The two Statements of sentences 8 and 9 are both inappropriate. We know that Lennie is not laughing at Curley at all. And he is certainly not challenging Curley's courage. It is the others that are doing that, and Curley is picking on Lennie to try and prove his valour.

Curley's attack on Lennie is described at some length and in brutal terms. Before the turn round in sentence 32, when Lennie grabs Curley's hand, eight

sentences are used to describe Curley's attacks on Lennie and their results:

Curley was balanced and poised. He slashed at Lennie with his left, and then smashed down his nose with a right. Lennie gave a cry of terror. Blood welled from his nose.(11-14)

He backed until he was against the wall, and Curley followed, slugging him in the face.(17)

Then Curley attacked his stomach and cut off his wind.(23)

Lennie took his hands away from his face and looked about for George, and Curley slashed at his eyes. The big face was covered with blood.(29,30)

The description of the first attack makes a point of Curley's boxing capabilities.⁵ Before he starts he is balanced and poised. His blows are called lefts and rights - boxing terminology in this context. He hits Lennie in the face, and then, in 23, switches to the stomach. All this suggests a methodic quality in Curley's attack, which in turn emphasises Lennie's helplessness. The verbs describing Curley's blows are particularly brutal. He slashes, slugs and smashes.⁶

There is an ambiguity in the last clause of sentence 12 which also emphasises Curley's brutality. Curley ".... smashed down his nose with a right". If "down" is analysed as a preposition introducing the adverbial phrase "down his nose" then we get an image of the direction of Curley's blow. If it is treated as part of a phrasal verb "smashed down", then "his nose" becomes an extensive Complement and Lennie's nose

actually gets smashed. Every attack that Curley makes has a particular part of Lennie as Goal, and in three of the four cases we are told of the physical result on Lennie. Twice (sentences 14 and 30) we are told that Lennie is bleeding profusely, and in sentence 23 we are also told that he is winded.⁷

Thus Curley attacks Lennie. He does so scientifically (because he is a good boxer) and brutally, and a point is made of the injuries that are inflicted on Lennie. Lennie on the other hand is confused and helpless. The analysis of Lennie's Goal-directed actions showed him to be more passive than Curley. He is consistently described throughout the passage as terrified and bewildered. Sentence 18 is key in this analysis:

Lennie's hands remained at his sides;
he was too frightened to defend himself.(18)

This static description comes in the middle of all the action involved in Curley's attack on Lennie. The two Free clauses are not linked, breaking up the flow of the action. Lennie makes no move to help himself. All three instances of an intensive Complement applying to Lennie in the passage occur during the fight:

.... he was too frightened to defend himself.(18)

The big face was covered with blood.(30)

.... one of his eyes was cut and closed.(38)

These static⁸ views of Lennie during the action help emphasise his helplessness and inability to control the situation. They contrast with the descriptions of George

and Slim:

George was on his feet yelling,
"Get him, Lennie. Don't let him
do it".(19,20)

Slim jumped up. "The dirty little
rat," he cried, "I'll get 'um
myself.(24,25)

George is not fighting, but he is active. He uses Commands to try and control the action. His lack of success can be seen in that it takes him eight Commands to get Lennie to do two things - first of to "get him" and secondly to let go. Slim is prepared to fight Curley himself. By showing the onlookers as active Steinbeck emphasises Lennie's static quality so inappropriate to the situation.

The main method which Steinbeck uses to show Lennie's helplessness is by making his actions inappropriate to the situation he is in. When Curley begins to attack Lennie does not fight back. "Lennie looked helplessly at George, and then he got up and tried to retreat".(10) Instead of protecting himself he looks to George, his protector, for help. He also looks for George in sentence 29. In sentences 15 and 16 and later, in 22 he calls to him. He tries to protect himself not by hitting back but by trying to get George to make Curley stop.

In sentence 10 Lennie's actions are depicted in a cumbersome, slowed-up manner. This is done by dividing the description into three separate Free clauses and by the insertion of the "and then" linker at the beginning of the second clause. He does not retreat.

First he gets up, and then he tries to retreat. When Curley first hit him we are told that "Lennie gave a cry of terror"(13) The first transitive verb describing an action of Lennie does not show him hitting back, but yelling like a frightened child. In turn, George orders Lennie to fight:

George was on his feet yelling,
 "Get him, Lennie. Don't let him do it."
 Lennie covered his face with his huge
 paws and bleated with terror. He cried,
 "Make 'um stop, George." Then Curley
 attacked his stomach and cut off his
 wind.(19-23)

Lennie's action after George's order to fight is completely defensive. He is so bewildered that he does not know how to help himself.

In fact on two occasions it is almost as if Curley's hitting of Lennie is a direct result of Lennie's action. Steinbeck achieves this effect by using the "and" clause linker where we would expect "but":

He backed until he was against the wall,
 and Curley followed, slugging him in the
 face.(17)

Lennie took his hands away from his face
 and looked about for George, and Curley
 slashed at his eyes.(29)

Both sentences give information about Lennie trying to prevent himself from being hit, and then co-ordinated with this is a picture of Curley hitting Lennie again. In both cases the most neutral linker "and" is used. It is a result of Lennie's action that Curley makes the move that he does. Lennie moves back and so Curley has to follow in order to hit him. Lennie takes his hands away

from his face thus providing Curley with an obvious target. Thus although Lennie's moves are attempts to prevent himself from being hit, in a sense they help to cause the particular form of the attack. Steinbeck's use of "and" helps bring out this fact.

The trend of Curley attacking and Lennie offering little resistance is suddenly reversed in sentences 32 and 33:

Curley's fist was swinging when Lennie reached for it. The next minute Curley was flopping like a fish on a line, and his closed fist was lost in Lennie's big hand. George ran down the room. "Leggo of him, Lennie. Let go."

But Lennie watched in terror the flopping little man whom he held. Blood ran down Lennie's face, one of his eyes was cut and closed. George slapped him in the face again and again, and still Lennie held on to the closed fist. (32-39)

Lennie now has the upper hand but Steinbeck systematically takes blame away from him. George gives Lennie four Commands to retaliate before the big man actually does so. And the retaliation itself is played down as much as possible. Lennie's reaching for Curley's hand is recounted in a non-initial Bound clause. The main topic of the sentence is Curley's fist, not Lennie's hand. We do not see Lennie actually making contact with Curley. Curley hit Lennie, but Lennie reaches for Curley's fist. Lennie's action is plainly one of self-defence. Curley is in the process of hitting Lennie again when he is stopped. The action is slowed down by the use of the past continuous tense.

In sentence 33 as well, as much weight as possible is taken off the fact that Lennie is now "attacking" Curley. The insertion of the initial adverbial phrase "the next minute" makes it seem as if Curley's flopping is almost independent of Lennie's action. At the same time however, Curley's attacking force is seen to be gone. Again, the main information topic of the sentence is Curley, not Lennie.

Besides making sure that Lennie is not blamed for his action, Steinbeck also keeps up sympathy for him. We are not told about Curley's physical state until after Lennie's pain and emotions have been described again. Although it is now Curley that is on the receiving end, it is still Lennie who is described as afraid and in pain. In sentence 37 we are told that Lennie is terrified, whereas Curley is described as "the flopping little man whom he held." There is no mention of fear or pain in this description, and the rankshifted clause qualifying "man" is really telling the reader about Lennie, not Curley. Sentence 38 gives a physical description of Lennie's injuries, not Curley's. At this point even George attacks Lennie. He slaps him "again and again", but Lennie just holds on. He is inactive in comparison with everyone else. And he holds onto a closed fist, not a man.

It is only after the focus on Lennie's pain that Curley is described:

Curley was white and shrunken by now,
and his struggling had become weak.
He stood crying, his fist lost in
Lennie's paw. (40,41)

This description implies rather than portrays pain. Curley does not bleed. His suffering is also made as impersonal as possible by using parts of him as Subject of two of the clauses. Curley is completely subjugated, but he is never actually described as hurt. His fist being lost in Lennie's symbolises Lennie's complete dominance over him even though Lennie is out of control himself. Curley's state is told of as quickly and as unsympathetically as possible. Attention is quickly switched away from him to George and Lennie:

George shouted over and over, "Leggo his hand, Lennie. Leggo. Slim, come help me while the guy got any hand left."

Suddenly Lennie let go his hold. He crouched cowering against the wall. "You tol' me to, George," he said miserably. (42-47)

George uses four Commands telling Lennie to let go before he actually does so. The adverb "over" is repeated twice, as was "again" in 39. All this portrays George's lack of control over Lennie. Because he is getting nowhere he begins to order Slim instead. Lennie lets go suddenly in sentence 43. He has now done what George wanted, but only after George had turned his attention to Slim. The adverb "suddenly" makes it seem as if the action was unprompted and unmotivated. Obviously George's orders must have had some effect on Lennie, but Steinbeck is at pains to show that George has no more control over his friend now than he had during Curley's assault. Lennie is afraid and panics. Once he does that there is no way of regulating his

actions. This helps absolve him from any blame.

After the fight is over the reader's attention is turned to Lennie before Curley:

He crouched cowering against the wall.

"You tol' me to, George," he said miserably.

Curley sat down on the floor, looking in wonder at his crushed hand. Slim and Carlson bent over him. Then Slim straightened up and regarded Lennie with horror. "We got to get him in to a doctor," he said. "Looks to me like ever' bone in his han' is bust."

"I didn't wanta," Lennie cried. "I didn't wanta hurt him." (46-54)

Lennie's pitiful emotional state is described before Curley is mentioned. Lennie's words "You tol' me to, George." and "I didn't wanta hurt him." push home the fact that Lennie is not to blame for what has happened. It is only then that Steinbeck allows Slim to regard Lennie with horror.⁹

Thus the passage as a whole shows Lennie's phenomenal strength in action. Curley's attack forces him into a situation which he cannot control. His actions are continually inappropriate, and he eventually ruins Curley's hand. The reader's sympathies are always with Lennie. He is attacked, and his eventual retaliation cannot be blamed on him. George was present in the scene, but has been seen to be ineffectual in his attempt to control Lennie. The whole event, in the context of Curley as jealous husband and Lennie's attraction for Curley's wife, represents a diminishing of hope for the dream. Lennie has been seen out of control, and Curley will obviously be vindictive. The situation is explosive and augurs badly for the dreamers.

NOTES

1. One of these has an e superscript.
2. Compare VI for example, where 77% of the speech sentences are Statements.
3. This is high in comparison with other passages. In passage I for example the figure is 3.5%, in II 0%, and in III 2%.
4. The terminology and grammatical concepts are taken from Halliday, "Notes"
5. We know that he got into the finals for the Golden Gloves Competition (see p.96)
6. It is probably that the onomatopoeic sounds at the beginning of these verbs add to the effect. But there seems to be no controlled method of deciding if this intuitive guess is true, and if so, what extent the effect has. The problem is one of deciding how much "meaning" an initial cluster like "sl-" has. Zellig Harris (Structural Linguistics, Chicago (1951 repr. 1963), pp.193-194.) says:
 "Difficult as it may be to argue for morphemic status for sequences like "gl-", it is also unsatisfactory to leave unstated the fact that so many sequences beginning with "gl-" have partial similarity in meaning. The solution is not, of course, to cast a deciding vote one way or the other, but to relate this situation, precisely as it is, to the other facts about the language. The sequence "gl-" is not a distributionally separable element; therefore it is not a morpheme in the definition which applied to "-er", "-ceive", "con-", "yes". But "gl-" exhibits, in many morphemes, a correlation between meaning and phonemic form, of the type which is also true for most of the distributionally separable morphemes as a whole." Similar remarks can be made about "sl-" and perhaps "sm-" as well.
7. We are also told that Lennie is bleeding after Lennie has smashed Curley's hand, see sentence 38.
8. Although it is not absolutely necessary that the use of an intensive Complement implies non-movement, as "He was inflamed with anger" shows, it is generally true

that the two are associated. Similar remarks can be made about verbs as "doing words".

9. The word "regarded" is ambiguous and nicely so. It implies that Slim looks at Lennie with a horrified expression and that his attitude towards Lennie is also one of horror.

1. THE TEXT (pp.132-134)

Lennie leaned toward the old swamper.(1) "About them rabbits," he insisted.(2)
 Candy smiled.(3) "I got it figured out.(4) We can make some money on them rabbits if we go about it right."(5)
 But I get to tend 'em," Lennie broke in.(6) "George says I get to tend 'em.(7) He promised."(8)

Crooks interrupted brutally.(9) "You guys is just kiddin' yourself.(10) You'll talk about it a hell of a lot, but you won't get no land.(11) You'll be a swamper here till they take you out in a box.(12) Hell, I seen too many guys.(13) Lennie here'll quit an' be on the road in two, three weeks.(14) Seems like ever' guy got land in his head."(15)

Candy rubbed his cheek angrily.(16) "You God damn right we're gonna do it.(17) George says we are.(18) We got the money right now."(19)

"Yeah?" said Crooks.(20) An' where's George now?(21) In town in a whore house.(22) That's where your money's goin'.(23) Jesus, I seen it happen too many times.(24) I seen too many guys with land in their head.(25) They never get none under their hand."(26)

Candy cried, "Sure they all want it.(27) Everybody wants a little bit of land, not much.(28) Jus' som'thin' that was his.(29) Som'thin' he could live on and there couldn't nobody throw him off of it.(30) I never had none.(31) I planted crops for damn near ever'body in this state, but they wasn't my crops, and when I harvested 'em, it wasn't none of my harvest.(32) But we gonna do it now, and don't you make no mistake about that.(33) George ain't got the money in town.(34) That money's in the bank.(35) Me an' Lennie an' George.(36) We gonna have a room to ourself.(37) We're gonna have a dog an' rabbits an' chickens.(38) We're gonna have green corn an' maybe a cow or a goat."(39) He stopped, overwhelmed with his picture.(40)

Crooks asked, "You say you got the money?"(41)

"Damn right.(42) We got most of it.(43) Just a little bit more to get.(44) Have it all in one month.(45) George got the land all picked out too."(46)

Crooks reached around and explored his spine with his hand.(47) "I never seen a guy really do it," he said.(48) "I seen guys nearly crazy with loneliness for

land, but ever'time a whore house or a blackjack game took what it takes." (49) He hesitated. (50) "....If you guys would want a hand to work for nothing - just his keep, why I'd come an' lend a hand. (51) I ain't so crippled I can't work like a son-of-a-bitch if I want to." (52)

"Any you boys seen Curley?" (53) They swung their heads toward the door. (54) Looking in was Curley's wife. (55) Her face was heavily made up. (56) Her lips were slightly parted. (57) She breathed strongly, as though she had been running. (58)

"Curley ain't been here," Candy said sourly. (59)

2. THE ANALYSIS.

We have now seen three main types of writing that Steinbeck uses. They can best be described in terms of the relation between the speech and narrative. They are:

- (i) Passages completely of narrative e.g. IV.
- (ii) Mixed passages mainly of speech, but with some narrative e.g. I, II, III.
- (iii) Mixed passages with a considerably larger amount of narrative e.g. VII, X, XI.

These three types correspond to three broad types of situation respectively:

- (i) Descriptions.
- (ii) Conversations.
- (iii) Passages with action.

This passage fits into the second category. The narrative accounts for 16% of the text. But this passage differs somewhat from the general type.¹ It is the first one without George in it, and the first which does not have a power struggle going on within it. This latter point is brought out by an analysis of the Sentence Types:

	S	Q	C	R	E
CANDY	23 ²	0	0	1	0
CROOKS	14 ³	3	0	1	0
LENNIE	3	0	0	0	1 ⁴
CURLEY'S WIFE	0	1	0	0	0

There are no Command sentences at all, and only four Questions. The Question asked by Curley's wife is not part of the conversation topic. She just comes in at the end of the discussion. An argument is developed and two

different points of view are put forward, but there is not a struggle for power of the type that we have seen in other passages. The text under discussion can be divided into three main sections corresponding with the entry of characters into the scene. Sentences 1-8 concern just Lennie and Candy even though we know from the context that Crooks is present. At sentence 9, Crooks enters the conversation and Lennie disappears from it. These three are the only people present until the entry of Curley's wife at sentence 53. The three sections are also contrastive stylistically. The last one is almost entirely of narrative whereas the other two are almost all speech. The first section has relatively short sections of speech when compared with the middle one.

The conversation is instigated by Lennie. He ignores the fact that Crooks is present and talks directly to Candy, his new colleague in the dream ventures:

Lennie leaned toward the old swapper.
"About them rabbits," he insisted.(1,2)

Candy and Crooks have been talking about other things, but Lennie, characteristically, wants to talk only of rabbits. That he is forcing the subject on the others can be seen not just by the fact that he is introducing an entirely new topic for "discussion", but also by the quoting verb "insisted". As explained in footnote 4 to this chapter, Lennie's first sentence is really a lead-in to a Statement that we do not get. Lennie likes other people to talk for him⁵ and so introduces a topic without adding to the discussion himself. His earnestness can be seen in his physical action of leaning

towards Candy.⁶ The old man plays up to him:

Candy smiled. "I got it figured out.
We can make some money on them rabbits
if we go about it right." (3,4,5)

Candy has been doing some thinking. Even the rabbits, the sop to Lennie, can be made into an economic proposition. As we saw in passage VI, Candy is now a member of the "in-group". This can be seen by his use of "we" in sentence 5. Lennie, however is not concerned with such realistic things as making a profit. He is only interested in the fact that he is going to look after the rabbits:

"But I get to tend 'em," Lennie broke in. "George says I get to tend 'em. He promised." (6,7,8)

Lennie's eagerness to make sure that he is not being cheated of his privilege is shown partly by the fact that some of his speech comes before the narrative clause introducing his interruption. He uses the antithetical "but" and the Subject "I", thus contrasting with Candy's "we". He uses one of his favourite clauses "I get to tend 'em" twice. Sentences 7 and 8 show Lennie's absolute dependence on George. They remind one of a young child telling someone that he has just been given permission to do something.

Thus Lennie and Candy are getting involved in the dream again when Crooks makes his presence felt, "Crooks interrupted brutally." (9) The verb "interrupted" is appropriate as it pulls Candy out of his reverie. The sentence final adverb "brutally" sets the tone for his speech. This marks the beginning of the middle section of the passage, which is less like a normal conversation than one would expect. It is more like a series of short

speeches. From sentences 27 to 38 for example, Candy says 128 words without interruption either from the other characters or the narrative. Correspondingly, there are few of those markers which signal that a conversation is taking place. Candy and Crooks use only one Response each in the passage, and yet they have 37 Statements between them. None of the Statements have response-marking Adjuncts. This contrasts with George's longer speeches in passages III and V for example.

Crook's very first sentence shows him to be sceptical of the farm scheme, "You guys is just kiddin' yourself." (10) This is the first and only challenge that the dream undergoes in the novel. It is by the most intelligent hand on the ranch. We know from IV, 6 that ordinary ranch men read Western magazines and actually believe in them. Crooks, on the other hand, reads books. In the description of his room at the beginning of Chapter 4 (p. 117) we are told:

And he had books, too; a tattered dictionary and a mauled copy of the California civil code for 1905. There were battered magazines and a few dirty books on a special shelf over his bunk. A pair of large gold-rimmed spectacles hung from a nail on the wall above his bed.

Thus a point is made of his literacy. Just before the passage under discussion he says (pp. 129-130):

I read plenty of books out here.
Nobody never gets to heaven, and
nobody gets no land.

Because he is represented as more intelligent and thoughtful than the rest of the ranch workers his challenge to the feasibility of the dream is seen by the reader to be a strong one. He says:

You'll talk about it a hell of a lot, but you won't get no land. You'll be a swamper here till they take you out in a box. Hell, I seen too many guys. Lennie here'll quit an' be on the road in two, three weeks. (11-14)

His confidence in his predictions can be seen in his use of the simple future tense without any qualification. There are no interjections like "I think" or "perhaps" in Crooks's speech. This confidence is shown even more by his producing specific predictions as to Candy's and Lennie's future. Sentence 13, "Hell, I seen too many guys." is significant. It indicates that Crooks is not an angry but a disillusioned sceptic. The exclamatory Adjunct suggests sympathy with the dreamers. A person who was just criticising them without feeling for them would have no use for such a word in that sentence. He has seen other people try to get land of their own and fail. This emphasizes the strength of his challenge to the dream. He sees their scheme as indicative of a general trend, "Seems like ever' guy got land in his head." (15)

At this point Candy interrupts:

Candy rubbed his cheek angrily. "You God damn right we're gonna do it. (16,17)

The narrative sentence is typical of Steinbeck. He gives variety by introducing a new speaker without a quoting verb, and indicates the tone of the reply by a sentence final adverb "angrily". Steinbeck has been seen

to make widespread use of both these devices. Candy is seen merely disclaiming Crooks's remarks. He makes no attempt to back up his position with argument. Sentence 18, "George says we are." is like sentence 7 of Lennie's. Both sentences are of FB construction with F expounded by "George says". Candy, like Lennie, is putting George in an exalted position. The reader is forced to draw a parallel between the two. Candy is acting in an unthinking manner more typical of Lennie. The only support that he gives to his claim is an enthusiastic reference to the money, "We got the money right now." The modification of the adverb by "right" is a typical way in which Candy expresses his enthusiasm.⁷ But Crooks is a thinker and does not accept unproven hypotheses as gospel. He queries it at once:

"Yeah?" said Crooks. "An' where's George now? In town in a whore house. That's where your money's goin'." (20-23)

The feeling that he jumps straight in is produced mainly by the fact that his first Question comes before the introductory clause signalling a new speaker.⁸ He asks where George is, knowing the answer full well. Then he replies to the Question himself with a Response of AA structure. Both Adjuncts answer the Question, the second more specifically than the first. The marked theme choice in sentence 23 stresses his belief that George is spending the money on himself.

The second half of his speech expands the sympathetic but resigned attitude expressed in his first speech:

Jesus, I seen it happen too many times.
I seen too many guys with land in their head. They never get none under their hand. (24, 25, 26)

Sentence 24 has many parallels with 13. Like 13 it begins with an exclamatory Adjunct followed by "I seen". And in each case the post-verbal part of the sentence consists of a headword modified by "too many". It is this modification that gives one the feeling that Crooks is in sympathy with the attempt even if he feels that it will not work.

The following sentence also contains "I seen too many & h". He uses this repetition to set up a contrast term for his final sentence. He talks about people dreaming of land - "land in their head." Then he says, "They never get none under their hand." This sentence is foregrounded by the unusual collocation of a word standing for "land" with the phrase "under their hand." The image is appropriate as it conjures up the idea of men working the soil.

Candy immediately jumps up with a reply:

Candy cried, "Sure they all want it. Everybody wants a little bit of land, not much. Jus' som'thin' that was his. Som'thin' he could live on and there couldn't nobody throw him off of it. (27-30)

The main feature of the first part of Candy's speech is his excited state. The first sentence has exclamatory overtones because of the introductory quoting verb "cried" and the initial Adjunct "sure". The second sentence has a tag structure appositional to "a little bit of land." This construction gives Candy's speech an air of spontaneity. He picks up the structure used in the tag and repeats it in sentence 29 and the first clause of 30. The final clause of sentence 30 represents the climax of Candy's reply. He is so excited that he produces a deviant, if

not ungrammatical sentence. He begins to use a clause with "there" as dummy Subject, and then changes to a clause type which does not need it. It is in this way that he expresses agreement with Crooks's notion that everybody dreams of owning a little bit of land.

From 31 onwards he uses himself as an exemplification of this general principle:

I never had none. I planted crops for
damn near ever'body in this state, but
they wasn't my crops, and when I harvested
'em, it wasn't none of my harvest. (31, 32)

Both sentences have a certain rhetorical balance. Sentence 31 has a negativiser on either side of the verb which alliterate with each other. In sentence 32, the first two clauses are about crops and the second two about harvests. In each case Candy outlines the work that he did in the first clause of the couple, and in the second he states that he did not get the fruits of his toil. The balanced effect is helped by the repetition of "crops" in the first two clauses and "harvest" in the second pair. The second clause in each couple is of SPC¹ structure. Candy stresses the rootlessness of his existence, saying that he worked for "damn near ever'body in this state."

So far Candy has merely conceded Crooks's point that many people have attempted what they are trying and failed. But now he claims that they are a special case, "But we gonna do it now, and don't you make no mistake about that." (33)

He strikes his point home to Crooks by making it twice. First he says that George has not got the money,

and then he says that it is in the bank.

Up to this point Candy's sentences can be seen to follow:

(i) either from one another by (a) sentential links e.g. the anaphoric use of "that money" in 34 referring back to the money already mentioned in 35; or (b) the repetition of words or constructions as in 29 and 30. or (ii) from remarks made earlier in the passage e.g. 34, which although it follows in some sense from the preceding sentence, is very obviously a refutation of Crooks's earlier remarks, and so can also be said to follow from those.⁹

Neither of these sorts of remarks can be made about sentences 36-39 however:

Me an' Lennie an' George. We gonna have a room to ourself. We're gonna have a dog an' rabbits an' chickens. We're gonna have green corn an' maybe a cow or a goat. (36-39)

Sentence 36 has no inter-sentential connections with what has gone before. But it is easy to see what is happening. Candy has disproved Crooks's main point and considers his hypothesis to be refuted. He now indulges in a little reverie of his own. The lack of inter-sentential connectives and its unusual form - a clause of Z structure which is in turn analysed as of hkh construction - marks the sentence off from its predecessors and shows us that something new is happening. The next three sentences are typical of those in the two dream passages. They are all of the form "We're gonna have X" where X is expounded by one or

more nominal groups co-ordinated by "and". Except for the green corn, all the items that Candy mentions were also mentioned by George when Candy overheard him in passage V.

The narrative sentence leaves us in no doubt that Candy has enacted a mini dream sequence, "He stopped, overwhelmed with his picture." (40) This sentence is similar to, "George sat entranced with his own picture." (VI,1) which was said of George just after he had enacted the second dream sequence.

Crooks's relatively more agile mind is not affected by the rhetoric or the dream picture. He comes straight to the most salient point, "You say you got the money?" (41) Candy responds with his usual eagerness and his only response in the passage, "Damn right." (42) His eagerness can be seen in the next few sentences in terms of the words missed out.¹⁰ Whenever he can he omits auxiliary verbs and subjects. Below are the sentences of the text with those elements needed to make them syntactically well-formed in brackets:

We ('ve) got most of it. (43)
 (There's) just a little bit more to get. (44)
 (We'll) have it all in one month. (45)
 George (has) got the land all picked out,
 too. (46)

He increases the evidence for the success of the venture in Crooks's eyes by saying that George knows a place they can buy. Thus Candy has now produced a more realistic case. The reader is prepared for Crooks's reaction by the narrative, "Crooks reached around and explored his spine with his hand." (47) The slowed-up

description contrasts with the fast delivery of Candy's speech. To reach around suggests a slow, deliberate action, and the verb "explored" upholds this feeling. The addition of the rather unnecessary adverbial phrase "with his hand" helps lengthen the sentence, which in turn adds to the effect.

Crooks substantially repeats the point made in his other two speeches, that he has seen other people try and fail:

"I never seen a guy really do it," he said.
 "I seen guys nearly crazy with loneliness
 for land, but ever' time a whore house or
 a blackjack game took what it takes." (48,49)

But this is not an objection, merely a statement of his incredulity at being so close to the achievement of such a dream. The narrative sentence "He hesitated." (50) again moulds the reader's reaction. Until now Candy has been on the offensive. Now he is unsure. This is also seen in his speech:

"....If you....guys would want a hand
 to work for nothing - just his keep,
 why I'd come an' lend a hand. I ain't
 so crippled I can't work like a son-of-
 a-bitch if I want to." (51,52)

The stops show his hesitancy. He also produces a tag structure "just his keep" in apposition to "nothing". Until now Crooks's grammatical constructions have been neat and well-formed. He has not omitted words like Candy. A change comes over his speech production which corresponds with the introduction of his hesitancy. The adverb "why" also has an arresting effect. The sentence

is an interesting mixture of notions. Crooks realises that he is in a weak position to ask to come in on the scheme - he is prepared to work for nothing. Yet at the same time he expresses his wish to join as if he is doing the others a favour, "I'd come an' lend a hand." He ends his bid to join them by an affirmation of his ability to work hard.

It is at this point that Curley's wife interrupts. It is made to seem sudden by the fact that her speech is not introduced by the narrative. We know it is not part of Crooks's speech, because, like Candy's "Me an' Lennie an' George." (36), it has no relation with the sentences which precede it, "Any you boys seen Curley?" (53) The narrative sentence that follows her question shows solidarity on the part of the three men. They are referred to collectively as "they". They are startled and react quickly as can be seen in the verb "swung". If it was replaced by "turned" for example, a different effect would be achieved.

The sentence telling us that it is Curley's wife that has interrupted, "Looking in was Curley's wife." (55) is foregrounded by its inversion of Subject and Predicator. Throwing the verb to the front of the sentence stresses it, helping to promote the feeling that she is intruding on the three men. The next two sentences are parallel in structure:

Her face was heavily made up. Her lips
were slightly parted. (56, 57)

Both are of SPCⁱ structure. The description is concentrated on points of her face. In both cases the

adjective acting as C^1 is modified by an adverb, laying weight on it. This description of her helps to explain Lennie's attraction for her. Her entry into the discussion about the dream is like her entry into the dream itself. She interrupts and spoils things when they are at their most hopeful.

The Adjunct "strongly" in "She breathed strongly, as though she had been running." (58) is slightly odd. "Heavily" would be more normal. It is the sort of term usually associated with the breathing of athletes or racehorses. It implies that she might be pretending in order to be more provocative. The Bound clause gives some support to this idea as it is introduced by the hypothetical "as though", suggesting the idea of a pretence. Curley's wife is just described physically. No information about her actions preceding her entry is given, thus leaving a doubt in our minds as to the reason for her interruption.

Candy answers her question, "Curley ain't been here," Candy said sourly. (59) By describing Curley's wife in some detail, Steinbeck produces a gap between her question and Candy's answer. This gives the feeling that he gives the information grudgingly. This notion is backed up by the final Adjunct of the narrative of sentence 59.

Coming after the fight with Curley, this passage helps keep the idea of the dream practicable. The winning over of Crooks is a major event. He is the only person who challenges the validity of the dream

as a venture, and he is soon convinced. It should be noted, however, that the conflicting elements in the novel are beginning to converge. This can be seen in the way that Curley's wife breaks in on the scene as soon as Crooks has been won over. The two conflicting trends of the novel become physically juxtaposed.

NOTES

1. All the conversation passages differ in some way or another. Passage II is much less of a conversation than VIII. But both can be seen to be conversational in type when contrasted with those in the other two categories.
2. Two of these have an e superscript.
3. Two of these have an e superscript.
4. The sentence in question is "About them rabbits"(2) which is an introductory sentence from Lennie to provoke talk on his favourite subject, rabbits. It does not fit into any of the four main Sentence Type categories, and so I have called it an Exclamation even though it does not fit this category properly either. Normally one would expect the person who used this sort of introductory form to go on and say something. But Lennie is a special case - he likes people to say things for him, thus causing the difficulty.
5. This can be seen in passages III and V especially, when he is constantly ordering George to tell him about things pertaining to the dream of the farm.
6. Candy is referred to as "the old swamper." He has often been described as old.
7. cf. VI, 19, 22 and 35.
8. Lennie's enthusiasm was indicated in the same way in sentence 6.
9. The notion of "follow from" here also includes the idea of antithesis seen in sentences 31 and 33 for example. I am pointing out those features which together go to make Candy's speech so far a part of a "text" rather than a random collection of sentences.
10. This is an obvious example of a device that could be used to indicate rather different things at different times. It could indicate boredom for example. But here we can gather from the immediate context that Candy is excited and so the omission of words is seen as a manifestation of that eagerness.

CHAPTER IX

THE DEATH OF THE PUPPY

CHAPTER IX

THE DEATH OF THE PUPPY

1. THE TEXT (pp.147-149)

Only Lennie was in the barn, and Lennie sat in the hay beside a packing case under a manger in the end of the barn that had not been filled with hay.(1) Lennie sat in the hay and looked at a little dead puppy that lay in front of him.(2) Lennie looked at it for a long time, and then he put out his huge hand and stroked it, stroked it clear from one end to the other.(3)

And Lennie said softly to the puppy, "Why do you got to get killed?(4) You ain't so little as mice.(5) I didn't bounce you hard."(6) He bent the pup's head up and looked in its face, and he said to it, "Now maybe George ain't gonna let me tend no rabbits, if he fin's out you got killed."(7)

He scooped a little hollow and laid the puppy in it and covered it over with hay, out of sight; but he continued to stare at the mound he had made.(8) He said, "This ain't no bad thing like I got to go hide in the brush.(9) Oh! no.(10) This ain't.(11) I'll tell George I foun' it dead."(12)

He unburied the puppy and inspected it, and he stroked it from ears to tail.(13) He went on sorrowfully, "But he'll know.(14) George always knows.(15) He'll say, 'You done it.(16) Don't try to put nothing over on me.'(17) An' he'll say, 'Now jus' for that you don't get to tend no rabbits!'"(18)

Suddenly his anger arose.(19) "Goddamn you," he cried.(20) "Why do you got to get killed?(21) You ain't so little as mice."(22) He picked up the pup and hurled it from him.(23) He turned his back on it.(24) He sat bent over his knees and he whispered, "Now I won't get to tend the rabbits.(25) Now he won't let me."(26) He rocked himself back and forth in his sorrow.(27)

From outside came the clang of horseshoes on the iron stake, and then a little chorus of cries.(28) Lennie got up and brought the puppy back and laid it on the hay and sat down.(29) He stroked the pup again.(30) "You wasn't big enough," he said.(31) "They tol' me an' tol' me you wasn't.(32) I di'nt know you'd get killed so easy."(33) He worked his fingers on the pup's limp ear.(34) "Maybe George won't care," he said.(35) "This here God damn little son-of-a-bitch wasn't nothing to George."(36)

2. THE ANALYSIS

This passage consists of 424 words of which 248 (68%) are narrative and 176 (32%) are speech. But there is only one person present:

Only Lennie was in the barn, and Lennie sat in the hay beside a packing case under a manger in the end of the barn that had not been filled with hay.(1)

This would lead one to expect a soliloquy, but there are a number of markers in Lennie's speech which show it to be a form of conversation.¹ An analysis of the Sentence Types gives the following table:²

	S	Q	R	C	E
LENNIE	18	2	0	1	2

The two Questions and Exclamations imply a conversation. This is reinforced by an examination of the nominal groups in the speech. There are eight instances of S and one each of C and Z being expounded by "you" where "you" is the person being spoken to.³ Sentence 2 informs us that the puppy is dead, but Steinbeck explicitly tells us at the beginning of the scene that Lennie is talking to it:

And Lennie said softly to the puppy....(4)

.... and he said to it....(7)

Having Lennie talk directly to the puppy enables us to see his child-like nature⁴ and to witness the workings of Lennie's mind, thus enabling Steinbeck to manipulate our feelings towards him.⁵ This manipulation is effected chiefly in terms of Lennie's changing attitude toward the puppy.

The narrative text of the passage is presented in an unlayered, deadpan way. This can be seen in the first three sentences:

Only Lennie was in the barn, and Lennie sat in the hay beside a packing case under a manger in the end of the barn that had not been filled with hay. Lennie sat in the hay and looked at a little dead puppy that lay in front of him. Lennie looked at it for a long time, and then he put out his huge hand and stroked it, stroked it clear from one end to the other.

There are no Bound clauses in the narrative text at all, and it often seems that the author is deliberately avoiding them. It would have been just as natural to have used a B adding clause in sentence 1, e.g. "Lennie was in the barn, sitting beside a packing case...." The same can be said of the second clause in 2. Thus what we have is a number of Free clauses joined together by "and". By continually using Free clauses Steinbeck can repeat Lennie's "name" as Subject of the clauses. In the first four sentences Lennie is the referent for the Subject of every clause. Steinbeck specifically refers to Lennie by name five times though there is no grammatical need to do so. It would be more normal to use anaphoric "he", but this appears only once, in sentence 3. In the second clauses of sentences 1 and 3 there is no real necessity to mention a Subject at all. This technique of stringing Free clauses together and repeating the Subjects has a twofold effect. Firstly it gives the impression of a simple objective narrative with the author very much in the background.⁶

Secondly, it slows down the flow of the prose, helping to convey Lennie's deliberative mood.⁷ That Lennie looks at the puppy and strokes it are both repeated. This also helps to slow up the action, which the lexis implies anyway, "Lennie looked at it for a long time"

This slowed-up effect produced in the narrative prepares the reader for the contemplative attitude that Lennie displays in his speech. He spends most of the passage discussing the possible effects of the puppy's death. In previous passages he has always tried to get people to think for him.⁸

In this first paragraph we are also reminded of Lennie's strength - and hence his ability to kill things accidentally - in comparison with the puppy. The puppy is "little", Lennie's hand "huge". The repetition of the fact that Lennie is stroking the pup helps to key the reader in on his feelings towards it. We know from his earlier eagerness to play and even sleep with the pup⁹ that he is very fond of it. That fondness is seen again here. Lennie's mood and its changes in the passage are matched by the use of three "-ly" adverbs in the narrative text. At the beginning he is tender towards the puppy. We are told in sentence 4 that he is talking "softly" to it. When he realises that there is no way of hiding the fact that he has killed the puppy he talks "sorrowfully",¹⁰ and his violent switch to anger at the pup is marked by the use of "suddenly" in theme position in "Suddenly his anger arose." (19) Thus as in previous passages, a major method which Steinbeck uses to indicate a character's mood or change of mood is that of an "-ly"

adverb in the narrative text, often in final position in the clause.

Lennie speaks for the first time in sentence 4:

And Lennie said softly to the puppy,
"Why do you got to get killed? You ain't
so little as mice. I didn't bounce you
hard."(4,5,6)

The first sentence that he utters consists almost entirely of a periphrastic verb phrase "do got to get killed". Its ungrammatical nature reflects the tortured complexity of Lennie's thought. The phrase splits into two parts, "do get killed" and "got to". There is a clash of tense between the main verb "get killed" and its interrogative auxiliary. "Get killed" would normally have an auxiliary in the past tense, "did".¹¹ By using "get killed" Lennie removes some of the blame for the puppy's death from himself. He implies that it was the puppy's fault. He uses the present tense "do" because he is performing a kind of double think. He is talking to the puppy as if it is still alive. By using "got to" Lennie removes a bit more of the blame from himself. He implies that the dog would have died no matter what he did.¹²

Sentences 5 and 6 tell us how the puppy died. We guess that Lennie has killed it from "You ain't so little as mice."(5) We know he always accidentally kills mice, so when he compares the pup with them we are forced to assume that he died as they did. The sentence is foregrounded by the unusual "so....as" comparative construction¹³ and the comparison of the singular puppy

with plural "mice". "I didn't bounce you hard" tells how Lennie killed the puppy. Obviously the bouncing was too hard for the puppy if not for Lennie. The use of the human pronoun "you" as Complement to "bounce" is unusual. One bounces things, not people. Lennie has still not admitted the pup's death to himself; he is still treating it as a live person. This refusal to accept that the dog is dead can be seen in the negative mood of the verb. Lennie tells us how he killed it by saying what he considers he did not do.

Sentence 7 begins with a narrative intervention and returns to Lennie's words in the second half:

He bent the pup's head up and looked in its face, and he said to it, "Now maybe George ain't gonna let me tend no rabbits, if he fin's out you got killed.(7)

As in sentence 3, the narrative description of Lennie's action is made to seem deliberate by dividing that action up into more than one part, and secondly by joining all the Free clauses together by "and". Lennie's complete control over the pup is seen in the way that he can bend it how he wants.¹⁴ Lennie's speech tells us what he is thinking about, thus explaining his deliberative actions. What he is afraid of is seen in the Free clause. George might not let him tend the rabbits on the dream farm. The negative mood of the verb is carried over into the Complement of the clause by the modification of "rabbits" by the deictic "no". The main thesis of the sentence is surrounded by uncertainty - seen in the sentence Adjunct "mayte".

Moreover, George will only have to make a decision "if he fin's out."¹⁵ The thematic "now" reminds us that it is Lennie's killing of the puppy that has brought about the new situation.¹⁶ Yet Lennie still manages his peculiar double think. He still keeps alive the notion that it was the pup's fault, "you got killed." The puppy, not Lennie, is the Actor in the sentence, just as it was in "Why do you got to get killed?"(4)

Lennie's reaction to the thought that he might not be able to tend the rabbits is to try and hide the evidence of the pup's death:

He scooped a little hollow and laid the puppy in it and covered it over with hay, out of sight; but he continued to stare at the mound he had made.(8)

Again the sentence consists of a number of Free clauses joined together with "and". The slowing down of the action stresses the pathetic nature of his attempt to hide the pup. Although the dog is out of sight it is not out of mind, as can be seen by the antithetical "but" introducing the last clause, "he continued to stare at the mound he had made." His attempt to hide the death of the pup is unsuccessful and so Lennie turns to the other way out of his dilemma, that the situation is not as bad as he thinks:

He said, "This ain't no bad thing like I got to go hide in the brush. Oh! no. This ain't. I'll tell George I foun' it dead."(9-12)

He tries to persuade himself by producing positive statements telling himself what he wants to hear. He backs up the negative verb of the first clause of sentence

9 with the deictic "no" modifying the headword of the Complement. The Bound clause of 9 reminds us of George's earlier instructions to Lennie to go and hide in the brush if anything untoward happened.¹⁷ After this longer sentence come two short ones which sum up his conclusion, indicating that he has persuaded himself that he is right. Yet in his paradoxical manner he is still thinking of ways to absolve himself from blame for the puppy's death. The deception he works out is not very plausible however. He will tell George "I foun' it dead." This reminds one of 1,43, where he used this very excuse over a dead mouse. It failed then, and the reader has no reason to expect it to succeed now. But for the moment at least it seems to have persuaded Lennie, for he unburies the puppy, "He unburied the puppy and inspected it, and he stroked it from ears to tail." (13) One again his movements are made to seem slow. The verb "inspected" helps remind us that the puppy is inert. One inspects papers or drains. But his affection for it can also be seen in the last clause. The adjunct "from ears to tail" shows the thoroughness and care with which he strokes the pup. It is reminiscent of "from one end to the other" in 3, which also described the manner in which Lennie stroked the dog.

It is at this point that Lennie realises that George will not be fooled by his deception:

He went on sorrowfully, "But he'll know.
George always knows." (14,15)

The adverb "sorrowfully" tells us of his change in mood. The certainty that George will not be fooled is reflected in the brevity and simplicity of the sentences:

and the Adjunct "always" in 15 which makes George seem omniscient. Lennie now goes into a little reverie which consists of a "scene" where George is accusing Lennie. He quotes George's actual words:

"He'll say, 'You done it. Don't try to put nothing over on me.' An' he'll say, 'Now jus' for that you don't get to tend no rabbits!'" (16-18)

George's first sentence stating Lennie's guilt is short and simple, showing the definiteness of his conclusion. He uses the phrase construction "get to tend" that Lennie himself uses when talking of the rabbits. Lennie knows that he has killed the pup and invests George with that knowledge. He stresses the change in situation that he has brought about by putting the two Adjuncts "now" 18 and "jus' for that" in initial position.

After he envisages George's condemnatory reaction Lennie's attitude towards the pup changes:

Suddenly his anger arose. "God damn you," he cried. (19,20)

The change in Lennie is indicated in more than one way. The narrative clause indicating it begins with an "-ly" adverb "suddenly".¹⁹ The use of "his anger" as Subject in the surface structure of the sentence and Actor in the deep structure emphasises the spontaneity and uncontrolled nature of Lennie's reaction already indicated by the initial adverb. The anger Adjunct "God damn you" receives prominence because it comprises a whole speech sentence. Lennie goes on:

Why do you got to get killed? You ain't so little as mice. (21,22)

These two sentences are exactly the same as the ones that Lennie used in sentences 4 and 5. Before Lennie was quiet and sad. Now he is angry. The exact parallelism helps point the sudden change in his temper. The next narrative sentence shows his anger in action, "He picked up the pup and hurled it from him. He turned his back on it." (23,24) This action contrasts with his earlier stroking of the pup. Steinbeck stresses Lennie's rejection of the pup and what it stands for in his eyes by the final Adjunct "from him" - a stress that would not be present in "away" or "across the barn". The important thing is not where the puppy goes but where it goes from. Lennie makes another physical attempt to dissociate himself from the dead animal when he turns his back on it.

Once he has thrown the dead animal away Lennie's rage subsides:

He sat bent over his knees and he whispered, "Now I won't get to tend the rabbits. Now he won't let me." (25,26)

Sentences 23 and 24 were full of Goal-directed action; 25 shows a much less active Lennie. The difference can be seen in the change from constructions involving C^2 to one with C^1 . Lennie whispers, showing his complete return to a more taciturn mood. He is now sure that he won't be able to tend the rabbits. This time the statement is not qualified by reservation words like "maybe".²⁰ "Now" is thematic in both of Lennie's sentences. He shows his certainty in his judgement by effectively saying the same thing twice. Lennie won't be able to tend the rabbits. George won't let him.

After the angry speech of 21 and 22, the narrative

showed us Lennie's physical actions in tune with his mood. Similarly here; the narrative following the speech reflects the change to a more quiet mood, "He rocked himself back and forth in his sorrow." (27)

Steinbeck uses the final adverbial phrase to make sure that the reader has grasped the new mood. The modification of "sorrow" by "his" helps convey the idea that Lennie is in a world of his own. The next sentence supports this by giving us a brief picture of what is going on outside the barn:

From outside came the clang of
horseshoes on the iron stake, and
then a little chorus of cries. (28)

There is obviously more than one person outside ("a little chorus of cries"), and they are enjoying themselves playing horseshoes.²¹ As the situation contrasts with that inside, so do the structures of the sentences describing the two locations. The last four narrative sentences have all been concerned with Lennie, and all of them started with the Subject "he". In contrast, 28 starts with a thematic Adjunct, and the Subject is delayed until after the verb. The second clause has no verb at all.

The switch back to Lennie is accompanied by a return to the more normal SP clause element order:

Lennie got up and brought the puppy back
and laid it on the hay and sat down. He
stroked the pup again. (29,30)

Lennie's fondness for the puppy forces him to forget the rejection. He does not throw or drop the pup, but lays it on the hay. This suggests a return to a more tender attitude. This is underlined by the fact that he

starts to stroke the pup again, as he did earlier in the passage. Lennie has now accepted that the puppy is dead. This can be seen in his words as well as his actions:

"You wasn't big enough," he said. "They tol' me an' tol' me you wasn't. I di'nt know you'd get killed so easy." (31-33)

Although he is still talking to the pup, when he talks of it he uses the past instead of the present tense seen in earlier sentences e.g. "You ain't so little as mice." (5)

The first two clauses of sentence 32 echo the "I told you and told you" formula often used by mothers scolding children. In this way we can see that Lennie is at last accepting some of the blame for the death of the pup. His excuse is that he didn't know. As in the fight with Curley, he hurts others, but unintentionally. Here he has accidentally killed something he loved. The ease with which he killed the pup is foregrounded by having an adjective in adverb position in the final clause of sentence 33. Instead of ".... you'd get killed so easily." we have ".... you'd get killed so easy."

Sentence 34 helps show Lennie's new, more realistic attitude towards the puppy, "He worked his fingers on the pup's limp ear." (34) The adjective "limp" reminds us that the pup is dead. Lennie strokes it no longer, but works his fingers on it. This implies that he is not concerned with the pup's welfare any more, and that he is preoccupied with the more important problem of what is going to happen to him.²² We then get:

"Maybe George won't care," he said.
This here God damn little son-of-a-bitch wasn't nothing to George." (35,36)

In 35 he comes back to the more realistic of the possible ways out of his dilemma. His final attitude toward the pup is seen in the Subject of the last sentence. It is by far the longest nominal group that Lennie utters in this passage, and it is full of attitudinal markers. "God damn you" and "son-of-a-bitch" are obviously derogatory. "This here" is normally associated with lower class speakers who use the construction to modify a noun whose referent they have little time for. In this context "little" is also derogatory in tone.²³ The fact that such a thing could mean nothing to George is stressed in Lennie's normal manner, with a double negative. Thus Lennie systematically indicates to himself that George will not be angry with him because he will not regard the death of the pup as important.

Lennie has accidentally killed the puppy he loved. This passage shows him contemplating what effect this will have on his dream of the rabbit. By portraying his fear in this way, with its resulting swings from sorrow to anger and repentance, Steinbeck develops Lennie as a person, helping us to feel for him more. The move is integral to the success of the ending of the novel. When Lennie dies it is not enough for us to think that it was a shame that the dream did not work. It is also necessary for us to feel for Lennie as an individual. This passage helps us to see him not just as a child-like figure, but also as a person whose aspirations and fears we can understand and get involved in.

NOTES

1. The use of "only" in sentence 1 is very appropriate. Not only is Lennie alone but he is also unimportant to the rest of the characters. Thus it really is only Lennie who is in the barn.
2. These figures do not include the instances where Lennie is "quoting" George's actual words.
3. Lennie's speech differs from that of the other passages in that it contains no Vocatives or Commands. Because he is talking to something that is dead Lennie does not need to control the listener or draw his attention. The only Command in the passage is quoted from George.
4. Children often invent invisible people who do things with them and are often blamed for their bad actions. Lennie blames the puppy for dying.
5. The method used here is half way between that of the novel and the play. The novel describes a person's thoughts or uses an interior monologue. The dramatist would write a soliloquy or introduce a confidant to be addressed as an audience. This once again shows Steinbeck's preoccupation with writing a novel like a play. The technique is successful here because of the special effects created by the presence of the dead puppy. It is less successful (because less naturalistic) when Lennie talks to Aunt Clara and the rabbit (pp.174-178). There, as here, Steinbeck wants to show how Lennie's mind works. But here there is something present for him to talk to. In the later case Steinbeck has to invent a figure which is itself a product of Lennie's mind. The situation in passage IX is abnormal and successful because of it. The later instance is so abnormal that it is not possible to believe in the scene.
6. This air of objectivity, the feeling that things are being described just as they are is also helped by other things. Lennie's place in the barn is described in a very detailed way in sentence 1, and the first reference to the puppy, "a little dead puppy" uses the unspecific determiner "a". This is unusual as the puppy has already been introduced in the novel.

We know about the pup and so "the" would be more normal. By using "a" Steinbeck makes it seem as if the narrative is completely uncoloured, that it merely describes the scene as it is.

7. J. McH. Sinclair draws attention to the effect of the changing of Subject referents in section 6 of "A Technique of Stylistic Description", Language and Style, Vol I No4 (Fall 1968), pp215-242. He notes that an increasing variety of Subjects produces an effect of acceleration. Conversely, continual use of the same referent would produce a decelerative or deliberative effect.
8. In passages V and VIII particularly Lennie can be seen getting George and Candy respectively to describe the dream farm for him. Whenever he has tried to think before he has not got very far cf. I, 8 when he cannot remember about the incident at Murray & Ready's.
9. See pp.76-78.
10. See sentence 14.
11. "Do get killed" could only be grammatical when the speaker is asking something about a fiction e.g. "Why do you get killed?" asked of an actress about her part in a film.
12. "Got" is also homophonous with the past tense of "get" It helps underline the idea of the pup's complicity in its own death. This is why "got to" is better than "have to" in Lennie's sentence.
13. "I am as big as John" is more normal than "I am so big as John". I cannot recall ever having heard the latter type of construction.
14. It seems to me that by saying that Lennie bent its head up, Steinbeck is subtly implying that the pup's neck is broken - in the same way that the mice, and later, Curley's wife, get theirs broken. One can certainly see this pattern looking back after the death of Curley's wife.
15. As always, everything depends on George. When talking about the rabbits Lennie always uses the phase construction. He also uses it here, the

- parallelism bringing out the contrast with "George says I get to tend 'em." (VIII,7) for example.
16. Jacobson gives the following figures for "now":
F(61=30%) M(16=8%) E(128=62%)
 17. See pp.31-32.
 18. Also used by Lennie in sentence 7.
 19. It has already been noted that each "-ly" adverb in the passage corresponds with a change in Lennie's mood. Moreover, this one is in an unusual and hence foregrounded position. Jacobson's figures for "suddenly" are: F(13=17%) M(49=65%) E(13=17%)
 20. Compare Lennie's previous utterance to this effect in sentence 7.
 21. Just before the start of this passage we were told "From outside came the clang of horseshoes on the playing peg and the shouts of men, playing, encouraging, jeering." (p.147) The first part of this sentence is very similar to that of sentence 28 - it has the same structure and almost the same words.
 22. In V,24 we were told that George stopped working with the cards that he was holding. There it signalled a move away from his own thoughts towards a consideration of Lennie - he began to tell him about the dream farm.

1. THE TEXT (pp.154-158)

Lennie sighed deeply.(1) From outside came the clang of a horseshoe on metal, and then a chorus of cheers.(2) "Somebody made a ringer," said Curley's wife.(3)

Now the light was lifting as the sun went down, and the sun streaks climbed up the wall and fell over the feeding racks and over the heads of the horses.(4)

Lennie said, "Maybe if I took this pup out and throwed him away George wouldn't never know.(5) An' then I could tend the rabbits without no trouble."(6)

Curley's wife said angrily, "Don't you think of nothing but rabbits?"(7)

"We gonna have a little place," Lennie explained patiently.(8) "We gonna have a house an' a garden and a place for alfalfa, an' that alfalfa is for the rabbits, an' I take a sack and get it all fulla alfalfa and then I take it to the rabbits."(9)

She asked, "What makes you so nuts about rabbits?"(10)

Lennie had to think carefully before he could come to a conclusion.(11) He moved cautiously close to her, until he was right against her.(12) "I like to pet nice things.(13) Once at a fair I seen some of them long-hair rabbits.(14) An' they was nice, you bet.(15) Sometimes I've even pet mice, but not when I could get nothing better."(16)

Curley's wife moved away from him a little.(17)

"I think you're nuts," she said.(18)

"No I ain't," Lennie explained earnestly.(19) "George says I ain't.(20) I like to pet nice things with my fingers, sof' things."(21)

She was a little bit reassured.(22) "Well, who don't?" she said.(23) Ever'body likes that.(24) I like to feel silk an' velvet.(25) Do you like to feel velvet?"(26)

Lennie chuckled with pleasure.(27) "You bet, by God," he cried happily.(28) "An' I had some, too.(29) A lady give me some, an' that lady was - my own Aunt Clara.(30) She give it right to me - 'bout this big a piece.(31) I wisht I had that velvet right now."(32) A frown came over his face.(33) "I lost it," he said.(34) "I ain't seen it for a long time."(35)

Curley's wife laughed at him.(36) "You're nuts," she said.(37) "But you're a kinda nice fella.(38) Jus'

like a big baby.(39) But a person can see kinda what you mean.(40) When I'm doin' my hair sometimes I jus' set an' stroke it 'cause it's so soft."(41) To show how she did it, she ran her fingers over the top of her head.(42) "Some people got kinda coarse hair," she said complacently.(43) "Take Curley.(44) His hair is jus' like wire.(45) But mine is soft and fine.(46) 'Course I brush it a lot.(47) That makes it fine.(48) Here - feel right here."(49) She took Lennie's hand and put it on her head.(50) "Feel right aroun' there an' see how soft it is."(51)

Lennie's big fingers fell to stroking her hair.(52)

"Don't you muse it up," she said.(53)

Lennie said, "Oh!(54) That's nice," and he stroked harder.(55) "Oh, that's nice."(56)

"Look out, now, you'll muss it."(57) And then she cried angrily, "You stop it now, you'll mess it all up."(58) She jerked her head sideways, and Lennie's fingers closed on her hair and hung on.(59) "Let go," she cried.(60) "You let go!"(61)

Lennie was in a panic.(62) His face was contorted.(63) She screamed then, and Lennie's other hand closed over her mouth and nose.(64) "Please don't," he begged.(65) "Oh!(66) Please don't do that.(67) George'll be mad."(68)

She struggled violently under his hands.(69) Her feet battered on the hay and she writhed to be free; and from under Lennie's hand came a muffled screaming.(70) Lennie began to cry with fright.(71) "Oh!(72) Please don't do none of that," he begged.(73) "George gonna say I done a bad thing.(74) He sin't gonna let me tend no rabbits."(75) He moved his hand a little and her hoarse cry came out.(76) Then Lennie grew angry.(77) "Now don't," he said.(78) "I don't want you to yell.(79) You gonna get me in trouble jus' like George says you will.(80) Now don't you do that."(81) And she continued to struggle, and her eyes were wild with terror.(82) He shook her then, and he was angry with her.(83) "Don't you go yellin'," he said, and he shook her; and her body flopped like a fish.(84) And then she was still, for Lennie had broken her neck.(85)

2. THE ANALYSIS.

This passage has a relatively large amount of narrative (43%) and we would expect it to have rather more action in it than the previous one.¹ An analysis of the Sentence Types of the speech produces the following table:

	S	C	R	E	Q
LENNIE	22 ²	6	2 ³	3	0
CURLEY'S WIFE	15	7	0	0	4

Lennie and Curley's wife use approximately the same amount of Commands. There are quite a few of them, leading us to expect a struggle for dominance in their conversation. In fact the passage develops into a very one-sided fight in which Curley's wife gets killed. Curley's wife has all the Questions and Lennie all the Responses, indicating that the woman takes the initiative. Lennie has three Exclamations, but Curley's wife has none. This is odd when we remember that she fights and gets killed in this scene.

The passage can be divided into three sections which correspond to changes in situation. The breaks will not be very sudden because the passage develops gradually, but it is possible to isolate the beginning of new trends:

Section 1 (sentences 1-35)

A conversation with Lennie doing most of the talking, and in which Curley's wife is asking questions. She uses all her Question sentences in this section.

Lennie tells her about the dream, things he likes, and some of his history.

Section 2 (sentences 36-51)

Curley's wife does all the talking. Half way through this section she begins to use Commands. Three of her seven Command sentences are used in getting Lennie to stroke her hair. She thus tries to control Lennie's actions.

Section 3 (sentences 52-85)

Lennie starts talking again, and takes control so that soon only he is speaking. Sentence 52 marks the beginning of Lennie's actions - he starts stroking Curley's wife's hair. From now on she gradually loses control of him. This can be seen in her first use of a negative imperative in sentence 53. For the first time she tells him not to do something. Her previous Commands were attempts to prompt him into action, not to make him stop. Lennie uses all of his Commands and Exclamations in this section. We see him trying to control Curley's wife and becoming agitated.

SECTION 1.

Passage X follows closely after the one where Lennie was talking to the dead puppy. It is in the same scene⁴ and sets up the same contrast between Lennie and the outside world:

Lennie sighed deeply. From outside came the clang of a horseshoe on metal, and then a chorus of cheers.(1,2)

As in passage X, the sentences describing Lennie have the most normal SP clause-element order, and the

sentences about what is going on outside the barn have the more unusual word order associated with those things outside Lennie's perceptual range. Thus in sentence 2 the first clause has a thematic Adjunct and its Subject is further delayed by its inversion with the verb. The sentence as a whole is an almost exact repetition of IX,28:

From outside came the clang of
horseshoes on the iron stake, and then
a little chorus of cries.(IX,28)

Both sentences are of F&P construction, and the clauses in each are of APS and &AZ form respectively. Many of the words are the same.

Curley's wife notices the noises outside the barn and interprets them:

"Somebody made a ringer," said Curley's wife.

Now the light was lifting as the sun went down, and the sun streaks climbed up the wall and fell over the feeding racks and over the heads of the horses.(3,4)

The description of the light in the barn helps set a tranquil scene, providing a contrast for the later action and for Lennie's state of mind.⁵ Lennie is not at all conscious of the world around him. Sentence 4 is unusually long⁶ and precedes Lennie's words. This helps detach his speech from the comment that Curley's wife made. The speeches of the two characters have no relation at all at this point. Lennie takes no notice of what the woman has said. He is still thinking about the pup:

Lennie said, "Maybe if I took this pup out and throwed him away George wouldn't never know. An' then I could tend the rabbits without no trouble."(5,6)

The unnecessary speech indicator⁷ "Lennie said" helps delay his words in the same way as sentence 4 did, thus making them more autonomous. Lennie's thoughts are much the same as in passage 1A. He re-expresses one of his less realistic theories that if he threw the pup away nobody would notice. It is also couched in the same language as before. He uses a double negative construction, and his uncertainty of the feasibility of what he is saying can be seen in the sentence Adjunct "maybe" which qualifies his initial statement.

Curley's wife, who has probably come to seduce Lennie,⁸ tries to attract his attention. Her mood is set by the final adverb "angrily" of the narrative clause introducing her speech:

Curley's wife said angrily, "Don't you think of nothing but rabbits?"

"We gonna have a little place," Lennie explained patiently. (7,8)

Lennie's reply is not a reply to the question asked. The narrative clause is ironic. Lennie does not really explain anything at all. He is so bound up in his thoughts about the rabbits that he can think of nothing else. The adverb "patiently" is slightly comic. Patience is not one of Lennie's virtues.⁹ He does not answer the question or explain at all. He just reiterates the dream vision:

"We gonna have a house an' a garden and a place for alfalfa, an' that alfalfa is for the rabbits, an' I take a sack and get it all fulla alfalfa and then I take it to the rabbits. (9)

Sentence 9 consists of five Free clauses all

conjoined by "and". This is an unusually high number, making Lennie's speech seem rather childlike.¹⁰ The succession of clauses starting with "and" also produces a run-on effect which would not be present if the one sentence was broken up into a number of sentences.¹¹ The first clause is of the same construction as many in the dream passages. It consists of "We gonna have C^o" where C^o is expounded by a number of noun phrases joined together by "and". The high incidence of so many "and" linkers both inter-clausally and inter-phrasally gives Lennie's speech a breathless quality, helping to show his enthusiasm for the dream.

This enthusiasm is immediately undercut by Curley's wife:

She asked, "What makes you so nuts
about rabbits?"(10)

As Lennie has just been speaking it would be more normal for the Subject of the introductory clause to be "Curley's wife" instead of "she". The pronoun is more terse, helping the undercutting effect. Lennie's taste is strange, and Curley's wife challenges it. Lennie's answer to the woman's question is delayed by two sentences of narrative:

Lennie had to think carefully before he could come to a conclusion. He moved cautiously close to her, until he was right against her. "I like to pet nice things. Once at a fair I seen some of them long-hair rabbits. An' they was nice, you bet. Sometimes I've even pet nice, but not when I could get nothing better."(11-16)

Lennie has to think hard about something which normally requires little thought. He treats the question

seriously, and the narrative, by delaying the response, makes his thinking seem ponderous. Similarly, his movement in 12 is made to seem slow because of the arresting effect of the adverb "cautiously" ¹² and the addition of the "extra" Adjunct¹³ "until he was right against her." It is as if he is confiding a secret to her. Lennie as usual, is concerned only with himself. Four of the five clauses above have "I" as Subject. His recollection of the fair is expressed in ungrammatical terms. "Saw" becomes "seen", "some of those" "some of them" and "long-haired" becomes "long-hair". Sentence 15, with Lennie's typical enthusiasm Adjunct "you bet" shows his pleasure at his memory. The last sentence of the group introduces mice into the scheme of things. We know from passage I, among other places, that the mice always got killed when Lennie petted them. This leads us to think that the rabbits would get killed too.

Curley's wife becomes rather uneasy:

Curley's wife moved away from him a little. "I think you're nuts," she said. (17,18)

As so often with Steinbeck, the narrative tells us of the character's shift in attitude by describing bodily movements. She only moves away "a little" suggesting unease rather than fear. Her accusation that he is crazy prompts Lennie's first really direct reply:

"No I ain't," Lennie explained earnestly. "George says I ain't. I like to pet nice things with my fingers, sof' things." (19-21)

The quoting verb is ironic. Lennie does not really explain anything. To him, the best proof that he is not

crazy is that George says so. It was shown in the scene with the puppy, that Lennie's life revolves around George's attitude towards him. In 21 he repeats what he said in 13, this time with more emphasis, produced by an appositional tag "sof' things." There is a clash of association between "sof' things" and "my fingers". Lennie's fingers are immensely strong. He crushed Curley's hand with them. But Lennie's reply does have the effect of softening the attitude of Curley's wife:

She was a little bit reassured.
 "Well, who don't?" she said. "Ever'body likes that. I like to feel silk an' velvet." (22-25)

The fact that he likes soft things allows her to be able to identify with him. Her return of confidence is marked by her introducing new lexical items into the conversation.¹⁴ ("silk an' velvet") and her use of the more relaxed sentence Adjunct "well". She invites Lennie to associate himself with her by asking "Do you like to feel velvet?"(26)

Lennie is pleased that she is not opposed to him any more:

"Lennie chuckled with pleasure."(27)

Both the verb and the adverbial phrase help indicate his mood. His answer to her question is decidedly in the affirmative:

"You bet, by God," he cried happily.
 "An' I had some, too. A lady give me some, an' that lady was - my own Aunt Clara. She give it right to me - 'bout this big a piece. I wisht I had that velvet right now."(28-32)

His enthusiasm is shown initially by the two exclamatory Adjuncts in sentence 28, and is carried on in a number of ways. The initial "an'" in 29 produces a run-on effect, and the repetition of "lady" in 30 gives the feeling that he is bound up in what he is saying. His speech is excited and disjointed, producing a tag clause "'bout this big a piece."¹⁵ In the last sentence the intensifier "right" is used with an adverbial phrase of place - a construction that Candy uses when he gets excited.¹⁶

At the words "I wisht I had that velvet right now", a change comes over Lennie which is registered by the narrative:

A frown came over his face. "I lost it,"
he said. "I ain't seen it for a long time."
(33-35)

Without the narrative guide the reader would not know that a change had occurred at all, for there is nothing out of the ordinary in Lennie's speech. Steinbeck uses a typical device in the narrative sentence of making "a frown" Subject in the surface structure and Actor in the deep structure, thus implying that the frown appears of its own accord. This is the first implication in the passage that Lennie is not completely in control of himself. More instances of this type of construction are used as the passage goes on.

Thus at this point in the passage Lennie has been established as self-centred, and Curley's wife has got over her initial doubts about him. She trusts him, but the first hint of Lennie's lack of control over his own actions has been seen.

SECTION 2.

This section shows Curley's wife becoming increasingly confident:

Curley's wife laughed at him. "You're nuts," she said. "But you're a kinda nice fella. Jus' like a big baby. But a person can see kinda what you mean. (36-40)

Her original uneasiness about Lennie has receded far enough for her to be able to laugh at him. In sentence 37 she repeats what she said in 18. But here she is much more certain. She does not qualify the statement with an "I think" clause. Instead, she tells Lennie that she likes him in her next sentence. The "but" linker marks the antithesis between "nuts" and "a kinda nice fella." The next two sentences use this same sort of antithesis. Lennie is like a baby, but she can understand him. Sentence 40, like 38, begins with "but", and the fact that both sentences use "kinda" strengthens the parallel.

By this time Curley's wife feels confident enough to talk about herself instead of Lennie:

"When I'm doin' my hair sometimes I jus' set an' stroke it 'cause it's so soft." To show how she did it, she ran her fingers over the top of her head. "Some people got kinda coarse hair," she said complacently. "Take Curley. His hair is jus' like wire. But mine is soft and fine." (41-47)

She feels that she no longer needs to pay attention to Lennie. The final adverb "complacently" in sentence 43 makes sure that the change in attitude is noticed.

Curley's wife now begins to try and control Lennie:

"Here - feel right here." She took Lennie's hand and put it on her head. "Feel right aroun' there an' see how soft it is." (49-51)

She tries to direct Lennie's actions. Both sentences that she utters are Commands. The narrative shows her actually taking hold of Lennie's hand and putting it on her head. This is the point at which she has most control over him.

SECTION 3.

Sentence 52 is the first narrative sentence for some time that has talked of Lennie, "Lennie's big fingers fell to stroking her hair." (52) It has a hint of menace. In contrast to the preceding narrative sentences, the Subject in the surface structure of the clause and Actor in the deep structure is not a person, but a part of one, "Lennie's big fingers." This method of implying that the parts of Lennie's body have a will of their own is also used in sentences 59 and 64. The adjective "big" reminds us of his size and strength, and the trouble that his fingers have caused in the past. Lennie's lack of control over his own body is also seen in the use of the phrase construction "fell to stroking" instead of the simple past tense "stroked".

But Lennie is obviously stroking too hard, and Curley's wife has to use her first negative Command "Don't you mess it up." Lennie begins to get interested in her soft hair:

Lennie said, "Oh! That's nice," and he stroked harder. "Oh, that's nice."
(54-56)

He uses one Exclamation sentence and one beginning with an exclamatory Adjunct. His words consist entirely of exclamations and a reiteration of "that's nice," This contrasts with his speech earlier in the passage, which was more complex and expanded. Nothing is said about what he is stroking. Only his action is described.

The reaction of Curley's wife is more abrupt than before, "Look out, now, you'll mess it." (57) There is no narrative to introduce the new speaker. It is not needed as the attitudes of both characters have already been established. Curley's wife uses an exclamatory Adjunct for the first time. The hardening of her mood is indicated by the adverb in the narrative, "And then she cried angrily, 'You stop it now, you'll mess it all up.'" (58) The change to a positive imperative with the retention of the "you" Subject shows her increased annoyance.¹⁷ She tries to stop Lennie, but with no success:

She jerked her head sideways, and Lennie's fingers closed on her hair and hung on. (59)

Her action produces a result exactly opposite to the one she requires. Lennie grabs hold of her hair. The two clauses of 59 are joined by "and" where "but" would have been more normal. By doing this Steinbeck shows that the escalation of Lennie's advances is a direct result of the actions of Curley's wife. Essentially, it is Curley's wife that attacks Lennie, not vice versa. Lennie is doing what he thinks is normal, and when she reacts violently to this he becomes afraid. It is noticeable that Lennie only hangs on to the hair. He does not actually make any movement to hurt her.

The result of Lennie's frightened reaction is to produce more agitation on the part of Curley's wife:

"Let go," she cried. "You let go!" (60,61)

The repeated Command indicates a less successful attempt to control Lennie. The second, like 58, has a "you" Subject included. The narrative clause tends towards being lexically empty in spite of the fact that Curley's wife is under duress. We are not told if she is in any pain. Steinbeck's usual final adverb to indicate the manner in which the person speaks is conspicuously absent. This marks the beginning of a policy in the passage of taking sympathy away from Curley's wife as much as possible and giving it to Lennie. All the time she is under duress and dying, Curley's wife is never referred to by "name". This helps depersonalise her, making it more difficult for the reader to sympathise with her. Steinbeck has made sure throughout the novel that she does not become a sympathetic character. She is never given a name and we know very little about her hopes and fears. She has intruded on the dreamers at the end of passage VIII, and she has caused trouble between Curley and Slim. For these reasons we disapprove of her somewhat.

Curley's wife is in trouble, but it is Lennie that we are told about:

Lennie was in a panic. His face was contorted. She screamed then, and Lennie's other hand closed over her mouth and nose.
(62-64)

He has those features that we would expect Curley's wife to have. She is the one that is being hurt, but it

is Lennie who is described as if he is terrified and in pain. Sentence 64, like 59, makes Lennie's action seem forced by that of Curley's wife because of the unusual use of the "and" linker joining the two clauses. She is trying to prevent Lennie from hurting her, but her attempt at prevention produces even more trouble for her. The adverb "then" after the verb in the first clause makes the woman's scream seem a separate event which has little relation with what has gone before. This helps remove the idea that Lennie is responsible for what happens. As in 59, it is Lennie's hand which is the actor, not him, again removing blame from him.

In 63 and 64 Lennie was described as if he was in pain when it was Curley's wife that was suffering. In Lennie's next piece of speech he uses language appropriate for a subjugated rather than a dominant person:

"Please don't," he begged. "Oh! Please don't do that. George'll be mad." (65-68)

He uses two Commands in an attempt to control the situation. But they are begging, not authoritarian Commands, as can be seen by the narrative verb and Lennie's use of the Adjunct "please." It is only after this concentration on Lennie's fear and bewilderment that we are told about Curley's wife:

She struggled violently under his hands. Her feet battered on the hay and she writhed to be free; and from under Lennie's hand came a muffled screaming. (69,70)

The fact that she struggles after Lennie's plea makes it seem that she is provoking the struggle in spite of his wishes. Curley's wife is very active. She struggles

"violently", batters her feet and writhes. All this is done under Lennie's hands, but we are never actually told that he is holding her down. Sentence 70 contains another example of a peculiar use of the "and" linker. The first two clauses both depict Curley's wife struggling. The third is joined to them by "and", but it shows her in even worse straits than before. Again "but" would be the more normal linker. The disparity between the last clause and the others is emphasised by its unusual structure. The Subject is delayed by an adverbial phrase and is also inverted with the verb. The joining of the three clauses by "and" is psychologically correct if linguistically unusual. Because she wants to get free Curley's wife struggles harder, making Lennie more afraid. This causes him to grip even harder. Every attempt she makes to escape worsens her plight.

Curley's wife is further dehumanised in sentence 70. "She" is Subject of only one of the clauses. The other two have "her feet" and "a muffled screaming" as S. The latter does not even have a possessive deictic. There are five instances in the passage of Curley's wife being described in terms of parts of her body rather than as a person. All these instances are between sentences 70 and 85, when she is being subjugated by Lennie. By describing her in these terms when she is in trouble Steinbeck carries on his policy of preventing us from sympathising with her. Exactly the reverse is true of Lennie. He is referred to by name or by an anaphoric referent (i.e. as a person) when his panic is being described, and when his

"attack" on Curley's wife is shown parts of his body occupy the S position in the clauses. This makes it less easy to blame Lennie for his actions.

After the description of the plight of Curley's wife in 69 and 70, Steinbeck quickly returns to Lennie and his fear:

Lennie began to cry with fright. "Oh! Please don't do none of that," he begged. "George gonna say I done a bad thing. He ain't gonna let me tend no rabbits." (71-75)

As before, he uses an exclamatory "Oh!" and a pleading Command, thus implying that Curley's wife is doing the attacking, not him.¹⁹ The quoting verb "begged" helps in the same way as it did in sentence 65. His simplified view of the situation is seen in "George gonna say I done a bad thing." The moral consequences of what he is doing are never brought up. He is only worried about George's opinion. At the thought of not being able to look after his rabbits he relents a little:

He moved his hand a little and her hoarse cry came out. Then Lennie grew angry. "Now don't," he said. "I don't want you to yell. You gonna get me in trouble jus' like George says you will. Now don't you do that." (76-81)

When he moves his hand Curley's wife screams. The use of "and" is the same as in sentence 70. Because she screams Lennie becomes angry. His speech changes. The expletives and pleading Adjuncts disappear, and his Commands become orders, not pleas. The narrative no

longer describes him as begging. Like Curley's wife when she was angry, he produces a Command with a "you" Subject. All his Commands have negative verbs. He only uses a positive verb to say that she will get him into trouble. His use of negative imperatives imply that Curley's wife is on the offensive, not him. But his orders have no effect:

And she continued to struggle, and her eyes were wild with terror.(82)

The use of initial "and" makes it seem as if her continued struggling is a result of his ordering her to stop. We are told that she is terrified, but the state is not attributed to her as a person, only to her eyes. The effect of her continued struggling is to make Lennie even more angry; "He shook her then, and he was angry with her." (83) The clause final "then" is unusual. In final position "then" means "at that time", which has no causal implication. Steinbeck thus implies that Lennie's action has little relation to the situation that he is in. By placing "and he was angry with her" after "he shook her then" he avoids the implication that Lennie shook her because he was angry. The fact that he was angry with her assumes the status of an afterthought. This is the first sentence in which Lennie is depicted as actually doing anything to Curley's wife.

The passage ends with:

"Don't you go yellin'," he said, and he shook her; and her body flopped like a fish. And then she was still, for Lennie had broken her neck.(84,85)

His anger is seen in the Command with an included

"you" Subject. Curley's wife is now completely depersonalised. She is just about to die. In describing her involuntary movements²⁰ Steinbeck refers to "her body" rather than to her as a person. This already contains the implication that she is no longer alive. Her body flops like a fish, just as Curley did at the end of the fight in passage VII.²¹ The difference is that she is is dead.²²

Thus the passage as a whole is handled in such a way as to keep the reader's sympathies with Lennie. Curley's wife has already been depicted as being not particularly likeable. By making it seem as if she is on the offensive, and by implying that her actions somehow bring about the worsening of her plight and finally her destruction, Steinbeck does now allow the reader the chance of blaming Lennie for what happens. Lennie is depicted as afraid and as not wanting to do what he does. Thus although he has effectively brought about the destruction of the dream by getting into the trouble warned against in passage I, we feel that Lennie is completely innocent and to be pitied for his plight and later fate at the end of the novel.

NOTES

1. See the discussion at the beginning of chapter VIII(p.156).
2. One of which has an e superscript.
3. One of which has an e superscript.
4. The book is divided into six chapters which correspond to scenes. Within each chapter everything takes place in the same location.
5. But it claims greater attention than it deserves because of its internal balance. The light lifts and the sun goes down, the sun streaks climb up the wall and then fall over (i.e. down) themselves. There are two sentence final adverbs instead of the normal one. Both consist of "over & NP. All this patterning makes one expect the sentence to have an importance which it does not possess.
6. It has four clauses. The average number of clauses per sentence in this passage is two.
7. It is unnecessary because we know that Lennie is speaking from what he says - he is talking about the puppy and George - and the way he says it. He uses double negatives and ungrammatical forms like "threwed" instead of "threw" which are typical of Lennie's speech.
8. We never really know as we are never let in on what she thinks. Nor does the narrative tell of her intentions. But she certainly makes up to him in such a way as to give this interpretation some support.
9. As seen by the way in which he breaks in on George's speech in passages III and V.
10. Young children learn to use a number of Free clauses joined together by "and" before they can handle more complex Bound forms.
11. Steinbeck could have said, "we gonna have a house an' a garden and a place for alfalfa. That alfalfa is for the rabbits. I take the sack and get it all fulla alfalfa. Then I take it to the rabbits." This flows much less smoothly. The run-on effect of the

original is also helped by the repetition of "alfalfa" (three times) and "rabbits" (twice).

12. Jacobson gives the following figures for adverbs of manner ending in "-ly": F(22 4%) M(180 31%) W(375 65%). Thus the positioning of "cautiously" in M position is unusual. This helps the arrest effect, and also Lennie's dilemma. He is attracted by Curley's wife, but George has told him that he is to have nothing to do with her.
13. "Some information is essential, some is not. Grammatically, we need the information given us at S and P (or at P alone) - any other information in a given clause is either 'extra' or 'delaying'. Delaying information creates a situation of "arrest" before S, or P, or C where there is a C. "Extra" information is that given after SPC within the clause, or after SP where no C occurs." Mark Burke, A Stylistic Analysis of Eight Poems by Robert Graves, M.A. thesis (University of Birmingham, 1967), p.17.
14. For a short discussion of this see appendix I.
15. The dash indicating a pause between P and C in ".....an' that lady was my own aunt Clara." produces a disjuncting of a different type. It is within the clause. Lennie is having trouble with his memory, he cannot remember his aunt. The "own" modifier stresses this.
16. See passage VIII especially.
17. The use of a Subject with an imperative in a one-to-one situation is unnecessary and seems to imply greater force than an imperative alone.
18. This is the last time that Curley's wife speaks.
19. The use of "began to cry" instead indicates that Lennie is actually crying rather than just shouting his words.
20. The fact that her movements are now involuntary contrasts with her earlier struggling.
21. See VII, 33.
22. Steinbeck overdoes things in the last sentence. We know that Curley's wife is dead from "and she was still." There seems to be no reason for adding the last clause. It enforces a parallel between the woman, the mice, and the pup - they all have broken

necks. But it also enforces the idea that Lennie is somehow responsible for what he has done, a notion that Steinbeck has systematically avoided throughout the passage.

As THE TOWN (1911-1914)

Lennie said, "Tell how it's gonna be." (1)
George had been listening to the distant sounds. (2)
For a moment he was business-like. (3) "Look across the
river, Lennie, an' I'll tell you an' you an' about an'
it." (4)

Lennie turned his head and looked off across the
pool and up the descending slopes of the hills. (5)
"We gonna get a little place," George began. (6) He
reached in his side pocket and brought out Carlson's
lugar; he snapped off CHAPTER XI and the head and lay
on the ground behind Lennie's back. (7) He looked
at the back of "GEORGE KILLS LENNIE" place where the
spine and skull were joined. (8)

A man's voice called from up the river, and another
man answered. (9)

"Go on," said Lennie. (10)
George raised the gun and was about to shoot; and he
dropped his hand to the ground again. (11)

"Go on," said Lennie. (12) "Go on at some place."
He gonna get a little place. (13)

"We'll have a cow," said George. (14) "and we'll
have maybe a pig an' a little place. (15) We'll have a... little place. (16)

"For the rabbits," Lennie repeated. (17)

"For the rabbits," George repeated. (18)

"and I got to look him up." (19)

"and I got to look him up." (20)

Lennie asked him something. (21) "and I got to look him up." (22)

and Lennie the man. (23)

"and I got to look him up." (24)

Lennie asked him something. (25)

"and I got to look him up." (26)

Lennie asked him something. (27)

"and I got to look him up." (28)

Lennie asked him something. (29)

"and I got to look him up." (30)

and Lennie the man. (31)

"and I got to look him up." (32)

Lennie asked him something. (33)

"and I got to look him up." (34)

Lennie asked him something. (35)

"and I got to look him up." (36)

1. THE TEXT (pp.181-184)

Lennie said, "Tell how it's gonna be." (1)
 George had been listening to the distant sounds. (2)
 For a moment he was business-like. (3) "Look acrost the river, Lennie, an' I'll tell you so you can almost see it." (4)
 Lennie turned his head and looked off across the pool and up the darkening slopes of the Gabilans. (5)
 "We gonna get a little place," George began. (6) He reached in his side pocket and brought out Carlson's Luger; he snapped off the safety, and the hand and gun lay on the ground behind Lennie's back. (7) He looked at the back of Lennie's head, at the place where the spine and skull were joined. (8)
 A man's voice called from up the river, and another man answered. (9)
 "Go on," said Lennie. (10)
 George raised the gun and his hand shook, and he dropped his hand to the ground again. (11)
 "Go on," said Lennie. (12) "How's it gonna be. (13) We gonna get a little place." (14)
 "We'll have a cow," said George. (15) "An' we'll have maybe a pig an' chickens....an' down the flat we'll have a....little piece alfalfa--" (16)
 "For the rabbits," Lennie shouted. (17)
 "For the rabbits," George repeated. (18)
 "And I get to tend the rabbits." (19)
 "An' you get to tend the rabbits." (20)
 Lennie giggled with happiness. (21) "An' live on the fatta the lan'." (22)
 "Yes." (23)
 Lennie turned his head. (24)
 "No, Lennie. (25) Look down there acrost the river, like you can almost see the place." (26)
 Lennie obeyed him. (27) George looked down at the gun. (28)
 There were crashing footsteps in the brush now. (29)
 George turned and looked toward them. (30)
 "Go on, George. (31) When we gonna do it?" (32)
 "Gonna do it soon." (33)

"He an' you." (34)

"You....an' me. (35) Ever'body gonna be nice to you. (36) Ain't gonna be no more trouble. (37) Nobody gonna hurt nobody nor steal from 'em." (38)

Lennie said, "I thought you was mad at me, George." (39)

"No," said George. (40) "No, Lennie. (41) I ain't mad. (42) I never been mad, an' I ain't now. (43) That's a thing I want ya to know." (44)

The voices came close now. (45) George raised the gun and listened to the voices. (46)

Lennie begged, "Le's do it now. (47) Le's get that place now." (48)

"Sure, right now. (49) I gotta. (50) We gotta." (51)

And George raised the gun and steadied it, and he brought the muzzle of it close to the back of Lennie's head. (52) The hand shook violently, but his face set and his hand steadied. (53) He pulled the trigger. (54) The crash of the shot rolled up the hills and rolled down again. (55) Lennie jarred, and then settled slowly forward to the sand, and he lay without quivering. (56)

2. THE ANALYSIS.

The last passage to be analysed is the only one where the amount of narrative exceeds the speech. 55% of the text is comprised of narrative. In the analysis of other passages it was noticed that the narrative percentage increased with an increase of action. There is some action in this scene; George kills Lennie; but, as will be seen later, most of the acts are uncompleted. A large part of the narrative is used to convey the irony of the situation. Lennie has killed Curley's wife, and the search is on to find him. Curley is out for blood, but George has got to Lennie first as he knew where to look. We soon realise that George intends to shoot the unknowing Lennie to save him from the terror of dying at the hands of Curley and the others.

The passage starts with Lennie trying to get George to tell him about the dream farm. But the lead-up to the telling of the dream does not follow the usual formula. Lennie knows that he has done something wrong, but does not realise the magnitude of his transgression. He has tried to get George to punish him in the normal way, that is by threatening to leave him:

Lennie said, "George."

"Yeah?"

"Ain't you gonna give me hell?"(p.179)

As was shown in passage II, the evocation of the anti-dream is as much a ritual as that of the dream itself. This time however George finds himself incapable of going through with it - because he is now face to face

with the prospect of living without Lennie anyway. He knows that if he does not do something Curley and the others will lynch Lennie. Because George has determined to kill his friend when he is not looking an ironic situation is produced. George and the reader know more about the situation than Lennie. The irony is conveyed largely by a discrepancy between the speech and the narrative. Lennie gets George to tell him about the farm while the narrative shows George steeling himself to kill him. This division between speech and narrative helps prevent the scene from becoming over-melodramatic. The total situation is ironic but generally Steinbeck does not try to wring extra significance from George's words. There are one or two exceptions, and in each case we feel that Steinbeck has overdone things. An example of this can be seen at the climax of the passage. Lennie begs George to get the farm right away, and George says, "Sure, right now. I gotta. We gotta." (49-51) The first two sentences obviously refer, for him, to his intention of shooting Lennie, whereas Lennie thinks he is talking about the farm. The feature of the language which allows this obvious irony to take place is the vagueness of the expressions used. Lennie had said, "Le's do it now." (47) The exponent of C^o in the sentence is the lexically empty pronoun "it". George's first sentence consists of two agreement Adjuncts, and the second two have no post-verbal predicates. This lack of specificity allows the words to carry more than one meaning.¹

The other feature which prevents the passage from becoming over-melodramatic is the lack of emotive descriptions of either of the characters. The internal struggles of George's mind are never portrayed. Instead, we are given a purely external, seemingly objective description. We are not told of George's fight with himself, but have to deduce it from sentences like, "George raised the gun and his hand shook, and he dropped his hand to the ground again." (11) Moreover, there is a noticeable absence of clause-final adverbs in the narrative. In other passages these have been the main indicators of the mood and reactions of the participants in the scenes.² The narrative sentences are very simple. Every clause which they contain is Free.

The passage begins with Lennie ordering George to tell him about the dream, "Lennie said, "Tell how it's gonna be." (1) The evocation of the two dream passages were started in the same way and with very similar expressions. A Command beginning with "tell how" or "tell about" is a favourite sentence for Lennie.³ By this time he has forgotten that he has done anything wrong, and is only interested in the dream.

An analysis of the Sentence Types gives the following table:

	C	S	Y	Q	R
LENNIE	6	5	1	2	0
GEORGE	3	14	1	0	4

Nearly half of Lennie's sentences are Commands. They are all used in getting George to talk about the farm. George needs a lot of prompting because he is

thinking about other things. His three Commands are all concerned with getting Lennie into a position where George can kill him without his knowing. Typically, Lennie is concerned only with himself. He issues six Commands and two Questions, but has no Responses. George, on the other hand has to keep up the pretence of doing as Lennie wants, and has four Responses.

Lennie's Command in sentence 1 is not followed immediately by a reply, but is juxtaposed with a piece of narrative telling the reader of the wider situation, a situation of which Lennie knows nothing, "George had been listening to the distant sounds." (2) Steinbeck uses this technique of juxtaposition throughout the passage to create tension. Every time Lennie begins to get involved in the dream vision we are reminded of the larger context which he is unwittingly a part of. The "distant sounds" that we are told of in this sentence get closer and closer as the passage moves towards its climax. The auxiliary "had been" in sentence 2 implies that Lennie's words suddenly bring George back to the immediate situation:

For a moment he was business-like.
Look across the river, Lennie, and
I'll tell you so you can almost
see it." (3,4)

Instead of immediately satisfying Lennie's demands George tries to get Lennie to look the other way so that he can shoot him. To get him to do so, he promises a telling of the dream ritual. This contrasts with the other two occasions when Lennie gets George to talk about the dream. In both passages III and V George put up some

resistance to Lennie's attempt at dominance. Here he gives in straight away. He no longer has any reason to protest, for he now realises that the dream is bound to fail. His only course left is to prevent Lennie's unhappiness as much as possible.

Lennie does as he is told, "Lennie turned his head and looked off across the pool and up the darkening slopes of the Gabilans." (5) We are not told anything about Lennie's mood at all. The use of the phrasal verb "looked off" suggests that he is not looking at the pool or the Gabilans, but only in that general direction as if he were trying to visualise the farm. George now begins to give a picture of the dream in the usual way:

"We gonna get a little place," George began. He reached in his side pocket and brought out Carlson's Luger; he snapped off the safety, and the hand and the gun lay on the ground behind Lennie's back. (6,7)

Juxtaposed with the beginning of George's attempt to keep Lennie happy is the beginning of the narrative description of George's preparations to kill his friend. Sentence 6 is of F&FF&F construction and divides into two parts. The first half is an example of a device that Steinbeck has often used. What would normally be described as a single action is split up into two clauses. Instead of "George took out Carlson's Luger." we get "He reached in his side pocket, and brought out Carlson's Luger...." The expansion of the description into two clauses slows down the action, helping to show George's reticence.⁴

The second part of the sentence also consists of two free clauses linked by "and". The first clause is short and sharp, reflecting George's action as he flips off the safety catch. He then returns to a state of inaction also paralleled by the structure of the clause which describes it. The Subject is relatively long (of dh&dh structure), and the post-P Adjunct position is filled by two adverbial phrases. Unlike the rest of the verbs in the sentence, "lay" is intransitive.

Sentence 8 is also about George and again is drawn out to slow down the action:

He looked at the back of Lennie's head,
at the place where spine and skull were
joined.(8)

The second Adjunct is in apposition to the first. The sentence would be more normal if either of the two adverbial phrases were omitted. The second gives us more detailed information than the first and is a more complex construction. It tells us the exact spot that George was looking at and contains a rankshifted clause. The physiological terminology (spine, skull) help to dehumanise Lennie a little.⁵

The next sentence is more vague than its predecessors, "A man's voice called from up the river, and another man answered."(9) It is also about a different topic. The distant sounds of sentence 2 have now become voices. But they are unidentified and in no specific place. The vagueness of "up the river" contrasts with the exactness of "at the place where spine and skull were joined." The nearing threat which pushes George on to kill Lennie is

always portrayed in an impersonal manner. Here the references are to "a man" and "another man." Later on in the passage they become more impersonal still.⁶ It is only George's struggle that is made to seem human.

The dream has not been mentioned since sentence 5. Steinbeck reminds us of it by getting Lennie to urge George on:

"Go on," said Lennie.

George raised the gun and his hand shook, and he dropped his hand to the ground again. (10,11)

Lennie is trying to get George to talk, but George sees it as an invocation to do the job that he is dreading. He tries to shoot Lennie, but cannot. The first two clauses of sentence 11 are joined by "and" where "but" would have been more normal. Psychologically the use of "and" is apposite, for it is the raising of the gun and the accompanying realisation that he is about to kill his friend that makes George's hand shake.⁷ The verb in the last clause is the antonym of the one in the first.⁸ It has been shown that Steinbeck juxtaposes the material about the dream life with that of the outside influence which is forcing its destruction. The real point of interest in the scene is whether George will pluck up enough courage to kill Lennie. The interest is maintained by showing George make a number of attempts to kill Lennie, only one of which succeeds. This effect can best be considered within the Structuralist notion of "narrative meaning."⁹ In sentences 7,11,52, and 28¹⁰ a narrative kernel opens two possible alternatives, (i) that George will shoot Lennie or (ii) that he will not.

In all except the last instance alternative (i) is taken. Every time George takes course (i) it leaves the possibility of the two alternatives being offered again. In the context of the outside pressure on George this possibility is so strong as to be nearly inevitable. Once George takes course (ii) there can no longer be any suspense - because there are no longer any alternatives.

After George has failed to kill him, the unknowing Lennie again orders him to talk about the dream:

"Go on," said Lennie. "How's it gonna be. We gonna get a little place."
(12-14)

His first sentence is a repetition of what he said in sentence 10. Sentence 12 is unusual in form. Although it is interrogative in mood it is really a cue for George to speak. Sentence 14 is an exact repetition of George's words in 6. Lennie not only urges him to carry on with the dream sequence, he actually starts it off for him. As before, George puts up no resistance at all to Lennie's dominance. He begins to tell Lennie about what they will have, knowing full well that the dream is about to be smashed:

"We'll have a cow," said George. "An' we'll have maybe a pig an' chickens....an' down the flat we'll have a....little piece alfalfa--"(15,16)

The formula is much the same as that for the two dream sequences examined. All the speech clauses are

of the general form "We'll have X" where X is one or more nominal groups with a farm word as its head. All these items were mentioned in passages III and V. George hesitates in the middle of the list but Lennie is enthusiastic, and soon interrupts him:

"For the rabbits," Lennie shouted.

"For the rabbits, George repeated.

"And I get to tend the rabbits."

"An' you get to tend the rabbits."

Lennie giggled with happiness, "An' live on the fatta the lan'." (17-22)

Lennie's minor sentence completes the construction that George was using. His interruption shows his enthusiasm as it did in passage III. Lennie shouts his interjection, and George merely repeats it. Lennie's eagerness contrasts with George's flat repetition throughout this section. Lennie shouts and giggles with happiness; George is invested with no emotion at all. Lennie begins both sentences 19 and 22 with "and", helping to give the impression that his enthusiasm is running away with him. When he produces his favourite cliché "An' live on the fatta the lan'" (22) George merely says "yes". Thus, in one sense, George is completely dominated by Lennie. He introduces no new lexical items into the conversation at all, and he always agrees with Lennie and follows his lead. But when Lennie turns his head we are immediately reminded that George is in control of the wider situation:

"No, Lennie. Look down there acrost the river, like you can almost see the place.

Lennie obeyed him. (25-27)

George repeats almost word for word the order he gave Lennie in sentence 4. The "no" Response of 24 is in direct contrast to the "yes" in 23. The one Response shows George being dominated, the next dominating. The narrative tells us very simply that Lennie obeyed him. George is still in control.

Once this crisis has been resolved the narrative turns its attention to George again. Although it is Lennie that is going to be killed, we are told much more about George than Lennie. George is the one who is seen trying to make the decisions. He acts as Subject for 23 of the narrative clauses, whereas Lennie is Subject of only 11.¹²

George looked down at the gun. There were crashing footsteps in the brush now. George turned and looked toward them. (28-30)

George looks at the gun but does not touch it. He is distracted by the sound of the crashing footsteps. This can be seen as another failed attempt to go through with the shooting. What were originally sounds are now footsteps. By giving a more accurate identification of the sounds Steinbeck gives the impression that the men are getting closer, thus increasing the tension of the passage. George just turns and looks. He makes no decisive action but looks vaguely "toward them". Lennie again demands that George tells him about the farm, thus increasing the pressure on George from the other side:

"Go on, George. When we gonna do it?"

"Gonna do it soon."

"Me an' you."

"You....an' me." Ever'body gonna be nice to you. Ain't gonna be no more trouble. Nobody gonna hurt nobody nor steal from 'em." (31-38)

Lennie asks a more direct question than usual. Instead of asking for a description of the farm, he demands to know when they will achieve the dream. This increases the irony and the pressure on George as it is now apparent that the dream will never be achieved.¹³ George's repetition of Lennie's interjection "He an' you."¹⁴ has the pronoun separated from the coordinating linker, thus indicating George's disbelief in what he is saying. Similarly, the rest of his little speech here has a false ring about it. He uses simple, unrealistic sentences in order to sooth Lennie. The concepts he uses are simple, and the statements universal. Everybody is going to be nice, and there will be no more trouble. The shallowness of the concept, is best seen in the first clause of sentence 37, where the universal "nobody" expounds both S and C.

At this point Lennie interrupts and changes the topic of conversation. George makes no resistance to this at all:

Lennie said, "I thought you was mad at me, George."
 "No," said George. "No, Lennie. I ain't mad. I never been mad, an' I ain't now. That's a thing I want ya to know."
 (39-44)

The main feature of George's response to Lennie is his eagerness to convince him that he is not annoyed. Not content with just saying "no", he reaffirms what he says in each of his five sentences. He repeats the "no" response twice, and then puts his opinion in an affirmative statement "I ain't mad." In turn, this statement is reaffirmed and amplified. This intention of George's of making sure that Lennie realises what

he is saying is best seen in sentence 44, where the Complement "that" is pushed to the front of the sentence, making it thematic.

Now that Steinbeck has established George's position, he reminds us of the nearing threat from outside, "The voices came close now. George raised the gun and listened to the voices." (45,46) The threat is still largely unidentified. The tension is increased by their sudden nearness.¹⁵ Instead of the more normal comparative "came closer", the ordinary adjective is used. The final "now" helps stress the sudden intrusion of the threat on George's mind. Sentence 46 has two free clauses linked by "and" where "but" would be more normal. George raises the gun, but instead of firing it, he listens to the voices. Once again George fails to take the course he intends.

As before, Lennie increases the pressure on George at the same time as the outside influences:

Lennie begged, "Le's do it now. Le's
get that place now."
"Sure, right now. I gotta. We gotta."
(47-51)

For the first time in the passage the quoting verb introducing Lennie's speech is lexically full. He repeats his plea to "do it now" in different words. The final "now" in both sentences indicates his insistence. As before, George immediately gives in to Lennie's plea, producing two response Adjuncts. Steinbeck again uses the vagueness of the pronoun "it" to wring some extra

"significance" from the speech. When Lennie says "Let's do it now.", George takes it to mean the killing as well as the meaning that Lennie intends. He falters and says "I gotta." before correcting himself. This is the last speech of the passage and it contains George's verbal realisation that he must shoot Lennie immediately. The remaining narrative describes the shooting:

And George raised the gun and steadied it, and he brought the muzzle of it close to the back of Lennie's head. The hand shook violently, but his face set and his hand steadied. He pulled the trigger, (52-54)

The initial "and" of sentence 52 shows that George's actions are a result of his realisation in 50. Steinbeck slows down the action and increases the tension by dividing what is essentially one action into a number of parts and devoting a clause to each movement. First George raises the gun, then he steadies it, and after that he moves it into position. In particular, the process of aiming is described in detail. The longer, more impersonal "of" genitive is used. The verb "brought" suggests a deliberate, precise action, a feeling which is backed up by the final adverbial phrase "close to the back of Lennie's head." Instead of being told where the gun is pointing, we are told the muzzle's exact position.

The Subjects of the three clauses in 52 are all parts of George's body. This dehumanising process prevents the outward description of George's struggle from becoming sentimental. The description is that of an objective external observer. The hand shakes violently.

Then, in contrast, his face becomes rigid and his hand steadies. Unlike the preceding action, the actual firing of the gun is over quickly. The sentence devoted to it has only one clause, and that is of simple SPC⁸ construction. Within the clause the nominal groups are also very simple - of h and dh construction respectively.

The aftermath of the shot, like George's actions before it, is described in slowed-up terms. The nominal group acting as S in 55 is comparatively long for Of Mice and Men. The verb "rolled" is repeated twice, and the adverb "again" is added at the end. The effect on Lennie is also divided up. First he jars, and then he falls over. The second clause is full of arresting adverbs. "Then" delays the verb "settled", which itself suggests a gentle movement. The direction in which the body falls is given by two Adjuncts. The second one, which contains the most explicit information, is delayed by the first, and there is arrest within the first Adjunct group itself. The adverb "forward" is delayed by a sub-modifying adverb "slowly". The last clause tells us that he lay without moving at all.

Thus we are not explicitly told that Lennie has been killed. We are given an external visual description of the events, which makes the writing seem objective and unmelodramatic. Attention in the passage is centred on George, thus preventing any sentimentalising over Lennie. The main feature of the scene is George's struggle to do something which he hates, but which he

knows must be done. He is gradually forced into killing Lennie by the forces gathered around him; and he manages to spare Lennie's feelings by pretending to tell him about the dream in the usual way. In other words, he has to envisage his own dream at the very moment that he is forced to destroy it. The dream of the farm is evaporated in spite of all the goodwill in the world.

NOTES

1. Other examples of this sort of irony in the speech can be seen in sentences 10 and 11, and in 32 and 33.
2. There is only one such adverb in this passage. By comparison, passage X had eight.
3. He produced four of them in passage III, and three in V.
4. It will be noticed that the extensive Complement to the verb is the gun. George is described nine times in the passage doing things involving such a Complement, and every time that Complement is expounded by the gun or part of it.
5. George would presumably have to look at him in this way in order to be able to shoot him.
6. cf. "crashing footsteps"(29), and "the voices."(46)
7. This use of "and" is similar to that described in chapter X.
8. It is interesting to note that in this and every sentence where the gun is mentioned, it is always referred to "by name". That is, it is never referred to by anaphoric "it" or other substitutional devices. Using lexically full nouns like "gun", "safety" and "trigger" instead of more lexically empty substitutions is one of the devices that Steinbeck uses to keep the harshness of the situation firmly fixed in the reader's mind.
9. The terminology here is taken from an interesting article on narrative analysis by Seymour Chatman, "New Ways of Analysing Narrative Structure With an Example from Joyce's 'Dubliners'.", Language and Style, Vol 11 No 1, (Winter 1969), pp.3-36. He says: "...Functions are the smallest narrative units. Like morphemes, they convey minimal meanings, but these are narrative meanings, not linguistic or lexical meanings;" It is essential that meaning be the criterion for establishing the unit; it is the functional character of certain segments in the story which make them units: whence the name 'functions' given to these primary units." Narrative meaning is

meaning which advances the plot by raising and satisfying questions; that is, narrative moments occur at which alternative possibilities arise. In the common metaphor, these are the seeds from which later narratively significant events flower. Thus they are radically correlative, entailing, enchainning. Chekov once said that if there is a gun hanging on the wall at the beginning of a story, it must go off before the story ends. But this statement is only valid if the original mention of the gun were in fact a function. For example, it might only be a bit of the description of the room of a sportsman (where "description" is ornamental, or "indexical", not functional); that is, the story does not depend upon his being a sportsman. Such a reference might even be negative - that is, precisely to frustrate expectation; the gun is there not to be shot off....

.... Functions are of two sorts - kernels (noyaux) and catalysts (catalyses), labelled K and C in the distribution code of the narrative analysis. A kernel raises a question, an alternative, an uncertainty - in Barthes word, a risk (risque). Kernels are genuine nodes or hinges of the story: they are branching points which require progression into one of two or more alternative paths. On the other hand, catalysts are completive in nature: they entail no choice but simply fill in and elaborate some kernel...."

The quotation in this extract is from Roland Barthes, "Introduction à l'analyse Structural des recits, Communications, III (1966), pp.28-59.

10. George's looking down at the gun but not picking it up can be construed as another attempt. He is producing an action which has the gun as goal.
11. There is no question mark, which suggests the absence of an interrogative contour.
12. "If the conclusion achieves a powerful and moving climax it is because the focus shifts to George,The reader's sympathies attach not to Lennie but to the intelligent and self-conscious George." F.W.Watt, Steinbeck (London 1962), p.62.

13. But Steinbeck does overdo it here - in the same way as he does in sentences 48-50. Lennie asks the question in a vague way, using a pronoun as the exponent of C^o in stead of a more precise noun. Thus when George uses the same pronoun in "Gonna do it soon." his sentence achieves an unnecessary double edge.
14. It is not an exact repetition, but the sentences are of the same construction and have the same words. The order of the pronouns is changed, as we would expect, as a different person is speaking.
15. Steinbeck pushes the threat at the reader by repeating "the voices" in 45 and 46 instead of using anaphora.

CONCLUSION

A. OF MICE AND MEN.

Of Mice and Men is seen to be a simple novel in terms of plot and language. There is only one central theme; there are no sub-plots, and no authorial discussions or digressions. The story is told in a straightforward and matter of fact way. Each of the six chapters corresponds to a change of scene, and there are no scene switches within chapters themselves. An analysis of the passages examined produces the following results:

Total number of sentences	530
Total number of clauses acting in sentence structure	917
Number of clauses per sentence	1.6
Total number of rankshifted clauses	36 (one every 15 sentences)
Number of Free clauses in the narrative text	316
Number of Bound clauses in the narrative text	23
Incidence of Bound clauses	1 every 13.7 clauses.
Number of Free clauses in the speech text	476
Number of Bound clauses in the speech text	102
Incidence of Bound clauses	1 every 4.7 clauses.

These figures indicate a simple style. There are less than two clauses per sentence, and by far the greatest proportion of those clauses are Free. It will

be noticed that the narrative text particularly is very simple, with an incidence of one Bound clause every 13.7 Free clauses. This simplicity and the notable absence of a narrator gives the narrative an air of objectivity, making it seem as if the events happened exactly as they are described. Emotions are portrayed in terms of observable external reactions rather than by the relation of internal mental events. It is this objective air which saves the novel from falling into melodrama and sentimentality, as can be seen in passage XI. The tension between the content and mode of expression produces a "controlled" style which continually avoids excess.

Three main types of writing can be distinguished. At the beginning of each chapter Steinbeck sets the scene with a block of narrative description. The rest of the novel is made up of mixed speech and narrative. When a conversation is being portrayed narrative description is kept to a minimum; but when events like fights and killings are described narrative increases at the expense of speech.

Of Mice and Men is the study of a dream which fails because the people involved are fallible and cannot control the events around them. Lennie is consistently portrayed as simple and unworldly, and it is apparent from early on in the novel that his unsophisticated outlook on the world is likely to destroy the hopes of the dreamers. Because of Lennie's inability to fend for himself, George has to look after

him and tell him what to do. But as early as passage I Lennie is seen as making an attempt to break free from this control. It is soon clear that if he does so he will do something to jeopardise the dream.

It is in the passages where they talk about the dream that Lennie exercises most control over George. These passages are marked off from the other conversation passages by their formalised, ritualistic manner. Lennie knows the content of George's words before he utters them. From this it is implied that the telling of the dream is a frequent occurrence for Lennie and George. Indeed, there are two discernible dream passages in the novel itself (passages III and V) and other places where parts of a dream sequence are used (see passages VI and XI especially).

However it is not the case that George is wholeheartedly in favour of the farm scheme. In passage II, he states that he could get along much better without Lennie. It is apparent that George believes in what he is saying at this point. He is genuinely attracted by a life without responsibilities. But he also wants the farm life with Lennie, as passage V shows. George is a complex character, one in which the reader can believe as a person rather than a stereotype.

It is apparent from early on that the dream hinges upon Lennie's actions and George's ability to control them. Lennie unintentionally kills mice and then the puppy because of his lack of awareness of his phenomenal strength. Curley attacks Lennie because of his yearning

to prove himself, and although Lennie is always on the defensive, it is Curley that comes off worst. Thus Lennie's unmeant transgressions get larger and larger until he kills Curley's wife. When he does this, George has to kill Lennie when he is not looking in order to save him from the horror of being lynched by Curley and the others. The dream dies with Lennie because George has no-one to be responsible for, nothing to prevent him from drifting. The tragic outcome of events is heightened by the fact that in order to kill Lennie George has to repeat the account of the dream of the farm that Lennie loves so much. The successful portrayal of the comic situation in passage X is effected largely by moving the focus of attention to George while at the same time keeping the description of the events external and seemingly objective.

That the outcome is felt to be tragic is very much a function of the sympathy that has been developed for Lennie throughout the novel. He is consistently characterised as innocent and unaware of his strength. Both when he breaks Curley's hand and when he kills Curley's wife, it is Lennie who is attacked and Lennie who is on the defensive. In passage X Steinbeck describes him as if he is frightened and in pain, taking as much attention as possible away from the fact that he is killing Curley's wife.

However it is not true that the novel moves towards its tragic conclusion without any let-up.

From passages II and III it seems that George does not have much faith in the dream. But in V he is shown as much more hopeful, and he soon says that he knows of a farm which is going cheap. It is at this moment that Candy asks to come in on the scheme. His money makes the dream a real possibility for the first time. All these things happen before Lennie crushes Curley's hand. Moreover, in passage VIII Candy manages to convert Crooks to a belief in the dream. Crooks is portrayed as intelligent and a pessimist, and so his conversion helps make the dream seem more feasible. All these elements keep alive the reader's hopes for the dream and hence interest in the story.

B. STEINBECK'S STYLE.

One of the things that contributes to the feeling that Lennie is liable to get out of control is the way in which Steinbeck often portrays his actions. By using a part of Lennie's body as Subject of the surface structure and Initiator/Actor in the deep structure of a transitive narrative clause the author implies that the separate parts of Lennie's body have a will of their own. George's attraction for his two different types of dream is portrayed in a similar way. In passage V he is seen getting involved in the farm dream in spite of himself:

George's hands stopped working with the cards. His voice was growing warmer.
(V, 24, 25)

In the same way his anger is seen to control him completely in passage II. Thus at the end of the passage Steinbeck can say, "His anger left him suddenly." (II, 32)

A consideration of deep structure concepts also helps show Lennie as helpless and dependent on George. In passage II, when George loses his temper, it is Lennie that makes the Goal-directed actions in order to try and make contact with him. It is not until the last sentence of the passage that George makes any sort of action with Lennie as Goal. In passage VII Curley's actions always have Lennie as Goal whereas Lennie's actions have a variety of Goals. This helps show that Curley is the attacker, and that Lennie is bewildered.

The dream passages in the novel are marked off from the others not just by the fact that both characters know what is going to be said beforehand, but also by their repeated use of list structures and particular words and phrases. In passages VI and XI the beginning of smaller dream sequences are marked off from the rest of the text by their lack of inter-sentential connections with what has gone before.

In passages VII, X, and XI, the three passages with most action and most narrative, Steinbeck makes unusual use of the clause linker "and". By using it to link two free clauses where "but" would be more normal he emphasises the fact that the action contained in the second clause is caused by that in the first, although the first action is designed to have an opposite effect.

Thus in X,59 for example, we get:

She jerked her head sideways, and
Lennie's fingers closed on her hair
and hung on.

The action that Curley's wife produces is designed to prevent Lennie from hurting but has the effect of making him hurt her more. This is one of the ways in which the reader is made to feel that Lennie is not responsible for her death.

An examination of the relation between the narrative and speech texts yields a number of interesting insights. Often a narrative clause informs the reader how to interpret the tone of a particular speech. Thus in II,15 for example, "'An' whatta I got,' George went on furiously." The use of "-ly" adverbs in clause final position in the narrative, as seen above, is a common feature of Steinbeck's style.

New speakers are not always introduced by a quoting verb. Instead, Steinbeck gives the text more variety. Sometimes a new speaker is introduced by a short descriptive sentence about him, as in VI, 13 and 14:

George watched him suspiciously.
"Well - I could get it for six hundred
bucks."

On other occasions the narrative introduction is missed out completely or comes after the words have been spoken. This is associated with special effects as in V,54 and 55:

"You'd fill up the sack and bring it in
an' put it in the rabbit cages."
"They'd nibble an' they'd nibble," said
Lennie, "the way they do."

Here the juxtaposition of the two different speeches without a quoting verb in between helps mirror Lennie's eagerness. On the other hand, the insertion of a narrative descriptive sentence in between speeches or sentences within one speech indicate a pause in speech production associated with caution, hesitancy etc.:

"How'd that be?"

George half-closed his eyes. "I gotta think about that." (VI, 29, 30)

Thus although Steinbeck uses a simple style in Of Mice and Men, he varies his techniques within that simplicity. Moreover, some of the devices within this simple framework are complex and subtle in terms of their effect. The simple use of an "and" linker instead of "but" for example is simple technically, but produces a subtle and effective change in meaning.

C. STYLISTICS.

The main justification for the stylistic approach is contained in the body of this thesis, in its ability to show specifically how literary texts work by the examination of small-scale effects. This helps one to make accurate statements about the meaning of a text, what it is about; and also about the methods which are used to produce specific effects. Thus George's concern with himself in passage II, as contrasted with passage I can be seen in an examination of the Subjects of the clauses he uses. The incidence of "I" as Subject rises from 1 in 5 to 1 in 2.66. This gives observable support

for what would otherwise be an undisciplined, unchecked statement - that George is more concerned with himself in passage II than in passage I. In passage VII, an already noted in this conclusion, the claim that Curley attacks Lennie and that Lennie is portrayed as bewildered and frightened is backed up not just by an enunciation of vocabulary items, but also by an examination of Steinbeck's systematic use of the relation between the deep and surface structure components of the narrative clauses in the passage. Literary critics often make simple statements like "Lennie is simple" or "Curley attacks Lennie", but the stylistic method shows precisely what leads one to make even such simple statements. It is a commonplace assumption that literary texts are subtle and varied. But the examination of such organisation involves a similar high degree of specificity on the part of the analyst. This is illustrated above in the description of two of Steinbeck's techniques.

It is apparent that linguistic research is most advanced in the grammatical field and it is this area which has been exploited most in this study. By comparison, lexical studies are underdeveloped. This is the main justification for using the techniques of practical criticism in conjunction with the linguistic stylistic approach. The latter helps make the former more rigorous, and the former allows one to say more general things about the novel as a whole. Thus although only specific passages of the novel have been analysed in detail, they can easily be fitted into an overall reading which at the same time they help to form.

The general approach of using both stylistics and practical criticism helps the production of a unified critical whole rather than a collection of seemingly unrelated small-scale analyses.

A number of things can be said about the ways in which a text can be approached. Many features worth notice have already been listed by others e.g. the positions of adverbs, and the exploitation of these position or arrest in a clause. In this study the examination of the deep grammatical construction of clauses in relation to their surface structure was found to be useful. With specific reference to texts containing speech, the general relation between the narrative and speech texts proved to be important. Information in the narrative often keys the reader in on how to interpret the mood of a speech clause. An analysis of the Sentence Types that a character used, along with the amount of words helped in discovering who was dominant in a particular conversation.

But it is not enough just to say that someone has the greatest proportion of a speech text, or uses a large number of Commands or Goal directed actions. It is also necessary to put such basic observations into context. For example, it was found that there is no necessary correlation between the number of words a person speaks and his position of authority in a conversation. A dominant person may use any percentage of a speech text between 0 and 100. Similarly, the use of a large number of Commands does not prove that a person is in control of a particular conversation, only

that he is trying to be. Thus although the noting of linguistic and literary devices is a helpful way to examine a text, the effect of those devices can only be judged in context. All is not anarchy however. It must be noted that certain devices are tied as to the type of effect that they can have. For example, the insertion of a piece of narrative between speeches always slows down the speech production and so produces one of a number of effects related in type - in this case hesitancy, boredom etc., but not excitement or agitation. Thus "Lennie said excitedly, 'What a good idea!'" is much less effective than "'What a good idea,' Lennie said excitedly." because the former uses a narrative/speech order which is inappropriate to the attitude expressed by the lexical content of the words.

Thus there are many linguistic devices at an author's disposal, each of which may have more than one effect according to the context in which it occurs. The possible uses of some devices is seen to be more strongly limited than others. One of the main fields open to the literary linguist is the observation and classification of these devices and how they are employed in specific works.

Much of Of Mice and Men is made up of conversation, and so its success as a realistic novel will depend partly on how well the speeches of the characters are rendered. We know that Steinbeck was interested in the language of the people he wrote about. In a letter to McIntosh and Otis, 2nd April, 1939, he says:

The speech of working men may seem a little bit racy to ladies' clubs, but, since ladies' clubs won't believe that such things go on anyway, it doesn't matter. I know this speech and I'm sick of working men being gelded of their natural expression until they talk with a fine Oxonian flavour.

No work has been done on the peculiarities of Salinas valley speech, and so it is not really possible to check how faithful the language of Of Mice and Men is to that of the Salinas area. It can however be checked against what is known about speech production in general. It will be convenient to examine the speech of the novel under three headings:

- (i) Structural Affinities
- (ii) Sound Representation
- (iii) Lexical Repetitions

(i) Structural Affinities

In general, one would expect written prose to have longer, more highly organised sentences than spoken language. This is because it is more difficult to follow complex subordinate ramifications in speech than in prose, where one can always re-read to get the sense right.

This prose/speech distinction is not absolute of course. A conversation with one person doing most of

the talking could have longer, more involved sentences than one with a fast interchange. Steinbeck's prose writing in Of Mice and Men would probably be less complex grammatically than a speech by Dr Johnson. One would expect the general distinction to hold however. An examination of the speech of some of the passages produces the following set of results:

PASSAGE	CLAUSES				NUMBER OF SENTENCES	NUMBER OF CLAUSES PER SENTENCE
	Free	Bound	R/S	Total		
I	43	7	2	52	38	1.37
II	42	8	4	54	25	2.16
VIII	55	11	4	70	47	1.75

From these figures it can be seen that there is little complex subordination or rankshift in the passage, and that the number of clauses per sentence is low. This lack of complexity reflects the nature of spoken language.

It is apparent that the novelist does not transcribe speech completely accurately. To do so would produce a lack of coherence in the work. Real speech is full of sounds which are irrelevant to the listener's understanding of what is being said, but which the speaker needs for various reasons, to gain time to think while speaking for example. It also contains a muddle of unfinished clauses and repetitions. I quote from a transcription of a conversation:

JOHN -Oh well we're not talking about this but I mean - er using the - um potentialities of teletlevision - to er um

MICE switch scenes and so on

JOHN and psychologically as well I mean when the when this bloke's blindfolded you see you can't see anything

because this bloke doesn't see anything - whereas on the stage well I admit - they'd have to er - dim lights and all this sort of thing - the there was a lot of - this camera work and Pinter must have had it in mind when he well probably admittedly was....

Items are repeated, pauses occur in places where they play no part in the listener's understanding of the text. Clauses are unfinished and material is interjected on the spur of the moment, when it is thought of. Sounds like "er" and "um", and nonce expressions like "well" are sprinkled liberally throughout the text. And yet when we hear such talk we understand it, and do not notice those pauses and interjections which do not contribute to the "meaning" of the speech. Ordinary speech may not be as complex grammatically as prose, but it is certainly complicated.

Steinbeck does not transcribe the pauses, interjections and repetitions as indicative of speech because they would be obtrusive in the written form. Instead, such features take on conventional 'artistic' uses and appear when they are needed to give the reader information. A pause can indicate hesitancy on the part of the speaker, repetition his inability to talk properly perhaps. Steinbeck uses various methods to make the reader feel that he is reading spoken English when in fact he is not. Clauses without predicators produce a disjointed, non-literary effect. Many of them appear as Responses e.g. "Damn right." (VIII,42) and "Jus' a dead mouse, George." (I,38). Sometimes they are used when one speaker interrupts another e.g. "An' rabbits, George." (V,20). This is similar to the role and structure of Nick's speech in the above transcription.

Another method is the use of tag structures as in "I could eat any place I want, hotel or any place." (II, 10). The tag helps to show George developing his thoughts as he goes along. The repetition of "any place" helps connect the tag to the main clause. But beside producing particular connotations, the tag is integral in the production of a form of speech in the novel which the reader can take for real conversation. The grunts that Lennie utters instead of words from time to time help in the same way e.g. "Huh" (VII, 4). The use of grunts instead of words in positions where the words are highly predictable is a feature of spoken English but not of written prose. These structural features enable Steinbeck to make the reader feel that he is reading naturalistic speech. But the speech of the novel is not naturalistic in the sense that it represents accurately the structural aspects of spoken English. Instead, it takes some of those structural features and uses them to produce a form that is sufficiently like speech for the reader to believe in it.

(ii) Sound Representation

It is well known that written English does not accurately represent the sounds of English. The same written form can cover two sounds as in "bough" and "cough", and one sound can be spelt in more than one way, as in "their" and "pair". "And" is rarely pronounced [ænd] but more often as [ən].

Modern novelists generally try and make the written form nearer graphically to the spoken form when representing certain kinds of speech, and Steinbeck is no exception. "watching" and "hiding" become "watchin'" and "hidin'" to

correspond more closely to working class usage. "and" often becomes "an." The omission of final sounds is conventionally used to represent lower class speech even when such a usage is not confined to lower class pronunciation at all. This is certainly the case with "and".

Steinbeck uses quite a wide range of conventions to indicate common speech. Instead of "must have" he writes "musta"; "out of" becomes "outa"; and "got to" becomes "Gotta". In these and other examples he is producing a form which is felt to be close to working class usage not necessarily because it is, but because such elliptic forms are conventionally associated in this manner. "Must ev" is quite common in novels using sub-standard speech, but Steinbeck notices the tendency in English towards using a general [ə] sound in word-final position, and so uses forms like "musta". He takes a widespread usage and conventionally applies it to one sector of the speech community. Sometimes whole words are missed out to correspond with speech habits rather than the formal demands of grammar. In XI, 16 for example George talks of a "little piece a little" instead of a "little piece of a little piece". Perhaps the most striking example of Steinbeck's concern with the sounds of working men's language can be seen in what at first looks like an inconsistency in his writing, the omission of final "g" in words ending in "-ing". Consistency would demand that they always be omitted as in "They ain't nothin', so nice as smoked salmon." (V, 51) But this is not always the case, "There

wouldn't be no more running round the country and getting fed by a Jap cook." (V, 40) There seems to be no reason for one word to have a final "g" and others not. That is, until we see another extract from the letter to McIntosh and Otis that was quoted from earlier:

There are curious things about the language of working men. I do not mean the local idioms, but the speech which is universal in this country among travelling workers. Nearly every man uses it individually, but it has universal rules. It is not grammatical error, but a highly developed speech form. The use of the final "g" in "ing" is tricky too. The "g" is put on for emphasis and often to finish a short hard sentence. It is sometimes used for purpose of elision but not always. Certain words like "something" rarely lose the final "g", or if they do, the word becomes "somepin" or "sompn". A man who says "thinkin'" will say "mornin'" if it comes at the end of a sentence. I tell you these things so you will understand why, in one sentence having two present participles, one "g" will be there and the other left off. This is a pretty carefully done mess. If you will read such a sentence over, aloud, you will see that it naturally falls that way.

Thus it can be seen that far from being inconsistent in his representation of the speech of working class men in California, Steinbeck has spotted a feature that others have missed.

(iii) Lexical Repetitions

In conversations the person who assumes the dominant role is usually the one who introduces new lexical items.

The dominated person will tend to use the items that the person in control gives him. Only if he tries to reverse the roles will he try to introduce new vocabulary. This is often seen in the way that people try to change the topic of conversation because they feel they are not adequate to converse on the original subject. This feature of lexical repetition in conversation can be seen in the following extract from a transcription:

- A Well did you use a two-two?
 B yes two-two
 A well three-o-three you know - the heavier one
 B they use a three-o-three as well
 A that's the one that has a slight kick
 B a three-o-three has quite a kick

In each case the first person introduces an item of vocabulary, and the second person, who is agreeing with it all, uses the same items and does not introduce any new ones. In passage I, where George is dominant, he uses the verb "remember" three times in his first five sentences. In agreeing with what he says Lennie also uses it twice in his first three sentences. It is more often the case in the novel that the conversations contain power struggles. Then the challenger would be expected to introduce new items. This can be seen in passage III for example:

"Someday-- we're gonna get the jack together and we're gonna have a little house and a couple of acres an' a cow and some pigs and---"
"An' live off the fatta the lan'!
 Lennie shouted. (V, 22, 23)

Lennie interrupts and changes the lexia completely. The verb "gonna have" is changed to "live" and the list

of concrete items that George has been expounding is completed by a more abstract concept "the fatta the lan'."

From these few general observations it can be seen that Steinbeck makes a genuine and usually successful attempt to convince the reader that he is representing accurately the speech of the men he is writing about. By doing so he helps us to believe in the characters. His written speech reflects spoken English not just in terms of sound transcription, but also in the way that the speech is structured. It should be noted however, that this process of writing "real speech" does not involve wholesale copying of the features of spoken English. The change from a spoken to a written medium involves a change of norms. Things that go unnoticed in one medium become foregrounded in another. To get round this problem the author has to omit some features that the linguist knows are typical of speech. The result is not a transcription of speech but a form which possesses some of the features of it and does a very fair job of masquerading as the real thing.

It has often been said in this thesis that Lennie is a child-like character, a simple person. But there has been no specific discussion as to how the reader gains this impression.

The most obvious pointer to Lennie's simplicity is his language. It was shown in chapter one that Lennie's speech in the passage under discussion was simpler than George's. He used less clauses per sentence, and fewer Bound and rankshifted clauses. His nominal groups were seen to be more simple and less varied than George's. Lennie also uses more Vocatives by far than any other character. He uses six in passage I, four in III and seven in V. George on the other hand uses only one in I, and none at all in the other passages where he and Lennie are having a conversation. In every case, the Vocative that Lennie uses is "George". This helps to show his insistence on getting George's attention and hence his dependence on his friend. In the fight with Curley, Lennie continually appeals to George for help. He never makes a positive action without George telling him, and is dependent on George whenever he has to make a decision. This simple dependence can be seen in Lennie's belief in the farm. The most convincing reason for his believing something is if George says so. Thus he can say, "George says I got to tend 'em. He promised." (VIII, 7, 8).

The way in which Lennie conceptualises the dream is naive in the extreme. For him, the idyllic life means being able to look after the hypothetical rabbits. Any other thought that he has about the farm is expressed by the cliché expression "We can live offa the fatta the

lan'." He uses this formula time and time again.

Lennie's lack of intellectual ability is seen particularly in passages I and IX. When George mimics him in I it becomes apparent that Lennie did not fully understand what was happening in the incident of the girl with the red dress. He could not comprehend that she could be afraid of him. The whole of passage IX shows him painstakingly working through what is a very simple series of thoughts relating to the death of the puppy.

Lennie has a child-like lack of social sense already noted in the way he continually uses the Vocative to draw George's attention to himself. Similarly, he has only one object in the conversations in which he joins in, namely to get the other people present to tell him about the dream. This can be seen in passages III, V, and VIII especially. Lennie thinks continually of the farm. He is smiling about it when Curley attacks him. This singularity of thought helps portray the simplicity of the character. George, by way of comparison, has two separate and conflicting dreams, besides his 'real' concerns - like his endeavouring to direct Lennie through life. This helps to portray him as a more complex person.

A further feature which adds to the build-up of the child-like picture of Lennie is the way in which other people regard him. George especially always treats him as a person to be painstakingly looked after and humoured. The tellings of the dream arise for

this reason:

Lennie pleaded, "Come on George.
Tell me. Please. George. Like you
done before."

"You get a kick outta that, don't
you? Awright, I'll tell you, and then
we'll eat our supper...." (p.28)

Lennie comes to be viewed as an unsophisticated character for a number of reasons which in themselves are quite complex. First of all, his language is more simple than the other main character, George; and the terms in which he thinks are shown to be naive and clichéd. Moreover, he never makes a decision himself. George has to tell him what to do, and indeed always treats him as helpless. Thus Lennie is portrayed as unsophisticated by what he says and does, and also by how the other characters in the novel view him.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following bibliography is a list of works quoted or referred to in this thesis.

- Barthes, Roland. "Introduction à L'Analyse Structural des Recits," Communications, VIII(1966), pp.28-59.
- Bolton, W.F. "Structural Criticism: An Application to Literary Prose," Archivum Linguisticum, Vol 16, Fascicule 2(1964), pp.89-95.
- Burke, Marke. A Stylistic Analysis of Eight Poems by Robert Graves, M.A. thesis (University of Birmingham 1967).
- Chatman, Seymour. "New Ways of Analysing Narrative Structure With an Example From Joyce's 'Dubliners'.", Language and Style, Vol II No 1(Winter 1969), pp.3-36.
- Corin, Fernand. "Steinbeck and Hemingway: A Study in Literary Economy, Part I," Revue des Langues Vivantes, Vol XXIV No 1(1958), pp.60-75.
- Crystal, David. "Review of 'Style and Stylistics' by Enkvist et. al.," Journal of Linguistics, Vol I No 1(April 1965), pp.173-179.
- Greenfield, S.B. "Grammar and Meaning in Poetry," PMLA, Vol LXXX No 5(October 1965), pp.377-387.
- Gregory, Michael. "Speech in 'A Tale of Two Cities'," A Review of English Literature, Vol VI No 2(April 1965), pp.42-55.
- Halliday, M.A.K. "Lexis as a Linguistic Level," In Memory of J.R.Firth, ed. C. Bazell(London 1966), pp.148-162.
- "The Linguistic Study of Literary Texts," Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists, ed. H.C. Lunt (The Hague 1964), pp.302-307.
- "Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English:Part I," Journal of Linguistics, Vol 3 No 1(April 1967), pp.37-81.

- Harris, Zellig. Structural Linguistics, (Chicago 1951, repr. 1963)
- Havranek, Bohuslav. "The Functional Differentiation of Standard Language," A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure and Style, ed. Paul L. Garvin (Washington D.C. 1964) pp. 3-16.
- Hendriks, W.O. "Three Models for the Description of Poetry," Journal of Linguistics, Vol 5 No 1 (April 1969), pp. 1-22.
- Hough, Graham. An Essay on Criticism, (London 1966)
- Jacobson, Sven. Adverbial Positions in English (Uppsala 1964).
- Jakobson, Roman. "Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics," Style and Language, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok (Cambridge, Mass. 1960)
- Jones, Charles. "Varieties of Speech Presentation in Conrad's 'The Secret Agent'," Lingua, Vol 20 No 2 (August 1968), pp. 162-176.
- Leech, G.W. A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry (London 1969).
- "Linguistics and the Figures of Rhetoric," Essays on Style and Language, ed. Roger Fowler (London 1964), pp. 135-156.
- "'This Bread I Break' - Language and Interpretation," A Review of English Literature, Vol VI No 2 (April 1965), pp. 66-75.
- Levant, H.S. A Critical Study of the Longer Fiction of John Steinbeck, Ph.D. thesis (Cornell University 1962)
- Lisca, Peter. The Art of John Steinbeck: An Analysis and Interpretation of its Development, Ph.D. thesis (University of Wisconsin 1955).
- The Wide World of John Steinbeck (New Jersey 1956)

- Marks, Lester J. A Study of Thematic Continuity in the Novels of John Steinbeck, Ph.D. thesis (Syracuse University 1961).
- Mencken, R.L. The American Language (London 1919, 4th edition with major revisions by Raven I. McDavid Jr. 1963)
- Moore, H.T. The Novels of John Steinbeck (Chicago 1939).
- Mukarovsky, Jan. "Standard Language and Poetic Language," A Prague School Reader on Esthetics, Literary Structure and Style, ed. Paul L. Garvin (Washington D.C. 1964), pp.17-30.
- Rascoe, Burton. "John Steinbeck," The English Journal Vol XXVII (March 1938).
- Riffaterre, M. "Describing Poetic Structures: Two Approaches to Baudelaire's 'Les Chats'," Yale French Studies, 36/37, pp.200-242.
- Saha, P.K. "A Linguistic Approach to Style," Style, Vol 2 No 1 (Winter 1968), pp.7-31.
- Sibley, Frank. "Aesthetic and Non-aesthetic," Philosophical Review, Vol LXXIV (1965), pp.135-159.
- Sinclair, J. McN. "Aesthetic Concepts," Philosophical Review, Vol LXXVII (1959), pp.421-450.
- Sinclair, J. McN. "A Technique of Stylistic Description," Language and Style, Vol 1 No 4 (Fall 1968), pp.215-242.
- Steinbeck, John "Beginning the Study of Lexis," In Memory of J.R. Firth, ed. C. Bazell (London 1966), pp.148-162.
- Steinbeck, John Grammar (O.U.P. 1965, unpublished), number 3 in a series called A Course in Spoken English.
- Steinbeck, John Of Mice and Men (New York 1937)
- Steinbeck, John "The novel might benefit by the discipline, the terseness of the drama The drama might achieve increased openness, freedom and versatility.....," Stage, 15 (January 1938), pp.50-51.

- Snell, G.D. The Shapers of American Fiction
(New York 1947).
- Thorne, J.P. "Stylistics and Generative Grammars,"
Journal of Linguistics, Vol 1 No 1
(April 1965), pp.49-59.
- Ullman, Stephen Style in the French Novel (London 1957).
- Wagenacht, E. Cavalcade of the American Novel
(New York 1952).
- Watt, F.W. Steinbeck (London 1962).
- Wellek, René. "Comments to Part Three," Style and Language, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok (Cambridge Mass. 1960), pp.98-105.